

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 25, 1957

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed from Friday, February 22, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply to the speech from the Throne.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt) (Continuing): — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned the debate, last Friday, we were considering what the hon. member from Weyburn (Premier Douglas) called 'the implications of progress' outlined in the Speech from the Throne. Before I go on with that discussion I would like to tell this Assembly a little bit about the constituency which I represent — that is the constituency of Humboldt.

The people of Humboldt are mostly of rural population. We stand with our feet planted firmly on the ground, but at the same time I think I can fairly say that we look ahead for progress; we look abroad for good ideas; we do not want to enter into a stalemate. At the same time we are not radical in the sense that we do not care to overthrow something merely because it exists. I feel that as an elected representative, I should speak and I should represent not only the Liberal people in Humboldt but all the people, no matter what their political colour may be. And I would not be doing justice, Mr. Speaker, to these people if I did not tell you at the outset that my people in Humboldt are not too impressed with the standard of debate in this House. My people feel that wit is not a good substitute for wisdom; they do not feel that to be clever is necessarily to be wise.

I think that the main thing my people want is justice to the individual and justice to every class. We also believe in local autonomy; and, Mr. Speaker, special privilege, political propaganda will not blind us to these concepts which we think must be kept clearly before a government if it is to give us good government. This fact is borne out by the fact that, in the last two decades, the people of Humboldt have voted out two cabinet Ministers — one a Liberal and one a C.C.F. So you see, Mr. Speaker, my people are not terribly materialistic; they cannot be bought.

February 25, 1957

It seems to me that in western Canada there is almost a tradition that during campaign speeches before an election, any political speaker must be taken with a grain of salt, and people are not too shocked if facts are slightly distorted during a campaign and in the heat of an impassioned appeal for votes; but, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that once any member has been elected and once a member is representing a constituency, he should represent all the people in that constituency no matter what their political allegiance. And even more so, I think that, once a Government has been elected, that Government should keep firmly in mind that it is the Government of Saskatchewan and not the Government of the C.C.F. voters in Saskatchewan. So I resent, Mr. Speaker, as do a great many other people in the province of Saskatchewan, the fact that when the Premier gets up he says that the C.C.F. will spend \$100 million on a provincial highways program, that the C.C.F. will contribute an average of \$3 million a year for municipal roads. The C.C.F., Mr. Speaker, will not be spending any of its money in Saskatchewan on roads – not the C.C.F. party. It is this Assembly on behalf of all the people in Saskatchewan that will vote that money, and it is the money of those people, all those people in Saskatchewan, that will be spent.

I think it is necessary for good debate, for good government, to keep party concepts and government concepts separate and clearly distinguished when necessary. The Leader of the Opposition stated (and I think most correctly) that it is significant when a government of this province presents a Speech from the Throne at a time when we are faced with agricultural depression and that government has no suggestions to meet this problem. If Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the leading agricultural province of Canada, does not offer solutions for this problem of agricultural depression, who will?

Mr. McDonald gave the Government a 16-point program which would assist agriculture and which would assist every farmer in this province, and they are the people who need the help. Is the Government going to pay any attention to Mr. McDonald's proposal? Well, if the attitude in the Premier's speech was any indication, they will not. The Premier said:

“During the past 10 years Saskatchewan enjoyed a period of industrial development unequalled in its history. A strong agricultural economy was supplemented by a non-agricultural economy.”

Before I go on to give you a few figures that might clarify this very pretty, this very rosy, picture, I would like to tell you, sir, that this idea of our Premier accepting with open arms progress and industrial development, reminds me of that little historical interlude between Margaret Fuller (who was an American writer and a rather dramatic personality) and Thomas Carlyle, an English writer. Margaret Fuller said one day, very dramatically: “I accept the Universe,” and Thomas Carlyle turned around and said, “Well, gad, she'd better!” I don't think we have much choice. In Saskatchewan no matter what government we have, we are going to accept progress because, as

the Premier pointed out, we are not a little island; we live in a country that during the last 10 years has had a wonderful, an almost inflated, economy. There has been great prosperity, great industrial development in Canada. Surely some of it is going to float over into Saskatchewan!

But let's check the figures used by the Premier. First of all, as to the Premier's population figures, no matter how these figures are juggled, subtracted, multiplied or anything else, one fact remains and it is that we do not, in Saskatchewan, keep our natural increase in Saskatchewan. As everybody in this province knows, we are losing to other provinces and to other parts of the country, young people and teachers and we are not getting the same number back from other parts of the country. That fact cannot be shaken away.

His second point was industrial development. There is no question, and I would be the last person to deny it, that within the last 10 years we in Saskatchewan have had some industrial development. It does not matter how unfavourable the political atmosphere in a province is, as I said before, if the entire nation is healthy and prosperous we are going to have some expansion, some small bit of prosperity. Let us see what actually this prosperity amounts to. In the Premier's desperate attempt to make Saskatchewan not suffer industrial stagnation in its picture under Socialist Government, the Premier quoted figures from the publication of the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce on Private and Public Investments, Supplement 20. The Premier said that it is a good gauge of progress or industrial development to see how much money has been invested in Saskatchewan, as compared with other provinces. Unfortunately, the figures that the Premier quoted (that is, the figures of \$514 million) is not, as you might think from his words, the figure for industrial investment in Saskatchewan. It is the figure for all investments; and if you try and break that figure down you will see what a large part of that is purely private investment, and what a large part of it is Government investment. For certainly if the Government is going to build buildings, those figures will show in this general figure. But is that an indication of industrial development?

I think it would be fairer to look at another figure in the same book that the Premier could hardly have missed, and those are the figures for investments and manufacturing. Those figures are given in that book for the year 1956. They are on the same page as the figures that the Premier suggested, and these, Mr. Speaker, are the figures: In Alberta, the amount invested in manufacturing was \$121 million. Compare that with Saskatchewan's \$13 ½ million. In Manitoba, the amount invested in manufacturing for 1956 was \$37 million. Compare that with Saskatchewan's \$13 ½ million. The picture isn't quite so rosy.

Another good way to know how much manufacturing, how much industrial development there is, is to look at the number of people who are employed in the manufacturing industry. What are the figures? Manitoba, in 1956, had 41,000 employed; Alberta had 34,658 persons employed. What did Saskatchewan have? A little over 11,000 – 11,499 persons employed in manufacturing! This figure is actually less than the number of persons

February 25, 1957

who were employed in manufacturing when our Socialist Government took office. Take those three things together: Investment in manufacturing is greater in Alberta and greater in Manitoba than it is in Saskatchewan; Alberta has three times and Manitoba has four times the number of people that we in Saskatchewan – there are fewer now than there were in 1944. From those figures who but a Socialist can see great industrial expansion? And, Mr. Speaker, there are few Socialists in the province of Saskatchewan outside of those innermost councils of the C.C.F. Government and the C.C.F. party.

Then the Premier gets another brush and another figure, or a batch of them, and he adds another rosy tint to this beautiful picture.

“Excluding fuel, total mineral production for Manitoba and Alberta combined in 1956 was \$73,600,000. But Saskatchewan...(these figures are so bad I almost got them lost)...Saskatchewan alone produced \$80,500,000 in this category.”

Why, Mr. Speaker, did the Premier exclude fuel? Was it because Alberta produces many more times the amount of fuel than we do in Saskatchewan? Let's take a fairer way of comparing it. Let's take all the minerals inclusive for 1956, and then the picture is slightly different, for the value of production in Saskatchewan is then \$114 million, and Manitoba and Alberta together total \$475 ½ million. That is quite a difference, Mr. Speaker, and it is quite a different picture if you don't pick your figures with such great care.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the Premier is standing on the border of Saskatchewan and trying to chase industry out. Of course he's not. He knows, as knows everybody else, that we cannot have a successful, self-contained economy in Saskatchewan unless we do have industry. And on one hand our Government officials go ahead and invite industry in; (in fact, some unscrupulous people might say they 'bribe' industry to come in), and on the other hand, they have a now famous section in The Crown Corporations Act which allows them to confiscate that industry. They have the 'Regina Manifesto' – that ball and chain that they have been trying desperately to shake off and haven't quite succeeded; and they have this beautiful new document called the 'Winnipeg Declaration of Principles' in which, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to find a principle. There are a lot of lovely concepts, concepts on which everyone in a democracy agrees: all people should be fed; all people should be happy. Those are wonderful concepts and certainly we in the Opposition would never disagree with raising the standard of living in Saskatchewan, in Canada or the entire world. I think that is almost self-evident.

The only clause that still interests me that is of any substance is the second last paragraph of this Declaration, and this is what it says:

“Democratic Socialism has achieved a place in the world which its founders could have hardly envisaged.”

I can see, Mr. Speaker, why they wouldn't have envisaged...

“Many labour and socialist parties have administered or participated in the Governments of their country...(and this is the vital part, Mr. Speaker)...as one of these democratic Socialist parties.”

And so on, and so forth. Now, isn't that the important thing – our Government is still a Socialist government no matter how they shade it, and no matter how many sections they may revoke. If those principles which should remain constant in a party, if that party is to have any political or philosophical significance whatsoever, if those principles remain socialistic, how can we compare favourably in industrial development with any other province in Canada? We cannot.

It isn't the words of the Premier; it isn't the flowery invitations he might extend to Conferences that is going to bring industry in. It is the political atmosphere. I would just like to read one or two statements that show the political atmosphere that has existed in Saskatchewan which statements show in themselves why we haven't got the industry our natural resources call for. In 1946, the C.C.F. Provincial Convention said (and it is reported in 'The Commonwealth' of August 7, 1946):

“Whereas the existence of natural gas and oil in commercial quantities in the province of Saskatchewan has been proven conclusively.”

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Premier in his speech on this debate said that Imperial Oil gave them a statement saying that the exploration in Saskatchewan was very disappointing. Apparently the news wasn't broken to the C.C.F. Convention, because they still think that the possibilities are very good. To go on with this:

“And whereas the C.C.F. as a Socialist Party believes in and advocates the public ownership of the natural resources of this province for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan...” and so on.

And then the vital clause:

“Be it therefore resolved that we urge our Government to take steps towards the implementation of the C.C.F. policy for the development and distribution of natural gas and oil

February 25, 1957

under public ownership and control and for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.”

That is the political atmosphere in which companies were to come in and explore. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one reason why we have some small amount of industrial development is because industrial concerns, big investments, know that soon the time of the Socialists will be ended in Saskatchewan and they can proceed to really go to town in exploration and development.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Official Opposition have at no time advocated that government should be the tool of big business. As a matter of fact, anti-trust laws, laws against monopoly, were put into effect by a Liberal government. The Liberal concept of a good sound economy is one where there is freedom in the market place, but a fair type of freedom – not where one big corporation has undue advantage over little people. Now, what is the situation in Saskatchewan? It will not be long if this Government stays in power, Mr. Speaker, before the biggest business in Saskatchewan will be the C.C.F. Government – and who is to protect us against them? Certainly not the Government itself; and with their great love for Government Boards, it won't be long before our courts will be sufficiently discredited that they will be in no position to protect us against the Government, but this Government will make the law, will administer the law and will judge us according to that law. That is the basic concept of Socialism – where the state owns all and rules all.

I think that the seating arrangement in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, will be ever so much better when Mr. McDonald occupies the position presently held by the Premier. Mr. McDonald has a policy for agriculture. He has ideas of how to help that class in Saskatchewan that needs help, and the Premier will be able to use all his wit and venom in the Opposition, where it will do the people of Saskatchewan some good.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, the opportunity of speaking on the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne is appreciated by my constituents, and it is my opportunity to present to this House the views and the needs and grievances of my constituency. Members of this Legislature must all remember that from the Government side must come good, sound plans for improving conditions, that is, pertaining to the difficulties that they proclaim are so evident in this province. For that side of the House is the government of this province and that is where these attempts to alleviate these same problems should come from.

(You know, I was told a few days ago that one of the most difficult things to do was to address this Legislature, and I am inclined to believe that it is rather difficult.)

I remember in my boyhood days of coming to this fair city of Regina and while in the city taking the opportunity of visiting the Legislature, and I remember as a child walking through the vast corridors of this

Legislative building and appreciating the serene atmosphere that was prevalent throughout the building. At that particular time the Legislature was in session and I had the opportunity of sitting in the gallery and looking down into this Chamber. I stood there spellbound and in awe of all the serene atmosphere and the dignity that was in this House. When I went back home I explained, or had the occasion to explain, to my classmates what I had seen. And the teacher went further on to explain to us that from all walks of life, from all parts of the province, people are gathered here to legislate and to make the laws that we should abide by. In junior minds it is realized and thought that these men, these great men, are the men that we, or at that time the juniors, should look up to. Then the years went on and we grew up believing that this Legislature was what we called, or were supposed to call, the shining example of men. Then, for some reason or other, radio was elected into this Legislature (I like to use that term), but from what constituency I don't know. In any event he came here and he let out into the world all the wonderful things that happened in the Government; but, Mr. Speaker, some of the very childish and abusive phrases that came out, especially from the Ministers of the Crown – such very abusive phrases and words, Mr. Speaker, as “juvenile delinquent,” “not dry behind the years yet,” coming from the top men from the Government side, accusing one of the eldest gentlemen in this Legislature, a man who has served this province for nigh on to twenty-some years, using such vile and abusive language as “senile decay.” Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what has happened to this Government? What views do you expect our junior citizens to have when we should be setting an example, and when we have such goings on?

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating you on your appointment to your office. From my previous experience of watching and hearing you, I know that you, with your background, your gentlemanly background, will bring back the dignity that this Legislature so much deserves.

I would like to take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of this House some of the most glaring neglect of this Government insofar as my constituency is concerned. Mr. Speaker, you do know that last year was an election year, and traditional to the actions of this Government a tremendous number of men were going over the province with measuring tapes and pegs, driving all over the country, giving the impression that there was going to be a tremendous amount of road work. Shortly after that the odd bit of machinery came around...

Mr. Loptson: — During the election, I suppose.

Mr. Coderre: — During the election is right. There were a couple of trucks; I am referring, sir, to the actions that were going on, on No. 2 Highway. Anyhow, after all this pegging (and I don't mean at cribbage), and the election was over, what happened to these work crews? They were gone! I presume they went into some of the holes that are still left on that highway. For the record I would like to bring a point out – unfortunately the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) is not here; I am sure that he probably could ask the Minister of Highways for a little activity in that Department, because a great part of that road is in his constituency.

February 25, 1957

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are talking of establishing a Department of Travel and Information. Do you know that I believe that the best travel and information that we could have would be a little more action, say, on roads, and a little less talk; and I am sure that the tourists would find much better use for it. Incidentally, we now come to the point of another road in my constituency; and, of course, that reminds me of some of the experiences I had while overseas. I remember from the Normandy beaches trudging across France, and on many occasions the enemy was sort of making the situation a little tough for us and I must say that we were very, very thankful to find these old French roads, you know, three or four or five feet below the grade level; and at that time I am sure we were very glad that they were there. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I appreciate seeing it here in Saskatchewan, particularly in my constituency!

You know we go a few miles north of Hodgeville and then we start to go into the underground. Well, I don't know, sir, but that road was built some thirty-odd years ago, and I haven't seen very much work done on it. I don't know whether the Government is expecting any activities from over the cap or not, but they show at least they have that concern to protect us in case of enemy action.

Another point I would like to mention here is that I am sure, with probably a little assistance on the part of the member from Morse (Mr. Gibson), the hon. Minister of Highways might take into consideration considering this road in his estimates for the next year, because this No. 19 Highway not only serves my constituency, but it serves a good part of the southwest of the province. I have a request to make to the hon. Minister of Highways at this point, Mr. Speaker, and that is the question of considering the municipalities in my constituency. You know, many municipalities in my constituency – and this not only applies to this particular constituency, but it is quite evident throughout this province – are so isolated from roads, in case of emergency, where they have to go and get repairs or they have to go and get medical attention. This Government proclaims that they are the 'humanity' government, and still they are prepared to leave many, and a greater part of the municipalities in this province, completely isolated from medical attention. I feel, sir, that the Minister of Highways should certainly consider giving assistance to these municipalities which are in that unfortunate situation. I might suggest to the hon. Minister of Highways that, after the wonderful winter we have had, which has cut down snow removal costs – in fact it has lessened those costs to practically nothing – I am sure that the money that he has left from last year's estimate could take care of the money necessary to assist these municipalities.

When we take into consideration the plan that we in the Liberal party have insofar as roads are concerned, I am confident that such a plan would be very practical and that the building of the secondary highway system would be completely carried out by the Provincial Government, if the hon. gentlemen would only realize that responsibility for roads in the province is not the responsibility of the Federal Government but of the Provincial Government. I would like to explain, Mr. Speaker, where the funds are to come from.

First you will take in the average part of the year the roads are in reasonably fair shape, but once early spring comes along the mud sort of gets the best of us and then traffic is at a standstill. Then winter; we usually find the roads are blocked up and there is no travel whatever, and we all know that when there is no travel on the roads of Saskatchewan there are no funds coming into the treasury. Now if we had the roads built to the standards that the Liberal party has strongly advocated – we call them the ‘secondary highways’, the Government calls them the ‘grid system’ – we feel that this road should be built completely and entirely from provincial funds. As I have explained, Mr. Speaker, for about four months of the year – and I think we are pretty well all agreed that our municipal roads are closed for approximately three to four months of the year – the revenue from the Gasoline Tax in that period of eight months is approximately \$19 million, that is, insofar as the records show in 1954-55; of course that includes licences. Now our revenue of eight months is close to \$19 million, surely the extra four months of travel would give an additional revenue for the treasury of anywhere from \$5 million to \$7 million in excess of that. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite evident that these additional funds the treasury will build, and can build, a secondary highway system. If this Government cannot do that to help alleviate the problems and the tax burdens that they have created upon the municipalities of this province, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they get out and leave the job to somebody else, somebody who can do something in this province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, previous governments in this province used to build and maintain the municipal bridges. This Government here can only put into effect a plan to load our municipalities with additional tax burdens by throwing – yes, I said, ‘throwing’ – and loading on to them the responsibility of building and maintaining those bridges.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is not the point I am trying to bring out. The point that I am trying to bring out is that all actions insofar as this Government is concerned towards our rural municipalities have been to throw back to them a greater additional tax burden. I would like to know if that is not part of the so-called planned economy they speak so much about. You know in their planned economy they seem to be planning; they seem to have an ulterior motive in it; and I think I can sort of visualize the end if they keep on with their actions in this province. The end will mean that they will own all the land, as is their basic Socialist plan. And that is it, Mr. Speaker; and they suggest and give the lame excuse that Ottawa does not give them enough. I suggest to the hon. gentlemen across the floor that they do not bite, or should not bite, the hand that feeds them.

Within the boundaries of my constituency we have the town of Gravelbourg with its many institutions which have been a tourist attraction for many years. The paintings in the church, incidentally, are probably second to none on the North American continent. The reason I am bringing

this out at this point is because I was sort of dealing on roads here, but I have another request, Mr. Speaker, to make of the Minister of Highways, and it is that he should take into consideration in his estimates again this year (if it has not been done), to consider No. 43 Highway east and west of the area of Gravelbourg. There is a two-fold purpose in asking for that, sir, and one is that that is the eastern outlet for the southwest part of the province as well as that being a road that the Saskatchewan Transportation Company uses twice daily. I hope that the hon. Minister of Corporations makes use of that road, and I am sure they wouldn't like us to say that they have been losing money, particularly on some routes. So, in order to facilitate their travel, assistance on that road would be greatly appreciated.

I noticed in the Premier's Speech from the Throne he was inferring that, in a special session in 1944, the purpose of his Government was to raise the standard of living for all the people of Saskatchewan. I must admit that the standard of living has been raised, that is, in comparison to the conditions existing in the 'thirties. But I am sure that these conditions were not brought on by any government of Canada or of the province. These conditions, Mr. Speaker, and all of you here know it, existed throughout the world. Now in any event, the C.C.F. party has been hollering 'blue ruin' and 'blue murder' ever since they have been in here. They have been hollering that depression is around the corner, conditions are bad, and that the standard of living is down. Well if, according to the hon. Premier, the standard of living is down, then I say this Government has failed, as they promised to raise the standard of living; and I have only one suggestion to make in these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and that is for them to get out, and again (I repeat) let somebody else do the job.

Another rather amusing thing that I heard the other day was when the hon. Premier was speaking. He was so magnifying the conditions and phrases as to give the impression that this Government was instrumental in bringing the wonderful surplus of wheat and the wonderful growing conditions that have prevailed in this province. I would like to ask the hon. Premier, just who does he think he is to give that impression that things are so beautiful? For taking the credit for growing these beautiful, wonderful crops and giving us this beautiful surplus of wheat that we have? Mr. Speaker, there is only one group of people to whom we can give credit for these conditions as they are, and that is to the farmers themselves for having improved their methods to where they can produce more and more wheat. But first, and last, and not least, the credit is to the good Lord for having blessed us, sir, with the conditions that we have had these last few years, and not to the Government as the hon. Premier was inferring the other day.

There is another thing that he referred to, the other day, which I thought was rather amusing in view of the fact of the conditions that this Government has allowed to exist over the past few years – well, we'll get on to that in a few minutes anyway. It was in respect to a statement made in the 'Leader-Post' by Dr. Link. The hon. Leader of the Government went to elaborate means to try and discredit our Leader here, on this

side. I will just ask you, Mr. Speaker, would any company or any organization, like the Imperial Oil, ever dare to agree with a statement like that, when they are operating in a province that has legislation such as Section 8 in The Crown Corporation Act? Act for the record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote this Act. Section 8 reads:

“That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may be a member of the Executive Council designated for the purpose, and without the consent of the owner or any persons interested therein, enter upon, take possession of and expropriate and use any land and any works used in the operation of any industrial or commercial enterprises or undertaking carried on in Saskatchewan where, in the opinion of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the taking of land and works is necessary for the operation of any business to be operated by a Corporation to be constituted under the authority of this Act.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, is this not the greatest threat to any business in this province, especially taking into consideration the fundamental background, or the philosophy of the party, when they were first organized in 1933, which was to confiscate all business for the Crown? How can we expect any industry to take the additional risks under conditions like that?

It has been the policy of the Liberal party to rescind, take out and throw out this section of the Act ever since it has been written into the books of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government has at last seen the light. The Government admit, by their action, that the Liberal party was right after all. They have repealed, or they are in the process of repealing, this section, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it will come into effect April 1. I hope that what I am saying now is not going to be instrumental in the Government forgetting about the Third Reading of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think people wonder what the C.C.F. Government is going to do to quieten the elements within their ranks that so want the Crown to confiscate all the interests in this province. I wonder what they are going to do. I believe that, when spring comes along and the hon. members across the floor go out to inhale some of the spring breezes, they will realize there is an ill wind blowing in the air. Were it not for the fact that it would not be proper parliamentary procedure I would be inclined to suggest three rousing cheers for the Liberal Opposition, who, for the last twelve years, have been constantly going after this Government and have at last had this Government, or made this Government, realize that Section 8 should be repealed.

The hon. Premier has the uncanny knack of manipulating figures and using fancy words to the extent that statements that he makes are not actually true; and yet it is not possible, sir, to call him a – well, I don't know; there is a word there that I don't want to use; but I don't

believe, Mr. Speaker, that he is actually bringing the true facts to light. However, I wish to bring out a few misrepresentations insofar as base metal products are concerned. The hon. Premier, the other day, mentioned in his speech that in 1955 we produced \$53.4 million of metallic minerals and in 1956, \$73.4 million. (These figures, Mr. Speaker, may not be wrong). Then he goes on to pay great tribute to the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources for having our mineral resources developed. What does he mean by that? Does he mean that the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources is instrumental in raising the prices of minerals, or is he trying to distort the figures that the people of Saskatchewan hear this – appear in the answer to a question that was asked here in this Legislature, the other day, on February 21, 1957, and I will quote, sir, from the ‘Votes and Proceedings’. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier goes on in his speech and gives the impression, or tries to give the impression, that the mineral production in this province has increased I don’t know how many times; I don’t remember whether he mentioned how many times. But, sir, on February 21, Mr. Cameron asked the Government the following question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

“For each of the fiscal years 1943-44, 1954-55 and 1955-56, what was (a) the number of pounds of base metals produced, (b) the number of ounces of gold and silver produced, (c) the number of pounds of other metals?”

The answer, Mr. Speaker, and it is the official word of this Government – now I don’t know who is the official word; but I shall keep on quoting, Mr. Speaker:

	<u>1943-44</u>	<u>1954-55</u>	<u>1955-56</u>
Base metals (lbs)	178,096,301	176,551,975	159,843,775
Gold (ozs)	159,385	101,660	81,250

”

I fail to see where there is an increase in production in this province.

Mr. Cameron: — About half!

Mr. Coderre: — And then on top of that the hon. Premier gives credit to the Minister of Mineral Resources for raising the price! And then we go on to silver, Mr. Speaker:

“Silver (ozs)	2,566,342	1,456,126	1,204,289”
---------------	-----------	-----------	------------

In other words, the records show that our production of silver is down to half what it was when there was a Liberal government in power in this province. I wouldn’t venture to say what has happened to the other half.

Mr. McDonald: — Gone underground.

Mr. Coderre: — Now, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Premier was mentioning the other day he was probably quoting something on uranium, but for some reason or other the information in regard to uranium is not available and we cannot tell you the number of ounces.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, was that an increase in mineral production? From what I can gather, and from what I have just quoted, there seems to be a definite decrease in the number of pounds or ounces of metals; and then the hon. Premier claimed that we have been developing mineral resources in this province at a tremendous pace. I would like again to quote from the ‘Votes and Proceedings’ in order to put on the records that I don’t believe we have increased in that regard. Mr. Korchinski asked – and in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, unless it is absolutely necessary that I quote in full I am not going to quote the whole text; Mr. Korchinski asked the Government the following question, which is in two parts:

“How many base metal mines have been brought into production since 1944, other than Eldorado Mining & Refining Ltd.?”

“What are the names of the Companies in the mining production, as well as their location?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question says there are seven. That is the figure that this Government quotes – seven. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to say that there are not seven. We know quite well that there are seven mines in this province; but the point is that the hon. Premier went on to give the credit to the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources for having increased the production of minerals in this province. Well I am very certain, Mr. Speaker, that the production of uranium in this province has not been the responsibility of this Government across the floor, but the Federal Government is the one that required that. It required uranium for its national defence, and it is the Federal Government – a Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, - that made it possible for these uranium mines to develop in this province. As far as I can see, and the record is here, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company seems to be the only one that is producing copper, zinc and a few of these items, and that company, Mr. Speaker, (and it is the only one that I see), has been producing in this province ever since a Liberal government was in this province a few years ago.

From what I gather we find that the hon. Premier has been manipulating his phrases and his words to the extent that he is trying to confuse the people of Saskatchewan, and I just thought that I should take the advantage in trying the best way I could to show what sort of a man he is, in trying...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member is out of order in ascribing motives to a speaker on the other side of the House. You stated that the Premier had been manipulating figures in order to confuse

the people of Saskatchewan. That is not in order.

Mr. Coderre: — Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the statement. It is probably the fact of my racial origin, but I sometimes have difficulty under stress and duress in expressing myself just the way I would like to. This was to be my last punch, but since I punched myself down, I'll stay down. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I am in a position to support the motion.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): —Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I join with my colleagues in congratulating you on the high office you now hold.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Leader of the Official Opposition, the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), for his excellent presentation in pointing out the very unfavourable position of the farmers and small businessmen due to policies and lack of policies of the C.C.F. Government and previous C.C.F. Governments in this province.

It is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to represent one of the oldest settled areas of this province, the Constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. It is comprised of an area running from Fillmore to Cedoux, Colfax and Sedley in the south; from Glenavon west to Vibank along the C.N.R. line; from west of Grenfell through to McLean on the main line of the C.P.R., and bordered on the north by the historic Qu'Appelle River along which you will find many of the most beautiful holiday resorts in this province. I want to take the opportunity at this time of inviting you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this Chamber and their wives and families to come and see and enjoy with us one of nature's truly beauty spots. I am sure that we will see that you have a good time, and it will be something that will impress your memories and make you want to come back with us again.

In addition to what has been provided by nature, due to the foresight and industry of some of our foremost citizens of the past, we have the man-made beauty attraction of the Forest Nursery Station and the Experimental Farm, both at Indian Head. Full picnic facilities are provided at both of these places. People from different countries of the world visit these institutions each year. To those people interested in agriculture, I would especially draw your attention to the Experimental Farm, where the latest technical and scientific data on farming methods, cereal grain varieties, crop rotation methods, horticulture, livestock and various products may be viewed. In this constituency we have a wide range of soil types. The heavy gumbo type land is to be found on the main line of the C.P.R. and also in the districts around Francis, Sedley and Colfax. Then we have our lighter soil zones to the south. Our farmers have adjusted their type of farming accordingly, so we find areas of straight grain farming and areas

devoted to mixed farming. Then, we are in the Regina milk shed area, and as a result we have quite a dairy industry. With a diversification such as this, we have some of the top registered seed growers in this province, some of the best dairy herds in the province, some of the best beef herds and swineherds in Saskatchewan.

At this point I want to go back and pay tribute to my Liberal predecessor who represented this area in the House, and I refer to the late F.M. (Fred) Dundas. Realizing the problems confronting the people of my Committee today, I think it is an appropriate time to pay my personal respects and the respects of those people I now represent to the memory of my Liberal predecessor, who for many years represented the part of Saskatchewan that I now represent. While he was a member he continuously brought to the attention of the Government of the day, be it a Liberal Government, be it a Conservative Government or be it a C.C.F. Government, the pressing problems of his people. He served them, and he served them well, during that period referred to as the 'hungry thirties'. No request was too small and none too large but received his attention. If he thought he could help out, he did so. His help to the sick and the hungry, giving feed and seed to the farmers, and food and clothing for the children and families, and the endless list of things will always be remembered. No man anywhere ever served his people better. For all he has done for myself, for all he has done for my constituents, for the service he has rendered to the people all over this province, I mention this in order that we may register our appreciation in the official records of this province.

We are fortunate in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley to have the Interprovincial Pipe Line as well as the pumping station at Glenavon, and, despite the C.C.F. part 'filibustering' at Ottawa, we now have the Trans-Canada Gas Line going through our seat from the west to the east. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that these two projects alone mean a great deal to our municipalities in the form of tax revenues. In the field of recreation, practically all of our hamlets, villages and towns have curling rinks. They have turned out in the past and are at the present turning out a share of the top curlers in this province. Then, too, we have our hockey leagues, one of which is the Triangle League. It is the largest league in the province playing intermediate "C" hockey, and in turn, the Intermediate "B" group is the largest group in the world. I mention that because I think that that is quite a record.

Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is in the main an agricultural constituency. The welfare of the merchants, the professional men, and the businessmen, etc., in the towns, villages and hamlets, depends to a very large degree on the economic position of the farmers. While we hear loud claims by this Government of oil, industrial and mineral developments, I would point out to you, sir, that so far none of this development has taken place within our borders. Therefore, it is my duty to point out some of the problems and conditions facing my constituents at the present time, many of which would apply to farmers and businessmen throughout other areas of this province.

February 25, 1957

We still have a very serious market road problem. Many of our farmers, after having lived on their farms and paid various taxes for over 50 years, still do not have adequate roads to get their grain, their livestock and livestock products to market for extended periods each year.

We also have a specific highway problem. I would like to draw your attention to Highway No. 16, running through the centre of this constituency. This highway serves a large market area. Prior to the C.C.F. Government coming to office in 1944, it was regarded as one of the best highways in this province. Since then, however, due to insufficient maintenance and repair, along with weather conditions, it has deteriorated to a point where spring and summer maintenance, plus snow removal in winter, adds up to a sum which would now justify a complete new building project. Not only does it serve the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, it would also serve the people of Cannington, and the people of Lumsden. I point that out to you, sir, and trust that the Government will, in its estimates, make recognition of this fact.

In the meantime, I would draw to your attention the inconvenience caused to the people of Odessa and Kendal through flooding caused by obstructions and lack of culverts in the present highway. Representation has been made, I understand, to some hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is hoped they will take measures to alleviate this situation.

There is much more I would like to say regarding my constituency, and its people, but I will have to leave this until a later date, due to the very limited amount of radio time allotted by this Government to the Opposition. And I am sure that my constituents would, in the radio time I have available to me, want me to bring to your attention, sir, some of the major problems affecting them in particular, and the people of Saskatchewan in general.

Agriculture is the basic industry in this province, and will continue to be for some time in the future. Farming is the biggest business in Saskatchewan today. Our farmers are shrewd, practical businessmen. On the success or failures of the farming industry depends the success or failures of the allied industries in our hamlets, villages and towns. Break the backs of the farmers of this province financially, and practically all the business men in the smaller hamlets, villages and towns will have to fold up.

The hon. members opposite are continually crying about the condition of the farmer in this province. Let us examine the records and see what they have done or are doing to do about it. Let us compare the treatment they have given the farmers with that of other groups. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is barer than Mother Hubbard's cupboard as far as agriculture is concerned.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — The farmers of this province have had the door slammed in their faced by this Government. The only thing they can offer agriculture in the Speech is that “a clearing and breaking irrigation and drainage program will be submitted.” It is now apparent, Mr. Speaker, that no relief from the crushing tax-burden of Socialism is in sight. The hon. Premier rose in this place, help up his little election program, and stated, in effect:

“This we submitted to the people of the province. They returned us to power – farmers must be satisfied.”

I have before me a list of the election results of last June, and previous elections, Mr. Speaker, and it is interesting to note that in the 1952 election the hon. Premier received 59.8 per cent of the total vote in the Weyburn constituency. Last year the eligible vote in his constituency increased by 1,436, and in spite of this, he only received 42 per cent of the total vote, or a decrease of nearly 20 per cent from 1952. He didn't even hold the natural increase. The combined opposition vote in his seat shows he was beaten by 474 votes. Surely, then, this shows, according to his reasoning, that more people rejected his platform than accepted it. Then in sight of the predominantly agricultural seats, his former colleagues were voted out. The hon. member for Moosomin, Leader of this group, had a majority of 1,150 over the C.C.F. candidate, and in that seat a combined majority of 3,225 rejected the C.C.F. platform. This same pattern follows throughout the vast majority of the rural constituencies of the province.

What are the reasons for this? There are a number of reasons. The members of this group in the Legislature have pointed out to the Government for years the rank discrimination against farmers by imposing on them the 3 per cent Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuels, oils and grease. Farm organizations have, time after time, met with Government representatives and pointed out to them the unfairness of the tax. We have stressed the fact that the farmers are the only group who are being forced to pay a tax on a producer's article. Every time the price of farm fuel goes up, you can depend on some C.C.F.ers making a great issue of the fact; but we have never yet heard one of them mention that the Government's share of the revenue is also increased. At long last, Mr. Speaker, we have at least convinced two hon. members opposite that it should be cancelled. In his remarks the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) passed it off lightly by stating it only amounts to about \$10 per year per farmer. I would invite the hon. member to come to my constituency and try and tell that to the farmers there. Then, the hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) passed his judgment by stating it only amounts to about \$1,000,000 per year. The hon. Premier makes a great story of the tremendous increase in revenues from industrial development during the last ten years, rising up to where it is near \$20,000,000 today. Surely then, now is the time to abolish this nuisance to the businessmen, and one of rank discrimination to the farmers of this province.

Let us examine the policy of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation as it affects the rural people. Here again, the farmers of this province are pushed off to one side and forced to pay on the average \$550 to have power hooked up. The farmer owns no part of the equipment. If at a later date he had the power disconnected, then the Power Corporation have the right to take back the transformer, wire, poles, etc.; the farmer does not get his \$550 refunded. Compare this to the Manitoba system, where power is brought to the farmer's yard without cost to him, and at the same time, he has the benefit of much cheaper consumption rates than the Saskatchewan farmer.

I have before me a list of comparative farm rates that I would, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, like to read. In Manitoba, for the first 50-kilowatt hours that the farmer uses, he pays \$3.60. In Saskatchewan, it is \$5.15, or an increase of 43 per cent. The Manitoba farmer pays for the first 100 kilowatt hours \$4.50; the Saskatchewan farmer \$6.90, an increase of 53.3 per cent. For the first 300 kilowatt hours, the Manitoba farmer pays \$6.75; the Saskatchewan farmer \$11.38, or an increase of 72 per cent more than the Manitoba farmer, and the scale follows this pattern from 400 to 600 to 800, 1,000, to 1,200, etc.

I have with me here power bill receipts from Manitoba farmers. Here is one, dated February 29, 1956, for 940 kilowatt hours consumed, \$12.51. Compare that with the bill of a Saskatchewan farmer. I have another one here, August 31, 1954, for 386 kilowatts consumed, a total bill of \$6.86; and so forth down the line. I am sure that the farmers of Saskatchewan realize, as we in the Opposition have pointed out, the tremendous difference in the initial cost of the electrification program and the tremendous difference in rates between the two provinces, and the tremendous saving that the Manitoba farmer has over the farmer in Saskatchewan.

It is interesting to note that here in Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is a monopoly. We would almost think by the amount of advertising that is done, that we had very serious competition in this province by some other groups, because we are forever hearing 'Amos and Andy', and I don't know whether it is 'Maw Perkins', (or is she supported by them?) and square dancing, and so on. I was interested, too, Mr. Speaker, to have before me a question which was asked by Mr. Lopton (or was it Mr. Sam Carr?) during the last session, when he asked the Government what total amount was spent by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to advertise on the radio, television and in the press and by other methods, in connection with the recent reduction in power rates, and you will remember at that time a great amount of publicity was put over the press and radio of this province announcing a reduction of a half-cent a kilowatt on anything used over 300 kilowatts. The answer to that was \$9,136.71, and I don't imagine that, in the district I live in, there are two farmers who would get the benefit of that reduction. Yet there was spent \$9,136.71 to try and convince the people that they were being quite lenient towards them.

Here is another very interesting thing, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Loptson asked the Government the following question, which was answered by the then Hon. Mr. Darling:

“What amount has been spent each year from 1948 to 1955 inclusive by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and/or the Saskatchewan Power Commission, for advertising and publicity, including radio fees, television fees, advertisements, preparation of such advertising and publicity itself?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is very, very interesting. In 1948 the amount was \$3,567, and that was election year 1948. In 1949, it had dropped down to \$1,122; in 1950 it had risen up again to \$4,558, and in 1951 up from \$4,000 to over \$35,000.

Mr. Loptson: — Election year.

Mr. McFarlane: — Oh, no, the election was in 1952; but wait – it was over \$65,977, but then the election is over. In 1953 the election was over, and we go back in 1953 to down to \$63,000. In 1954 – well, something must have happened; they are up again to \$75,000. But when was the next election?

Mr. McDonald: — 1956.

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes, 1956. In 1955 something must have happened again, it wasn't \$75,000; it wasn't \$80,000; it wasn't \$100,000, but it had risen to \$116,427. Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, when we add up those figures we find out that it amounted to \$365,152 and some odd cents, and surely some of that money could have gone towards a rural electrification program to help alleviate the tax-burden and the high cost of farming in this province today.

Mr. McDonald: — Why do they advertise?

Mr. Cameron: — They like to hear themselves talk.

Mr. McFarlane: — We have continued to point out to this Government their very unfair treatment of the farmers with their rural electrification system. We have always maintained a system should have been inaugurated in this province the same as in Manitoba. Apparently they now realize that themselves, but refuse to do anything about it.

I want to read, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, a press clipping at the time of the Alberta election campaign in June, 1955. It is taken from the files of the 'Leader-Post', June 20, 1955, and I quote from a report of a meeting in Alberta under Canadian Press headlines:

“Alberta’s C.C.F. Leader, Elmer E. Roper, said Saturday that a C.C.F. Government would extend electrification to every part of the province feasible, without cost to the farmer.

“We make no bones about what a C.C.F. Government, if elected, will do. We will set up a public power authority in Alberta, which will acquire private power systems at a fair price. The authority would assume farmers’ power debts, repay money paid for lines, and will extend electrification to every part of the province feasible, without cost to the farmers.”

Mr. Cameron: — Is that a C.C.F. program?

Mr. McFarlane: — What did the people of Alberta say? They said by their vote, the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan have had years to put your program into effect in that province. Until they can show us they are prepared to do it, then we want none of your promises; and it is interesting to note the gentleman was defeated and in the province of Alberta they only elected two C.C.F. members.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How many Liberals?

Mr. McFarlane: — Seventeen Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How many in British Columbia?

Mr. McFarlane: — In his speech to the House, the other day, the hon. Premier stated, in effect, this Government’s rural electrification program has put a hired man on every farm and a hired girl in every farm House. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with him. Due to his policies that situation is developing. With the high installation cost, and high consumption rates, the farmer and his wife will have to see employment outside the farm, and that is exactly what is happening in many parts of this province today, while in Manitoba the farmer and his wife can stay in their home and enjoy the benefits of the best rural electrification program in Canada.

Another unfair tax imposed upon the farmers of this province is the Mineral Tax. They are being taxed on something that neither the farmer nor the Government knows if he owns it. His mineral rights should have been left alone. If this Government wants to tax them, let them do so after the different minerals are brought into production. Many of those today receiving Mineral Tax notices do not understand them, and are disregarding them entirely, with the result that title to the minerals will be taken over by the Crown. This will mean that should any of these minerals be found and developed at a later date, the farmer or his heirs would not be able to share in any of the revenue. This is, indeed, an unjust and uncalled for tax on the farmers’ land.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, two tax notices, one of which, as of June 14, 1955, the amount was \$52.80, and on this one it states: "Except coal and petroleum." The other one states: "Except coal, petroleum and valuable stones," as of February 25, 1955, and the amount is \$52.80. I want to point out, here, that there are a number of these that went into the different districts from which I come with the result that the farmers didn't understand what the tax notices meant. Not only did they not understand why one man was taxed at \$52.80, and excepted coal and petroleum, and the other one should be taxes \$52.80, excepting coal, petroleum and valuable stones. They get together, discuss it, and as a result are confused, and I would like to urge, Mr. Speaker, that this Government remove this tax on the land of the bona fide farmers immediately. If the hon. gentlemen opposite are reluctant to do this, then at least mail a letter to each farmer explaining the Act in complete detail, and the different classifications of the minerals. As of January 25, 1957, the total amount collected by the 3 cents per acre tax was \$6,066,753.50. A large amount of this was the farmers' money, and worse still, in 332 cases the mineral rights have reverted to the Crown. As of March 31, 1956, the total mineral tax arrears owing to the Government amounted to \$968,128.10. Much of this, again, will be owed by farmers who stand a chance of losing their rights for all time – not only for themselves, but this prevents their heirs from sharing in something which should be rightfully theirs.

I have pointed out, sir, some of the taxes imposed on my people that are creating an ever-increasing tax burden. These all add up to the fact that for every dollar spent prior to the C.C.F. coming to power in 1944, they now spend \$5.50, or 5 ½ times as much. We, in Saskatchewan, have been paying a per capita municipal tax of \$63.63, which is the highest in the whole of Canada. Taxes for school purposes have increased at an alarming rate. We are paying a per capita municipal tax for education which is 37 per cent higher than the average for all the rest of Canada, while this Government is only paying 26.6 per cent of the cost of operating school =s, which is about the lowest in the whole of Canada. At the same time a great many of our rural schools are being closed. This Government, instead of getting down to business in this province and doing something for agriculture =, continually cries to Ottawa. They are forever growling and biting at the hand that feeds them. By their performances at Ottawa and here in Saskatchewan, the people of Canada have had an opportunity to hear their policies, assess their lack of achievements in the province. And what has been the result? Outside of Saskatchewan they only have 12 Federal members for all the rest of Canada – 12 members from Newfoundland to Victoria. The C.C.F. never was, and never will be, a party for the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, there are items in the Speech I would like to support, but due to the fact that it does not forecast any program to rectify the conditions that I have pointed out, I have no alternative but to vote against it. In all sincerity, how could I support a Speech that does not forecast any policies or legislation that would meet the crying needs of the people of rural Saskatchewan? I cannot support the motion.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to associate myself with those who have congratulated you on your elevation to your present position. Realizing your background as Minister in Charge of the Power Corporation (which sometimes of necessity generates sparks), your background should be of great value to you in putting some of the sparks that may be generated in this Legislature to the same useful purpose that you were able to put the sparks generated in the Power Corporation to a useful service to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those who have congratulated the mover and the seconder on their remarks in respect to the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Before proceeding with the Speech from the Throne as such, I wish to take a moment or two to deal with some of the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) in his address on the speech from the Throne. The first remarks which I specifically wish to deal with are those in respect to the Select Special Committee which was appointed by this Assembly last year. He was wondering what happened to the report. Well, if he had read the terms of reference which were set out in establishing this Committee, he would be well aware of what happened to the report. I don't propose to read all the terms of reference that were set out in establishing this Committee, but rather to refer only to Clause No. 2. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite at that time supported the establishing of this Committee. Clause No. 2 reads as follows:

“Recognizing it is expedient that the views and advice of this Assembly, and of farm and other interested competent organizations and persons be made available to the Provincial Government for presentation to such a Conference...”

referring to the request of the establishing of a Federal-Provincial agricultural conference.

Members will recall that, at the time of the establishing of that particular Committee, there was indication that the Federal Government might undertake to convene such a conference, and it was for the purpose of giving the Government of the province of Saskatchewan some guidance in its presentations to that conference that the Select Special Committee was set up, and to whom the official report was submitted. No one can blame the Special Committee for the fact that the Federal Government failed to convene such a conference. No one can blame the Provincial Government, because they did continue to urge that such a conference be held. If the fact that this particular report has not yet been utilized, the blame can be placed at no one's doorstep other than the Federal Government at Ottawa. I suggest that it was in poor taste on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to suggest — (pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I should have made reference to the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) when he interjected into his Leader's speech that he supposed that the report went to 'Lower Slobovia'.) I might continue in this vein, Mr. Speaker, and suggest that if it had gone to where it was

supposed to have gone – and that was to the Conference called by the Federal Government – it could have served a useful purpose in our agricultural economy here in western Canada and in Canada as a whole.

It was not that the Provincial Government had no plans or that it was unwilling to implement those plans. This Assembly and the Provincial Government of the province of Saskatchewan have always and on every occasion showed its willingness and eagerness to co-operate with the Federal Government in bringing about a proper marketing policy for the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

The member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) was chastising the Premier to the extent that he referred to some of the remarks which the Premier made in his address to this House, in which the hon. member was suggesting that the Premier was trying to take credit for the increase in production in this province. The Premier previously pointed out that agricultural jurisdiction was divided into two parts – production and marketing; and the province was charged with the responsibility as far as production is concerned, and the Federal Government as far as marketing is concerned. The Premier did point out that the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan knew it was partly due to favourable weather conditions, but the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan, working by themselves and in co-operation with the Provincial Government, had brought about a continued increased production in agricultural products. That has been true every year since 1939, on the whole. It is true there has been some variation but, on the whole, ever since 1939, you have seen a continual increase in the volume of production of agricultural products in the province of Saskatchewan.

It is not in the field of production that we have been lacking here in Saskatchewan or in western Canada. It has not been in that field at all; and that is the field for which the Provincial Government is responsibility. It has been in the field of marketing, in which there has been such a sad lack of policy which could move these agricultural products from the farms of western Canada to the places where they are needed. We do suggest, and the Premier was suggesting (and properly so), that we have fulfilled our responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to the marketing agencies to see that our agricultural products are moved, and cash returns placed in the hands of the farmer.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, we in this Assembly asked for such a marketing conference. We endorsed it unanimously at the time that we made the request. It is true that some of my hon. friends did not vote for the report when it was submitted, but they did in respect to the conference itself. The Gordon Commission, which issued a preliminary report not so very many weeks ago, realize the same thing as we here in this Assembly have realized on numerous occasions, that the farmer himself cannot possibly be expected to be left to his own devices as far as the marketing of his agricultural products is concerned; that the farmer cannot be expected to operate unprotected in a society in which every other industry has received the protection and, in many cases, the assistance of the

Federal Government, not only in the marketing of the products which they produce, but also have on many occasions received help in the production end of those products.

I, on my own behalf, think that members on this side of the House will concur with me that we make no apologies for the fact that the report that we submitted to this Assembly, last year, never got any further than the Provincial Government, because we realized it was not our fault, and we realize that it was not the fault of the Provincial Government.

The Leader of the Opposition and other members today have followed suit – pardon me, I should say the Official Opposition. The Leader of the Official Opposition and some of his members today went on record trying to prove that this Provincial Government had not done much for the agricultural industry or for the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan, and they suggest some of the things this Government might do in that respect. For instance, the Leader of the Official Opposition, and also, I believe, the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) today, made reference to the three-cent per acre Mineral Tax which is being imposed upon those who own mineral rights in the province of Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Official Opposition did suggest that we were attempting to levy a tax on something which the farmer, or somebody else, didn't know whether it was of any value or not.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the very principle and the basis of any land taxation in this province is levied on exactly the same basis. When a municipality or a school unit, or a school district levies the tax on the land in the spring, there is no guarantee and no certainty that that land for the year in which that tax is levied will have any production; and that is exactly in the same category as a mineral tax...

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — That is not correct.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Once again may I point out that there is no compulsion as far as paying this tax is concerned. The individual who pays the tax must believe in his own mind that it is of some value or otherwise he would not be paying the tax on it. That is true in respect to our land. When we pay our taxes on land in years in which there is no production, we pay the tax because we realize and we appreciate that there is some value in that land, and at some future date the production will pay for that tax.

I might also point out that they attempt to use this as an argument of increased cost as far as the farmer is concerned, or as far as the agricultural industry is concerned. It has been pointed out in this House on many occasions that the bulk of these mineral rights are not held by individual farmers who are operating the farm at this particular time. Even those farmers who are operating their farm, and who own their mineral rights, cannot regard the mineral tax as part of the cost of agricultural production. It could be construed as a cost chargeable as a speculative cost.

Mr. Gardiner: — That's a new one!

Mr. Brown: — It is speculative insofar as they are retaining it in the expectation of obtaining some revenue from it at some future date.

I might go on and refer to some of the other indications of what he suggested this Government might do by way of relieving the farmer in his present price-cost squeeze, and in every respect and every instance they suggest that it shall be in the form of the removal of taxes. At no time during the Leader of the Official Opposition's speech, and at no time this afternoon in the remarks which were made by the member from Gravelbourg or the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley did they attempt to strike at the root of the problem that is facing the farmer at the present time, which is the cost-price squeeze. Though taxes is a part of the cost, my friends will recall that in the Committee, last year, information was brought out that in the last four or five years, as far as land taxes in particular were concerned, they have been reduced as a percentage of the cost of production. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the taxes have been an insignificant factor in the increasing cost of production as it affects us. I would think both of these gentlemen, who represent agricultural constituencies, would have drawn the fact to the attention of the House that it was not these smaller items which are basically causing a bankruptcy in the agricultural industry, but rather it is an ever-increasing cost-price squeeze in respect to the cost of production on the one hand and a reduction in the returns received for our products on the other hand.

The Leader of the Official Opposition went on to make reference to the electricity projects in this province, and made reference to the fact that we can certainly (to quote him exactly) "decrease the rate charged for electricity." I presume in that he was referring to the rates charged to the farmer on his power bill. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley quoted some figures here, this afternoon, in respect to that amount which the farmers in the province are presently paying for electricity, and he did attempt to compare it with the province of Manitoba. At no time have we ever suggested that we have as yet reached the stage in this province where we were able to compare favourably with the province of Manitoba as far as electrical charges were concerned.

Opposition Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, we had a Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan for some 35 years that did absolutely nothing towards developing a rural electrification program in the province of Saskatchewan. They are critical of the rates being charged by the Power Corporation to the farmers of this province; they are critical of the rates which have been charged the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, and yet, since 1945, there have been five reductions of power rates in the province of Saskatchewan. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley: what did the farmer have to pay for this power under

February 25, 1957

a Liberal administration in the province of Saskatchewan? Compare it with the rates which they charged at that particular time. I know the answer can be very simple, Mr. Speaker. They didn't charge them anything because there were no farmers who had power in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Well, that's not correct.

Mr. Coderre: — I take exception to that.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Okay, there were 137 – pardon me, there were 138.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — He doesn't want to hear it.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — All right. I will withdraw the statement, Mr. Speaker, and change it to 138. After all, when you reach the state of 40,000 farms electrified in the province of Saskatchewan, it makes 138 look like practically nothing anyway.

Mr. McCarthy: — It looked pretty big in the thirties.

Premier Douglas: — Big by Liberal standards.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Criticism has been made this afternoon also by the Leader of the Official Opposition of the fact that we have a construction charge here in the province of Saskatchewan, while there is none in the province of Manitoba. I think I only need to say that when we, here on the C.C.F. side of this House, set out to establish a Power Corporation in this province, when we set out to undertake rural electrification in this province, we went to the farmers of this province and we said to them: "You can obtain rural electrification in this province but there is only one way we can visualize that it can be done and that is that you pay a proportionate share of the capital cost." The farmers of this province concurred in our belief at that time to the extent that we had, at the end of the last year, over 40,000 electrified farms.

Mr. Danielson: — When did that happen?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — It happened in the election of 1948.

Mr. Danielson: — Bunk!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — And in 1952 and 1956.

Mr. Danielson: — Bunk again!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley made some reference to No. 16 Highway, suggesting that it was one of the most important highways in the province of Saskatchewan. I think the Minister of highways has recognized that No. 16 has some importance in our Saskatchewan economy; but I might point out to the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that, under the Liberal Government they didn't recognize it as an

important highway at all. Up until 1944 on that portion which lies within his own constituency there wasn't one mile of gravel; and at least the Minister of Highways of today has recognized the importance of it and has brought it up to a standard...

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

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — I have a 1944 highway map here which was published by the Hon. Mr. Proctor, Minister of Highways, and I must accept that as the official record.

Mr. McCarthy: — That was a figment of his own imagination!

Mr. Cameron: — You'll have to get hotter than that, Brown.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The Leader of the Official Opposition, along with some of those today, went on to criticize our grid system that is being established in the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is significant that we are getting a market road system established in this province. Criticize as they may, the people of the province of Saskatchewan are determined that they are going to improve their transportation system, and they are undertaking to do it; and this Government has given them the leadership and the co-operation by which it is necessary to do it.

My hon. friend from Gravelbourg referred to some of the secondary highways in the province of Saskatchewan. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, these secondary highways were something I think the Minister of Highways inherited from the Liberal Government. If I were in other placed, I might be inclined to make some more potent remarks as to what the secondary highway system was, and the secondary roads were, when this Government came into power in 1944. For they were part of the highway system that has no mother — and apparently didn't even have an 'Uncle Sam'! There was nobody who had any responsibility in respect to them. Here was a road system in which the municipalities were responsible for the construction of them, and in which the Department of Highways of that day was responsible only for the summer and surface maintenance of those roads. What this Government has attempted to (and in which I entirely concur) is to endeavour to solve that secondary road problem by making it possible for us to have a better highway system in which there is proper jurisdiction in respect to the different classifications of roads.

I would point out that there has been a continuing increase in the standard of maintenance and construction, and that the Provincial Government has, on many occasions, assumed the responsibility of the construction work on some of these secondary roads in the province of Saskatchewan. I do think it is a credit to the Government and to the Department of Highways that they did see fit to improve these secondary roads in spite of the fact that it is not their responsibility, and something which they inherited from a former Liberal Government.

I would just like to make one short reference to another remark made by the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). I don't intend to imply, Mr. Speaker, nor am I suggesting that in any way she was attempting to deliberately mislead the House in the figures which she quoted, because I don't think that was her intention at all. I think the mistake she made, a mistake which members of the Liberal party often make, is that she and they fail to realize the prime necessity of the province of Saskatchewan, and our prime necessity in this province is the building up of primary industries. The figures which she quoted, this afternoon, are accurate as taken from the Private and Public Investment in Canada, August, 1956, but they were in relationship to the secondary industries, and not in respect to primary industry and the construction industry in this province. That is what we need in this province. When you take those figures in respect to the primary industry and the construction industry alone, we compare very favourably with the province of Manitoba. In Manitoba they had an investment in 1956 of \$58.9 million in the primary industry and construction industry. In the province of Saskatchewan we had \$140 million. In other words, in those types of industries which we need in this province we had two-and-a-half times as much investment as had the province of Manitoba. On these same types of industries and constructions, we compare rather favourably with the province of Alberta which had \$241 million as compared with ours of \$140 million.

While I am not suggesting that she was attempting to mislead the House, nevertheless I felt that I should point out to this House that in those types of industries which we need we are certainly getting our fair share of the investment capital, and much of that credit can be given to the Government of the province of Saskatchewan for the fact that we are having a continual increase of industrial development in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning for a moment or two to the Speech from the Throne itself. I think that private members of this Legislature, and particularly members on this side of the House, should approach this Speech from the Throne on two counts. We on this side of the House represent more than a political party. We represent a movement; we have a philosophy and we have an ideology, and it is our duty and our responsibility, being members of this movement, to relate the Throne Speech to our ideology and our philosophy, to see whether it is carrying forth those things which we believe in – economic justice, social security and equality for all classes of people. That is on one count we must look at it in that light; and I don't think that our ideology and our philosophy can better be expounded than it is in the 'Winnipeg Declaration. References were made to the Winnipeg Declaration here this afternoon by the member from Humboldt and references were made to the Winnipeg Declaration by the Premier when he was making his remarks, and you know, Mr. Speaker, every time I hear quotations from this Winnipeg Declaration the better I get to like the darn thing. I am not going to take time to quote too much from the Winnipeg Declaration, but rather to point out what I think the Throne Speech should indicate in respect to ideology and philosophy. We say in this Winnipeg Declaration: "in spite of great economic expansion, large sections of our people do not benefit adequately from the increased wealth production.

Greater wealth and economic power continue to be concentrated in the hands of a relatively few private corporations. The gap between those at the bottom and those at the top of the economic scale has widened.” We must analyse this Speech from the Throne to see if it cannot, within the limitations of our provincial economy, do something towards reducing the gap between those at the top and those at the bottom. Again, quoting from the Winnipeg Declaration:

“The growing concentration of corporate wealth has resulted in a virtual economic dictatorship by a privileged few. This threatens our political democracy which will attain its full meaning only when our people have a voice in the management of its economic affairs, and effective control over the means by which they live.”

We must ask ourselves: does this perpetuate and work towards the end of greater economic democracy, because, unless we have economic democracy, we cannot have political democracy? It is in those respects, as far as ideology and philosophy is concerned, that we must analyse this Speech from the Throne.

I said we were more than a political party. We are. We are a movement; but we are also a political party which has received the endorsement of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, based upon a platform which was placed before those people last June. The Premier read into the records of this House the commitments which the C.C.F., as a political organization, made to the people at that particular time; but I suggest that we, as private members on this side of the House in particular, have to pay very close attention to that, and to see that the Government, when they are bringing forth their profession, do relate it to those commitments which were made at that particular time.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, I carry this along with my unpaid bills so I will never forget that I have it with me, and I am going to go over these points one by one. I will be brief, in an endeavour to give myself an opportunity to analyse, and to give this House an opportunity to appreciate, whether or not the Government is attempting to fulfil those commitments which were made at that particular time. You will realize, Mr. Speaker, that this was a four-year program which we submitted to the people at that particular time. Five-year program, pardon me. We have been going for a regular four-year interval, and I will be expecting the Government to have these commitments filled so that, if necessary, we can go to the people in four years' time. On every occasion they have been able to fulfil the commitments which they have made to the people in less than five years.

(1) The first commitment which we made was that we would spend \$100 million on a provincial highway system in this province in the five years, and you will note in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the fact that there will be increased expenditures in respect to the highways; to approve estimates to provide for another program for extensive

highway improvements. I must accept that we have started to make progress towards the implementation of Item No. 1.

“(2) Contribute an average of \$3 million a year for municipal roads.” This is, of course, in reference to the grid and to the equalization of programs which has been put into effect by this Government, and you will notice that in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the fact that the rural grid road system was well received, and that the program will be increased in 1957. We are well on the road to seeing a full implementation of Item No. 2.

“(3) Increase substantially the Provincial Government’s contribution to the cost of education.” The Government’s policy in respect to this was enunciated at the Provincial-Local Government Conference which was held in this very Chamber, and I have confidence to believe that the substantial increased contributions which are forecast for 1957 will be carried on into other years. Therefore I feel satisfied that a commitment in that respect is being undertaken to be filled.

“(4) To bring up to 65,000 the farms supplied with electricity and double the general rating capacity of the province.” The Speech from the Throne forecasts an ever-expanding power program. With the realization that the Power Corporation was more than able to exceed its commitments in the last four years, there is no question remaining in my mind that with a continuation of the same policies in the next five years (and I see no change in those policies), 65,000 farms will unquestionably be reached. The Speech from the Throne forecasts that we are travelling towards that end and I can support it on that basis.

“(5) To bring natural gas to all the cities and intermediate towns and villages.” The program which has been enunciated by the Power Corporation of bringing gas to the city of Regina, and the forecast for the future of the continuance of this program lead me to believe that we are proceeding along the lines of fulfilling that commitment.

“(6) Expand existing drainage, irrigation and reclamation programs.” Once again in the speech from the Throne reference is made that we will be asked to vote estimated for this very specific purpose.

“(8) To expand hospital plan to include out-patients and other health services.” The Speech from the Throne indicates that there is going to be a continuation of the improvement of the health services provided for the people of the province of Saskatchewan, once again moving along towards the end of fulfilling Point No. 8.

“(9) Expand our social welfare benefits.” Once again the Speech from the Throne indicates, in my opinion, that the Department of Social Welfare, working in conjunction with other services and other agencies, is continuing to expand the social welfare benefits received by the needy people of the province of Saskatchewan.

“(10) Continue to attract new industry to provide employment and to create local markets for farm products.” The Premier, in his remarks indicated that we already have received new industries in the last few months and that there is every indication that in the immediate future there will be new industries brought into this province, creating employment and local markets for farm products.

“(11) Protect and improve working conditions for wage-earners, especially those in the low-income brackets.” You will note, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne makes reference in this respect: “with a view to providing a greater measure of protection not only for employees but also for employers who pay fair wages, the Government will propose certain amendments to The Minimum Wage Act.”

This was our 11-point program as related to provincial affairs. I think, and I am convinced in my own mind, that the Speech from the Throne indicates that on the two counts I have suggested it was our responsibility to give an analysis to the Speech from the Throne, they have fulfilled their obligations in that respect both as to our philosophy, as to our ideology and as to this program which we committed ourselves to the people and which we said this Provincial Government would undertake to fulfil. On those two bases, I certainly can support the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I, and I suppose along with you, joined the Socialist movement as a protest against human suffering and human privation. There is no indication in my mind that complete human suffering and human privation has been, to any great degree in the world, completely eliminated, but I do feel that we here in this little province of Saskatchewan are making our contribution to the Canadian economy and to the world economy in our endeavour to see that there shall be a complete elimination of human suffering and human privation. Further, Mr. Speaker, you and I (I know myself and no doubt yourself) joined the C.C.F. movement as a means by which we, the ‘little people’, might be able, in our own way and in our own right, to formulate and control our own destiny, and to the extent that the Speech from the Throne indicates in my mind that we, the little people of the province of Saskatchewan, will be given the opportunity to control and formulate our own destiny, and that we will go on to even greater heights than we have seen in the province of Saskatchewan, I shall support the motion.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, first I would wish to congratulate you on your elevation to your high office. I hope that I am not one of those that cause you too much trouble. I believe that I am making just a little bit of history here today. This is the first time in 13 years that a representative of Touchwood has taken any part in any debate in this House. You are aware, sir, your chair was occupied by Mr. Tom Johnston who for 18 years represented Touchwood ably and well. I know I can speak for you, and I can speak for myself and can speak for all members of the House, that it is a pleasure to sit in this House behind the Premier. We hope he has the opportunity to sit in this same seat on this side of the House for a good many years to come.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder on the very able manner in which they moved and seconded the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. They not only brought honour to themselves, but to their constituencies, and certainly to the parties which they represent.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, before I go any further I would beg leave to move adjourned of the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 10 – An Act to amend the Provincial Parks and Protected Areas Act.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the amendment of this Act in one detail is to prevent digging in parks and other protected areas, particularly in the protected areas or provincial parks within the province without the consent of the Minister of Natural Resources. Another Section to it is that if excavation is carried on at all, it must be carried on in a manner prescribed by the Minister. Any objects found in the protected areas or the provincial parks will be deemed to be the property of the Crown; and then there is the prohibition of selling, bartering or otherwise disposing of some of these objects.

The purpose of the Act is to safeguard, on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, any sites of historical and pre-historical value. The reason is that, by unregulated digging or excavation, particularly by non-professionals, the value of these sites has been destroyed as has been shown particularly in some of the other provinces of Canada. We know that, for example in Ontario they have had a similar provision put in the Act to safeguard such sites. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next Sitting.)

Bill No. 28 – An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this amendment will include rural telephone employees who earn more than \$750 per annum, municipal secretaries, secretary-treasurers of villages, town clerks and secretary-treasurers of school units in the Act. Representation was made last summer by the Rural Municipal Companies' Telephone Association, asking us to make provisions to

include the employees of the rural telephone companies, with the exception of those who make a salary of less than \$750 per annum. That is the principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I move Second Reading.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next Sitting.)

**Bill No. 30 – An Act respecting Urban and Rural Planning
and Development.**

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I might say, Mr. Speaker, this is an effort at the revision of what is commonly known as ‘The Community Planning Act’. The need of the revision has been brought about very largely as a result of the increased population in the various urban communities of the province of Saskatchewan, with particular reference to the cities and a number of the towns.

Annually in the last two or three years, the Community Planning Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs has been called upon many, many times throughout the year to make changes and alterations in the boundaries of villages, towns and of cities. This is brought about by the results of the increased population moving into the urban areas. In recent years the cities have experienced a considerable problem associated with the proper planning and the proper land-use and zoning of the areas within, and the new areas that have been added to, their boundaries in order to take care of the increased population, and we are making an effort here and suggesting to the Legislature certain amendments to the Act in order to bring it more into conformity with this development, and in many respects to simplify the community planning of these urban centres.

I think there is one principle that one should mention on second reading, and that is it makes provisions for the municipal councils to exercise some control over the development of the area adjacent to the boundaries of the urban centres, with particular reference to the cities and to some extent to some of the towns.

Secondly, it also makes provisions for an interim control over development while the town or city might be in the process of revising their whole community planning Act, and bringing in a master plan. There are occasions when it takes two and possibly three years for the planners of a city to bring in a master overall community planning, and in the interval they felt, as a result of their representations to the Department, it was necessary to have some measure of interim control while they were finalizing their master plan.

This Act consists of some 137 sections which approximately 20 to 25 sections are being amended with some two or three new sections added, for the purpose, as I stated before, to give to the municipalities

February 25, 1957

a greater measure of control in the whole field of planning the development of their communities.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move Second Reading of this Bill respecting Urban and Rural Planning and Development.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next Sitting.)

**Bill No. 32 – An Act to amend The Highways and
Transportation Act.**

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, there are two main principles in this amending Bill. The first was made necessary because of a transfer of the control of market roads and bridges to the Department of Municipal Affairs, and while we continued on, this summer doing the work through the Operations branch of the Department of Highways, there was just some doubt as to whether we have the legal authority. The greater part of this amendment is taking care of the situation, making it possible for the Operations Branch of the Department to provide the service of bridge construction and to supply the materials necessary under Section 21 of The Highways and Transportation Act.

The second principle is in connection with the controlled access highways. As you know, two years ago we passed legislation here making it possible to designate certain highways as controlled access roads. A difficulty has arisen in that when we come to towns and villages, it is difficult for these small municipalities to provide for them as access roads, and under the amendment here, we will have the right to declare a road through a town or village a limited access road, providing that the highway on the other side of that town or village is also a limited access road. Before this can be done, we must secure the right of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Those are the two main principles involved in these amendments, and I move Second Reading of this Bill – an Act to amend The Highways and Transportation Act.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the whole at next sitting.)

**Bill No. 39 – An Act to amend The
School Attendance Act.**

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, most of the amendments contained in this Bill are minor and can be discussed in Committee. There is one change in principle, however, which should be drawn to the attention of the Legislature at this time. At the present, our School Attendance Act defines requirements for attendance in terms of miles from an operating school. Obviously, with the introduction of school buses on a considerable scale this is no longer an adequate definition, and so the amendments here propose to make the school attendance laws apply to those children who reside within 1 ½ miles as measured by the nearest passable road from an established school bus route. I would move second reading of Bill No. 39.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

HOURS OF SITTING

Premier Douglas: — That completes the second readings, Mr. Speaker, and I was suggesting that the Whips confer to see if it would be agreeable to all parties to sit tomorrow evening. I know the members have a lot of Committee work and they want a certain amount of homework to be done for the Committee work, so I am pushing it as fast as I can, because I don't want it all to pile on during the last couple of weeks of the Session. I think, if the members are agreeable – the Whips, I believe, have conferred and there seems to be a general agreement – that we would sit tomorrow evening. If we are going to sit tomorrow evening, it will be necessary to go into the Committee of the Whole tomorrow night to start to deal with the Bills which have already had second reading.

To do that, it will be necessary for the House tomorrow to give consent to setting aside Standing Order 40, which prevents us from going into Committee of the Whole, until the Speech from the Throne has been disposed of. If the members insist, of course, that the Standing Order stand, then we can't go into the Committee of the Whole until after this debate has ended. But if the members are agreeable, we can go into Committee of the Whole tomorrow, and deal with some of these Bills that are in Committee stage. So, the members will have time to think it over.

The reason I am raising this is that, if the members aren't prepared to agree, that means we won't have enough business to sit tomorrow evening; but if they are agreeable, we will go on and sit tomorrow evening. If any member objects, of course, we cannot set aside the Standing Order.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m.