

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 26, 1957

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

HOURS OF SITTING

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned last night, I drew the attention of the House to the fact that if we want to sit tonight, there isn't enough business on Second Readings without going into Committee of the Whole, and that Standing Order No. 40, Section 1, provides that we cannot proceed into Committee of the Whole until after the Speech from the Throne has been dealt with. Therefore the policy we have followed in other years has been to set aside that Standing Order so that we could go into Committee of the Whole and proceed to discuss the Bills which have received Second Reading, and which have been referred to the Committee of the Whole. As I pointed out, last night, the Standing Order, of course, can only be set aside by leave of the Assembly.

I would, therefore, move that Standing Order No. 40, Section 1 be suspended in order that the Assembly may proceed forthwith with the appointment of a Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — It is moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

“That Standing Order No. 40, Section 1, be suspended in order that the Assembly may proceed forthwith with the appointment of a Deputy Speaker.”

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to express our thoughts from the Opposition side of the House in this respect, and we think that we should go ahead with the Public Accounts Committee and leave the Committee of the Whole alone until, according to the rules of the House, we approach that particular subject.

Premier Douglas: — I will withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Is leave to withdraw the motion granted?

(Motion withdrawn)

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed from Monday, February 25, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood (cont'd.)): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate, yesterday evening, I had just congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne and I had congratulated you, sir, upon your elevation to your high office. I am sure that you will continue the enviable record set by your predecessor, Mr. Johnston, which he built up while he served in this House.

I was amused at the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) with his remarks about his impressions of the decorum of this House. I quite agree there is room for improvement. I have here two speeches — the speech of the Premier and the speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition — and I took the trouble of going through them, yesterday evening, and I counted up the interruptions of both those speeches. I find that during the Premier's speech there were 42 interruptions — 40 from the Official Opposition and two from this side of the House. When I went through the speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition I found there were 11 interruptions — nine from the official Opposition and two from this side of the House. I think these records show who is lacking respect in this House. You know, Robert Burns once said: "If we could only see ourselves as others see us! It wad frae monie a blunder free us, an' foolish notion."

This is the first opportunity I have had since the election to speak to the people of Touchwood, and I would like to thank those people who elected me. I want to assure them that I will endeavour to serve all the people of Touchwood to the best of my ability. I will put forth their views (or try to) on their problems at all times.

I was pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech that once more this Government is allocating more money for the assistance of the municipalities and schools, in the way of increased grants. I would say that these two items are in the minds of the people of Touchwood, the farmers of Touchwood, more than anything else, but with the advent of mechanization and a few wet years, I think the road problem looms larger than anything. Fifteen years ago, 75 per cent at least of the grain that was hauled into the towns of Touchwood was hauled in mostly on sleighs. Today it is all hauled in with trucks, some of them with 300 bushels or more. Also, with the excessive rain and snowfall during a period of three years, the water table rose to the point to where the municipalities had a terrific amount of grades flooded. If it had not been for the prompt assistance of this Government at

that time we would have had a major catastrophe in 1955. As it is, the municipalities are still striving to catch up on the back-load of flooded grades.

Due to those bad years, the municipalities have found themselves with large sums of arrears of taxes. At the last annual meeting day one of my municipalities had \$125,000 in arrears of taxes on the books. Through the years since 1944, this Government has alleviated many of the burdens of the municipalities by increased social aid, by increased health grants, and improved services. The hospitalization scheme alone has made a great easement of the financial burden on the municipalities, especially in municipalities where we have a large Metis population. One municipality, in 1946, spent close to \$15,000 in the care of these people.

In spite of all this assistance the municipalities, like the farmers, have been going further and further into debt. Why is it? Touchwood is really a rural constituency; the population of our largest village is seven or eight hundred. It is also a constituency comprising mostly small farms, situated in the parkland area; but whether a farm or a municipality is situated on the good land through from Dysart to Markinch, or whether it is situated in the Touchwood Hills, whether it is situated around Ituna or in the Beaver Hills from Jedburgh and Parker View, they all find themselves in the same more or less dire straits – losing money and going broke. In the last four months we have seen many of the farmers leaving their land for the cities for the winter, looking for work. I think many of them will not return if they find suitable work. Why are these men leaving the farms? The Opposition would like the people to think that it is the fault of this Government, and their high taxes. It is no such thing! The farmer today is caught in an economic squeeze caused completely and altogether by the result of the policies of the Federal Government in Ottawa.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Meakes: — The trouble with the farmer today is that his cost of production has gone up and up until it is higher than his income. From 1941 to 1947 we had price controls; prices were level. Then in 1947, price controls were taken off, and since that time the farmer has reached the point in this spiralling inflation where the small farmer especially is being squeezed out.

I was interested in reading in the December issue of the 'Union Farmer' some figures on this subject. I think they should be on the records of this House, if I may have permission. Before doing so I would like to point out this fact. In this summary they refer to a farm, a small farm, with 480 acres of cultivated land, or less. I would like to state that at least 80 per cent of the farms in Touchwood are in this category. At least

February 26, 1957

50 per cent of them have a cultivated acreage of 250 acres or less, and I think a good 20 per cent of them have 100 acres or less. This is a summary taken in the Kindersley area, describing the situation, taken from the books of 83 of the farmers of the Kindersley area. They are described as:

“A small farm is a farm of 480 cultivated acres or less; a medium small farm, 481 to 720 cultivated acres; a medium large farm, 721 to 960 cultivated acres; and a large farm, over 961 cultivated acres.”

This summary is based on \$1.18 (No. 2, average price, Kindersley). As I said there were 83 farms – 21 small, 30 medium small, 21 medium large and 11 large.

Now let us take a look at the investment required to operate these farms, and the returns on such an investment. The total investment in buildings and land and machinery for the small farm was \$24,503; the medium small was \$40,356; and the medium large was \$46,371; and the large farm was \$81,392. How many young farmers here in Saskatchewan will there be that think they will be able to make a start in farming when they realize the capital investment required?

Now let us look at the cost of producing a bushel of wheat – first, allowing the farmer no wages for his labour, and secondly, allowing \$3,000. Producing a bushel of wheat, with no allowance for labour, cost the small farmer 83 cents; the medium small, 76 cents; the medium large, 75 cents; and the large, 58 cents.

The cost of producing a bushel of wheat, allowing \$3,000 for labour: \$1.39 for the small farmer; \$1.08 for the medium small farmer; \$1.02 for the medium large farmer; and 72 cents for the large farmer.

When we look at the cost of producing a bushel of wheat on a per crop acre basis, allowing no operator's wages, it cost the small farmer \$19.25; the medium small, \$18.55; the medium large, \$17.47 and the large, \$15.35.

Cost of production per crop acre basis, allowing \$3,000 for operator's wages: it cost the small farmer \$33.20; the medium small \$26.68; and the medium large \$23.61 and the large \$18.97.

And finally, the Kindersley Vocational Farmers Associations' summary points out that to break even and pay the farm operator \$3,000 for his labour, it would be necessary for the yield to average 29 bushels to the acre for the small farmer, and 17 bushels to the acre for the large farmer, when grades were as good as they were in 1955.

With the weather as variable as it is on the prairies, it would be a stout heart indeed who would undertake to risk his future on the chance of getting an average yield of 29 bushels to the acre, and then only to break even. Everyone has lately concluded that assistance must be given to help young farmers become established in farming. With financial odds like those set out above, will we help young farmers to become established in the business only to have them become bankrupt?

Then they finish up like this:

“These figures are particularly interesting when we hear from the Federal Minister of Agriculture, himself a farmer, that farmers were never better off than they are today.”

Mr. Loptson: — You hear that in this House, too.

Mr. Meakes: — The article goes on:

“I can only suggest that it may be that farmers should all aim at becoming Federal Cabinet Ministers if they are to make a go of farming, for then they would be in a position to comfortably augment their own farm income and not have to bother the Government with their trouble.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, these figures show that the small farmer has got to the point where, if the Federal Government doesn't do something about it right away, we are going to have hundreds and thousands of farmers bankrupt.

I might point out that these conditions are even worse in another prairie province. I was in Manitoba, this fall, and in a 34-mile area there had been 40 auction sales, all of them small farmers. They are in a worse position than we are. They have no hospitalization scheme, no government insurance, no Farm Security Act to protect them. What else can we expect but bankruptcy, when everything that the farmer has to buy in the way of production has gone up 200 per cent or more and the things we sell have not gone up, but in many cases have gone down? In a matter of eight years a combine has risen from \$2,700 to at least \$6,800 and other machinery has risen in much the same ratio. The wanted disregard of the Federal Government to inflation and the financial difficulties of the farmers is nothing but criminal.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

February 26, 1957

Mr. Meakes: —As soon as a few more hogs or eggs go on to the market than usual, then down goes the price, only to go up to the consumer after it gets into the hands of the packers.

If the taxes on my farm were cut in half I would save about \$150, but the \$100 a year that I have lost on every calf that has been born for the last five years amounts to \$1,000 a year. No, Mr. Speaker, taxes are not our problem. The western farmer will never have the security necessary to keep him on the farm until we have parity price on our products. . .

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Meakes: — . . . and until it is guaranteed that the products the farmer sells will not only bring the cost of production, but bring a decent standard of living as well. The farmer doesn't want, something for nothing. All we want is a fair chance to make a decent living, and a little bit of security for our old age. One of the best farmers in Touchwood constituency told me last spring – “I have operated my farm for the last three years on the money that I put by for my old age, from 1945 to 1950.” It is a terrible thing that while this has been going on, we have had a continuous rise in the profits of corporations, year by year. The year 1956 was again a gala year – for corporations! Here lies an injustice that can only be cured by Ottawa. Our prices must be raised – either that, or we must have price controls and prices slashed back.

For his year-end message, January 3, 1957, for the ‘Western Producer’, President J.H. Wesson, in giving his year-end report said this – (He had been discussing improved sales of wheat in the year past):

“Even on the basis of these good sales many farmers did not break even on the year's operations. The continued high cost of the things needed to operate a farm and maintaining the farm family was putting the farmer in an impossible position. The price he received for his grain and other agricultural products was too low to keep the average farmer out of debt. The improvement in income in 1956 will not breach the gap between costs and prices as shown in the 1955 figures. The result is that many farmers are dipping into their reserve to keep going, while other farmers are accumulating debts which will be extremely difficult to pay at present prices.”

Mr. Speaker, here is gross injustice – when one segment of our society is being discriminated against in comparison to another segment. The farmer today is the forgotten man, an unnecessary digit to elect governments in Ottawa.

In talking to the businessmen of our towns, they too, realize that they are completely dependent on agricultural success. When the farmers prosper, they prosper; when the farmers' money runs out, many of our businessmen are in the same position as the farmer – going broke. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, before the end of this Session there will be resolutions before this House requesting the Ottawa Government to do something to alleviate the state of western agriculture; and I suggest that it should have the unanimous support of every person in this House.

The people of Touchwood appreciate what this Government has done for agriculture. Realizing that a provincial government has no control over physical market policies, this Government has done many things to alleviate the burdens that could be lessened. The grid road plan, supplying electricity to the farms has done a lot to keep the farmers on the land wherever it is possible. Improved old-age assistance, hospital plan, free cancer treatment, improved health services, mothers' allowances, old-age assistance – all these things are helping agriculture by helping the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with previous speakers that I think the time has come, seeing that we have increased revenues from natural resources, when we should remove the Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuels. The amount that would be saved by the individual farmer would be small, but it will be of some assistance in this time of misery for the farmer, when he is being put through the wringer.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to supply the motion.

Mr. John Thiessen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, from little acorns giant oaks do grow. I want to concur in what my hon. friend has just said about the farmer and everybody else. But, first of all, I would like to mention that I am here representing a constituency which was represented by Mr. Louis Larsen, who has gone to the 'Great Beyond' and I hope that as time goes on, I can possibly win the friendship and the love that fellows carry for him on this side of the House, and possibly on the other side, too. He was recognized as a good member throughout the entire constituency of Shellbrook. I was a new man out there when the last election came along, and it was not my ability, nor was it my standing, that elected myself as their representative, but the C.C.F. policies which had been laid down here in Regina, and the person of Mr. Larsen, who, as I said, had gone to the Great Beyond.

I would also like to associate myself with those who have congratulated you on your position, and congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and all the other members who have been selected to this House for the first time, and also to those who have been elected many times over. It goes to show that they have done a job, which no one else has ever tried to do in this province.

February 26, 1957

At the opening of this Session of the House, we heard quite a number of names read to us of men who had left this world, who had died and gone on, but who had left a name for themselves in this province, and possibly also in the Federal field. I am now thinking of two members who had been more in the federal field, but who have also gone on before. One of those was a person who realized early in life that the ordinary people, the common man, of this Dominion of ours, was not getting a square deal and many people called him Leftist. He did things for the people, or tried to do for people what no one else had tried before either. And it is out of these little acorns that he planted that giant oaks have grown. Today, any political party wanting to build a platform to stand upon must use oak out of the oaks that grew out of the acorns that this man planted. In last spring's election, we had a political party who used wood out of a different make. I call it a \$500 plank, but it proved slippery and they slipped. It wasn't as substantial as an oak plank would be.

I am also thinking of another person who has also gone. His ambition in his youthful life was to go left, but later on conceded that he was prepared to go a long ways right, to be able to go left once in a while. And it is of these left turns that such things as Unemployment Insurance and Family Allowances have come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 1930s have been brought in; I imagine it has been harped on and harped over so often that it is not news any more. But the way that both Opposition parties brought it in, it seemed to me that they had an opinion that this was something that God gave, something that we had coming to us. Looking at it from that angle, I would say that that is not true. The good Lord provided us with food, and provided us with all the clothing that we could use, and with all the shelter that we needed, and yet it could not be distributed. It wasn't the fault of the One that created the world, or the ones that produced these things; it was the fault of distribution, the fault of those who had political manoeuvring and were not doing these things so that people could get the things they required. In the world you found them talking about burning coffee in locomotives, so that they could create a scarcity to get a price; when you heard them talking about loading beef and pork into ships and sinking them into the ocean so that they could create a scarcity; when they talked of even loading wheat and doing the same thing, to create a scarcity. When in this province of ours we were somewhat short of feed in some area, the Federal Government came in and said, "We must help the farmers of Saskatchewan"; and they came in here and they bought our cattle at one cent a pound. I saw a good many cattle that went through the elevator weight scales in those days as canners and cutters at one cent a pound.

Today, we have the Opposition party sitting in here and they say we should do things for agriculture. Well, things were done for agriculture a long time ago, and they were done a lot different than they are being done today. At that one cent a pound and the rest of it, they were sure not

assisting any agricultural policy; and I am afraid that if the Liberal members were again sitting on this side of the House, things would be much the same as they used to be. I was a Reeve and a Councillor a good many years, and I think I served under as many Premiers in this province as anybody has – that is, in the municipal field.

Here, in the speeches in this House, I don't find anybody that is run down or called as many things as our Premier of the province, and today I think there are only two Premiers who I can remember have ever tried to do things for the people of the province; one was the Hon. J.T.M. Anderson, who was here before I was on my own farm, and I thought he was trying to do things which were necessary in the province. Then the only other Premier that ever did anything was our Premier, T.C. Douglas.

I had an old friend, one time that was when I first started to farm, and he was quite a studier of policies and politics, and he said to me, "What do you make of these things as they are today?" And I said, "I don't know. You are a lot older man than I am, what do you think of them?" Communism was discussed, and he said: "You know, Communism will never work, because in Communism they are using God's system under the Devil's name, and, therefore, it can never work." Well, I said, "What is wrong with our system?" He said, "Our system under the old political party is that we use the Devil's system under God's name, and it can't work either."

So, in thinking that over, I was wondering about the Social Credit. If you read the scripture at all you will find that "St. Peter" when Christ was baptised and left this world, he (St. Peter) said: "There must be ways that we can keep the outside world away from the Christians that we have today." So he invited them in and they lived in one place, they sold their belongings, and they didn't have very much to pay down, but they thought it would all go to pay God, and it lasted until their money was gone and then it petered out; and St. Peter found that he had to have a policy and regulations laid down and I think eventually the Social Credit will have to have the same thing, or else they will find it doesn't work either.

The previous speaker mentioned about taking off the Hospitalization and Education Tax on farm fuel. If it should happen to come about, I am not going to stand here and oppose that policy; but it seems to me that every time that we do something for the farmers of this province, that we have the Federal Government policies coming in and eating up the difference all the time. This time it is the increased interest rates on the money that we must borrow, and it is going to cost the farmers of this province more money than we can save them on the Education and Hospitalization Tax. Again, the same thing applies to the Public Revenue Tax, which the province took off. The Government here thought that they were going to do something for the people of this province, and so they took it off, and the Federal Government took off

February 26, 1957

price controls, and today we are paying much more than three mills more for our machinery than we ever did before, again gone to other people than to the people of this province. I feel that if this Government took all the taxes off the farmers, the Federal Government would find some way to tax the people, and they wouldn't get it either.

Reference was made, the other day, that, after listening to a radio speech, the children wondered whether God had made the world, or the C.C.F. I want to assure my hon. friends that God was the creator of this world and all its inhabitants, and that the only way to save a soul is by faith through Jesus Christ our Saviour. But, I still maintain that the C.C.F. made Saskatchewan.

They also talk about the saturation point being reached in taxes, and that taxes cannot go any higher than what they are today. I will again refer back to when I started farming and raising my family out on a farm in the '30s. Crops weren't too good, but I threshed about 1,400 bushels of No. 2 wheat in one year, and I hauled 450 of that to the elevators, and it wasn't enough to pay the year's taxes; that is the 450 bushels of wheat off a half-section farm. You could sell about 18 pigs to cover a year's taxes; you could sell about 10 head of cattle to cover a year's taxes. If the taxes are high today, they haven't reached the stage they were when we had a Liberal Government in this province, and that applies both provincial and federally.

Now, for just a few minutes, I would like to talk a little about our constituency down there. We are what is generally known as a northerly constituency. Our people are farmers; we have little of anything else excepting small business people and a farming population. Our farms are not large like they are in other constituencies of this province. They are mostly small farms, half-sections, and we have a lot of quarter-section farmers, and we only have one farmer who operates about 15 quarters. Most of those people are good C.C.F.ers, first of all. Next, they are people who make their living at home. We have a large population of Scandinavian people, and then we have quite a population of French-speaking people; but they are all good farmers, if we could get a policy laid down which would assist them in making a living, and we are not asking too much of a policy.

The hon. member who just spoke ahead of me said "parity prices". Down there we have been discussing it, and possibly it is pretty hard to establish parity. If we could get for our farmers the minimum cost of the average production; if we could get that and then the average living enjoyed by the average people of the Dominion of Canada, the farmers would be satisfied. But today they haven't got it, they definitely haven't; and there is no way the Provincial Government can guarantee that they are going to get their average minimum production nor an average living. It has to be done by a sales method, and we have no control of that.

We have quite a number of highways in our constituency down there, even 15 miles of paved road. We have No. 40 Highway running from Shellbrook to Blaine Lake, a good highway; a lot of it is practically new, and it is all gravelled. We have No. 55 Highway from Shellbrook to Shell Lake, in good shape. Then we have No. 3 Highway from Shellbrook to Big River and north. The only stretch of highway that isn't in good shape is the stretch from Canwood to Big River. This has not been rebuilt since this Government came in, but it has been kept in condition so that travelling has been pretty fair on it. We have all the highways, except that section that I mentioned which has been built and gravelled since this Government came in, and that is a credit to possible Mr. Louis Larsen, who was in this House before I was.

We are in a northern part where possibly we could improve the roads going into the farming communities, and, therefore, we were happy and we were glad when the Government announced the grid road system. The grid road system when it is established in our municipality out there, practically in all our divisions, and built, will not leave any farmer more than 3 ½ or 4 miles away from a market grid road system or a highway, and with some of the road building that is being done there now, many people are going to be much closer than that. Then there is something that we need, and that is a bridge cross the river at possibly Laird Crossing. We organized what we called a Petrofa-Laird Bridge Association last year, and went in to see the Minister, and this is now being discussed. I thought I should bring this in because the people up there know that this is required, as over 50,000 vehicles crossed this crossing in one year.

Then we have two union hospitals, one in Shellbrook with about 20 beds, and one in Big River, which, I think, has eight beds; but I am not too sure about that one. They are both manned with good doctors, and they both have a good nursing staff in them, and are practically filled all the time. Our high school facilities, we have them in every village and town that we have in the constituency. Our whole constituency is practically all in one school unit, and our mill rate has been 25 mills, and the Government has been paying just about 68 per cent of the cost of operating the unit, and they feel that the Government has really done good in education. We have a lot of bus lines, and a lot of our children are now going into centres where they can get a proper education.

We have one problem that I would like to mention and that is the problem of telephones. We have very few of them, and the way our population is up in the northern part of the constituency, it is pretty hard to develop this. I am hoping that we might get a system of installing a telephone company which is a little different than what it is today.

Then we have another problem which we have taken over from the L.I.D. territory, and that is a Metis problem. It is brought to my attention pretty nearly every month when the time for assistance comes along, but this problem was much worse before this Government came in. The problem

February 26, 1957

was left to the individual municipality and they paid the whole shot of Metis' aid. If they went to the hospitals, the municipalities paid for it. If they went to doctors, the municipalities paid for it. Today we have an agreement with the Provincial Government whereby they pay us back all the money that is required to keep these Metis people in clothing and shelter. We stand the hospitalization cost, which is much less than it would be if we had to keep up the doctoring and everything else.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion.

Mr. H. Begrand (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, first I wish to congratulate you on your elevation to your present high office, in which we are all sure that you will do high honour. Therefore, I wish you every success, sir, in the discharging of your heavy responsibilities.

I also wish to extend my congratulations to the hon. members from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and Yorkton (Mr. Neibrandt) for the magnificent job they did in moving and seconding the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I also wish to take this opportunity to extend to the people of the provincial constituency of Kinistino my sincere thanks for their vote of confidence on June 20 last by re-electing me for the second consecutive term with a large majority. I can assure my friends in the Kinistino constituency that I will, in the future as I have in the past, try to merit their confidence and trust by serving them and the people of the province to the best of my humble ability.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the year 1956 will go down as one of the greatest years in the history of the province of Saskatchewan for several reasons which time will not permit me to go over. But the development and expansion in primary and secondary industry has been tremendous in 1956. Saskatchewan-made products are vastly increasing in volume and value. The expansion is also taking place in all spheres of mineral production. For instance, the crude oil since 1956 over 20 million barrels were produced compared with 11 million in 1955, and a high of 345 barrels in 1944. Of course, we had a Liberal Government at that time in power in Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has been marching forward very progressively since 1944, the year the C.C.F. Government was elected, and today the people of Saskatchewan are reaping yearly increasing benefits and services, the results of federal far-sighed and well-laid down economy in 1944.

Another great evidence of success in 1956, Mr. Speaker, - we had an election last year in the province of Saskatchewan, and in the political field also the people of Saskatchewan made doubly sure they were not going to

see the march of progress turned backwards. They want the march of progress to go on, and, in order to make sure that progress would continue in all fields, they re-elected the C.C.F. Government for its fourth consecutive term. This tremendous victory by the people of the province is much more noticeable because it was attained in the face of a terrific campaign by both the Liberal and Social Credit parties.

The two social Credit governments from the west invaded Saskatchewan last year during the election. Both invasions were headed by their premiers, Cabinet Ministers and scores of M.L.A.s and they both put on a terrific campaign. What I mean by a 'terrific campaign', Mr. Speaker, is that both of these parties went all-out on a campaign of real misrepresentation and insinuation. They did their utmost to poison the minds of the Saskatchewan people against their Government. All the political trickery at their command was used, but again for the fourth consecutive provincial election, both the Liberal and Social Credit groups underestimated the integrity and intelligence of the Saskatchewan p. The Liberal party is forgetting, or trying to forget, that Saskatchewan had a long stretch of Liberal Government – 39 years; well, there were four years of Tories, but there is no difference!

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Speak for yourself.

Mr. Begrand: — And in 1944 when the C.C.F. took over, the province had practically no highways – mostly cow-paths; no hospitalization service; no free cancer services; no mental illness services, treatment or care of the blind, or very little to speak of. I am only naming a few. In other words, in the field of services to our people there was practically nothing, and the province was financially busted! The people of Saskatchewan will never forget the bitter and tragic experience that lasted for 39 years, and they again voted against them last June 20, and I predict, with that long experience of a Liberal Government in the province, that never again will a Liberal Government be elected in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Optimistic!

Mr. Begrand: — The Social Credit party, trying to outdo the Liberals, forgot one thing. They forgot that the Saskatchewan people have been keeping a close watch on the doings of the Alberta Government. They have not forgotten the bribery used on the Alberta people in 1953. You know, before they were elected they promised the people of Alberta a \$25 per month pension for every man, woman and child, for life. The promise was made in the 'thirties when almost everybody was hungry.

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — That's your C.C.F. policy.

February 26, 1957

Mr. Begrand: — Was the promise fulfilled? Of course not. It was never intended to be fulfilled, Mr. Speaker. But they got in. Saskatchewan's people have confidence in their C.C.F. Government. It is a people's government, built by the people, owned by the people and working for the people, and it has as its motto "Justice for All and Special Privileges for None"; and today the people of Saskatchewan are increasingly enjoying and reaping the benefits of that great partnership started in 1944.

Mr. McCarthy: — Hooray!

Mr. Begrand: — I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my little contribution to the political situation of Saskatchewan may be of some assistance to my hon. friends opposite. But with my experience with them in the past, and since this Session has started, I doubt if it will, for in my opinion they are lacking very much in absorbing ability.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — That's propaganda for you!

Mr. Begrand: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with some business matters of some importance. I will deal with the 'time' question, and when I deal with the time question, Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the feeling of the people of the Kinistino constituency, and their sentiments which I endorse 100 per cent.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Do you know what time it is?

Mr. Begrand: — Last fall, we had a plebiscite in the province of Saskatchewan to decide this time question once and for all. Unfortunately I am convinced that this important question is more confused today than it ever was before.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Begrand: — I don't think there is any question, Mr. Speaker, that that portion of eastern Saskatchewan where they have been on Central Standard time for a long time were not to be called upon to vote on the question at all, because they don't want their time zones to be disturbed. However, for some reason or other they were called upon to vote with the rest of the province. It is a very confusing ballot. On Ballot A the vote was 101,292 for Central time and 67,950 voted against Central time. However, one must not forget that under Ballot A it was a straight vote over the entire province, including the eastern one-third of the province, and rightly so, which voted almost 100 per cent for Central time.

Breaking the ballot down into Part B which was on a community basis, this part is amazing to me, for we have had this system in Part B of the ballot in operation since, I believe, the war. The results were as

follows under Part B: 83,267 for Mountain Standard Time
 72,561 for Central Time
 18,390 for Daylight Saving Time,

A majority of 7,684 in favour of either Daylight Saving Time or Central Time. But again one must not forget, Mr. Speaker, included in this small majority is the whole one-third of the eastern part of the province who again voted strongly for Central time. This clearly indicates that had a simple and understandable ballot been used, and the vote taken, as it should have been across the province west from the present Central Time Zone, Mountain Standard Time would have carried by a large majority.

This being so, I wish to make my position very clear on this very important question. I don't want any rural school children to be compelled to get up, nor their mothers, between five and six in the morning in order to be ready to get the school bus by 7:00 o'clock a.m. Neither do I want them to go to bed when the sun is still high, and neither do I want to try to interfere with the cycle of the sun. Therefore, I will support Mountain Standard Time legally through an Act of the Legislature to cover all the portion of the province lying west of the present Central Time Zone, and I will oppose any other formula. This time set-up does not have to inconvenience the city people in the last, Mr. Speaker. All they have to do in the summer is to open their business places and go to work at eight o'clock in the morning and close at five o'clock in the afternoon. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the rural people will accept this change in closing hours very graciously. Rural people are very patient; but there are limitations.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the other members regarding the cancellation of the Education and Hospitalization tax on farm fuel. The rural people of this province, one and all, agree that that tax was a necessity during a good number of years, to help finance schools and to finance our hospitalization scheme; but I feel as they do, with our increasing provincial income from year to year, that the time has arrived for the cancellation of that tax on farm fuel. It is justified, and I hope that the Government will take action at this Session along those lines.

Regarding highways in my constituency, I wish at this time to extend my thanks to the Minister of Highways for the completion of Highway No. 3 on schedule. It was a three-year project, and it was carried out as scheduled, and I wish to thank the Minister of Highways for that. At the same time I wish to remind the Minister of Highways of the problem of No. 44 secondary highway in my constituency, and the extension of No. 20. I wish to remind Hon. Mr. Douglas that this is highly essential, and I hope he and his Department will look into that matter in the not too distant future.

February 26, 1957

I would like to say a word regarding agriculture. All my friends on the opposite side have been labouring under false ideals such as cancellation of taxes, removing of taxes and all these – that's only peanuts, my friends, and they know it.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Begrand: — The fundamental trouble lies in the fact that we are not getting our fair share of the national income, and they know it very well; but they have not had the intestinal fortitude to come out and tell the people of Saskatchewan what the trouble is, and I am going to tell them.

Mr. Cameron: — You're doing well, there, boy.

Mr. Begrand: — Our agriculture today, Mr. Speaker, is facing one of the worst crises it has ever faced before. In 1946, the farmer could buy a combine for less than \$3,000 with a pick-up; that is only a small example - \$2,700 in 1946 complete with a pick-up. Today the same machine, but with material 50 per cent poorer, costs you \$7,500. They know it. The same price increase has taken place in every other item the farmer has to buy for his farming operations. Since 1951, the western farmers' net income has fallen by over 66 per cent, and is still falling. On the other hand, the cost of production is still going up. This indicates the gravity of the situation and something must be done, and done at once. I hope my friends will support what I am going to say in a few minutes.

In 1946, 23 per cent of the population was engaged in agriculture and received 11 per cent (or a little better) of the national income. However, today 16 per cent of the population is producing as much as the 23 per cent in 1946, but they are only receiving less than 5 per cent of the national income. That's where the trouble lies. For instance, dealing with the machine industry as just one example. The total labour cost in 1946 in farm machinery production right across Canada was \$25 million, and the machine companies produced \$65 million worth of machinery in 1946, with a wage scale of \$25 million – a fair relationship. In 1955, because of wage boosts due to increased cost of living, labour engaged in farm machinery production received \$50 million in wages, but production of farm machinery amounted to \$171 million. In 1955 there was an increase of \$25 million in wages paid over 1946 for farm machine production. That may sound like a terrific increase in labour costs, and the machine companies, Mr. Speaker, have been right on the bit to attribute the increase in farm implement prices to labour costs. That is why machinery is selling at such a good price; every time the labour costs went up, that was the reason why farm implements went up. Of course that is not the case, at all.

However, let us see what has happened to the farm machinery production in 1955 in Canada. While the total wage boost was \$25 million higher than in 1946, the value of farm machinery produced in 1955 was \$106 million

more than it was in 1946, where they produced \$65 million of farm machinery at only a labour cost of \$25 million. In other words, in 1946 after labour costs were deducted, the machine companies produced \$40 million worth of farm machinery, while in 1955 after labour costs were deducted, the machine companies produced \$121 million worth of farm machinery, or a net increase over 1946 of \$81 million over labour costs.

It would appear to me that every time there was an increase in labour costs, more than double the increase was added to the price of the machinery, and this principle has been applied all the way along the line of materials the farmers have to buy. This is the result of the lifting of price control in 1946 by the Liberal Government at Ottawa, and while this condition has been freely allowed by the Liberals in Ottawa, farm income has gradually been going down and not a single word of protest has yet been heard or raised from the Liberal party of Saskatchewan, through its M.L.A.s or the Leader of the Opposition. Farmers are extremely anxious that something be done by the Federal Government to immediately improve the situation; but to the present their demands are falling on deaf ears at Ottawa.

I have been raised in Saskatchewan and have been raised on the farm, and have been a farmer since I have been able to work, and am still actively engaged in farming. Over this long period of time I have long ago come to the conclusion that agriculture in order to survive and take its proper place in the well-being of our country, must get its fair share of the national income at all times. In order to attain and retain that position, farmers must get a price for their produce commensurate with the cost of production, and that simply means parity prices. Farming is the only industry today that is not subsidized. Millions of dollars are being paid out in subsidies to other industries so that they can make their huge profits. These are the people that have worn out the sidewalk to Parliament in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, seeing that the farmers don't get subsidies on their farm produce and that they themselves be allowed to make their huge profits. Yet agriculture has been, and will continue to be, our greatest industry. As a first step I am entirely convinced that every farmer in Saskatchewan and in western Canada should belong to a Farm Union. What is parity price? Parity is equity, justice and equality, and a parity price system can be established in Canada for agriculture. And it does not have to demand a subsidy at all, contrary to the nonsense spread around by some people, and politicians – of course, you know who they are – Liberals.

Parity price is a system of control of prices for the benefit of the consumer. This could be obtained by the Federal Government re-establishing price control as they did during the last war and a short while after, during which time the national income was fairly well divided. However, if the Federal Government refuse to do this, the second method of obtaining parity prices is for the Federal Government to pay a cash subsidy, the amount to be

the difference between current yearly prices and the yearly cost of production. At the present time parity price for wheat, for instance, should not be less than \$2 a bushel – not at Fort William, but in the farmer's pocket! Our American friends, a few miles south of us, are getting over \$2.20 a bushel net to them in one payment, and their cost of production is less than the Canadian farmer's.

As amazing as this may appear to some people, a farm cash subsidy would not cost the Federal Government too much money. I would say that the Government, by increasing the farmer's income, would recover somewhere around two-thirds of the money paid out for such a subsidy through increased income tax collections, sales tax, etc. That is the second method of bringing back agriculture to its proper place. However, if the Federal Government failed to implement either of these remedies, there is a third one, and although it should be used only as a last resort, I cannot see anything wrong with it at all, and that is why I said earlier that every farmer in Saskatchewan and western Canada should be a member of a Farmers' Union. . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Are you?

Mr. Begrand: — . . . and through the Union (a Union must have a very strong membership) make one last appeal to the Federal Government, and if they still refuse to recognize the just demands of agriculture along the lines already outlined, then there would be nothing left but to call a general meeting of all the Union Lodges to further study the situation and call for further action. The farmers are the only group of working people that are not organized, and we have been paying a high price for being unorganised, Mr. Speaker. Even the inmates of gaols and penitentiaries are somewhat organized. They go on strike once in a while, both in this country and the United States, and every time they do they obtain some improvement in their conditions. Last fall, Mr. Gardiner made a speech in Saskatchewan, in which he said the farmers are getting parity price now. He said that.

Mr. Cameron: — It was afterwards denied.

Mr. Begrand: — He stated that the farmers of Canada have the highest standard of living that can be found anywhere among farm population. How ridiculous a man can become in his old age! Well, you know our American farmers, a few miles south of us are getting over \$2.20 a bushel for their wheat – not this year, not last year; they have been getting a good price for the last 20 years. Then Mr. Gardiner went on to tell every young man that there is no better future than on the farm. Mr. Gardiner again well knows that is not a true statement. The average young man is not able to start farming today for himself. It is impossible. It requires a small fortune to start farming today and under present conditions, he is sure to lose it in a short time. However, supposing a young man starts farming, he is sure to tie himself up financially for the next 30 years at present prices for grain and cost of production. For all the speeches that the Rt. Hon.

Mr. Gardiner has made so far concerning farm problems, he might just as well have kept them for himself.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has never to this day contradicted Mr. Gardiner's statement last fall re parity prices, and I now challenge the hon. Leader of the Opposition, during the course of this session and over the air, to tell the Saskatchewan farmer that he is now getting parity prices for his grain.

Mr. McDonald: — Do you want the answer now?

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, now.

Mr. Begrand: — Mr. Speaker, in concluding I was happy again to see from the Throne Speech a gradual increase in grants for education and roads. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Motion.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, in rising in the House for the first occasion. I should first of all like to add to what others have already said in congratulating you upon your succession to the position of Speaker of this House. I am sure that all members of the House have full confidence in your capacity and fairness in discharging the duties of chairing this Assembly.

I would also like to pay tribute to my predecessor, the former Attorney General, Mr. J.W. Corman, who served the constituency, long before I did, for many years in this House. I am sure that, if I can do even half as worthy a job as 'Jack' Corman did for Moose Jaw, I shall be doing very well indeed. I often think that Jack Corman, here as everywhere, epitomized the spirit of Moose Jaw – congenial, tolerant and progressive, and (if I may say so) friendly – from the "Friendly City" of Moose Jaw.

Moose Jaw, as Members well know, has this reputation of being a friendly city. The city and the area have an interesting history, not only for the immediate past, but for many centuries before that. It was, as members of the Assembly may know, a centre for the Indian cultures of the past. We have chosen in Moose Jaw to commemorate these by-gone cultures through the names of our bridges and viaducts; such as the Thunderbird Viaduct, that spans the valley from North Hill to South Hill; the Sioux-Bridge, the Cree Bridge and the Assiniboine Bridge. We have tried in that way to keep before the people of the area their debt to the past, to the former native population.

February 26, 1957

I think all would acknowledge that Moose Jaw is an interesting place to visit. Those who have seen our Wild Animal Park, our Crescent and our River parks, would probably agree. The emphasis in our city, I think, has always been on informality, and anyone with notions of pretence, or personal grandeur, is one that is treated rather humorously, if not perhaps very coolly. I think, too, that the fact that we have a large railroading population may give to our city a broader and a more comprehensive viewpoint than might normally be the case.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are grateful to know that action will proceed this year for the completion of the highway from Moose Jaw to Chamberlain, since that section of the road is very important to our economic well being. I would also like to suggest that there are other road programs in the immediate vicinity that will help us a good deal. I hope that I can suggest to the hon. Minister in charge that some action may take place in the very near future, to assure that at least in this term of legislative office there will be a blacktopped highway from Corrinne to Moose Jaw, and that as soon as possible; in any event, that something will be done to build up that road so that it may eventually be hard-topped. I think, too, that for our neighbouring centres, especially those centres on the way to Assiniboia and southward, that we would like to see the most rapid action in service roads that will help the people of that area connect with our city.

I would like to turn, for just a moment, to the question of the Buffalo Lake Causeway, and I would here request what has already been requested elsewhere, that the Federal authorities very soon will let our Government know what their intentions are with reference to the height of Buffalo Pound Lake, so that the Causeway over the Lake may be finished; so that will be settled once and for all.

I think I should tell the House here, in case it is not realized generally by everyone, that Moose Jaw is the main industrial city for Saskatchewan, per capita of population. I think most of the hon. members will know and be familiar with the general nature of our industry: the fact that we are one of the largest divisional points for the Canadian Pacific Railway; the fact that we have one of the largest flour mills in Canada, with a production of something like 5,200 barrels per day, for all products connected with flour and oat milling. We have had a development in oil refining of about \$15 or \$16 million in the last six or seven years. Also, we are very pleased to be the location for the new Saskatchewan Training School, which I want to acknowledge here to be an admirably planned institution.

My constituents also wish me to say that we believe Moose Jaw offers a first-rate, and the best, location for the projected Saskatchewan Technical Institute, which will be build eventually somewhere. We think that there are some eminently sound considerations why it should be located in our city. First of all, I think one of the reasons is that we have one of the

finest technical high schools on the prairies, and that the presence of that high school would complement an institute of higher technical learning. As well, I think I should say here, while perhaps respectfully disagreeing with the hon. lady member from Regina, that it is not an extremely good reason that the institute should go to one of our larger centres, or our largest centre. It seems to me that were that principle always followed, inevitably all development would go to one point; and again with great deference, we think that the cities of Regina and Saskatoon are already very well blessed with a large degree of Government employment and institutions, and that in this instance, it would be fairer to share. Moose Jaw would probably be the best place for the institute to be located.

I want to point out, too, that an institute of this kind will undoubtedly be of great service to the rural population, because of the extremely large measure of mechanization in agriculture today. So far as young farmers are concerned who are coming to receive the benefits of any technical institute, they really don't care whether it is in a large city, or a smaller centre. Having in mind again, the fact that we have a skilled instruction not only in the technical high schools but in the industrial shops that are in the cities, I think that every good reason exists why Moose Jaw should receive the most favourable consideration when the location of this institutions is being determined. Perhaps I should add that there will be no difficulty in reference to sites for this institute. We will guarantee in our city, to make available a centrally located site for this institute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other questions that I would like to deal with here this afternoon: first of all, with reference to the question of education, and the matter of municipal costs, generally speaking. I have (as some members will know) been a member of the city council of Moose Jaw for the past eight years, and I don't think that anyone has been more aware of the pressures on local government finances than I have been, during that period. Increasingly, the question of school rates has bothered all of the people on the city council, and on the school boards in my city, and I know that we have been looking for some solutions. However, it does seem to me, notwithstanding anything that has been said in the House to the contrary, that it is necessary to look Federally when it comes to the matter of solution of any municipal cost that is concerned. I don't think that this is a question of argument; it is really not a narrow political question; it is a matter that has gone past that, and should be considered a non-partisan issue. When you consider, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian School Trustees' Association in a report made by its agent, Dr. Lazerte in 1955, pointed out that the Federal Government must assist each province in raising the level of its foundation program to an acceptable Canadian standard, because the provinces varied in wealth; and the level at which a foundation program would be fixed would necessarily vary from province to province. And then, the report of the School Trustees' Association, which, of course, includes

February 26, 1957

all types of political thinking, made the specific recommendation that the Federal Government should be requested to assist in financing elementary and secondary education by giving aid to the extent of \$150 million per annum at the present time, one-third of this aid to be on a per pupil basis; and two-thirds as equalization grants. It went on to point out that provinces with a low tax-paying ability are unable at the present time to provide even 30 or 40 or 50 per cent as much money on the education of each of their children as are more fortunate provinces. So I think, as I said, that it is no longer really a question of whether or not we have any political opinions on this thing. If we want the kind of equal opportunities in education that will be the same not only for all people in Saskatchewan but for all Canadians, then we must accept the fact that, because of the varying degrees of ability to pay across the country, only with Federal aid can a truly uniform educational standard be secured. I think, too, that when you look at the whole area of taxation it will be seen how little of the financial results go to the municipalities and the ten provincial governments, and how much of a share of the final taxation collected remains with the Federal Government.

I have here a table which I am not going to give in full, except to give the figures for one year and that is the year 1955. Taxation in that year including all taxation for Federal, Provincial, and municipal governments realized a total of \$5,483,260,000. Of that sum, \$4,102,500,000 or 74.8 per cent, went to the Dominion Government of this country, and the remainder, 10.1 per cent in the case of the provinces and 15.1 per cent in the case of the municipalities went to the 4,220 local governments, and the ten provincial governments in Canada. So, I think, on the basis of those figures, that it can be clearly seen that the financial capacity of local and provincial governments is unable to cope with the need in any of the provinces, even the wealthiest. Some kind of taxation reallocation must result if many of the things that we know are necessary are to come about.

It is interesting to note that this sort of realization has been now, I think, effective in the United States for at least the last decade, and possibly before, and I don't know whether the Hon. Members will have noticed, but in one of the current issues of 'United States News and World Report' it is noted that the Eisenhower Administration intends, in the next four years, to donate, or rather contribute, to the States, on a matching basis, \$2,220,000,000 and that the States will be asked to contribute, as a matching series of grants, only an additional \$1,280,000,000. So it can be seen that the question of Federal assistance for education in the U.S.A. has long since gone past the academic stage, and I think it is further reason why in this country, we have to take another look, and our Federal authorities must consider, and consider very fast, extra assistance to provincial and municipal governments.

Some mention was made in the remarks, I believe, of the Leader of the Opposition that natural gas rates in Moose Jaw were too high. Well, now I think, admittedly, they may be higher than rates in the province of Alberta, and I believe the reasons for that have been given here and elsewhere many times. We are starting out a gas system and have not had a gas system in effect for 25 or 30 years, as has Alberta. But nevertheless, I think this should be plain to everyone that, through the rates that are now effective in the city of Moose Jaw and other cities that have been blessed with the advent of natural gas by the action of this Government =, very substantial savings are being made.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Davies: — The savings may be from 20 to 30 per cent, and they may be more than that. I can give you my own experience, since I am a recipient of natural gas services since November 7, 1956. With heat for a three-bedroom bungalow and for a water-heater, my bill is, up to two days ago, \$46. Now, at this time of the year I should have been very fortunate indeed to get by with double the expenditure with the coal furnace which I had formerly. I think that this is a practical illustration of the thousands of dollars of savings that will be made, this year by the residents of that city.

I somehow took the intimation in the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the people of Moose Jaw, and the people in the urban areas generally, were getting something that the people in rural areas were not getting. I don't believe that that is the intention of this Government, Mr. Speaker; and it struck me as rather strange that, during the election campaign before the 1956 provincial election in this province, some of the urban speakers were stating that the trouble with the gas program was that it was going to assist the rural areas and that the city areas were going to be paying for that development. I think that, so far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as most fair-minded people are concerned, when it comes to the investment of public moneys, they do not want to see rural residents or urban residents benefit one over the other, but for all sections of the population to enjoy the development and to enjoy the facilities that come from such a wonder thing as natural gas.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Davies: — It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a policy of Liberal thinking that they don't seem to mind public money spent to finance a private monopoly but resent it when public money is used to finance a public monopoly. . .

The previous speaker has already mentioned something about prices and costs, and I am not going, if I can help it, to repeat what he said. I want to preface my remarks by saying that I was born on a farm.

February 26, 1957

I know something about farm difficulties. I have a lot of farm connections amongst my relatives. I think you all know that I work for a provincial labour organization. I want to say that, in all of my work, I try and keep in mind that the interests of the farmer and the worker are interdependent, and I sincerely believe that they are interdependent. I make a very sincere effort to understand the problems that are today besetting agriculture. I do, believe also that they are very real problems indeed. And again, not wanting to get away from what we can do provincially to help agriculture, it seems to me again clear that the principal solutions are in the hands of the Federal Government. I believe, though, that the Speech from the Throne does to the extent that it is possible (and I believe that that is a considerable extent) attempt to do something for the farming population, so that the type of economic evils that they are now meeting will be met, at least, in some way, and have some alleviation. I do feel troubled and disturbed, though, when I notice many of the newspapers and periodicals that support the Official Opposition, attempting to split the basic sections of the community – the farm and the labour sections of the community – by pointing out, at least so far as the newspapers in this province are concerned, that somehow the high income of wage and salary earners has been responsible for the trouble in which the farm areas find themselves today.

I think, first of all, it is important for all members to realize, if they don't realize it now, that we are not today suffering anywhere because there are any scarcities, or because any one major section of the community is getting too much. I think that everyone will have seen the section in the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, which comments that there has been, over the last 25 years, a real or constant increase in national productivity of 3.06 per cent per annum. I think, too, that if you scrutinize certain year groupings, it will be apparent that the wage and salary earners and the farmer are not receiving as large a section or division of the national income as they did even in earlier years. It may come as a surprise to the members of the House to know that during the period 1930 to 1939, the workers' share (if you will, the wage earners' and salary earners' share of the national income) was 66.2 per cent, while in the period 1946 to 1954 the percentage division had declined to 58.3 per cent. This was in this kind of a changed situation – that there was a much larger national production even as I have said per-capita-wise, and a much larger group of working people. I am referring to "Working people" for the moment – to city people. At the same time, it will be seen that the share for the investors had increased very substantially, and I intend as I go along, to try and point out just how those shares have increased.

First of all, perhaps I might make some reference to the question of farm machine costs, and the Hon. member who has just spoken, I think, has done a very good job in pointing out that labour costs as an element in the final costs are really not the significant costs to the farmer. I think that it is not necessary really, in this Legislature, to argue about it, because, as I understand it, it was the unanimous findings of a Committee

of a previous Legislature that there were very high costs concerned in the profits of farm implement companies, which in a large measure was responsible for the high prices to the farmers. And if there was any need to amplify, or extend, that finding, I think the Ottawa Inquiry of 1936 and 1937 would be sufficient to underscore what I have just said, and what the Inquiry said, and I am only quoting in part, but I think it is sufficient, when they said in that booklet, that:

“... over the period 1891 to 1936, retail prices of farm implements had been maintained at too high a level as shown by the financial returns of the companies in the industry.”

So I say there should be no doubt, and there should be no argument, about what has happened in this field over the years.

I think, too, that something should be said about other costs, about other rising prices that hurt the farmer of this province, and for which the wage earner is frequently blamed. I think, perhaps, the one that occurs most frequently in the papers and periodicals of the day, has reference to steel. A year or so ago, there was a steel strike in the United States, and there followed after that higher wages in the industry and an increase in the price of steel of \$8.50 per ton. What actually happened with that increase?

Mr. Speaker, the cost to the steel companies of the first year's increase under the settlement was 20 cents an hour for workers - \$8.00 for a 40-hour week. If you take the 600,000 steel workers in the United States and Canada, and multiply it by the \$8.00 per week, you get a figure of \$4,800,000 weekly. The increase of \$8.50 a ton, however, resulted in two million tons a week at the \$8.50 a ton, or an increase of \$17 million - 3 ½ times more than the wage increase that was granted to the working people in that industry.

We have been talking here frequently, about the cost of farm fuels, and I think that a study of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' Union, just released, will be interesting to the Assembly. It shows that the total labour cost for refining a barrel of crude oil into gasoline was 28.3 cents in 1949, but by 1954, because of the increased productivity of each worker, the labour cost per barrel had dropped nearly three cents to 25.4 cents per barrel, and the total labour cost for refining a gallon of gasoline on this basis, is two-thirds of a cent. Here you have wage increases in an industry (and in this particular industry they have been fairly substantial), but an overall reduction in cost, and I think it is apparent that that has not been passed on to the consumer.

February 26, 1957

Turning to our own country, the Canadian Labour Congress 'News Report' for January, 1957, points out that just for the nine months ending on September 30, 1956, the estimated profits of corporations, after taxes, had increased \$235 million – to \$1,399,000,000 from \$1,164,000,000 in the previous year.

Again, if I may refer to some figures which are pretty close to home, I would like to speak about the question of automobile and truck costs. I think that members of this House are familiar with the fact that there have been, again, some new price increases, and the United Auto Workers, who are rather tired of being the goat or the whipping-boy for these increases, have just recently pointed out that, taking the Ford Company of Canada profits based on 1955, the net profit for 1956 would be exceeded by some \$20,729,000 and this would amount to an estimated net profit of almost \$2,200 per plant worker. If you go to General Motors, the increases are even more startling, because it was found that the annual rate of return on net work during the first six months of 1956 was over 50 per cent before taxes, and 23.7 per cent after taxes. I think you will agree that a profit of ten per cent would be a very handsome one, indeed, and here you have a very much larger profit than that.

One of the hon. members, I believe yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was making reference to the fact that this Government may become the biggest business in the province, and voiced some fear over that fact. I think there is nothing particularly the matter with public big business as long as, at all times, the proper democratic measures are kept to keep control of whatever is big; but I couldn't help but think of a news item which appeared in the 'Leader-Post' on February 21 where Professor C.A. Ashley of the University of Toronto, a political economist with the Department of Commerce of the University, makes this following statement:

“That enormous economic power rests in the hands of fewer than 200 Canadian, the vast majority of whom are Bank Directors.”

And, without reading the whole item, I shall read just some extracts.

Mr. E. Kramer: — Who owns Canada?

Mr. Davies: — He refers to the Bank of Montreal:

“... where 30 Directors hold 220 or more directorships, including industrial and commercial giants such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, International Nickel, Dominion Rubber Company, Bell Telephone Company and the Steel Company of Canada.

“Royal Bank of Canada – Twenty-five directors hold more than 240 directorships. Some of the firms: Canadian Breweries, Canada Cement, Imperial Oil, Imperial Tobacco, Acadia Atlantic Sugar and B.C. Power.”

I am not going to refer to any more than that, but it does seem to me that our worry today is not the worry of whether we have big public utilities that are owned by the public, but whether or not we can control the private industrial giants that have arisen during the past 50 years particularly, and which are not being controlled by the Federal Government of this country.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Davies: — Finally, on this point, Mr. Speaker, I think, I would like to say that the plight that farming people in this province and other parts of Canada find themselves in, could not be rectified by workers taking a cut in salaries or wages, because that condition would not help, but would aggravate the situation in which the farmer finds himself. I think the best illustration of this is found again in the findings of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Using the Dominion of Bureau of Statistics figures, the Commission points out that in real value, in constant value, from 1935 to 1953, the amount of money spent from disposable income on four products, had increased from \$1,676 million to \$3,321 million, and these are constant figures again. Remembering that the farm population has decreased in Canada from about 1,200,000 to around 800,000 persons, it will be seen that the situation in that respect, at least, has improved somewhat, and that the only effect of cutting the consuming power of working people, who in this country number seven workers to every one farmer, would be to actually aggravate the situation in which the farmer finds himself.

We have now a situation where the totality (or pretty well the totality) of beef production is consumed in Canada; in fact, I think, in 1956, there were some importations of beef from the United States into Canada. A total consumption of 1,700 million pounds was achieved in this country last year, which is more than the total consumption and total exports during the year 1944, when the farmers of this country strained every nerve to ship (I believe it was at that time about 700 million pounds of pork) to the Old Country, in relief of that hard-pressed island.

I would like to say, too, Mr. Speaker, that there is in the interdependent philosophy that official labour now holds in this country, a feeling that we must do something to assist the farming people in pressing the legislative centres of the country to enact suitable legislation in that direction, and I am very happy to say that the newly-merged National Congress has, only a short time ago, passed resolutions in convention that approved parity, equitable prices for farm products, and agreed that the farmers should not have to sell on the domestic market and lose thereby.

February 26, 1957

Now, on the program that is envisaged in the Speech from the Throne, I think that perhaps anyone, no matter on which side of the House, might be able to find something that wasn't quite to his liking, and be able to say that there should be some additions. I, nevertheless, think that in spite of that, the Speech from the Throne shows the same general onward and progressive directions that the Speech from the Throne have shown since the inception of this Government. That is why personally I suppose it for what it means overall.

I would like frankly to suggest that the time is here, though, to give some consideration to certain pieces of Labour legislation. Particularly because a number of other provinces across the country have come rather close to what we have achieved in Saskatchewan, and with the additions that they have made in legislation, I think that it should cause us, or enable us, to go forward without at all getting too far ahead of these provinces. I think, specifically, that the question of Hours of Work needs a very prompt review, and I think, too, that matters such as a Sick Pay law, and Workmen's Compensation should be considered. First of all because there is now a total of eight out of ten provinces that have achieved a 75 per cent level of Workmen's Compensation, the remaining two being around 70 per cent, I think this Government could maintain the leadership as it has shown before, by doing something in this direction.

I think that there is some need for a Sick Pay law. I think everyone in the House will be familiar with the fact that in industry today, whether it is organized or un-organized, it is frequently the pattern that, for two or three weeks of the year where there is sickness for any particular worker, time is granted to him with pay for that period of sickness, in the same way as for a longer period in workmen's compensation something is paid for that disability. I think that we might proceed somewhere along the line by passing legislation that would go at least part of the way of some of the more advanced practices in industry. I think in the field of statistics and research that we could make an improvement that would assist the understanding of all the members in the Assembly on labour questions.

I think, too, that the matter of a Woman's Bureau in industry is perhaps now a moot point. I think it is needed to keep pace with the numbers of women workers in industry today; to enable us to provide for and protect, them where this is required.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to give to you, and to the House, some of the problems of my constituency, and some of the problems of the section that I know about best. I say that for all of the reasons that I have attempted to give. I intend to support the Speech from the Throne when that vote is put before the Assembly.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I believe it is customary to congratulate you, sir, for your appointment. When I heard that you were going to be the Speaker of this House I was naturally pleased. I don't know the new members who were elected on the other side for this session, but when I checked over the list of those who were here before I left, in 1952, I thought that you were the best qualified for that position, because I found, in the time I was in this House, that you, sir, did not engage too much in partisan politics. You carried out your duties as a Minister very well within the range that was provided to you by this Socialist Government. I found you to be a real gentleman, and so I thought they had made a very good appointment. Therefore, I congratulate you, sir, on your high office.

I would also like to congratulate all the speakers who have spoken in this debate. I am sure that they feel relieved of their worry of preparing a speech and having it off their chests, especially those speakers who were speaking for the first time. I know it is quite a worry; and now they can relax and attend to the business of the Legislature.

I would like especially to congratulate the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) for the wonderful speech he delivered here and for the propositions and criticisms he advanced. I always remember the advice of that great famous statesman and politician, Churchill, who said, when he was in the Opposition and when he was asked by Mr. Atlee what he proposed to do – he was very critical of the government; and when he was asked by Mr. Atlee what he proposed to do, he said: “After we kick you out, I will show you what we are going to do; I am not going to give you any ideas.” Our Leader of the Official Opposition actually did give many good ideas to the Government – he shouldn't have, but he did, and he was criticized for it: for example, the 16 points by which the farmers' lot could be alleviated was pooh-poohed by the other side as being nothing very significant.

I also wish to congratulate the lady members in this House. It is a novelty to me because, when I was here last time, there were no ladies in this House and, of course, the men acted as if there were no ladies present. I feel that there is quite a bit of restraint in this House because of the presence of the ladies.

I find myself at rather a disadvantage speaking today, Mr. Speaker, as there have been four C.C.F. men on the other side speaking. I notice they have succeeded in putting a man to sleep up in the galleries there – he just woke up a while ago; and I am not kidding you, either. They are very effective in that respect.

I have a few things outlined here that I would like to say and I am just going to give the outline and then I will proceed to deal with each one if there is enough time. I have something to say about the Redberry seat, then there is something to be said about the Throne Speech and the radio broadcasting; then the various M.L.A.s in this Legislature; then I am going to talk about social welfare in this province, and also about Socialism; and then I am going to remark on some of the things that were said from the other side. I am not going to do that now because I know that they will start hopping around and they will make my speaking very difficult, so I will leave that for the end.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the Throne Speech is concerned (you have heard it before, but I think it requires repeating) there is very little in the Speech. It isn't just that we want to hear ourselves talk when we say that, but there actually is very little in that speech of what is supposed to be in a Throne Speech. I checked this Speech with a magnifying glass and I have found that there are fifty paragraphs in the Speech. I have marked "zero" beside the paragraphs that did not deal with any forecast of legislation, and I have found that there are twenty-five paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne (and they are large paragraphs) that have 'zero' because they have already appeared, in the past, in the Bureau of Publications 'Newsletter'. They are telling of the various things that have happened in this province and that has been repeated over and over again, and if you take the Bureau of Publications releases and study them and this Throne Speech, you will see that many of the paragraphs are taken out of the Bureau's publications.

Then, of the twenty-five remaining paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne, I found seventeen (I have to give the Government credit) that were not in the past, but were looking to the future; but these forecast amendments, weak amendments, to some very unimportant Acts. There was just one thing that was new there, and that has been mentioned before; they are going to set up a Tourist Bureau, a Department of Tourists in this province. Well, I suppose it is a welcome new addition to the Department that we have now; I suppose it isn't doing very good work.

Seven paragraphs in this Speech from the Throne are 'Regrets' about Ottawa not doing what they are supposed to be doing, and one paragraph is actually self-condemnation. The Government condemns itself in the first paragraph by saying: "However, on a long-term basis the most serious threat to agricultural solvency is rising farm costs and falling farm prices." And they are not proposing to do anything about it.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — The Saskatchewan farmers are up against the wall, and they are not proposing to do anything about it! There is not a thing in this Speech — they condemn themselves when they admit the farmers are up against it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the constituency which I represent. It is unfortunate that my constituents will not hear what I am saying – I will have something to say about that, too. But I would like to say something about the constituency of Redberry. Fundamentally, it is a Liberal constituency. It has always been Liberal; the people are solid. . .

Some Government Member: — Between the ears?

Mr. Korchinski: — They hold to anything that is worthwhile. It is true that, in 1952, I lost my seat, but it was by such a small margin that I always considered that it wasn't actually any loss, because, as you know the official count was 70 votes; I was supposed to have been defeated by 70 votes. I appealed to have a re-count and we did have a re-count and it was brought down to where there was officially 24 votes difference between the two sides. But actually it was 'zero' difference – and I will explain to you why it was. The judge of the re-count explained to us that any ballots that are marked with ink, or with a ballpoint pen, are not valid. On this you can agree or you can disagree as far as I am concerned; you can count these ballots or you can reject them. We had agreed to count those ballots. Well, if these ballots had been rejected there would have been a tie, and that wasn't funny; it was quite serious. I am telling this to you fellows because you might have the same experience. It was a tie – actually a tie; and, of course, the Returning Officer has the casting vote. That is how it happened that the C.C.F. got Redberry in 1952. But in 1956 we won it back again, and I think I hold that unique position in this Legislature – that I was defeated in 1952, and I am now back again. I might be defeated again whenever an election comes, but I am not worrying about that because I have gone through that process; but I just wonder what some of you fellows over there would think if you got defeated. You would just shiver and shake.

Mr. McDonald: — They'd never be back.

Mr. Korchinski: — They just hope that they will never come to that day; but they may. You can never tell. There was quite a bit of forecasting from the other side about what was going to happen to the Liberal party in this province, and what was going to happen to the C.C.F. Well I wouldn't bet a broken nickel on the C.C.F. party in this province; I can tell you that right now.

This Redberry seat was carved out of a Saskatchewan map – I don't know by whom; but it was absolutely a very poor plan, a very poor map. You would find, if you wanted to cover the Redberry seat, to visit your constituents, you couldn't do it by going through the Redberry seat; you would either have to go into North Battleford or Turtleford constituency to reach your own people. There are no roads that run east and west; most of the roads run across, north and south. The seat straggles from east to

west. It looks like a hatchet on the map, with the blade pointing at Regina.

Mr. Danielson: — At Socialism!

Mr. Korchinski: — That's right. And I believe it was mostly as the result of gerrymander; that this C.C.F. Government was afraid, or that they were trying to win North Battleford, and they took certain places where there were a lot of Liberals and just took them away from Battleford, and so, if you look on the map, there is no reason for having a map like that and I think that most of the people agree — although I like having all those people in that seat. They are wonderful people; there is no question about that. I really enjoyed the last campaign, and I am sure that I will enjoy representing the Redberry seat — they are wonderful people; but it is not a natural seat. I mean it is not a natural map.

As far as the radio broadcasting of the Legislative proceedings is concerned, I want to lodge a protest as the member for Redberry seat. I don't see why all the other members should be privileged to have their speeches go out over the air and have their constituents listen to their speeches, and why my speech should not go on the air. Why am I different from anybody else? I thought that the socialists believed in equality. Mr. Speaker, do you call this equality? I thought I was just as equal as anybody else. I know that even in the 'Animal Farm' the Socialist textbook, it says that all the pigs are equal — all the animals are equal, but the pigs are more so than the others. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is right; I don't believe it is right that the radio should be handled as it is. I don't see anything else in this but the aim of this Government and the C.C.F. party to use that radio, not as a means of information, but as a means of propaganda; because how is it right that they should have all the privileges of the air, or all the time given to the other side?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You've got more than your share.

Mr. Korchinski: — That isn't so! And if you want to debate this question I would like to start a debate on it in this House.

Some Hon. Member: — Let's hear the facts.

Mr. Korchinski: — The speeches should all be broadcast, or none at all; that is the way I see it. I can't see why any Minister or any member of this House should have any privilege over another member. They should all be broadcast, or none. The way we have it now, we get the Government having the biggest share of the airtime and it creates absolutely a wrong impression to those who listen — an absolutely wrong impression. It sounds as if there was no other side to the question. For example, the province doesn't hear what I have to say. Maybe it is just as well; but it is wrong. I still claim that as an elected representative of Redberry, I have the same rights as anybody else in this House.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Talk to your Whip.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am absolutely denied those rights right now because some other members have greater privileges than I have, and I don't think that the British Parliamentary system allows that.

Some Hon. Member: — Talk to your own side.

Mr. Korchinski: — I have the floor of this House and I would like those jokers on the other side of the House not to interfere with me while I am talking because I have something to say here and I am going to say it.

Now they say that they are fair and that they stand for equality for everybody. Well then, they condemn Ottawa so often and so much about everything; that everything Ottawa is doing is wrong. I happen to know that there are also political broadcasts from Ottawa for which the taxpayers pay with tax money, like we pay here now; and I find (and I stand to be corrected if it isn't right) that Ottawa pays for twenty-one broadcasts and apportion those broadcasts on this ratio: the Liberals take four hours, the Conservatives take three hours; the C.C.F. take two hours, and the Social Credit takes one hour. That is to say that the Government gets 4 to 6 – four hours for the Government and six hours for the Opposition. That is absolutely right. Now look at the membership at Ottawa. The Government here tells us that we have to broadcast on the proportion of the elected members. Well, this isn't on the proportion of elected members. The Liberals have 170 and the some-odd members in Ottawa; the Conservatives have 51; the C.C.F. have, or had, 23; the Social Credit have 15 and there are five others. Now, if you divided the radio time that they have in Ottawa according to this ratio of membership in the House of Commons, I don't think that you would arrive at the ratio that they use here. I don't think the C.C.F. would get very much time on the air – 23 to 170 would be very small; they might get five minutes.

I don't think it is fair. I believe that something should be done; that either all the speeches on the Throne Speech debate and the budget debate be broadcast, or none, because the radio broadcasting creates an absolutely wrong impression on the electorate. I have heard that over and over. You will hear from certain people that the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) made a wonderful speech, but nobody heard him in his seat. Why shouldn't they?

Mr. McDonald: — He didn't want them to.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, if he didn't want his people to hear him, that is his business; but I would like to have my people hear what I have to say here, and I, therefore, think something should be done about it.

I say that the C.C.F. members and members of the C.C.F. party are using radio and television very extensively in trying to form public opinion. Well, of course, that is their business; but I may say that some of it is rather amusing – I don't mean the broadcast from this Legislature, but the broadcasts from outside it. And that is paid for with taxpayers' money! I have heard some people say, who have seen our Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on television, that their children came running and said, "Mamma, come and see the new Phineas T. Bluster from Howdy-Doody; he is talking about car insurance." The mother says, "No, that couldn't be possible." "Sure! He's always talking about money and Bluster always talks about money." And here is the Provincial Treasurer on the radio, talking about car insurance. Well, after the mother went and looked she said, "Ah, you are mistaken. That is not the Howdy-Doody show; it is something else."

There are other people who have remarked that they had seen a panel discussion on T.V. from Saskatoon. It was a C.C.F. panel discussion and there were a whole bunch of men sitting along the wall and they had mistaken them for the San Francisco Beat, and when they get to the question as to where they come from they. . .

Mr. Speaker, there is another complaint that I would like to lodge in this Legislature. I believe that the members of the Legislature are unable to discharge their duties properly to their people the way the business of this Legislature is conducted. It seems to me that as soon as we get here there is a rush, rush, rush. Now I am as anxious to get back and to get to my work as anyone else, but I think that we should spend all the time necessary to examine everything that we are supposed to examine in this Legislature; and I certainly don't like the way we are rushing through the Public Accounts, and the way we are rushing through everything else. I think we should take enough time to give very, very close scrutiny to everything that happens here. The business of the Government is growing so much that it should take quite a bit more of our time than it has up to now, and we should be prepared, when we are elected, to come here and do the job right.

Another complaint that I have is that this Government does not seem to be able to take the members of the Legislature into their confidence as far as their ridings are concerned. Now I know this is not just a complaint from this side. I know that I have heard (I am not going to mention who) from the private members of the Government, that they certainly don't know what is going on and what the Government is doing in their constituencies. This is more or less a Government by Order-in-Council and by the dictatorship of the Cabinet; . . .

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — That they are just there for – forelooks. Of course, they have their caucuses and so on, but the private members have little to say about what goes on in the constituencies which they represent. I believe it would save this province a lot of money and it would make the Government of this province much more efficient (I don't care who is in power or who is not) if, once an election is over, politics should be forgotten and we should get down to the business of running the affairs of this province to the best of our ability. I would forget the politics and try to help the people in their seat as much as possible; but this Government seems to be afraid to take us into their confidence as far as our people are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a bit about the Department of Social Welfare, and about some of the policies of this Government. I know that this Government and the party that forms the Government has always been proclaiming how they are concerned with humanity and that humanity is the first thing in their concern. Now by humanity I think that they meant, or should mean, all of humanity – not just certain sections of humanity; and I certainly do not believe that they carry out their policies in respect to our old-age pensioners, or what we are becoming accustomed to call our 'senior citizens'. I know of some cases where these senior citizens of our province are living in very dire conditions. I know of old ladies and old gentlemen living in one-room shacks, without any conveniences, without proper food. I have visited quite a few of them and the complaint was always the same – that "this is as much as we can afford on what we are getting; we can't afford any more." Therefore, I believe at this time that this Government should do something about it. I think they should increase the supplementary allowance. I know that, in the past, it hasn't always been so. This Government hasn't shown itself to be very generous to our senior citizens, despite all their talk about 'humanity first'. They have shown themselves, on very many occasions, very stingy when it came to looking after our older people. And instead of getting any help from this Government – as much as they could do, of course; we know that the Federal government is paying a very large share of the pension. Instead of this Government giving any help to the old people of this province, all they get is a great bunch of propaganda about what this Government is doing for them; but actually they don't find that this Government is doing enough.

I suppose it is old history, but I think it should be brought back and recorded – this Government actually, on two occasions, have robbed the old-age pensioners of this province of what was due to those old-age pensioners, because in May, 1947 – they like to quote what happened before 1944, so I am just going to 1947; in May, 1947, the Federal Government increased the old-age pension from \$25 to \$30 a month. At that time the old-age pensioners were getting \$30 of which the Federal Government was paying \$25 and the Provincial Government was paying \$5 supplementary allowance. When the Federal Government increased their share to \$30, for eleven months the

old-age pensioners did not get the benefit of this increase. As soon as the Federal Government increased the old-age pensions to \$30 the Provincial Government withdrew their supplementary allowance and the old-age pensioners were still getting only \$30. Not until eleven months later, until the gentlemen that are sitting over here brought this to the attention of the public, did this Government put back the supplementary allowance and the old-age pensioners got \$35.

Mr. Danielson: — It amounted to \$670,000.

Mr. Korchinski: — It was taken out of the pockets of these old people and spent by this Government on I don't know what; but it was taken from the old people. At the same time the other provinces, when the Federal increase came, they just passed it on to the old-age pensioners. In 1952, the Dominion Government took over the payment of the basic pension of \$40 a month to persons aged 70 and over. The Saskatchewan Government, by this very act, saved something over a million dollars, because, after 1952, Saskatchewan's total expenditure on old-age pensions was \$2,380,000 and after the Federal Government took over the larger share of the payment to our senior citizens, the Provincial Government spent only \$1,270,000. So it saved over \$1 million, and I believe this saving should have been passed on to the old-age pensioners by way of supplementary allowances.

The Federal Government's share before 1952, was \$5 $\frac{3}{4}$ million, and since that time the Federal Government has increased its share up to \$22 million, which was last year's contribution – from \$5 million to \$22 million, while the Provincial Government has decreased by 50- per cent its contribution to the old-age pensioners of this province. They can't say that they cannot afford to help more, because they have more revenue; they have an actual extra \$1 million which they saved by the Federal Government taking over the greatest share of this burden. It should be remembered that by The British North America Act, old-age pensions are not the responsibility of the Federal Government. That is nothing to laugh at, and if you are laughing you haven't studied The British North America Act. . .

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . because only upon agreement with the province has the Federal Government been able to get around this particular item in The British North America Act, and to contribution such sums to the support of our senior citizens. I am not one to say that they should not be contributing, mind you. I don't want this to be interpreted that I am against the Federal Government contributing to the old-age pensioners. Not at all. I am in favour of them contributing more. But I am also in favour that this Government should do what they preach, because it certainly isn't fair that our senior citizens should be receiving such a small supplementary allowance from this Government while other provinces are paying much more.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — What about Manitoba?

Mr. Korchinski: — You don't know anything about Manitoba anyway, so there is no use explaining it to you.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, just so the hon. member won't leave a wrong impression and leave himself open to attack later on – he is surely familiar with the amendment to The British North America Act in 1951, which gave the Federal Government sole jurisdiction of people 70 and over. That was a constitutional amendment to which the provinces agreed.

Mr. Korchinski: — I said there had to be arrangements made with the provinces in order to get around The British North America Act. There had to be a special arrangement made with the provinces in order to be able to have the Federal Government come into this field.

I am sorry the Premier is worrying that I am leaving myself open to any attack; I am not afraid of any attack. I was prepared when I came here to be attacked from every angle, and I am not afraid of that. I have gone through all kinds of attacks, so I am not too much worried about them.

I would like to say something about this increase that the Government made in 1952 in the supplementary allowance. I think there was more propaganda than there was increase. That is the usual way they do things. For example, the Minister of Social Welfare (at that time the Hon. Mr. Sturdy) said that one group will have the highest supplementary allowance of anybody in the Dominion of Canada. The Provincial Treasurer said, "The increase varies up to a maximum of \$17.50, so that the new supplementary allowance will range from \$2.50 to \$20 per month." I don't think those statements were according to the facts. There is some grain of truth in them; but there is a lot of propaganda.

During the session of 1956 (that was last session), the Liberal members obtained the cold hard facts about this whole set-up, and it was found, cases of persons receiving supplementary payments in this province. Out of this 17,300 persons, only 32 received \$20 per month. Now they might as well have raised it to \$100 per month if they were going to pay only to 32 persons; it wouldn't cost very much anyway and it is good propaganda for them. There were 8,800 or fully half of the total, who received no increase whatever; they were still getting \$2.50 a month supplementary allowance. . .

Mr. McDonald: — Shame!

February 26, 1957

Mr. Korchinski: — After all, the propaganda I believe there was quite a bit of discussion about this whole thing in the provincial election. The Premier was running around the province saying that the average supplementary allowance was \$8, while the Leader of the Opposition claimed that it was \$5 and a few cents, and he was contradicted so many times – I saw the reports in the press. Well now, I see in the Annual Report of the Social Welfare Department that the average payment is \$5.38 so after all, the Leader of the Opposition was right.

Mr. Cameron: — Who knows the Accounts?

Mr. Korchinski: —It is possible to get a supplementary allowance of \$20 per month in Saskatchewan only in certain cases – very few cases. You have to be an absolutely destitute person, and you have to be married – that makes it worse; and only one of these receiving the old-age security pension, with no other income at all, that would classify in that income bracket where you could get \$20 per month. Now I think that this income bracket where you could get \$20 per month. Now I think that this Government should do something about these supplementary allowances. I think that is something we could do here in this province. We don't have to go to Ottawa; we could do it right here. You see, I am not holding any brief for Ottawa or anybody else; but it always sounds wrong to me when I heard, in this House, member after member, Ministers and others, getting up and attacking Ottawa for what they don't do, because they are just trying to distract the public eye from this Government. They are just trying to draw the attention of the public away from this Government to Ottawa. Is there something brewing and wrong at home that you want to attack your neighbours? In that way you will get the attention of the public away from your own home. That is what Mussolini did when he attacked the Africans in Ethiopia. He had difficulty at home, so he went ahead and attacked them because he wanted attention taken away from Italy and get the people interested in the war in Ethiopia. That is what this Government is doing constantly.

What would people in the rural areas think of a municipal council that got together, and for meeting after meeting, did nothing but accuse the Provincial Government of not doing their share. I have read a few minutes of municipal councils' meetings, and I find no reference to the Provincial Government ever; no political reference. At different times they do have certain dealings that are mentioned, but they don't get up and make speeches and criticize the Premier or the Ministers for the shortcomings of their own actions. That is exactly what this Government is doing – for their own shortcomings they are criticizing somebody else. They have certain duties to discharge, and I think the sooner they get down to those duties the better it would be for everybody concerned. I certainly would like to dwell upon that point over and over again – that we should increase the supplementary allowance to our senior citizens, because they are absolutely entitled to it. If you go and see those old people in those shacks – I know of one old lady living in an old reconverted garage; there is a big door that is blocked off

and there is a little window cut in the wall, and that is where she is living today. I don't think it is right. I don't believe it is right to have conditions of that kind existing in Saskatchewan. We are not that poor. We are not very rich, but we are not that poor that we should have our people living like that. They can't speak for themselves. They are not going to come up here and argue with you. They are quite satisfied, and they try to get along and they even try to save enough for their own funerals. I have seen them, from what little they are getting, trying to save enough for their own funerals. Now I don't think it is fair. I don't care who is the government, or where it is. It is not fair that these old grandmothers and old grandfathers should be suffering in this rich province. I believe that this Government should do something to try to do their share to alleviate their plight.

Now I am interested in the Social Welfare Department. There is a lot to be said about the Social Welfare Department, and I would like to devote my attention to that Department in my speech today. I don't think the mothers' allowances are high enough. I believe that this Government could do quite a bit to improve the lot of the widows in this province. You will find, if you compare with the other provinces, that this Government's help to the mothers in this province is scandalously small. It is much smaller than our neighbouring provinces. I have here before me a chart showing a comparison, that was drawn last summer, giving the contributions of the neighbouring provinces; and I was appalled at this chart. A widowed mother with four children received in this province a smaller allowance than in the other neighbouring provinces. In Manitoba, a widowed mother with four children received \$118 per month; in Alberta, \$95 per month; and in Saskatchewan, \$60 per month.

It will be claimed by the Minister of Social Welfare, and by the spokesmen for the C.C.F. party and by the Ministers of this Government, that this Government has a wonderful health plan that these mothers are the beneficiaries of; but it should be remembered that these other provinces also contribute to health care of the mothers – that is our neighbouring provinces; each one of them has a health plan for their mothers in that group.

Premier Douglas: — Would the member explain the Manitoba health plan?

Mr. Korchinski: — Yes, I can explain that. It is carried out by the municipalities. The province gives the money and the municipalities carry out the health plan.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes exactly.

Mr. McDonald: — And they are getting \$2 million more this year.

Some Government Member: — You've been listening to Hubert!

Mr. Korchinski: — I don't think this is something to be laughed at.

You can't get this thing off your chest by laughing. This is something serious. I am not saying this just to be saying that the Government is wrong; I believe absolutely that more could be done. I suppose they will come back and say: "Look at how much the Liberals would spend; they would spend a million here and a million there, and yet they want you to cut the taxes!" We have heard that all over; that is their favourite dodge. They say: "The Liberals want us to spend more money and yet they want us to take taxes off." Well, I think it is possible, and if they can't do any better they had better get out of here. It is possible to cut the taxes down and spend more money on these services. If they don't know how, it is time they should move over and let somebody else do it.

Here is a chart I want to refer to about mothers' allowances in these three provinces. A mother with one child in Manitoba gets \$51, in Saskatchewan \$40, in Alberta \$50. A mother with two children in Manitoba gets \$76, in Saskatchewan, \$50 and in Alberta \$70. A mother with three children, in Manitoba receives \$92, in Saskatchewan \$55, and in Alberta \$85; a mother with four children, \$107 in Manitoba, \$60 in Saskatchewan, and \$95 in Alberta. A mother with five children, in Manitoba gets \$125, and Saskatchewan \$65 – just about half; and \$105 in Alberta. And so on. You will find that, in Saskatchewan, Ottawa pays to two persons over 70 years of age security pensions of \$80 per month and the C.C.F. Government at the same times pays the same amount of \$80 a month to a widow with eight dependent children.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, humanity first!

Mr. Korchinski: — I don't think that is a very bright picture, and I think this Government should do something about it. Of course these rates you get on the chart here, in Manitoba, they do not include the allowances for winter fuel. Actually the Manitoba Government pays more. Winter fuel allowances are paid for seven months of the year in addition to the above rates. These allowances, of course, vary with the various requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about Socialism.

Mr. Cameron: — Yeah, you can deal with it in a few words.

Mr. Korchinski: — I think that this matter of Socialism should be debated more in this province. It has not been clarified, and I think that it should be clarified, because the Government members have failed to do it. They have failed to explain to the people of this province what Socialism means actually. During the election it was very cloudy and befuddled, the way they talk about Socialism; and when they get up to speak about it, there are as many different types of Socialism as there are members on the other side. The Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) was referring to the 57 brands of (what is it) – Heinz. Well, there are more brands of Socialism in Saskatchewan than that.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You have almost that many yourself.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am not just saying this out of my own thinking. I have been studying this matter for a long time. At one time I also considered joining the Socialists.

Some Hon. Member: — Thank goodness you didn't!

Mr. Korchinski: — I don't accuse any of you people across there of being insincere. I believe that you are just as sincere as anybody else — I mean the majority; perhaps there are some that are not. I believe that you are just as sincere as anybody else in this House; that your hopes and intentions are to do the best you can for the province of Saskatchewan. I again would ask all the people of Saskatchewan to study carefully Socialism, its history and its various phases as they occurred in Europe. We have no Socialism in this country, and therefore, there is nothing to compare it with here; but the various phases as they occurred in Europe, and from the history of Socialism and its various phases, we can learn and guide ourselves for the future.

The member for Bengough (Mr. Brown) said (and he was very emphatic about it) that this was a 'way of life'. I am sure that the member from Bengough has not studied Socialism thoroughly, because I believe that he is a farmer and I am sure that he would not support that doctrine if he had studied it thoroughly. I am sure that, if the truth were told to the members across the way, the biggest part of them would leave the party. I am not saying this because I am trying to convince them and convert them; I know it is impossible. It would be very difficult for them to convert me now; I know that. But I think that actually they should study this philosophy because, wherever it has been tried, it has proven to be a failure, and what we are hearing now from the Premier and the advocates of this particular belief in this province is really pathetic. I am not saying this to discredit the Premier. I think he is a very fine gentleman, and in private life I think it is hard to find one who is as good and as kind; but I think that his political belief is wrong, and I want to try and show that right here in this Legislature. I think it is time that he stopped talking about this Socialism and he should study what this whole thing is about.

Now it isn't a laugh. I would prescribe some reading for everybody on this side and the other side and any other side, whoever is interested in Socialism. There are many books and I have read very many books; some of them were perhaps very difficult and very involved. I have the Communist library of 17 books; all the Socialist writings; but I found that this book hit the matter right on the head. Now these books, sir, were not written by capitalists. There is one here that is the most recent. This was written by A.R. Crossland, former Socialist M.P. in England — you likely know him; I believe he was in Canada here. This book is entitled 'The Future of Socialism'.

Premier Douglas: — Is that Crossman?

Mr. Korchinski: — Crossland. The entire book has been read in manuscript by Mr. Hugh Dalton, Mr. D.P. Henderson, Mr. I.M. Doolittle, and Mr. P.M. Williams, and individual chapters by Mr. J.H. Smith and Mr. Michael Young. This is a recent edition to the Legislative Library, and I was very interested to read this book. This is a book by a Socialist about the future of Socialism. Now I am sure that the Socialists should read that at least, and carefully study it. I would suggest that you start with ‘The Road to Serfdom’ by Professor Hyack. I spoke about this book which is also to be found in the Legislative Library (I don’t think they have enough copies there though; they should have more copies) on a previous occasion. I spoke about Professor Hyack’s arguments when I was in the Legislature before, and I don’t know who it was – I think it was the Premier who attacked Professor Hyack as a reactionary and as a person whose books should not be considered. He said that there was another book in reply to this and I read the one he recommended to me, and I found that that Socialist book (I just forget by whom it was written) was about the same type of reply as the Premier’s. It was not a reply to the arguments of Hyack; it was an attack on Hyack as a person. Now we should not always use the same technique of attacking a person. If you don’t like someone, you should not attack or smear him or try to discredit him. I think we should listen to Professor Hyack.

Professor Hyack says in the introduction of his book that he had an opportunity, which very few people ever had, to live for a long period of his life in one socialist country, and then to move into another socialist country and live there a long number of years, and the arguments and reasons and conclusions that Professor Hyack advances in this book are very worthwhile and should be read by every person who is interested in politics in Saskatchewan, or any place else in Canada.

There is a more recent book here by Professor Hyack; it should not actually be said that it is by Professor Hyack, because the introduction is by Professor Hyack, but there are four or five contributions, I think, all great economists and historians. How this book came about was that this particular society in Europe who had seen in their lifetime Europe totter into ruin under this doctrine of Socialism had organized together as a society of intellectuals, of professors of universities, and this society’s members present papers and there are five such papers in this book. It is very interesting reading; it deals with capitalism. Then there is another book called ‘The Road Ahead’ by John T. Flynn; it is a very interesting story too. But I would say that you should start with Professor Hyack, then this second book by Crossland. There are many other books you can read, Karl Marx. . .or “Das Kapital” and “The Manifesto”, and you have the library of Socialist books. There are twenty volumes in all that go together with this particular work of Marx.

Now, it might be irritating to listen to this . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, it's just dull.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, it might be dull, of course, to you.

Mr. McDonald: — It depends upon your capacity to listen.

Mr. Korchinski: — Of course, one of the greatest writers about Socialism, Lord Acton, said: "There is nothing as irritating as an exposure of the pedigree of certain ideas." There are certain ideas that have been copyrighted . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You'll wish you had kept quiet.

Mr. Korchinski: — . . .But it is rather irritating when you start explaining where they originated. I should have enough time I believe to finish this. We will have to go back to the very beginning of this movement before we understand it properly. It originated in France as a reaction to the French Revolution. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this great upheaval in human history that occurred in France proclaimed on its flags slogans standing for liberty, fraternity and equality; and through years of internal strife and suffering, through the actions of the French people, we naturally have all gained something. This nation in those years, before Napoleon's time, had suffered very greatly; but those were the standards on which they were marching to victory. They were marching under the standards of equality, fraternity and liberty. Socialism arose as a reaction to that, and it might appear strange to my Socialist friends but Socialism's origin, or its beginning, was actually dictatorial. The founder of this modern Socialism was a Frenchman, Saint-Simon, and he said that this idea that was promulgated in France was all wrong; that the people have to be led by planning, controlling boards. That was his philosophy; and he said (and it is right in the book of the founder of Socialism) "that if anybody is going to object to our planning boards and our government, he is going to be treated as cattle." Now that was the start of Socialism; that people were going to be treated as cattle.

May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

Premier Douglas: — Call it 5:30.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, when will I get a chance to finish?

Premier Douglas: — You can go on tonight; you can go on at 7:30.

Mr. Speaker: — We will call it 5:30.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, are you going to have a sitting in the House here tonight?

February 26, 1957

Mr. Speaker: — Being now 5:30, the Assembly will recess until 7:30 this evening.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, in half an hour I would be finished.

Premier Douglas: — We can come back from 7:30 to 8:00 and when the hon. member is finished we can adjourn the House.

Continuing at 7:30 p.m.: —

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you for your great forbearance for letting me go on developing the topic that I had started before recess. I was dealing with Socialism and I believe it is very important that we have a debate on Socialism in this Legislature, because the party that forms the Government of this province at the present time claims to be Socialist and it is very important for the people of Saskatchewan to understand what makes Socialism 'tick', what is the mainspring of their energy and other lines of their activities. This is, of course, quite a bit of theory; but we should not underestimate theory in politics because it is apparent what we believe in, and that is, of course, the ideals that we House old and the beliefs that we have to guide and control our actions. Therefore it is very important to know what these people believe in, and from there you can then go ahead and judge their actions as applied in practice.

As I have stated before, Socialism originally started after the French revolution and was frankly and openly totalitarian in its principles; but, under the pressure of the democratic movements of 1848, in the revolutions of 1848, where the people of the various nations of Europe were trying to throw off the reactionary system imposed upon them by the Congress of Vienna, there was a string of nations right across Europe, and Socialists, seeing that their principles of totalitarianism were not being very favourably received, began to ally themselves to democratic principles, and tried to take from the democratic movements various slogans and use those in their movement. Now instead of promising freedom to the individual, as did the various Liberal movements at that time in Europe, they began to promise Democracy is an individualist institution and is in irreconcilable conflict with Socialism, which is based on the collective concept of society. People quite often wonder what difference there is between the Socialists and the others in this country. There is a very great and tremendous difference. The difference is (that is originally) that we believe in the individual's rights as superior to the rights of the state, and the Socialist believes that the state is the highest structure and that the individual is only one of a number in the manipulation of the state.

Premier Douglas: — Bunkum!

Mr. Korchinski: — This is just . . .

Some Hon. Member: — The boss is in the gallery behind you.

Mr. Korchinski: — This is just a sign that the Premier of this province hasn't studied and read Socialism.

Premier Douglas: — I've read more Socialism than you've ever dreamed of.

Mr. Korchinski: — He uses Socialism just for his own purposes. I did not think that he was that way; I thought more of him before.

The Socialists were a collectivist party, based on a collectivist concept of society. There is no doubt about it. I want to say when this thing was started, that I can call to witness men who were studying this particular theory, and I am going to quote from one of the writers of that particular time, who was interested in politics as we are all today; and this was nobody else by de Tocqueville. Nobody saw more clearly than de Tocqueville that democracy as an essentially individualist institution, was in irreconcilable conflict with Socialism. Here is his quotation:

“Democracy stands for the individual's freedom . . .” (He said that in 1848)

“Socialists restrict it. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man; Socialism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number. Democracy and Socialism have nothing in common, but one word — ‘equality’. But notice the difference! While Democracy seeks equality in liberty, Socialism seeks equality in servitude.”

Now those are the words of de Tocqueville, who was a political scientist of those days. To cast off the suspicions that were attached to the beginnings of Socialism, the Socialists began to harness to its cart the human desire for freedom; but since the revolutions and the Liberals had already used the words of freedom, the Socialists, as I said before, began to promise ‘new freedom’, economic freedom. You have heard it said over and over in Saskatchewan, that political freedom without economic freedom is not worth having. This is how the Socialists started away back in 1848, and it has been repeated in Saskatchewan over and over again, and people who have not paid too much attention began to think that this was something good — that economic freedom was the primal thing, and that political freedom without economic freedom was not worth having.

February 26, 1957

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend who said that in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Korchinski: — All the C.C.F.

Premier Douglas: — That statement is not true.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, here are some papers. I didn't get to the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan yet, I am going to.

Premier Douglas: — Well, fine. Get to them. But don't misquote us, that is all.

Mr. Korchinski: — No, I wouldn't do that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, no!

Mr. Korchinski: — Now this political freedom that they claim is not worth having, and the economic freedom they are looking for, is nothing else but another way of saying that they are looking for economic power.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — This promise of 'new freedom' is nothing else, and of course we can see that as a part of our friends across, it is a promise of a new wealth to a select few; but of course this particular promise of 'new freedom' has become the most powerful weapon of Socialist propaganda to many people. We have heard – and I don't think the Premier of this province will deny the fact – a lot of talk about planning. I am going to quote from his speeches over the radio when he was explaining the 'Winnipeg Declaration'; he is continually coming back to this 'planned economy!' I would like to deal with that particular topic in Socialist beliefs.

Mr. McDonald: — Does that include Communism?

Mr. Korchinski: — But all these species of Socialism have one common thing. Planned economy is one basic thing that they all hold in common. Now we should not be misled of names of political parties, because it is very difficult to tell what those parties stand for until you study their platforms.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It sure is!

Mr. Korchinski: — For example, in Europe we have all kinds of groups who call themselves Socialists, who are not Socialists in their concepts at all. You have, for example, in France the Radical Socialists. They are very much more like our Progressive Conservatives in Saskatchewan, or in Canada. They are not Socialists in their concept at all. So when we talk about Socialism in Europe, we would have to examine their particular platforms to see what they actually believe in and what they are standing for.

There are two things, when we consider Socialism, that we have to take under study: the aim of Socialism and the method which they are going to use to achieve that aim. Now their aim has been copied from the Progressive Liberalism of Europe; they have no different aim than any other party; their aim is as high as, say, that of Liberals or any others – social justice, greater equality and security. Those are some of the aims of Socialists; but those are also the aims of Liberals and of other parties. So it is not a definition for Socialism. Their aim is not a definition; but the method is very interesting. Their method of achieving this aim is through abolition of private enterprise and through planned economy.

When we discuss Saskatchewan Socialists we will find that they have cast aside this first point in the method of Socialists, the abolition of private enterprise. They have now come out with a theory or an explanation that this is a mixed economy. This is a very peculiar kind of Socialism; but they have put aside the general and understood principle of Socialism that private enterprise should be abolished; but they still believe in planned economy, and planned economy is the mainspring of Socialism. All collectivisms have a common feature. They have this feature: a deliberate organization of the labours of society towards a definite social goal. All the collectivist groups have that goal. So the basic issue here, in the collectivist groups is this: it is the conflict between individual freedom and collectivism, and there is no other issue. That is the basic issue in which we differ from Socialists.

Now collectivism, Mr. Speaker, has the following general followers: Socialism, Communism and Fascism. These three groups, generally speaking, are all collectivist groups, and they differ only in the nature of the goal to which they are striving; but they are all hitting for that goal through direct efforts of organizing society. They all differ from liberalism by having a central planning for common good and not allowing for alternative planning of individuals – not allowing any alternative scheme of planning; it is supposed to be central planning and a planned economy.

Planning, Mr. Speaker, is a very popular thing; it is a popular expression. Everybody desires planning. Everybody who is sensible makes plans in his own private life. In local small governments or on a higher plane of government, everybody desires planning. It is necessary and it is

wise to plan. We should handle our problems as rationally as possible, and with as much foresight as possible, and that is, of course, planning. But this is not what the Socialists mean by planning. In spite of everything the Socialists claim that the Federal Government, for example, in this country has no plan; we do have plans. Free democracies all have plans; but their plan is different totally from the Socialists' plans. When we talk about a plan we talk about a permanent framework within which various individuals and various individual activities would be carried on by different persons according to their own individual plan. That is the sort of a plan that the economy of Canada and of the United States is built upon. There is a framework of law and a great plan within which individuals can follow their own pursuits as long as they don't interfere with the activities of others and infringe upon the rights of others. They may go ahead and decide about their own happiness in their own way. We plan, in our Liberal planning, so that individuals can follow happiness according to their own individual plan.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You don't contend you are happy, do you?

Mr. Korchinski: — Now the Socialists have an altogether different type of concept when they talk about planned economy. They talk about central direction of all economic activity, according to a central plan. In this single plan they lay down how the resources of the society should be centrally directed to serve a particular end in a definite way. Now there is a difference in these two planned economies. Liberal planning is for competition; Socialist planning is for inferior methods of co-ordination. That is a great difference. In Liberal planning parties are free to buy and sell at prices at which they can find a partner to the transaction. The second point is that, in their planning, there is a free entry to different trades, open to all on equal terms. Law, according to their plan, should not tolerate individuals or groups which try to restrict this freedom of individuals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come down to the 'Regina Manifesto'. We all lived through the hard times in Saskatchewan, and we all know the history of this fractional party that started in Canada during those hard years. A group of people in this province (and I hope and believe that they were all very sincere) were trying to find a way out of our difficulties. At that particular time we had two major parties in the field; there were some fractional parties that appeared and disappeared, but the major parties were the Conservatives and the Liberals in the field. With a lot of time on their hands, and I say, with the desire to do some good to their country, they began to cast their thoughts for some way out of this difficulty that we found ourselves in as a society; and they dug up this socialist idea, believing that there was a solution to our difficulties. There was a lot of agitation. I remember all that. I was a young man attending school here when these Socialists were active in Regina and, as I said, I tried to figure out if this was a good thing to join, and many others, I am sure, across Saskatchewan, did the same thing. Well, some of us decided it was a good thing

to join and some of us decided it wasn't. I happened to find myself on the side that didn't think that this was a rational movement to join; but anyway these people got together and drew up what they called the 'Regina Manifesto'. This was a sort of a proclamation to the people of Saskatchewan of what they believed in. They claimed that, through this particular way of belief and with what they would put into practice, our difficulties would be solved. As I said, some of them were sincere souls and well-wishers; others I am now beginning to believe, that formed the 'Regina Manifesto', the greatest need that they had was not a solution of the difficulties that the people were faced with, but the hope of getting into power. There were quite a number, I am beginning to believe now, who were interested more in how to get into power than in the problems of this province.

In this 'Regina Manifesto' as in all Socialist documents, the basis was planned economy and this other now outmoded principle of 'eradication of capitalism'. They have abandoned this particular phase, "abolition of capitalism" because, as the years went by, as people began to take more and more interest in the mainspring of this party, and what was making them tick, they began to see that abolition of capitalism was something rather hypocritical as applying to the C.C.F. party in Saskatchewan, because I am led to understand, there are quite a few capitalists among the main proponents of this party. And so it was rather odd that they should be talking about abolition of capitalists and, at the same time, becoming fairly substantial capitalists themselves. So this particular thing was taken out of the 'Regina Manifesto'.

Before we go ahead with explaining the 'Winnipeg Declaration' I would like briefly to describe some of the findings of the Socialists in England. We always have this claim of the Socialists in Saskatchewan that the Socialist theories cannot be put completely into practice until the Socialists get control of the Federal Government, because on a small sphere, in a province, they cannot actually show what they could do. But we had a Socialist Government in England and the history of Socialism in England is very interesting. I suppose most of you know (or you should know if you are Socialists) that the Socialism in England had its roots in so-called 'Fabian Socialism'. The greatest proponents of Socialism in England were the two Webbs. They are both gone, now, and I was interested to find that this particular man, Crossland, corroborates the belief that I had before. I claimed in this Legislature once, that the ultimate result of any Socialism, if it was carried on to its rightful conclusion, would be Communism; but it was always very strongly denied that there was any relationship between the Socialists and the Communists. Well, I find that this Crossland says that "the founders of Socialism in England actually embraced Communism toward the end of their lives." That is, they started with Socialism and preached this particular belief to the people of England, and later on they ended up following Marx and his beliefs; and one of the greatest Socialists in England, Cole, a great writer of Socialist literature, also joined the Communist party towards the end of his life. So actually it

February 26, 1957

just proves what we, who studied Socialism, believed. Crossland says as follows:

“But Marxism was dominant in the intellectual influence in our lives and it made a profound impact upon my generation of Socialists in their formative years, before the war.”

And he goes on to say:

“The most notable conversion, of course, was that of the Webbs themselves, who began by eschewing Marxism altogether and ended by embracing it whole. The outstanding younger Fabian figure, G.D.H. Cole, was also a leading exponent of Marxism in his later years.”

We had heard the damning of capitalism from Socialists across this country in the ‘thirties. They claimed that all our difficulties stemmed from the fact that the wealth of this country was in the hands of a few and that these few were exploiting the masses. They also claimed, in according with Marx (in this belief they held Marx to be true) that capitalism had certain inherent weaknesses in its own interior organization and that it would finally collapse from those weaknesses. This was the belief that the Socialists in England also held, but their experience showed different. This man says:

“It is thus clear that the British economy is now behaving in a reasonably buoyant and production manner; and there is certainly no sign of imminent collapse of capitalism in England.

“And my own view, which I discuss in detail in the economic chapters, is that at least the present rate of growth will continue, and that the future is more likely to be characterized by inflation than by unemployment.

“It is easy to forget today, not merely how unanimous Socialist writers were in anticipating the collapse of capitalism, but how completely their analytical systems, their prophecies, and their recommendations, all hinged on this central belief, and how wrong they were.”

He has the courage at least to admit that the Socialists were wrong in predicting that capitalism would collapse because of its weaknesses.

We also hear quite a bit about profits and the damning of profits; that there should be no profits. This man, and the Socialists in England, have changed their minds about that. He says, among other things, as follows, and I quote:

“It is rather absurd to speak now of capitalist ruling-class. It is a mistake to think that profit, in the sense of a surplus over cost, has any special or unique connection with capitalism. On the contrary, it must be the rationale of business activity in any society, whether capitalist or socialist, which is growing and which is dynamic.”

In other words, he says that a profit is a good thing, and it is necessary; the only measuring stick in either of the societies, whether it is capitalism or Socialism.

And then he talks about economic power. Well, as I said, economic power meant nothing else but power of wealth that the Socialists were seeking for. Here is what he has to say, and I quote:

“Of course the arguments presented in this chapter relate only to one manifestation of power in modern society, and that, in my view, of diminishing importance. Economic power, in the sense described in this chapter, and which rather naturally obsessed pre-war Socialists when they were analysing capitalism, now poses fewer problems than other forms of power which have nothing to do with ownership or private industry as such, and indeed cut-across the capitalist-socialist controversy. These are first the power of the enlarged and bureaucratic state; . . .”

He says, and I give him credit for it, that we should not be afraid of economic power as much as of the power of the bureaucratic state, which we have growing up in Saskatchewan, too.

“Secondly, the power of a small hierarchy of Court, Church, and influential newspapers, either to block reform or to impose its own social and moral standards on groups and individuals; and thirdly, the power of those who control the bureaucratic mass organization, whether public or private – the B.B.C., the Coal Board, and the Trade Unions quite as much as I.C.I. or Unilever.”

February 26, 1957

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would ask the hon. gentleman to limit his references to the book to those matters which will support his own argument.

Mr. Korchinski: — That is exactly, Mr. Speaker, what I am doing. I am discussing the economic power which is so dear to the discussions of the Socialists, and this is a very important authority because it comes from a Socialist in England.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, but I would remind the hon. gentleman that it is his own views that are of interest to this House.

Mr. Korchinski: — Yes, that's right. My views are that Socialism is absolutely wrong, and I am quoting a Socialist to prove it. I haven't come to the conclusions of my argument, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I am not as smooth as some speakers are, but what I am trying to show is that the Socialists themselves (and this particular man here) are very bewildered and beginning to believe very much like we are believing now. We can now say, 'I told you so'. But they won't listen to us, you see. That is what I am trying to prove — that 'I told you so'; that these fellows are wrong. What I am trying to do is this: I am trying to save the Socialists in Saskatchewan the trouble of going through all these stages because the English Socialists have gone through them and they are now reporting on them. They had the chance to have supreme power in the country there and, today, they are reporting on this thing and they say that there is nobody as confused — in his own words, he says so in this book — as the Socialists in England are.

As I said, there is nothing as irritating as the discovery of the pedigree of ideas. . .

Mr. Lopton: — Nothing as irritating as the truth!

Mr. Korchinski: — This is very irritating, I suppose. Here is another. I quote, with your permission, Mr. Speaker:

“What is Socialism about now?”

You see he wrote this book and he is trying to tell the Socialists what their next step should be.

Mr. Speaker: — I must insist, sir, that you confine your quotations to very brief quotations from the book. You are reading long excerpts from it and I must ask that you make them brief.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I admit, Mr. Speaker, that this could have happened much more briefly. This book cost the Legislature \$8.50, and could have been . . .

Premier Douglas: — Why not let the members read it?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Not as much as the one you had them order.

Premier Douglas: — Why not let the members read it, without having to be exposed to it.

Mr. McDonald: — They don't like it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Just a moment. I want you to pay attention to my ruling and not answer me back as you have been doing. I am asking that you confine your reference to that book to brief excerpts, not to read long pieces from it.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make it as brief as possible, and I will try to abide by your ruling. There are just two more quotations and I will be through.

This is a very important quotation because I think it is the central thought in this book. This is the quotation:

“What is Socialism now about? The Labour party has not yet given a clear answer to this question; indeed, no one who has observed the party since 1951, furiously searching for its lost soul, can have failed to sense a mood of deep bewilderment.”

Their souls are lost. There is no question about that!

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to quote; I am just going to make a reference to this book and if anybody is interested, they should read this book. There is nobody as confused as this Mr. Crossland. There is no question about that, because he is searching for the truth, and yet you can see that he is groping towards what, as I said, “we told you so; you were wrong”. Towards the end of the book he is just about back where he started from, and he just about proves that our beliefs, as Liberals, are quite the right beliefs for the development and for obtaining the highest standard of living of any place in the world.

After having cited the experiences of the Socialists in England, I would like to come back for just a minute or two to the Winnipeg Declaration. I was very interested in watching the C.C.F. in pre-convention days and at the convention. I wasn't there, but I have all kinds of reports from the press, and I suppose they are quite reliable; and it seems to me that the main reason for the Winnipeg Declaration was the Saskatchewan election, which just about meant the defeat of the Socialists in Saskatchewan.

February 26, 1957

They finally decided, and they said to themselves: “Boys, there is something wrong with this; we just about had it; we will have to do something about this if we want to stay; we have a good thing in our hands and if we want to keep this thing in our hands we had better do something about it”.

That is the way it appears to a layman from the outside; that is the way it appeared to me, and I think it is so, and I think there are other people who have the same views. So they got together in Winnipeg and they were in quite a corner there. You see, in their group they have the left wing, the centre, and the right wing, and it is pretty hard to get those people to pull together. Some of them want more socialism and some of them want less Socialism, and some of them don't care a hoot for Socialism as long as they stay in power. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, (and I want to be contradicted by anyone else from the other side or from any side) the purpose of this document is to keep Socialists in power in Saskatchewan and to try to save the remnants of their defeated party across Canada.

I suppose I am going to be criticized left and right for dealing with these theories, as the Leader of the Official Opposition was criticized for going across Canada and citing the experience that the Socialists had at the hands of the voters. I think it was absolutely right that he did that, and I don't think there was anything wrong. This is a thing peculiar to Socialists; it is okay; it is fine if they go down to Asia or to Korea or to any place else, but when we get up here and contradict them, well, we are not supposed to; we are out of order. It is okay for them. They can do anything; but as far as we are concerned we should just watch it and confine ourselves to the business at hand.

It says here in an editorial:

“Mr. Douglas Takes Stock.”

That was after the election. He found that his stock went down pretty low so he began to take stock.

Mr. McDonald: — Pretty near foreclosed on him.

Mr. Korchinski: — I would, too, if I were he.

Premier Douglas: — It didn't go down as badly as yours.

Mr. McDonald: — We made a lot more gains than you did.

Premier Douglas: — Dropped 20 per cent.

Mr. Korchinski: — It isn't a question of that. It doesn't say here that Mr. McDonald takes stock; it says that Mr. Douglas takes stock. It says here that he claims (and everybody saw that) "that we are now going to have a mixed economy." You see, this is the preparation of the public opinion for some great change to come, the same way as the Bureau of Publications and the Hon. Provincial Treasurer usually prepare the public for raising the licences and car insurance premiums by writing articles about how many terrible accidents we have had in Saskatchewan. They want to sort of soften up the public so that when this rap comes, the people would say, "Well, we can't do anything about it; it is our own fault." So this is the way we are being prepared, by Mr. Douglas taking stock.

Then the next editorial appears: "Example of C.C.F. Realism." This is their national chairman; I think his name is Lewis. He says that some of the beliefs they held were not exactly according to Hoyle, and they thought they would do something about it. So it goes on and on, and it finally says here, in headlines in the newspaper:

"C.C.F. discards the Regina Manifesto. Swings right to society embodying public, co-op and private enterprise."

This just shows you, Mr. Speaker, how naïve some of their supporters are; to say that they have discarded the 'Regina Manifesto', when these fellows tell you plainly and openly that they didn't discard that Manifesto; and actually they didn't. This 'Winnipeg Declaration' is the same old Manifesto, but it is dressed up a little differently. It is just like a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Jackass.

Mr. Korchinski: — Just the same as with cars. They come out today and they have these high fins. This 'Winnipeg Declaration' is the 'Regina Manifesto' with long fins attached, because they still have the central idea here of planned economy. Planning by whom and for whom and of what? That is the question. No one ever has explained. The Premier, in his explanations of the Winnipeg Declaration — I obtained the first copy of it; I didn't get the rest of it but I had a chance to get a summary of the rest of it and he goes on to say that: "We are going to substitute in our society social planning." I wrote something here out of his radio speech. He says:

"What do we mean by social planning? We simply mean that our society should be organized with special aims and objectives in view."

You see, he is going to organize our society. That is the same old Socialist idea from way back in the old days, and if people don't want to listen to this organization they will be treated like cattle. That is exactly what the originator of this whole movement said, and that is what, when applied in practice, happened in Russia and is still happening; and that is what would happen if it was carried to its ultimate conclusion here. He is going to plan; he is going to have social planning. I certainly wanted to hear, and I would like to have him explain, how he is going to do this social planning and this planned economy. Very lightly he skips over this information and goes on to say how he would direct capital into various channels. He said something here in his address when he was dealing with the Speech from the Throne. He just takes out a little example that would be appealing to the public and describes it and talks about it, but he never gives the whole picture, because the whole picture is terrifying.

Now I have a copy of the 'Winnipeg Declaration'. This is their own publication, published by the C.C.F., so it is authentic; and it is printed in Montreal. And here is what it says:

"1956 Winnipeg Declaration of Principles of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Parti Social Democratique du Canada)"

How come? Why have two names?

Mr. Cameron: — They couldn't reveal the truth down there!

Mr. Korchinski: — Those people in Quebec — why don't they call themselves C.C.F. right across Canada? Is the truth for the Quebec people different from the truth for the rest of Canada? This is the whole trouble with the C.C.F.: they are continually changing. You will hear that from their speakers continually. They say that "the concepts that we held in the 'Regina Manifesto' have to be now rearranged." They don't apply now! They have found something different. The fundamental principles — the truth that they held as truth in 1933 is not true today; they have a different truth. We are all in search of truth; this is the main thing in this Legislature. We want to find out what is wrong and what is right. Well, what they held right in 1933 isn't right any more today. They had to change the truth. We don't change the truth on our side. We have the same truth all along.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — The basic principles of Liberals have stood all along the same. I hear a lot of laughter from the other side, because that is all they have to do is laugh; but you have never heard the Liberals say that they are now abandoning this idea of individual freedom and that the state is there to serve individuals. But the C.C.F.

apparently think there is a different side of truth for every particular or special generation.

Another thing I notice in this Winnipeg Declaration; they say that capitalism is basically immoral. This fellow, Crossland, said that they found in England that there is nothing wrong with capitalism; there is nothing wrong with profit, whether it be Socialist profit or capitalist profit – that capitalism isn't actually the big bad wolf that the Socialists thought all along. These fellows here are away behind. They are still driving the Model-T Ford as far as Socialists are concerned; and they are still saying that capitalism is basically immoral.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be dealing with this if I did not think that their politics, their confused way of thinking about Socialism, and their catchwords, are causing harm to Saskatchewan. I am concerned because I believe that this Socialist group that we have in Saskatchewan is causing harm to Saskatchewan with their confused thinking and by their utterances across Canada. I think that they should study Socialism and come out with it and say what they mean, because they haven't. They haven't so far as I am concerned. They are using here and there a catch phrase, trying to catch votes; but they don't come out with their basic principles. They have never discussed their basic principles properly.

I think this socialist argument, as far as I am concerned, has been carried far enough. I believe that we should have some contributions from the other side in defence of Socialism. If they can convince me that socialism is the right thing I will cross the floor and join them.

Some Government Members: — No, no, thanks!

Mr. Korchinski: — I think they are afraid of a good man.

Premier Douglas: — Anything but that!

Mr. McDonald: — Good men are afraid of them.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, you can see that this is just a group for a select few. They wouldn't want us to come and sit on their side. We can't afford Cadillacs. . .

Premier Douglas: — Minimum I.Q. of 100.

Mr. Korchinski: — I wanted to deal a bit with the speakers. I think it is usual to rebut some of the sayings of the opposite side; that is what they do in the debating society, at least, and this is a debating group here. We have had many C.C.F. speakers. We have had four today, and you will forgive me if I criticize them a little for what

they said. I don't have any malice against them, but what they said wasn't just right.

The hon. member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) started his speech talking about interruptions and that he was amused by the interruptions. I don't think that he meant interruptions; I think that he meant applause and interruptions. He had statistics there, and he said that our side contributed so many interruptions and his side so many interruptions, and that as far as the Premier was concerned there were just two interruptions from this side. Well, one of our hon. members kept a record from thereon, when he heard about the novelty of keeping a record of interruptions. He kept track and he found that the first speaker had six interruptions – that means applause and so on; the second speaker had eight interruptions; the third speaker – he was about the best because he had twelve interruptions; and the Premier had two interruptions. Therefore, if this is any kind of a Hooper rating, or radio rating or whatever you want to call it, or popularity rating, I believe that the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) and the Premier should change places, because he is a lot more popular as far as interruptions are concerned. He had twelve and the Premier had two.

Now, the hon. member from Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) said he wasn't experienced in politics, but anyway he was elected, and he told us what elected him. I can tell him what elected him. A well-oiled political C.C.F. machine elected him. If he says that he didn't come here under his own colours, then he admits that this machine put him in here. Then he said that there were two good men in Saskatchewan – Anderson and Douglas; it's a very nice team! I think someday when the history of Saskatchewan is written there will be two black pages reserved for those two fellows. He read us a lecture from the gospel, for which we are very thankful.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Moron!

Mr. Korchinski: — There was quite a bit of federal campaigning in their speeches. I forgive them because they are just repeating what their master did – 'his master's voice' – a broken-record about federal politics.

The hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) was trying his best to hook up the farmers and labour together to pull the socialist wagon. I notice that they had quite a chore in Winnipeg, when drawing up this 'Winnipeg Declaration', when it came down to the discussion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and one group wanted nothing but Canadian ships carrying goods to the Seaway, and another group said, "What do you mean" Are you going to make us pay more for what we buy here?" They just about had a fight there. And this member is trying to do the same thing. He is trying to say that the interests of labour and the farmers are exactly the same.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Are they not?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Which are you for?

Mr. Korchinski: — This man over here from England says that one of the dangers now facing society is Government boards, planning boards of all kinds, bureaucracy, and unions. He has all that in his book. You can look it up and maybe it will open your eyes.

Premier Douglas: — Which are you for, farmer or labourer?

Mr. Korchinski: — I said that these people have very many interests in common. There is no question about that. But they also have some interests that are not in common. So don't try to use this little particle of truth – you know what happened in Russia . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You ought to be in Weyburn!

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if you will forgive me for this final little part that I have to say here, I would be remiss in my duties if I didn't The Premier of this province, in his wonderful way of speaking, witty and so on, gave a blast directed towards the Leader of the Official Opposition, and he said that the Leader of the Official Opposition was St. John the Baptist with the Social Crediters. Now I think that people who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones, because he is the very same gentleman who was actually something like St. John the Baptist of the Social Credit Party. Here I have a photostatic copy of the proposals that he used when he first ventured into the political field, and this is a picture of a handbill – I can table it or I can pass it on if you fellows want to see it. This is what it says: “Social Credit will increase the purchasing power of everybody. Social Credit will mean more business for the storekeepers. Social Credit will mean more traffic on the railroads.” C.C.F. – Social Credit, Weyburn Constituency. “Douglas has been a student of Social Credit for many years. Douglas had endorsed Social Credit.”

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — “The C.C.F. will make the Social Credit scheme possible.” This is one of the bills that he was peddling around the Weyburn constituency, and he has the nerve to call the hon. member here St. John the Baptist of the Social Credit. I hope that the Social Credit will give credit where credit is due.

I think you have gathered from what I have had to say that I am not going to support the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare): — I would like to take this opportunity, sir, of joining with the others and congratulate you on your election to your high office. I agree with all that has been said. There are very few in this House who could claim to have such a high degree of respect from all members of the House, and I believe you are as satisfactory a choice as could possibly have been made. I trust, sir, that in the course of your duties I will not offend Your Honour in any way. I will try not to.

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address, also. They come from two parts of the province that I know very well. The seconder came from a part of the province where I spent a good many years; in fact the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and I were opponents then, as we are now, in a great many activities, and I hope we continue that way, unless he, if course, eventually becomes converted in his dying hours — which I doubt. The other young member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) is from another part of the province that I worked in considerably, and I like to think that some of the things I may have said when they were younger men than they are now, helped to encourage them to think along the lines that they so ably expressed a few days ago.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the (I was going to say 'learned' dissertation of the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), because he was mentioning St. John the Baptist and other sainted people, and I assume that, after that dissertation, we will be favoured with a St. Bernard in the House, probably, to help us along to understand the intricacies of Socialism as expounded by him.

Mr. Kramer: — He was getting pretty doggy, wasn't he?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I would like to point out to the hon. member for Redberry and those who enjoyed his speech with such glee, such girly giggles, that the people of Saskatchewan are rather sensible people and they are inclined to view people by their fruits; in other words, 'by their fruits ye shall know them'. And the people of Saskatchewan have had an opportunity to speak and to say which they like the best. It may be, as our hon. friends opposite say, and as he mentioned, that the C.C.F. dropped in some support, but the Liberals dropped even more. The result is that the people of Saskatchewan have decided that he will sit over there, and I shall sit over here on the Government side. "By their fruits ye shall know them". That, after three terms of C.C.F. Government. It would be well for our friends across the way to remember that. If they hope to come over here they had better not only themselves propose something that will capture the imagination and the beliefs of the people of Saskatchewan, but do something that will eliminate forever the very great injustices their party did to this province from the time it existed as a province under Liberal rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have lived in this province as long as most. I have read some books also on these matters, and on other matters too. You can read many things. One fellow writes one thing today and another one tomorrow; he may be just writing because he wants to sell a publication. He may change his mind. He may not be a very good character; he might not be very strong in his beliefs, and be easily swayed. But I have lived all these years here, since 1917, and I know something of the history of Saskatchewan, and I know what we suffered under Liberal rule in this province. I know the gains we made under a C.C.F. Government before I became associated with the Government myself. So, as I was saying before the hon. member came in and took his seat, "by their fruits ye shall know them", and the people of Saskatchewan looked, and the result is the hon. member from Redberry is on the opposition side – on your left, Mr. Speaker, - and I am on your right, and I still claim to be a good C.C.F.er.

However, I am not going to deal with his remarks on Socialism, tonight, because he said a few things this afternoon that I was interested in when he was dealing with a couple of matters affecting the Department of Social Welfare. He said he was going to say some words about it; he was going to criticize the Department of Social Welfare, and he did, which was his right. I am rather glad he did. It gave me an opportunity to see what he and his colleagues are thinking.

I think it might be well just to deal with the two matters he dealt with mostly this afternoon, or before the supper recess. He mentioned about old people being in dire circumstances, and then he went on to say that the Provincial Government should do more for them. I don't think anybody wishes more than those on this side of the House that more could be done for these people. But there is a limited treasury, and there are many things that have to be done, and the hon. member knows this. He should also know that if any people who are receiving old-age security pensions or old-age assistance, or disabled person's allowance are in the dire straits he says he knows people are in, then they have a right to go to their municipal council and they may apply for social aid. If the municipal council grants them social aid, they will be reimbursed to the extent of 75 per cent over and above the province's contribution to the care program, and the supplemental allowance to the old-age security pensioners.

Then he mentioned that, in the change-over from old-age pensions to old-age security, the province saved \$1 million or more; something over \$1 million. That's true; and he assumed, I suppose, that that was all thrown down a rat-hole. He thinks that should have been paid out in more supplemental allowances.

Mr. Korchinski: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — He doesn't apparently realize that \$1 million went into the building of a nursing home to provide a place for people who had nowhere else to go in the town of Melfort. This is \$1 million. He didn't mention the \$2 million being spent out here in the Legislative grounds, on the new Regina nursing home for more and more people who are in the same situation. He made fun of the supplemental allowances. He mentioned only a few receiving the total amount of \$20 a month supplemental allowance, and he concluded by reading the Annual Report (he did not quote all of it), that the average increase in supplemental allowance was \$5.38. He didn't refer to the passages above, where it explained that 9,000 people enjoyed that increase, and those 9,000 people got an average of \$8 a month. He criticized the Premier for having said that \$8 was the average supplemental allowance. \$8 a month is the average supplemental allowance; but we'll put it in exact figures - \$7.99 a month for 9,000 people who received an increase in supplemental allowance to the tune of over \$600,000 a year. This is where part of a million dollars went.

Increase in mothers' allowance took another \$400,000, and then disabled persons will take another \$240,000, anyhow, for if the requests of this Government to the Federal Government are acceded to, if the eligibility requirements for disabled persons' allowance are broadened by the Federal Government as we have asked, then it will be considerably more than that because more people will come under disabled persons' allowance.

When people are quoting, they should remember what they are quoting from, and they should be practical. Maybe the hon. member didn't think to mention those figures, but he did mention that \$5.38 was the average, if you take the total amount of the increase in supplemental allowance, and spread that over 1,700 odd people who are receiving this assistance. . .

Premier Douglas: — 17,000.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes, 17,000, pardon me. . .then you get that figure. But a lot of them are not eligible to have needed it, according to the income allowances; but the 9,000 that did get it received an average of approximately \$8, or as I said to be exact, \$7.99 apiece.

He went on to deal with mothers' allowances, and he mentioned the provinces on either side of us. He was particularly anxious to show that Manitoba did better. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman, and all members who may be listening, that the other province to our east does not provide many of the things for its elderly people that we do; but coming to mothers' allowances, he mentioned that in Manitoba the allowance is \$51 a month for a mother and one child; in Alberta, \$50; and in Saskatchewan \$40 a month. He was careful not to mention that in Alberta, the municipality pays 20 per cent. However, let us deal with the exact weight — the volume — of the mothers' allowance program in the provinces that he mentioned. I am taking the

last figure on which we have actual information from the other provinces – March 31, 1954. At that time Saskatchewan had 2,272 families on mothers' allowances; there were 5,925 children and 698 incapacitated fathers, making a total of 8,895 people receiving mothers' allowances. Manitoba had 1,099 applicants, added to which, of course, is the 2,848 children and about 300 incapacitated fathers – a total of 4,247. In Alberta, the same figures – they had 1,609 families; there were 3,632 children – a total of 5,241 people. Remember those were the figures: Saskatchewan with a total of 8,895; Manitoba, 4,247 total people; Alberta 5,241.

Now we will see what the expenditures were in that year. Mothers' allowance expenditures in Saskatchewan were \$1,217,309; in Manitoba, \$1,006,507; in Alberta, \$1,112,803. Health services: in Saskatchewan, \$333,252; in Manitoba there were no health services supplied to these people. If they want proof of that, I have the Annual Report of Manitoba Department of Health and Welfare which I will quote from to show that they do not provide health services for the mothers' allowance cases there. I quote from Page 226 on the paragraph headed 'Mothers' Allowance' in black letters from the Annual Report for the calendar year 1955, Department of Health and Welfare of the Province of Manitoba:

“One of the pioneer programs of the division is that of aid to bereaved and dependent children generally known as mothers' allowances. It is a means of putting into a home in which the father is dead or disabled, a monthly income to meet the cost of food, clothing, shelter and household operations.

“The allowance is computed on a budget basis and the amounts are established by government policy. Hospital costs and general medical, dental and optical services remain as a municipal responsibility.”

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — They pay their share of it.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes.

Mr. Korchinski: — Dealing with the increase in supplementary allowance you stated that the average increase was \$8 per recipient. On the total cases?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — On the 9,000 who received assistance.

Mr. Korchinski: — I thought it was on total cases.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, I explained that carefully. If you will look at Page 25 of the Annual Report that is on your desk.

Mr. Korchinski: — I stated it was \$5.38 from your report.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, he asked a question and now he is making a statement. I explained very carefully that, spread over the total cases, the supplemental allowance amounts to \$5.38. I said that. But I said that the hon. member neglected to deal with the figures on the top of that page where I will quote those words: "Over 9,000 persons received an increase. These increases average \$5.49 bringing the payment to these 9,000 recipients of an average of approximately \$8 – to be exact, \$7.99.

I want to deal with some other aspects of mothers' allowance, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I want to deal with some of the differences in the eligibility test as between Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I would like to mention also that no province in the history of Canada ever ruled by a Liberal Government paid a supplemental allowance, or provided medical service.

Government Members: —Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Laugh that one off!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — However, I am going to deal with the difference in eligibility tests in the two provinces. In Saskatchewan, a mother and one child may have a total of \$5,000 in real and personal property, including \$1,000 in cash, and no restrictions are placed on property management. In Manitoba, cash value of all assets available for maintenance, except clothing, furniture, and bedding may not exceed \$3,000. Applicants may be required to turn over cash assets to the Director of Public Welfare, who will release sufficient to –pay current liabilities.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Sounds like Russia.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — The Director may hold up to \$2,000 in trust for the recipient, and pay out the balance as mothers' allowance. Real property may be dealt with or administered by the Director. That is the Liberal Government of Manitoba. That is one of the eligibility differences.

Premier Douglas: — No planning!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Again, Saskatchewan allows a mother the sum of \$540 a year, or \$45 a month, before reducing the allowance. Now this is what Manitoba does: allows a mother \$20 per month before reducing the allowance, as compared with \$45 in Saskatchewan. In Manitoba, also, children living at home and earning, are expected to contribute one-half of their earnings over \$55 a month, which amount is deducted from the allowance. Another difference in the eligibility test.

Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Health): — Back to Charles Dicken's days!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Another eligibility test comparison is this: In Saskatchewan there is no lien registered against the property to ensure repayment of the allowance. Manitoba registers a lien against real property, and any allowance is recoverable from the property to the extent to equity in the property exceeds \$2,000.

Premier Douglas: — Shame!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Another one: Saskatchewan provides allowances where the father is in a penal institution under sentence of one year or more. In Manitoba they only provide allowance where father is in a penal institution, if he is totally and permanently incapacitated, as certified by a medical certificate. Even the fact that he is in gaol is not enough. He must also be incapacitated according to a medical certificate, before she can receive the mothers' allowance.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — You buys better not talk about Manitoba!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Another difference in the eligibility test requirements; in Saskatchewan we pay the allowance to divorced or separated mothers. In Manitoba they only pay the allowance for divorced or separated mothers if the father is deal or totally and permanently disabled.

Another difference in the eligibility test: Saskatchewan pays allowance to a mother deserted for one year or more, providing she has taken reasonable steps to obtain support from the father. In Manitoba, they pay the allowance if a mother has been deserted for four years or more, and the whereabouts of the father is unknown. The children, however, must have been in receipt of municipal assistance for some time prior to the application before assistance is granted, even under those conditions. There is a Liberal Government in Manitoba, don't forget!

Mr. Kramer: — Generous people!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — More comparisons. Saskatchewan pays allowance to an unmarried mother who has lived in common law marriage with the father at the time of his death, or if by an agreement for support or partial support by the father, approved by the Director, has been made with the father – we have an agreement with him; or if a reasonable effort has been made to secure support for the child, or it is considered inadvisable to press the father for support of the child.

In Manitoba they pay the allowance to an unmarried mother if the father is deal or disabled, but can make exceptions with the approval of the Minister. In Saskatchewan, the allowance is paid whether the person is a

Canadian or whether she is a British citizen or not. In Manitoba the parents must be, or have been, British subjects. In Saskatchewan, we require one year's residence in the province to qualify for mothers' allowance; in Manitoba, two years' residence prior to the death of the father. In case of desertion, mothers must have legal residence of one year, in Manitoba, prior to desertion. She must have been deserted for four years before being eligible, as I mentioned before.

Now, as I said before, when people are making comparisons (and some one said at one time that comparisons are odious) they should be reasonably sure of their grounds. I gave an indication of the caseload here in comparison with the other provinces. If you want go even further west, beyond the prairie provinces, we could go to British Columbia and we will find that their mothers' allowance cases amount to 393 families, with 40 husbands and 900 children, or a total of 1,333 people, which makes a vast difference between the case load any of these three other western provinces carry as compared with Saskatchewan.

When the hon. member stands up and tries to make it appear that because \$1 million was saved in the province by the advent of the old-age security by the Federal Government, he certainly didn't take all the factors into consideration, and I think he should have. He has shown himself quite capable of studying books he wanted to study to support the position he has taken. That is his right. I am not objecting to it at all; but I suggest that he be equally diligent in studying the things that happened in this province, to quote correct figures, and to analyse correctly. . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, does the Minister imply that I am dishonest? If that is what he said, I would like him to take that back.

Mr. Speaker: — I didn't understand him to say that.

Mr. Korchinski: — He said that I should be equally honest.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, if I implied the hon. member was dishonest, I withdraw any such implication. I meant no such thing. I said that he is capable of careful study to support anything he wants to support; he apparently then is not capable, or does not desire, to study as carefully those things which he does not wish to support. I am trying to give him evidence now to show that, if he had analysed the situation as carefully as he analysed the other dissertations and the material he supported, he would have arrive at different conclusions with regard to how the million dollars saved by the advent of the Social Security Act of the Federal Government was spent by the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to prolong this at all, but I didn't think I could let these things that he said, this afternoon, in regard to social welfare pass without bringing to the attention of the House the actual facts of the situation. Having destroyed my right to speak later on this debate, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you I am going to support the Motion.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — In view of the complete silence over there, I move the adjournment of the Debate.

(Debate adjourned)

MOTION FOR RETURN

Moved by Mr. Nicholson, on behalf of Mr. Elias: -

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 2) showing:

- (1) Number of oil leases granted by the Government in each fiscal year 1944-45 to 1955-56 inclusive,
 - (a) to oil companies
 - (b) to other lessees (by name);
- (2) Number of acres covered by each such lease;
- (3) Percentage of oil rights retained by Provincial Government in each case.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, this Motion for Return will entail some 5,000 leases. It will be a book of 100 pages, foolscap size. I wonder if this is a fishing expedition? Now, when the answer comes we will see that many leases have expired; many leases have lapsed. The document won't be of too much use. A leaseholder makes a farm-out agreement with another party who is to do some work, and to earn an interest in that land. When they have earned that interest, then this old lease is cancelled, and two, or probably three, new leases issued. Then for the purpose of doing work on their leases, companies can group them into groups not exceeding somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20,000 acres in a lease. To suit their program of exploration, they re-group this land so that you sometimes have new leases issued just on re-grouping a portion of land which is leased, so that in each year there will be a lot of duplication of land in this return, and what it shows actually — well, it won't be possible to interpret it to show very much. It is going to be a big job to get it. As I intimated, I don't think the document will have any value. We estimate that it will cost in labour from

February 26, 1957

\$400 to \$500 to get this work done.

Although I am interested in economy, I realize that the members of this Legislature, and the member who moved this motion may want to spend that \$500 to prove to him that it is no good, and I am quite willing to do that. If the hon. member wanted to move such a motion, we could give him a list of the current leases with the acreage and the name of the holder quite easily. The leases in effect as at a certain date, that list won't be guaranteed for tomorrow or the day after, either, because there are changes which take place.

As to the last part of the motion – the percentage of oil rights retained by the Provincial Government in each case. Well, actually, when land is leased, all of the land in that lease is subject to the terms of the lease and the lessee has the right to all of that land. My hon. friend wanted to know the percentage retained. Well, that is determined before, or at the time, the leases are created; but you just cannot answer that question. It is impossible to answer that third part, and we would have no choice but to explain that it couldn't be answered; that Crown reserves in the old permits were set up on a checkerboard pattern, and the new permits are on the corridor pattern, and in the drilling reservations, the land that is held to the Crown is on a pick-and-pick basis – turn about pick on quarter-sections of land; so it couldn't be answered at all.

As I said, I am just going to leave it to the Legislature, and certainly if the hon. member who moved the motion wants us to get this information, it is going to take a while to get it; it is going to cost a little bit to get it, and I don't think it will be any good when he gets it; but if he wants it, we'll get it. If he wants to withdraw the motion and talk about asking for some information that he wants, I will be glad to confer with him on that.

Mr. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias) is not in the House at this time. I don't know what to say in regard to the hon. Ministers remarks. . .

Premier Douglas: — Then adjourn the debate on it. It will stand in your name until tomorrow or another day.

Mr. Nicholson: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS**Bill No. 41 – An Act to amend The Public Utilities Companies Act.**

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, under The Public Utilities Companies Act, certain pipelines may be designed a common carrier, and when they are declared a common carrier, of course, they must accept oil that is offered on a professional-rata basis, if necessary. And also it is provided that the Local Government Board may declare one of these companies to be a common purchaser, and an amendment was necessary because the wording of the Act only took notice of pipelines and not of other possibilities, and in case it was a common purchaser rather than a common carrier.

The other change provides that a pipeline company shall file their tariff with the Local Government Board. If there is a complaints about pipeline tariffs, the complainant, if he cannot other wise get satisfaction, may take his complaint to the Local Government Board, and have the case heard before them. The Local Government Board then has the authority to set the tariff. And if the Local Government Board is going to do this work, it is only fitting that they should be supplied with copies of any tariffs as they go into effect.

I would move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

Bill No. 412 – An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, Section 33 of The Public Works Act gives the Department advances out of the consolidated fund, money which we use to pay for supplies to be placed in stock for use in or in connection with public works, and to pay for supplies and services in connection with the operation of machine shops, repair depots, by the Department. The reading isn't clear, nor is it suited to the operations of our supply division. It has been found necessary to have a means of transportation at our disposal. This amendment makes it possible for the Department to pay for such supplies, services and automotive equipment out of our advance account. With this explanation I move second reading.

February 26, 1957

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Would that mean you are bypassing the Purchasing Agency and all in the purchasing of cars and equipment in the Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — No, purchases are to be made through the Purchasing Agency of any automotive equipment.

Mr. Cameron: — From the advance account

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Yes.

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

The Assembly then adjourned at 9:10 o'clock p.m.