

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
14th Day

Tuesday, March 5, 1957

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

On the Orders of the Day:

CORRECTION RE HIGHWAY NO. 47

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the letter tabled by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) from Highways Minister Douglas to the delegation of Melville constituents, which Mr. Gardiner said was refusing to do construction on No. 47 Highway, until the Federal Government had completed a three-mile stretch running through an Indian Reservation. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the road in question was not part of No. 47 Highway; it was a municipal road.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate On Address-In-Reply

The House resumed, from Monday, March 4, 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. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, permit me to add my congratulations to you on having been chosen for the high office which you now hold. I trust that I shall at all times be governed by your authority and that I shall not offend the dignity of this Assembly at any time. May I also congratulate all those who initiated and have carried on with the debate up to this time. In particular, I would like to commend all the new members, because with few exceptions they have made valuable contributions to this debate, and their ability as public speakers augurs very well for this Assembly.

I must not forget to congratulate the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition, who has been re-elected with considerable odds. Those of us who are fortunate enough to sit on your right do not envy the difficult job of the hon. member opposite. I should also, with all good grace, congratulate the candidate for the position of the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition. I noticed the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner), speaking yesterday in this House, made reference to the fact that he would like to fill, at least half as well, the seat that his venerable predecessor had held many years ago, and I refer to a once Premier of this Province of Saskatchewan, who is now the Minister of Agriculture in the Government of Canada. He,

of course, made it very clear that he would not be quite as able as his predecessor and sire; but in any event, he indicated his ambition, and I am just wondering if the hon. Leader of the Opposition caught on to the declaration of intent.

Mr. McDonald: — Very good.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is quite possible that some arrangement has been made where our good friend may be sent to Ottawa, and he may be replaced by the candidate. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that it is only a matter of about three years ago, in the city of Prince Albert, when there was quite a contest on for the leadership of the Liberal party. At that time, except for the fact that a gentleman from Saskatoon used his influence and energy quite strongly, we find that the positions are held as they are today, but I don't think the competition for leadership has changed.

Mr. McDonald: — Were you there?

Mr. Berezowsky: — The debate is coming to a close, and I might say that in all the time I have sat in this House, I have never seen a more vicious or distorted interpretation of the Throne Speech, or of the policies of the C.C.F. Government. Actually, some of the antics of the members who sit on your left could only be possible in a circus. With the exception of the Leader of the Opposition, who did put up a 16-point program, and did give some constructive criticism, and one or two others, there has been no constructive criticism which is traditionally the job of an opposition. And to that extent, I submit, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have failed.

Some Gov't Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The speeches began shortly after the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition ended, with the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) criticizing and calling out 'Socialists' — he didn't refer to us as Communists, but I think he intimated that. Then it ended yesterday with the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) following the same phase. No doubt they enjoyed their speeches immensely.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): —Don't you want to be called Socialists?

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — He's objecting now.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. I said they intimated that we are Communists, although they did not use that term. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that, yesterday when the hon. member from Arm River was speaking, the hon. Leader of the Opposition left his seat for a considerable length of time, because I can understand how he must have felt, listening to this kind of argument.

Some Opposition Member: — He was enjoying it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I can understand, too, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. member . . .

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — A whole lot better than yours.

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . why the hon. members opposite have continually suggested that these broadcasts do not be put on the radio.

Some Gov't Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Listening to the speech yesterday by the hon. member from Arm River, I am quite certain that certain people of Saskatchewan would, in considerable numbers, many who have been traditionally Liberal, depart from supporting that political party.

Mr. McDonald: —Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I just want to correct the member. I wouldn't want it to go out over the air that the Liberal party, or myself or anyone else on this side of the House have objected to the broadcasting of the Legislature. We have objected to the division of time; however, after listening to the member this afternoon, I doubt the wisdom of even broadcasting the debate.

Premier Douglas: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. McDonald: — It is a question of privilege.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. members have suggested that either we go on full time on the radio, which is an impossibility, an impractical suggestion, or that we cut out the broadcasts altogether.

Mr. McDonald: — Why?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I will let the people who are listening tell you.

Some Opposition Members: — Why?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Pardon me; but I must ask the hon. gentleman to refrain from discussing the subject matter of a resolution which is on the Order Paper.

Mr. Berezowsky: — The hon. member from Redberry when he got up to speak in this House brought in half a library of books and tried to indicate to this Assembly how learned and erudite he was. Now, I would like to take a few moments of my time today to also bring in two or three books for reference. I am not going to read them, but I may quote one or two paragraphs from each one of them. The reason I do that, Mr. Speaker, is this — the hon. member from Redberry comes from a people to which I also belong — a race of people called the Ukrainian people who always fought for democracy.

Some Gov't Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — They were democratic at a time when the rest of western Europe was in the throes of slavery, and I cannot understand a man who is a teacher, and in Ukrainian communities, taking the stand that he has taken, and I intend to show him today, in the very few moments at my

disposal, how wrong he is in his ideology, if he has any.

First of all, I just happened to have these books at the time he brought the library in. I have a book here by Gunnar Myrdal. I haven't read it all. It is a very interesting book; a book on political philosophy. He refers here to the 'welfare state', and I would like the hon. member from Redberry to read this book, though he may not be able to assimilate it. I doubt if he could.

Mr. Korchinski: — I've read it. I've read that book already.

Mr. Berezowsky: — He says he has read it. I don't know how he could have read it because it came into print, as a matter of fact, only two or three months ago. But he may have. Mr. Speaker, on Page 27 of this book, the title of which is 'The Welfare State', Mr. Gunnar Myrdal says this:

"As one of the important means of equalization opportunities for individuals and of stamping out impediments for social mobility, all these integrated countries" (and he is referring to certain progressive countries) "have gradually found it appropriate to take vigorous measures to even out differences in income and wealth. This line of policy has been advocated by the Liberal economists for about 100 years." (It has been advocated for about 100 years, note). "But only since the beginning of this century has the principle of redistribution taken on a political importance. Without exception all the advanced countries now have effective systems of taxes on income, capital and inheritance, which is strongly progressive, and tends to prevent or limit the continued passive existence of private fortunes for several generations.

"In all these countries the public purse has at the same time, or even earlier, increasingly taken on the responsibility of paying for public health services, and of defraying the cost of many other social necessities. Equal and free access by all citizens to primary and higher education, paid out of public funds is an ideal that has gradually been given reality. The principle was, in fact, inscribed in the constitutions of many of the states of the United States."

Yes, it is in the Constitutions.

"Complex and very expensive systems of social security have gradually been built up against all sorts of income and expenditure risks."

Many of these things are on paper. They have been thinking about it for 100 years, and they are only beginning to do something about it. I can only say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that if Adam had been the Liberal party we would still be going around with fig leaves on our bodies.

Some Gov't Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: —And I can also add this: that if Moses had been the Liberal party, we wouldn't even be dreaming of a national health insurance plan. Fortunately, we have had people that worked for progress.

Mr. Korchinski: — What about Eve?

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, tell us about Eve!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: —Mr. Speaker, I'll take another book. This book deals with democracy, and I again recommend it to every member of this House. It is a good book.

Some Opposition Member: — The life of Adam and Eve!

Mr. Berezowsky: — On Page 1, this is written, by the way, by R.D. Waller, I don't think he is a Communist. I am quite sure he isn't. On Page 1, on mention of the occasion of this report, here is what he says, and I want the member from Redberry and particularly the members opposite to listen to this paragraph, because it named a certain gentleman who was a leader in the Liberal movement in Great Britain, and he, I think, was to a great extent, responsible for some progressive actions in the old country. Here is what it says:

“It seems to be a characteristic of total war that no sooner is it engaged, then a creative spirit begins to think of its end, and the possibility of creating a new Order nearer to the heart's desire.

“Asquith set up a Cabinet Reconstruction Committee in 1916; another committee was set up by Lloyd George in 1917.”

Mr. Danielson: — Another Liberal.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That's right, he was a Liberal. I'll tell you something about him, too . . .

“This was replaced in August of that year by the Ministry of Reconstruction, first with Dr. Addison as Minister and later Sir Ogden Geddes.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, Lloyd George's daughter, just the other day, was elected as a member in the old country in England, on the side of the Labour party. Here is a Liberal family that has seen the need to progress, and has seen the light. Here is another book, and I happened to have these — I didn't go to the library like the hon. member from Redberry did, and select special books. I just happened to have these when he was talking. I refer to this book called 'Freedom in Contemporary Society' by Samuel Elliott Morrison. I don't know who Mr. Morrison is, but he writes a good book.

Mr. Cameron: — You'd better find out.

Mr. Berezowsky: — On Page 56, what do we find?

Mr. McDonald: — The 'Manifesto'!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Here is a reference to Lloyd George in this book. It says:

"Free enterprise attained a theoretical justification in laissez-faire."

I wonder if my hon. friends opposite know what 'laissez-faire' is. It is something that died in 1914, and all that is left is a little bit of stench, now.

Some Opposition Member: — You're making a pretty 'lazy' effort over there!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I will read that again:

"Free enterprise attained a theoretical justification in laissez-fair, and there are people today who regard laissez-faire as a law of life, or of nature's promise to revelation."

How true, when it is referred to the hon. members opposite.

"The imposition of checks and controls by governments in the last 40 years, especially their transference of income from one class of the community to another by taxation and minimum wage has seemed, and still seems monstrous, almost blasphemous to many victims . . . "

That is exactly what we have been getting from the other side. Then he says this:

"Fifty years ago British and American economists and statesmen apparently reached final conclusions on the value and necessity of private enterprise on the living standard, yet in 20 years the consensus has been broken and the outlook changed by wars and depressions. A new theory has arisen

which demands that government, not private enterprise, lead the economic procession; that the secret of economic health is government spending; that thrift is no longer a virtue and that good citizens need no longer expect to bequeath or to inherit large fortunes.

“David Lloyd George remarked in his speech of 29 of April, 1909, introducing his famous budget, a budget now regarded as the precursor of our present trend: ‘Spending is pleasant, paying is irksome; spending is noble, paying is sordid’.”

He meant to be ironical, but the real irony is that this became orthodoxy, and that, my friends, is the way to the road of progress today.

Mr. Danielson: — Social Credit members may be able to tell you about that.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now, particularly for the benefit of the member from Redberry, and all those who may be listening in on the radio today who are of Ukrainian origin and all others who are interested, I would like to point out that, just a hundred years ago (as a matter of fact, last year we had a centenary in remembrance of this great man) was born a man by the name of Ivan Franko. Ivan Franko was a good man; he came of peasant stock. He was of the same people as Taras Shevchenko was. He was the same stock as the member for Redberry is and I am, originating from hard-working people. He was a man of vision and he had a brilliant mind.

Mr. Danielson: — There’s a great difference there!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Ivan Franko is to the Ukrainian people the same as ‘Robby’ Burns is to the Scottish people, or Shakespeare to the English people, or maybe Robert Owen. He was a great man and he is revered by his people. Before I mention what Ivan Franko said in one or two of his poems, I would like to point out to the hon. member from Redberry, too, that in the Revolution, or the war of 1916-18, and then when the Ukrainian people for a short time obtained their independence, they set up a government which was called ‘The Ukrainian National Committee’, and the members of that Committee, Mr. Speaker, were, in the main, Social Democrats Professor Hrushevsky and many leaders of these people who are honoured today in the homes of Ukrainian people like the hon. member from Redberry.

And the general who fought the last fight against the armies of General Haller and others was General Simeon Petlura. He was murdered by the communists in France. That man today is revered, his picture is to be found in practically every home. And who was Simeon Petlura? He was a member of the Social Democratic party. Who was Ivan Franko, the great poet and the man who fought for the emancipation of the Ukrainian people? He was a Social Democrat. Many of the Greek Catholic priests in

March 5, 1957

the western Ukraine were Social Democrats. The hon. member never heard of it!

Mr. Korchinski: — Don't talk nonsense!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now here is what Franko said. I think he can say more in the few verses I have here than I can say in one-hour's speech, and this is for the education of all of us. Here is what he says:

“Friends of Mine, Pure of Heart,
Strong of muscle and honest of mind,
Arise.”

Or, in another poem:

“Man' brotherhood, his future free from worry
I saw and base that future hurry.
The fields before my eyes by borders were unbroken,
By labour fructified the soil
Rewarded man by all his toil.
‘Twas to my free and happy people I have spoken.”

Then again:

“How I crave land of my birth,
Some of the strength rearing deep in the earth,
Even a drop would uphold like a tower
Liberty's fight in this grim hour.

Some of your warmth to sustain Life's blood
Make great emotions rush in a flood.
Swell my heart and fill my mind
With love of mankind.

Some of your fire to make my tongue
Lash and battle every wrong.
Sear every soul with a message of truth,
Burning forever with passion of youth.

Make my hands strong to break every yoke,
My mind ever clear, firm through all strife.
Strength to work, work and work,
Labour through life.”

It was men like Franko, Burns and Shevchenko who, having been born with a dream, put their visions into words and these words are growing into reality, whether there are members opposite who think so or not.

Some Gov't Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — This debate, Mr. Speaker, is coming to a close, and it is about time.

Mr. McDonald: —It sure is.

Mr. Cameron: — I agree with you there.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, it is about time. Before proceeding with some of the matters that concern my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would like to straighten up one particular statement made in this House by the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson). He made a reference in this House, a few days ago, saying that the veterans were in a bad state of affairs. I am quite sure the hon. member from Nipawin would not want to leave a wrong impression, to leave the impression with the people of this province that this Government has not done the right thing by the veterans. If the veterans are suffering today, they are suffering, sir, for the same reasons that the farmers are generally in the north — in the hon. member's constituency and my constituency; and probably all over the province they are suffering, and it is due to the price-cost squeeze. The reason I say that is this . . .

Mr. Cameron: — What did your Royal Commission say?

Mr. Berezowsky: — They are referring to certain sections of the province, just as the hon. member from Notuken-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), spoke the other day. He only knows one particular part of the province of Saskatchewan. The Royal Commission made surveys in certain parts of the province, and they recognized what I am saying today, that not every part of the province has to have half-sections for economic units. In the north we need a half-section in order to have an economic unit, and this Government has done more than any other government in Canada now, or prior to this time, for the veterans who fought the wars of this country. Mr. Speaker, where the hon. member was wrong is that, in the first place, the lands turned over to the veterans were, in the main, School Trust lands. As a matter of fact, the figures I received from the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) indicate that 80 per cent of the lands which they obtained on a 10-year lease or a 33-year lease (or whatever it was) were School Trust lands, and if you will look up the various agreements and the various Acts of this province, you will find that School Trust lands were turned over to this province in 1930 for a particular purpose, namely, to provide revenue for the province of Saskatchewan for the purposes of education. And no government, whether it is a Liberal government or this Government, has any right to take away what is in trust, and turn it over to a few individuals for free, no matter how badly they may need the land!

Mr. Nicholson (Nipawin): — How much land in the Carrot River area is School Trust land?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am talking about the general picture in the province of Saskatchewan. The hon. member is trying to take a few quarter sections in the Carrot River area. I am saying about 80 per cent of the lands in Saskatchewan are School Trust lands that have been turned over to the veterans.

Mr. Nicholson: — What quarters in the Carrot River area?

Mr. Berezowsky: — If the hon. member wanted to talk about the Carrot River, he should have so indicated; but he left the impression in this House that this Government had not done the right thing by the veterans, and that they were in a sad state of affairs, and I am just trying to correct him.

Mr. Nicholson: — I still say so. I still say so, so don't try to correct me.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Apparently the Liberals agree with him! But now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to show you what the Liberal policy was with these School Trust lands. The only policy they had was that you should sell this land to the highest bidder . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That is correct.

Mr. Berezowsky: — And then they gave him terms. I have them here. I don't know whether I will read them or not, but I might. Yes, I have it here: one-tenth down, nine equal payments, 6 per cent interest to the highest bidder, and you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what chance a veteran would have to be able to re-establish himself on those terms.

Take the case of Manitoba. We hear a lot about Manitoba. Well, I have relatives down in Birch River, in a section of the country where some of this land was turned over to veterans on a similar kind of basis, where it was sold to them at a price beyond what they could pay. They are definitely going to continue to be in debt and pay high interest rates. But in this province, feeling that we did have responsibility to the veterans, we proceeded to make an arrangement with the Dominion Government to release us from that particular kind of agreement, and we did receive a concession (as the hon. members know) that we could sell this land, not to the highest bidder, but that we could sell it to the veteran at its productive value. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that, in my community, I have veteran farmers who have a half-section of land, who today could receive \$20,000 for that half-section of land. They told me that. Yet under the terms that we have, and under the assessment of the valuation that we have on this productive basis, we have disposed of and sold that land to them for \$6,000 and \$7,000 — a third of the cost. Then the hon. member from Nipawin dares to say that this Government has left the veterans in a bad state of affairs!

What are the terms? Is it nine years? Is it 6 per cent compound interest? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not. The terms that we give our veterans is one-tenth down, 20 equal instalments, a long period of years to pay and only 3 1/2 per cent simple interest, not compound interest; and if it is a crop-failure year, Mr. Speaker, then they are released from making payment for that year. Now, I leave it to the people of Saskatchewan. I leave it to the members of this Assembly who are honest with themselves — I think you all are; but I leave it to them to say whether any better deal could have been given under circumstances of that kind, and with trust lands.

Then the hon. member suggested that we should go and take two crops from the veterans and give them title. Again I suggest, Mr. Speaker,

that the hon. member was not acquainted with the facts because I have figures here to prove that many of the veterans do not have to pay any money to get title right now – without any payment whatsoever.

Mr. Cameron: — How?

Mr. Berezowsky: — He asks how, and I will tell him. There are two kinds of veterans. One veteran asks this Government, or at least this Government agreed to go ahead and clear the land and break the land at the expense of the Provincial Treasurer, at a cost of \$20, \$24, or \$30 an acre, whatever it was. But the Government paid all the expenses of putting that land into the position that it could produce crops; the veteran didn't put up a penny. In a case like that, where the veteran has only turned over a sixth, or a seventh or an eighth share of crop (most reasonable, for most of the land otherwise in private hands is at least a third share of the crop) they paid only that much and I am glad it was so. But that is all they returned after we broke all this land the cleared it; all they had to turn over to the Department is that particularly small share of crop.

Those people are assessed on the basis of the productive value of the land, and, as I said, although that section may have been worth \$20,000 the man is asked \$6,00 or \$7,000. Most of them are very happy about it, except the hon. member from Nipawin.

Then we have the other kind. The other chap is the veteran who put in his own money to clear and break. He invested his capital; where he got the money isn't the question at all. He invested his capital and cleared the land, he broke the land and he has turned over crops to the Department. Those shares of crops added together, in some cases, are more, in some cases are equal to, and in some cases a little more is required, to pay for the valuation of the land, as I said, on a productive basis. I have figures here to show some of the veterans who won't have to pay a penny. Now, would it be fair, I will ask the hon. member from Nipawin, to ask those people who have already paid for the land to turn around and have to give this Government another two crops? What I am trying to point out, without malice, or anything like that, is that the whole suggestion was impractical, and I want this Assembly to get the story straight so that they will be able to give some assistance to the veterans, and also be able to answer questions when they are asked in the field, instead of having them misinterpreted the way they are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, apparently I will have to wait until some other opportunity to discuss the various questions I wanted to discuss today, concerning problems in my constituency. I will, however, touch on one or two of the problems, seeing that I have a few minutes' time.

I will say that, generally, for the people of the north, I think they are the finest people anywhere; not that they have any greater potentialities than other people in this province, or in this part of Canada, or any other part of Canada, but because of the fact that they settled in that

northern area under conditions and circumstances which were hard to endure. When I give credit to the people of my constituency, whether they are farmers, or trappers, or fishermen, or miners, I always keep in mind the early days when they went into that forest region, into that whole area which is called Cumberland constituency today. We also have the same kind of people to the east and to the west and to the south of us. Those people went in there, and with their bare hands, so to speak, with axes and grub hoes, tore out the trees and the stumps and put a fraction of an acre, or an acre, into crop; and it has taken many, many years. They first started to settle there, I think, about 1908 and it is only very recently that the rich area has been opened up; and because of that fact, because they have worked so hard for a living, they grew into a fine and hardy people. They understand the value of work, and they appreciate work, and they appreciate that fact when they are trying to make a living.

What I was coming to, Mr. Speaker, is this – and it has been mentioned in this House on a number of occasions – that part of the province of Saskatchewan, where the people worked hardest to establish themselves in homes, and whether they are veterans (as was pointed out) or whether they are people who were originally civilians and established themselves there, they are today squeezed worse than in any part of this province, or probably in Canada. The most hard-working people are the hardest squeezed, and were it not for the fact that this Government has initiated various programs, such as establishing pasture lands and forage crop lands where these people on quarter-sections and half-sections can go out and obtain this fodder to supplement the little hay they may have on their quarter-sections, or their half-sections of land, conditions would be much worse.

I suggest to this Government at this time that I would appreciate it if they would extend those programs to as great an extent as possible, and I have in mind one particular thing. In that area we do have some sub-marginal lands that could be incorporated into these forage communities, and I would suggest, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister of Canada has mentioned that they are willing to assist Quebec, I am quite sure that, being the children of the state, that the Prime Minister of Canada would go just as far with the people of Saskatchewan, and maybe this Government and the Government of Canada can get together and possibly purchase some of these lands, or buy the land, I mean, from some of these people on sub-marginal quarters and try to re-establish them in areas where the land is much better. And then we could take these sub-marginal areas and make pasture units and forage units out of them.

I know in my immediate community of Meath Park, a distance of about 15 miles, during the last few years, because of the policy of this Government we have been obtaining around four to five thousand tons of hay. It may not be a great deal, but you would be surprised, Mr. Speaker, what good it has done for the people of my constituency, and in that particular area.

Seeing that my time is up, Mr. Speaker, I will leave the other subjects I had in mind to discuss today, for a later date; but as you have

seen, I am certainly going to support the motion, because I think the Government is on the right track, and doing a fine job.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all join all those who have already extended to you congratulations on your election as Speaker of the Assembly. Having had the opportunity of working with you in the past, I realize that you are probably better suited for that high position than any other individual within this House.

I want to also take the opportunity of congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure that the people of Swift Current and the people of Yorkton are proud of their representatives. They certainly handled themselves well, and proved their value and ability.

Going into the debate, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to reply to some of the criticism made yesterday. Referring to the hon. member for Notuken-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), he dwelt for some time on the dignity and serenity of this House, and I notice that a few of the other speakers of the Opposition spoke on this very same topic. Yet I notice that even today if anybody brought (what would you say?) confusion to the House, I believe that the Opposition contributed more than the Government side of the House. I realize that we all do a certain amount of it, but I want to give you the history (I believe one of them gave it) of the House, when I was back here sitting in the galleries. At that time there was no C.C.F. party within the House, back in 1930 and 1929. I notice that the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) probably referred to some of that period, when he used to sit in the galleries. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that at that part time, when I came into these galleries, I thought I was a Liberal. My dad was still a Liberal in the Canora constituency, dragging the No. 9 Highway north of Canora. I came into this House, believing I was a Liberal. In fact, the first man that I wanted to spy in the Opposition seats at that time was the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, who was then Leader of the Opposition and of the Liberal party. But I am going to tell you after sitting in the galleries of this Assembly, many an evening while I was attending normal school, I took every opportunity to attend and listen to the Session. I remember in those days when the depression was setting in, in 1930-31, when I realized that an economic depression was sweeping across this province, the Dominion of Canada and the world, and I was sitting in the galleries of the Assembly, and listening to our workmen in action down below here. I remember that they threw jibes at each other, joked, hammered their fists on the table, their feet into the floor, yelled "Hear, hear!"; and then some member of the Legislative Assembly would rise up and they would all start singing: "When it's springtime in Regina," Mr. Speaker. Remember the song, the popular song, 'When It's Spring-time in The Rockies'? I just want to point this out to some of the younger members of the opposition, as to what went on in the House here, some years ago. But with the coming of the radio broadcasts, I believe that that has brought dignity and serenity back to the House, although I realize . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Settle down.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . they are not prepared to sing as they did in those days. Then, I remember when they sang, and the Speaker tried to bring order, a member would rise up and say: "Well, why can't we do it, they do it in the House of Commons in Ottawa." So, I suppose it goes on over there yet.

Mr. McDonald: — If you promise not to sing, we might . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — All right. Leaving that point, I would like to refer back to the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch dwelling considerably on the Liberal political philosophy. He elaborated on it considerably and tied it right up with the Christian principles of the Christian philosophy, and thought that it was so much more than what the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) talked on the day before. And I am going to tell you it sounded very nice. But I know that the white man has had those very same philosophies throughout the world, and particularly in the under-developed countries of the world, Asia and Africa. I am going to tell you the African finally realized that he can die of hunger just as well under those philosophies as he can die of hunger under Mohammedans or Buddhist philosophies. Mr. Speaker, we need not only the philosophy; we must act upon that philosophy, and we haven't done it. I was born of a Christian family.

Mr. Gardiner: — But you have given it up.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I remember my folks brought us up to believe that one of the greatest sins is to destroy a crust of bread; and I believed that, and still do. That is a Christian philosophy. And I remember this same Liberal Government who has that wonderful philosophy — and it is a wonder philosophy; but you have got to put it into action. I saw philosophical government throughout Canada and the world in the 'thirties burn coffee. I saw them dump oranges into the ocean. I saw this same philosophical government pay the farmers not to produce food. I heard of them slaughtering hogs and cattle to turn into fertilizer, to get it on the land to produce more barley, produce more oats, more hogs, destroy them and turn them into fertilizer, and back onto the land.

Mr. McDonald: — There's lots of fertilizer this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I saw in the city of Regina, when people asked for bread and work, they got the policy and the baton. Yes, Mr. Speaker, when God gave us plenty in those 'thirties there certainly was plenty.

Mr. McCarthy: — Where?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — This Christian free enterprise Government at that time took the plenty and flung it back in the face of God, and then speak about its philosophies — Christian philosophies. Yes, as a municipality secretary-treasurer in the town of Canora, I saw people dying in their

homes because they were not able to pay for hospitalization or medical attention.

Mr. Loptson: — You are a fine example of a municipal secretary.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — For example, in the town of Canora at that time, we had a 45-bed hospital with three storeys, but two of the storeys were closed; only one was open in those days. People were not coming into the hospitals; they were dying at home, under this Christian philosophical Liberal Government.

Mr. Cameron: — Who gave you that word?

Mr. Loptson: — What were you doing as secretary of the municipality at that time?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I remember that there were people who criticized those actions and proposed remedies, but by the Liberal philosophers they were called Communists, atheists, and were ridiculed in this province. But in 1944, this group with the poor philosophy was elected, and what did they do? One of the first things they did was to bring about a hospitalization plan allowing all people of Saskatchewan the use of the hospitals of the province of Saskatchewan.

This group was supposed to have poor Christian philosophies. They immediately organized an air ambulance service to rush in the sick from the outlying areas of Saskatchewan to the hospitals of the cities and the towns of the province. Don't forget that. Yes, this is the group that organized and commenced the building and extensions of hospitals in this province. I can refer right back to my own home town, Canora; the Canora hospital was extended from 45 to 80 beds, and all the complaints that I heard from the people of my constituency now was: "There is no room in that hospital." Hospitals were full, yes; there were sick prior to 1944 but we had empty hospitals. This is the same group that, immediately after 1944, increased old-age pensions, mothers' allowances, increased social aid assistance immediately.

Mr. McCarthy: — You took it away from them.

Mr. McDonald: — You took it away.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — You can laugh. This is the group that passed the first Farm Security legislation in the Dominion of Canada, and, Mr. Speaker, later on saw it nullified by the Liberals at Ottawa. They guaranteed that never again shall the farmer be evicted out of his homestead.

Mr. Cameron: — How many evictions have you had?

Mr. McDonald: — Sixteen hundred – driving people out of the country.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Keep in mind the dignity of the House that you boys talk about.

Mr. Cameron: — Don't interfere, eh?

Mr. McDonald: — Give us the truth, Alex.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that every one of these Christian acts, every one of these Good Samaritan acts, were opposed by the Liberal Opposition when the laws were brought in in this Legislature.

I am, too, wondering whether the troubles of the world today are not due to too much philosophising and not enough Christian action. I know that it is written in the Good book "Wherefor by their fruits, ye shall know them," and I am going to tell you the people know the Opposition and know the Government.

Mr. Danielson: — You bet they do.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I do want to say that sometimes people do forget; they take these things for granted. There are some people who have forgotten that these Good Samaritan principles were pioneered by the C.C.F. in Canada, in North America; that through this pioneering, these same Christian programs were finally brought about in the province of Alberta and the province of British Columbia. But I am going to point one thing out — that practically none of these programs have yet been instituted in any province of the Dominion of Canada that has a Liberal Government, a Liberal Government with those high philosophical principles.

I want to say that I believe men like J.S. Woodsworth, and I am going to include T.C. Douglas, who have philosophised, and we know that you need to philosophise; but who acted and accomplished, they are going to be remembered long, long after those that only philosophised.

Then, I go on to the next point. The hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch said: "Industries were anxious to invest in Saskatchewan in 1944." In fact, Mr. Speaker, he depicted the picture. I could see the capitalists on the Manitoba border, on the Alberta border, on the United States border, with bags full of money just waiting for the C.C.F. to take over. And the moment we took over in 1944, they rushed into Saskatchewan, but, of course, we drove them out.

Mr. McCarthy: — They were here before that.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — But, Mr. Speaker, what were they doing on that border prior to 1944? Why didn't they come in under a Liberal administration, if they were there waiting? "There," he said: "industries were anxious to invest in 1944, waiting . . ." They were waiting there a long, long time, from 1905 to 1944, and somebody kept them out. I know that sometimes they refer to Manitoba, but I would like to point out that, as far as Manitoba is concerned, they were building hydropower development back in 1910. Manitoba had three great foundries and a steel mill prior to the First World War in 1914. Rural power was extended in Manitoba during the 1920s. A pulp mill

in Manitoba was established in 1924. What did we have in Saskatchewan?

Some Gov't Member: — A Liberal Government.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Who kept them out?

Mr. Cameron: — Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And then they talk about Manitoba. They refer to Alberta, and I want to point out that Alberta was producing oil prior to 1914, the first World War; and during the 'twenties and the 'thirties Alberta was Canada's greatest oil-producing area. But, what did we have in Saskatchewan? Nothing but the philosophical Liberal party; period, Mr. Speaker.

Now, since the C.C.F. took over, since 1944, I am not going to take time in enumerating, except to glance over them. We have a potash industry development, we have a uranium industry, we have salt mines, we have sodium sulphate mines, the building industry terrifically expanded, a new steel pipe plant in the city of Regina, a transformer firm producing transformers, wire and cable firm in Weyburn, sewer and pipe plant in the city of Regina, a cement plant in the city of Regina that they tried to stop. And I remember the Rt. Hon. 'Jimmy' Gardiner getting up in the House of Commons, and he said: "Ah! You can't establish a cement plant; the clay, the shale of Regina is not good enough for it." As good an engineer as he is — The Minister of Agriculture! But I am going to tell you that the cement plant is operating now at full capacity in the city of Regina; a wallboard plant, oil industry, gas industry and the terrific expansion of refineries.

I am going to do a bit of quoting. You know, even the Liberal press sometimes, in its sober moments, comes out and tells the truth.

Mr. Gardiner: — Which one is the Liberal press?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The 'Leader-Post'.

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The 'Leader-Post', and I am going to quote from the 'Leader-Post' of December 31, 1956, headlined: "Flourishing Saskatchewan" and I am going to read portions of it:

" . . . the year undoubtedly marks the greatest progress Saskatchewan ever has made in this regard."

Mr. Danielson: — In spite of the C.C.F.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yet the Opposition will continuously try to belittle and sabotage Saskatchewan's industrial development. Then they go on and they say, Mr. Speaker:

“Our oil production in barrels soared from 11,300,000 in 1955 to 20,900,000 in 1956, while in value it climbed even more sharply, from \$17,400,000 in 1955 to \$35,800,000 in 1956.

“Even that habitual optimist, Mineral Resources Minister Brockelbank was too conservative, a few weeks ago. He predicted oil production worth \$28,600,000, but it reached \$35,800,000 . . .”

They continue:

“ . . . Saskatchewan’s mineral production increased from \$85,342,000 in 1955 to \$111,623,000 in 1956, Mr. Brockelbank predicted. But even this \$111,623,000 apparently is too low by some \$7,000,000 as the total value of mineral production has climbed to around \$118,000,000.”

Mr. Speaker, everything that we have stated about Saskatchewan’s expansion has been understated by this side of the House. It is admitted by the Liberal press of this province. They go and they say, and I am going to quote again:

“Lumping together the farm cash take, the mineral, fish, fur and lumber production, and the manufacturing output, results in an impressive total of approximately \$1,100,000,000. This is only a part of the gross provincial product for 1956. With the addition of services and finance ‘production’ the GPP should hover in the vicinity of \$1,600,000,000. This, on a population basis, is just about what our share of the gross national product of approximately \$30,000,000,000 should be.”

And, Mr. Speaker, you want to keep in mind that, although we have reached a level in 1956 with that of the Dominion of Canada, we know that our agricultural economy is down. Therefore, the industrial expansion of this province must have been terrific.

Going on, and I want to make a remark or two in connection with the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner). He gave us some figures and statistics on the P.F.A.A. payments, giving Biggar-Rosetown, Melville and I believe North Battleford, but, of course, he did not quote figures to show the amount that the farmers paid into this fund in each of the constituencies. Then he came back with the old bit of blackmail, the threat that if you criticized the P.F.A.A. “we’ll throw it out the window.” The same attitude as one other political figure used to use in this House, when talking about the Wheat Board: “if you dare criticize the Wheat Board, we will throw

it out the window."

And then, of course, he dwelt to some extent on the population counts of the province, and tried to point out to the people of the province and this House that the farmers are pulling out due to the C.C.F.

Mr. McDonald: — True.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And somebody over there yells "Hear, hear!"

Mr. Loptson: — Well, in my district they are going to Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote a paragraph out of the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospect (the Gordon Report) appointed by the Federal Liberal Government . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, use your own Commission.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . a Commission, not ours, a Liberal Commission, and here is what the Liberal Commission has to say as to the loss of agricultural population. They say:

"Great changes have taken place in Canadian agriculture since the end of the last War. Between 1946 and 1955 the physical volume of output per farm has increased by 30 per cent, and the gross physical output per man-hour by almost 75 per cent. The farmers are doing a wonderful job; carry on.

"This greater productivity has been made possible in part by favourable weather conditions in western Canada, and in part of substantial increases in the use of power and equipment on farms. At the same time the number employed in agriculture dropped by about 30 per cent, from 1,186,000 to 817,000."

In other words, they didn't say the agricultural population dropped 30 per cent in Saskatchewan; they stated it dropped throughout the whole of the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Speaker. And I would say that that is due mainly to the cost-price squeeze coming up on us since the lifting of price controls in 1946 by the Federal authorities.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Do you want price controls?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I am going to quote one other section . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Is he advocating price controls?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: —

"Over a long period of time, the average incomes of agricultural workers, farmers, family labour, and hired labour were generally lower than the incomes of other producers, except fishermen."

Mr. Barrie: — How about the timber men?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, the agricultural workers of Canada, the farmers, under the present economy are next to the fishermen. Fishermen have always been a class next to slave labour.

Mr. Loptson: — They sure were when you were on the Fish Board.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And so, in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker, practically every member of this Legislative Assembly has got up and talked about agriculture, and I believe that we should talk about agriculture. It is the major industry of this province.

For example, reviewing the Speech from the Throne, I would like to point out that it is concerned with and has something for every phase of our Saskatchewan economy and for all our people. If you check the Speech from the Throne, there are 50 paragraphs in it. Twenty-seven of the paragraphs deal with general well-being, health, welfare, education, highways and so on, of all the people of the province of Saskatchewan, rural and urban. The next nine paragraphs of this Speech from the Throne deal with agriculture and agricultural matters; seven of them deal with industrial development, and rightly so; two of the paragraphs deal with labour, one deals with the teachers, one with the fur industry, one with the fish industry, and one on northern development. I say, Mr. Speaker, an exceptionally well-balanced planned program.

Concern and emphasis, of course, was given to the agricultural economy. And here I would like to read from the 'Western Producer', and I am going to quote this. This is a talk made in another province of the Dominion of Canada. This concerns the Speech from the Throne of another provincial government, only lately:

"It is a matter of deep concern to my Government, that farmers' net income is not commensurate with the buoyant state of our general economy. My Government continues to explore avenues through which farmers and ranchers may achieve and maintain a position of nearer parity, comparable to that enjoyed by those engaged in other industries."

And I agree with that. The Speech then went on to say:

"The Government will press the Federal Government to exercise three statutes of Federal responsibility: long-term loans at reasonable interest rates; revision of the anti-dumping regulations in the matter of fruit and vegetables; retention of freight rates; assistance on feed grain for livestock and poultry."

And I see that even the Leader of the Unofficial Opposition (Mr. Weber) in this House seems to have agreed with the Official Opposition and says:

"We realize that the Federal Government has failed, and failed agriculture miserably throughout Canada and Saskatchewan, but we are going to ask that Saskatchewan, the Provincial Government fill this gap."

In other words, they are all asking that the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan pull themselves up by their very bootstraps, out of the mire and the chaos that they are in agriculturally.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . he'd go straight up.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I would like to point out that down through the years we have warned that this situation was going to happen to agriculture. Since 1946, when price controls were lifted in this country, we knew that all other commodities of the industrialists and so on would skyrocket, and through the sky-rocketing of prices, there is bound to be a cost-price squeeze on the agricultural people and the workers of this country.

I am going to give some statistics, and these statistics are taken out from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics — Liberal figures, not C.C.F. They give us that the total number of people employed in agriculture at the present time is 15 per cent of the people of Canada, but that they received less than 7 per cent of the national income. Where is the other 8 per cent? And yet, the hon. member for Melville, the other day, stated that the farmers are not too badly off. I am going to check and see where the 8 per cent went to. If you check other figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, for example in 1946, take an index for the national income as 100, take weekly wages in the Dominion of Canada, and set them at 100 (although I don't believe they were 100), set the net farm income at 100, set the corporations profits at 100, investment income at 100 (and I know that they weren't all even in 1946). But in 1946, they lifted price controls and they told the people of Canada that by the lifting of price controls they would give freedom to the Canadian people. I am going to show you who got the freedom, Mr. Speaker. If we use that as 100 per cent in 1946, let's follow through to 1950. What has happened? In 1950, the net national income has gone up from 100 to 149; the weekly wages went up from 100 to 138 (lagging behind); net farm income went up to 136 — lagging behind the net national income; corporation profits up to 160, 'way above the net national income. You see who got the freedom, Mr. Speaker. And investment corporations did even better. Their index jumped in five years to 167.

Now let's go to 1956, ten years after price control was lifted. The net national income, from 1946 to 1956, jumped to 211; weekly wages jumped to 187, but didn't keep up with the net national income. Now, let's take a look at the net farm income that the Federal Minister of Agriculture stated, not very long ago: "They never had it any better," and some of the boys across the House agree with it. Who stated that they have parity prices? Let's take a look at the figures and again, these are Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures. While the net national income went up from 100 to 211, and weekly wages went up from 100 to 187, the net farm income went up from 100 to 136, and is remaining on that same five-year level, five years ago. And when we look at corporation profits, they have jumped from

100 to 220. See where the income that the farmer and the worker lost went to! Those are the boys that got the freedom, and if you take investment income, investment income in that ten-year period jumped from 100 to 200.

I am going to give you another set of figures taken out of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I am going to give you the percentage of industrial groups earning net incomes of \$2,500 or more as of 1954. We look at this and we find that in 1954 only three per cent of the farmers of Canada earned \$2,500 or more. Is that being well off? Wage-earners received 43 per cent, or 43 per cent of the wage-earners received \$2,500 or more, and it is just because labour is organized a little better than are the farmers of Canada, or of Saskatchewan. Now, let's take a look at the manufacturers, and 81 per cent of the manufacturers made \$2,500 or more. And, then, when you look at the financiers, they are in the top and the special group, 92 per cent of them made \$2,500 or more.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this is sufficient to prove that the farmer is in the same boat through the whole Dominion of Canada, and not only in Saskatchewan, and that the cost-price squeeze is his difficulty, and the reason why, for example, he could not even pay some of the taxes. But, I want to point out again that I believe that disparity in income has even been encouraged by the Federal Government through subsidies to these particular special interests, and I am going to quote from the last Norman Rodgers, one-time Liberal Minister of Labour, when he computed and stated in 1937, this:

“The net loss to the farmers of western Canada, as a result of the operation of the tariff was \$110 per head . . .”

Premier Douglas: — In 1937?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — In 1937, yes. And today it is estimated that through tariffs alone, we pay \$200 million a year from the province of Saskatchewan to subsidize eastern industry. Yet, when I see our members of Parliament in the House of Commons get up on the floor and speak in the interests of the farmer of Saskatchewan, western Canada and Canada, not only the eastern members call them “cry babies, rumour-mongers” and so on, but so do our own Liberal members of Parliament sent from Saskatchewan, from Manitoba and from Alberta. If it is right to subsidize one industry I believe it is right to subsidize another industry.

Now, going on with subsidization, and high interest rates; we have, I believe, experienced in the last year, five increases in interest rates in Canada, and I believe that this again is a subsidy to eastern financiers. They haven't made enough. They were the highest group according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Freight rates have always been loaded against the west in favour of the east, and that is a subsidization for the railways of Canada. Gold subsidies of \$10 million paid annually, and then again, to the farmers of Ontario (and I don't begrudge them) \$18 million a

year to subsidize the freight hauling of feed grain. So, why can't some subsidization be provided for the agricultural industry of the west?

A moment ago, I read you what one of the premiers of a western Canadian province stated in the Legislative Assembly, and that happened to be the Premier of British Columbia. I am going to read, for example, from the 'Western Producer' of February 21, a statement by J.H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Pool, and it is headlined: 'Deficiency Payments – The Only Solution To Farm Problems', and he states:

"Mr. Wesson said deficiency payments from the Federal treasury is the only solution to the problems confronting prairie grain growers.

"The cost-price squeeze is at the root of the problems, he said. There is nothing the farmer can do about the cost of farm machinery, nor about rising freight rates."

And, of course, I was glad to see in the commencement of this debate, that finally the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) has come to the realization that agriculture is in a precarious condition. And so from the information that he gave the House this is what I gathered. He admits that the Federal Government has failed and failed miserably, but he was going to come out with a 16-point program for the province to do what the Federal Government had failed or refused to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Korchinski: — He didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I am going to tell you that I thought that this was something new. I actually did. I thought with the new addition of the young members and then with the addition of a young member of the learned profession, I thought now they have really got something — a 16-point program — there is something to it. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if you look at it, it is the same old mulligan stew that was 'Gardinered' between Ottawa and Saskatchewan, 'Tuckerized' 'Stained' and stewed in this city, and delivered to the House in the past eight years. Yes, if you add all that up, what does this mean? The same thing as they have told us in the past — cancel taxes and reduce your revenue, but increase your expenditure. Now, Mr. Speaker, even a child knows better than that.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Children are intelligent.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — During the weekend I had the opportunity of going with a fine comb through these 16 points, and I wondered what brain, what visionary brain, thought up the 16 points. You know in the past they used to bring that mulligan stew in a great big tub but this time they brought it in 16 different bowls. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, when you throw them back into the tub and sample it, it is the same thing that they have been bringing, for the past eight years, into this Legislature. All it amounts to is, reduce your revenue, increase your expenditure. Even

if they told this to a child, he would catch on. If the child had ten cents in his pocket, they would say: "Put a nickel aside, but go down to the store and spend twenty-five cents." Now, how can you do that? And, so if you total up this particular mulligan stew, Mr. Speaker, you find that all it says, and you can say it only in a few words: "Reduce your revenue by \$3 million and increase your expenditure by \$35 million."

Mr. Gardiner: — You can quit now, you are off the air.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — They don't tell you by reducing your revenue by \$3 million what services they want us to cancel off. And when they say increase the expenditure by \$35 million, they don't tell us where to levy taxes and upon whom, to raise that \$35 million.

Mr. Gardiner: — Eliminate the waste.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — In other words, as I stated a while ago, their whole criticism of the Throne Speech has been advising the farmers of Saskatchewan to pull themselves out of the chaos that they are in by their own bootstraps.

Now, I have done some figuring. For example, the problem of the agricultural economy today is to make up the difference between their share of what their net or national income should be, and what it actually is at the present time. If you check that difference, it is \$256 million, that the price squeeze has taken out of the agricultural economy of this province. And so the Leader of the Opposition says: "The province should fill the gap," and then, of course, the Leader of the Unofficial Opposition (Mr. Weber) pretty well agreed to the same thing. But, I see the Leader in British Columbia doesn't; he agrees with us.

I am going to take time to check the 16 points. The first point, Mr. Speaker, he stated they can certainly adopt our program of rural electrification. What a joke! Now, I would like to ask them, what program? The one that you had when you were the Government of this Province?

Premier Douglas: — That's easy to adopt.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . or the one in the Opposition? When they were the Government of this province, and somebody stated that they had some 136 or 146 farmers tied up with electrical power, when they bought the Power Corporation, there were some 136 farmers tied into it already, and the best that they ever did was give eight farmers, in 1943-44, in that whole year, electrical power.

Mr. Danielson: — It took you until 1948 to do anything.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And they made the farmers pay the total cost . . .

Mr. Danielson: — It took you until 1948 to do anything.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . of bringing that power to the farms.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . that is what the Power Commission's Minister said.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, if I was the hon. member . . .

Mr. Danielson: — He said they couldn't do anything until 1948. That's what the Minister said.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I am telling you the truth, that's why you are jumping up.

Premier Douglas: — I have tried not to interfere, but this gentleman has, all through the debate, been sitting in his chair and talking at some length. I can understand interjections, but this has been interjections of several sentences, while people are speaking and it is completely out of order. I do think the hon. member ought to at least recognize some of the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Going back the Leader of the Opposition suggests they can certainly adopt 'our program of rural electrification'. But, you know the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) got up the other day and he let the cat out of the bag. Yes. For the first time, I have heard a Liberal member admit where they would get this money from, and he said: "We would do the same thing as they do in Manitoba, borrow money from the mortgage companies, supply it to the farmers and then collect it over the next 50 to 100 years." In fact, in Manitoba they are not only going to make the farmer pay who is living now, but his children, and his children's children will pay for that power, and they will probably pay twice to three times as much as the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Yes, you can laugh. But I am going to tell you, that kind of rural electrification is the same thing as the Liberal administration in 1920 had in the rural telephone scheme of this province. They supplied rural telephones to the farmers of this province of Saskatchewan in those days free — well, actually it was with a \$5 deposit . . .

Mr. Danielson: — What are you talking about?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, they paid \$5 down and then they signed and paid taxes on the land for the next twenty years, and they paid two and three times as much as they would have paid if they had done it right then and paid for it in cash. So let's not kid ourselves. I know that on the hustings they told the farmers "we will provide free power." But in this Session, the hon. member from Pelly let the cat out of the bag. I have been saying that right along. Yes, they can do it. They can borrow money, supply it to the farmers, and out of the general revenues of the province over the next 50 to 100 years . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Where are you borrowing yours?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, pay it back. It is no wonder that some of the mortgage companies love the Liberal philosophy.

Mr. Danielson: — You borrow \$22 million a year.

Mr. Loptson: — The farmers are borrowing it now, to pay you.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Then, the hon. member for Pelly talked about a reduction of rates. Hasn't he forgotten that electrical power rates have been reduced from 15 cents in 1944 to only eight cents on the maximum, and the minimum in those days used to be four cents and it is down to one and one-half. We have given some five reductions in rates.

Mr. Weber: — Try to tell the farmer that.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Here I like to usually, and I believe that the people of the province should, check politicians for their short-sightedness . . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . . or far-sightedness.

Mr. Cameron: — You said a mouthful, Alex.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I remember prior to 1944, when I was a municipal secretary-treasurer up at Canora, I used to go utilization with 'Sandy' Nicholson and campaign for the C.C.F., and at that time the hon. member for Pelly ran on the Liberal ticket, in the Federal election. I remember 'Sandy' Nicholson prior to 1944. He used to say that he believed that if a C.C.F. Government was ever elected in the province of Saskatchewan it would be possible to build on the soft coal mines of Estevan a power station; build high grid lines into northern Saskatchewan, into Canora and Yorkton, Pelly and so on, and bring electricity to the farmers in the towns of that area of the province. Boy, I remember the hon. member for Pelly really had a nice time. Oh, did they ever laugh! Did they ever ridicule 'Sandy' Nicholson for philosophising, for thinking, for planning! I remember the propaganda they used to spread then: "Why, if these Socialists ever got in, they would bankrupt the province. This is an impossibility. Could you imagine such stupidity as building power stations in the coal mines 275 miles away and bringing electricity to the farmers." Well, you know, even some of the C.C.F.ers laughed. They thought it was a joke.

Mr. Speaker, inside of seven years, from 1944 to 1951, this was a reality under a Government who believed not only in philosophising, but in action. The power stations were built on the coal mines, and the high grid lines were built into the north; and I remember in 1951 I had the opportunity, with you, Mr. Speaker, at that time Minister of Power, to turn on a rural area in between Buchanan and Margo, giving light in 1951 to 373 farmers of that area. A dream? The Liberals used to call it a 'dream of a preacher', because 'Sandy' Nicholson was a Minister of the Gospel. That dream became a

fact and a reality. We didn't only philosophise; we acted and did it – and then he has the audacity, Mr. Speaker, to talk about power.

Okay, that's point one. I will be a long time before I get through with the 16 points.

Mr. Cameron: —Let's take it as read, Alex.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Point No. 2 . . .

Some Gov't Member: — They would like to take it as read.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yeah! I know they would love it, and I am not going to give them the opportunity. I am going to take my time.

The next point is their programs of road grading. Now, again, I am going to ask, Mr. Speaker, do they mean the road grid system that they had when they were the Government of the province, or do they mean the election promises? I am going to give them some examples of their road grid prior to 1944. I realize Mr. Speaker, that it is not fair to compare this time with those of the 'thirties.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh! Gosh!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — You don't agree?

Mr. McDonald: — We realize that.

Mr. Danielson: — Talk to the other fellows over there.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I say it is not fair to compare equally . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Why do you do it then?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I give you the reason why I do it. But here I am going to give you a leeway of one to three, if our Budget has increased since 1944 by three times, I am going to give you a leeway of one to three. So I have prepared some statistics, and this is prepared on the rural municipalities wholly or partially within my constituency, and I am going to give you some of the road grants to the municipality, and I am going to show you the expenditures on bridges, because I remember a member of the Opposition got up here a few days ago, and said: "Why when we were in power we were responsible; it was always understood that we were responsible for the total municipal bridge building program, 20 feet and over." And I am going to see how well you built them. So if I take a municipality, for example Rural Municipality No. 273 (and that is a good one), the Rural Municipality of Sliding Hills up at Mikado. Now, I am going to use six years, because I want to give them the benefit of the doubt. I am going to use the last six years under Liberal rule in order to bring in 1938, 1939 (you had an election then) and 1943-44. I want to give you two elections

because that is the only time they usually gave some grants, and if I kept those two years out, they wouldn't have any. So I am going to quote No. 273. During the six-year period that they were in power, they gave this municipality \$870. During the last six years that we were in, \$5,310, plus \$24,136 cancellation of Public Revenue Tax; or in other words, directly and indirectly, we contributed to this municipality \$29,446, or in the ratio of where they gave \$1 we gave \$38. Now, that is a pretty nice philosophy, isn't it? I am telling you it is a better philosophy to give \$38 than \$1.

Now, let's take the bridges. In this same municipality during the six years, they spent on building, the total construction of the necessary bridges (yes, they said they were responsible for the whole works) some \$6,397. Then, of course, we came along and in our last six years, and we admit that we are only responsible for building half of them, we only take responsibility for half, I believe it runs from 40 to 80 per cent, depending on the financial standing of the municipalities. But where they spent \$6,000, we contributed \$58,000, or one to ten. And then they talk about taking over the building of the whole road grid system. Again, we are prepared to pay half, and the municipality half. Well, you know, they are going to pay for the whole thing like they paid for the bridges. Yeah!

In other words, where we plan to build this road grid over a period of ten years, they can take the responsibility for building the whole thing, but it will be 150 years before they complete it, because they are going to dabble it out in the same way as they dabbled towards the construction of the bridges.

Mr. Danielson: — If they included the \$1,600,000 you confiscated from the municipalities — that money that you stole from the municipalities on the assessment equalization . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Now I am going to give you another municipality. I am going to give you Rural Municipality No. 305. I will only pick one here and there, or I can give you every one of them, if you want. And in the last six years of Liberal rule, this municipality, the Rural Municipality of Invermay (and the hon. member for Pelly knows the Reeve over there very well and knows where he stood politically for years and years), they contributed, over the six years, \$1,247; while we, in the last six years, contributed \$14,385 in road grants, plus \$10,487 in cancellation of the Public Revenue Tax, or we gave twenty to what the Liberals used to give one — one to twenty. Now, let's take a look at the bridge building program. Again, they were responsible for the total construction of bridges. Let's not forget that. And over the six years in the Rural Municipality of Invermay, they paid in the total bridge construction to that municipality, \$152.86. They sure did a lot of building, and I know that municipality well, and I know how many creeks and rivers there are. They need bridges.

Mr. Barrie: — They have them.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The total building of the bridges.

Mr. Barrie: — They had them before that.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Now, in the last six years the C.C.F. (and, of course, they will only acknowledge 50 per cent of the responsibility), contributed to this municipality \$6,553.97, or in the ratio of \$1 to \$43.

I am going to give you another one, the Rural Municipality of Preeceville No. 334. I notice that the Rural Municipality of Preeceville, under the Liberal administration, in six years received two grants, one in 1939-39, and one in 1943-44. In between, no roads; they don't need any. And, of course, if you look over this whole chart, you will find that the greatest contribution they made was in 1938 when their Budget was low. By 1944 their Budget was up, yet they didn't give very much. I wonder why! They realized that they had had it, that they were going out, and so why spend money! They might as well give up. But anyway, in that municipality they gave two grants amounting to \$1,535. If you check our next six years, we contributed to that municipality \$14,040, and cancelled Public Revenue Taxes to the tune of \$16,033. In other words directly and indirectly we contributed \$1 to \$20.

Now let's take a look at the bridges. For bridges in this municipality, over the six years they were in power, (and again they were responsible for the total cost of the bridges) they spent \$2,596. In the next six years when we estimated we were only responsible for half the cost of the bridges, we contributed to this municipality \$34,996 towards the building of the bridges, or in other words, \$1 to \$13.

Some statement was made by, I believe, the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie). He said the road grid isn't going over so good. Well, I am just going to take one municipality, the Rural Municipality of Clayton, No. 333. Two-thirds of that is in his constituency, and one-third of the municipality is in mine. Maybe I should give him the whole statistics on this one. Under the Liberal administration, in six years, this municipality of Clayton received in grants \$7,966.74, and \$6,000 of it was in 1938-39, the election year. In the next six year, this municipality received from this Government \$31,902 in grants, and then through the cancellation of \$16,218 of Public Revenue Tax that the Liberals used to collect and we don't or a total of \$48,000. But, here is a good one. I checked this year's statistics to see whether they did any grid work on the 50-50 basis, and I find that this municipality, this year, is going to receive in equalization grants and grants on road grid the sum of \$31,618. Mr. Speaker, this municipality is going to receive four times as much money this year from the Provincial Government as they did receive in six years under the Liberal administration.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's why No. 134 didn't get any. It all went up there.

Mr. Danielson: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The hon. Minister of Mineral Resources, the other day, quoted from all over the province, and the story is the same . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Political patronage.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . on the road grid system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out at this point, too, aid to agriculture. He says: "Why don't you do something for the farmer?" We are doing something for the farmers! We are contributing, this year, to one municipality \$31,000 to aid in the construction of rural roads in that municipality, and the same story is true throughout the whole of the province of Saskatchewan, if they take advantage of the grid road.

We will go on. Eliminate Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuels. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that immediately after we were elected and since 1946, up to the present time, almost in every Session we have been throwing off items that were taxed before by the Liberals. In fact, to the present time, over 50 per cent of the items that were taxable under their educational tax when they brought it in, are today exempt. I am pretty sure that the people of Saskatchewan have enough faith that, when the time comes, the farm fuel tax will be thrown off, too.

Mr. Danielson: — Wait until tomorrow.

Mr. McDonald: — We know it's coming off.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That's what they would do; they would wait until an election.

Mr. Danielson: — Kick him out of the House.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Point No. 4 — "take off tax on municipal machinery." I would like to point out that our contributions and so on to the municipalities have paid for that particular tax a dozen times or more.

No. 5 — "take off the three per cent Mineral Tax." Before it is here, Mr. Speaker, they are fighting on behalf of the C.N.R. and the Hudson's Bay Company and not the farmers. As far as I am concerned in my area of the province, there is probably one farmer out of 100 that has Crown rights under his land. The rest is either held by the Crown or by the C.N.R. or the Hudson's Bay Company.

Mr. Danielson: — Where did you come from?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The sixty point, Mr. Speaker: "pay the total cost of education." Now, this is the one — if we brought it in — that would run us (I believe I had an estimate here) to some \$30 million. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that down through the years from 1943 to 1944, we have been continuously pouring money into the municipalities in order to cover up that cost-price squeeze gap created by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCarthy: — What did you do with R.M. 134?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Oh, sit down, you'll get a chance.

Mr. McDonald: — He's not standing.

Premier Douglas: — He doesn't want a chance.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — In 1944, the approximate cost of education under their Government was \$4 million. In this last year we were contributing over \$17 million, or over four times as much. And it has been stated by the Premier that grants will be increased to education.

This is a good one. No. 7 — "use highway equipment to build the grid system." You know he is even duplicating it. They are going to build it, where they ask us to totally build the grid road, and now they say on top of that throw in some of the highway machinery; duplicate it. They must be really hard up for points.

Premier Douglas: — Give them a rebate.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — No. 8 — "provide adequate storage for farmers" — a direct Federal Government responsibility. And then he goes on and says, No. 9 — "reduce farm truck licences."

Well, let's take a look at the farm truck licences. If you take a look at the farm truck licences (and I am going to compare them) they usually compare to Alberta and Manitoba, so I am going to make a comparison of farm truck licences. The minimum truck licence in Alberta, up to 4,000 pounds, is \$10; to 6,000 pounds is \$15; to 12,000 pounds is \$25. In Saskatchewan the comparison is \$10; \$12.50 and \$15. In Manitoba the lowest truck licence is \$12.50 for 5,000-pound limit; then \$17.50 for 7,500 pounds, and it goes up \$5 for every half-ton increase.

Mr. Kramer: — Without insurance.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, and at the rate where we charge \$17.50, Manitoba's Liberal Government charges \$42.50 for a farm truck licence, and he has the gall to say reduce farm truck licences!

Now, there is a better one coming up. Oh, yes! I should mention that in both Alberta and British Columbia, in British Columbia there is even a licence on farm tractors of \$5, and in Alberta there is a farm tractor licence of \$10, that neither Saskatchewan nor Manitoba have.

Mr. Weber: — For highway service.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Now, we go on, and he says in Point 10 — "reduce farm truck compulsory insurance." Now, this is a joke.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Priceless, this one.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes. Farm trucks paid, up to 1950, \$4, and anything above 1951, irrespective of the weight, \$6. Reduce that. I would love the boy to go over into Manitoba and tell them to reduce truck insurance or any of the other provinces of the Dominion of Canada, where they are two, three, four, five times as high as they are in the province of Saskatchewan.

No. 11 — “decrease cleaning charges on cleaning grain.” Now, he is really picking up the peanuts, and he is going to feed the peanuts to the farmers of Saskatchewan. Little tidbits.

No. 12 — “decrease hay-cutting fees.” Now this is a dandy. I suppose he doesn’t realize that there were only 725 hay permits issued in the province of Saskatchewan. He doesn’t realize that the hay cutting permit fees and grazing pasture fees are tied to the market price of cattle on the Winnipeg Stock Market. In other words, if the price of cattle goes down, the fees have been going down, and, Mr. Speaker, these fees have gone down since 1951 by 60 per cent. I am going to tell you the farmers of Saskatchewan and of Canada would be happy if the Federal Government had some of the things tied to their costs, and as it goes up, farm commodities group, or as costs go down, farm commodities go down. The agricultural situation today would be far better off than it is at the present time.

No. 13 — you could “decrease dues collected on lumber and fence posts,” and, of course, the dues collected on lumber and fence posts of all the production in Saskatchewan amounts to some \$600,000 which we collect in the Department of Natural Resources, and we give it right back to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Not only that, but when the Timber Board creates a profit, that profit is turned back to the Government and turned back to the farmer in services, while before it used to go to the Company. I say it is all turned back.

No. 14 — you could “Decrease rates on electricity.” Well, I talked on that one. We have decreased rates five times, and it is less than half of what it used to be under a Liberal administration in this province, when everything was dirt-cheap.

No. 15 — “loans to farmers,” and he says, because the Canadian Farm Loan Board has failed, you, the Provincial Government, must take it up.

And then, of course, I looked high and low and I could not find the 16th point; but I am going to remind the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, of the 17th point he gave, a dandy one, in the provincial election. They promised the farmers of my constituency, up and down — I know they did in the north-eastern area, and I wouldn’t be a bit surprised if they did it throughout the whole province of Saskatchewan; they promised the farmers \$2 a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels. Where did you lose that promise? Why didn’t you include that point here? Or has that gone on to Ottawa secretly?

Yes, the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) was around there, I know, promising two bucks a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels. Why don't you talk about it? If the farmers need it, they need it now.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I believe I am going to be the last one to take part in this debate on this side of the House, and for that reason I am going to make my remarks rather short, and preserve some of the material that I think is of value for the debate on the Budget.

Before I start, I would just like to make a few remarks about the speech of the previous speaker, the hon. member for Canora (Hon. Mr. Kuziak). I noticed he went on pretty good — at least he was successful in lulling a couple of his colleagues over there to sleep. I believe it was their snores that made him stop for a while, and as soon as he quit, they both woke up. It reminds me of the time when I was on construction work and I was always there at night, and as long as the tractors were going I could sleep, but as soon as they stopped, I woke up. I think that is what happened to the hon. member's colleagues there during his speech.

There is another matter I would like to draw to the attention of this House, and that is the fact that he was continuously referring to the Liberals in the 'thirties. There wasn't any Liberal government in Saskatchewan in the period of the 'thirties he referred to. There was no Liberal government in Ottawa during the period that he was referring to. There was a Co-operative Government here from 1929 to 1934, and there was a Conservative Government in Ottawa . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Where did we heard that word before?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . from 1930 to 1935, and that is the period he is always referring to.

Mr. Korchinski: — But they don't know that.

Mr. Loptson: — Apparently they don't know, or they don't want to know that. Then I want to draw to the attention of this House that it is of no comfort to his colleagues to listen to him insulting the intelligence of the people of Saskatchewan by comparing what you could do during the war, and what you could do after the war. That just shows how backward they are in bringing forward some concrete propositions of their own to the people. You will know, Mr. Speaker, that during the war from 1939 until about 1945, every provincial government in the Dominion of Canada was under obligation to the Federal Government to spend as little as they could possibly do. They were prevented from going on with any new projects, whether it was road building or the construction of buildings, because the Federal Government wanted to have access to all the tax-paying power of the Dominion of Canada to prosecute the war.

Then another thing that he referred to was himself a secretary of one of the municipalities down in his constituency, where somebody died because he didn't have medical care. What was he doing as a municipal secretary? I was interested in municipal affairs during those years, and never at any time, if there was an indigent case, did they have to suffer as a result or want of help to go to a doctor or to hospital. And I take exception to such a slur on the municipal council that anybody should have to die because the council didn't look after him and send him to the hospital, or to the doctor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said those few words I am not going to answer any part of his speech because it is typical of how the hon. member has been carrying on. I would say that, if one-third of it was true, he would be pretty true to his record.

I want to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations for the position which you hold now. I am rather surprised that you are here at all. I expected certainly that you would meet the same fate as the last member for the constituency of Swift Current. He had the audacity to vote with the Opposition on one occasion. It was on a Resolution from this side of the House, asking the Government to increase the supplementary allowance for old-age pensioners. Leader of the Opposition and behold! Mr. Speaker, when the nomination convention came about, he was no longer a candidate for the next election.

You, Mr. Speaker, have the record while you were the Minister of Public Works here, and at the head of the Power Corporation, of discharging your duties in the most admirable way. At no time can anyone say that you at any time used political skulduggery or trickeries to try to build up something that would coincide with the barking of the rest of your colleagues. Yes, when you were on the hustings during this last campaign, my report was that you gained votes by telling the people that the Power Commission, could not start farm electrification until late 1948 or 1949, because, you said, in the first place the farmers didn't have the money to pay the necessary deposits, nor did they have the money to electrify their houses. Secondly, you said, if they had had the money, you couldn't procure material or men for the construction of the power lines . . .

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): —It is not fair to argue with the Speaker.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . while my hon. friend who just spoke was only two towns away, telling the people how the Liberals hadn't done anything before 1944, and how the C.C.F. had started immediately they were elected. That, Mr. Speaker, put you down, of course. You are no longer qualified to act as a Minister of Public Works or as head of the Power Corporation, because you wouldn't play ball with the rest of the fellows, telling this fabricated story. So they couldn't do anything less than put you in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You should be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. Loptson: — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will discharge that duty as honourably as you discharged your former positions . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Back to your old place.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and I am glad to congratulate you on your position at the present time.

Premier Douglas: — Get your tongue out of your cheek.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, the Premier said, “take the tongue out of my cheek”. He probably won’t want me to do that after a while.

Premier Douglas: — You don’t frighten me, and never did.

Mr. Loptson: — Further, I want to congratulate particularly the new members of the House. I am very pleased with the quality of the members. I am happy about the boys that are on this side of the House. They have discharged their duties and have performed well on their feet, and I am also happy about the young fellows on the other side of the House. I want to say to the young hon. member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) that he did a very good job when he delivered his first maiden speech, and I would suggest that if he believes in the philosophy that he propounded during his speech, then he has no business to be sitting over there. He should be over here.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — And for a young fellow — now, mind you, I was a young fellow once myself and I would like to tell him the experience that I had when I chose what party to go with. There were only two parties at that time, and I was an ambitious young fellow, too. That was away back in 1905, and I had quite an influence in the community because where I lived there were mostly all Icelanders, and not all of them could talk English and I supposed I was used, more or less, as an interpreter. So I felt I was valuable to a political party, but naturally I was a Liberal, as the man I was working for was at the time. But I thought the Conservatives were a little more active, and I’d like to join them because they made more noise than the Liberals.

Mr. Kramer: — They don’t these days.

Mr. Loptson: — So I went to the Leader of the Conservative Party. He was a man of about 50, and he was a candidate in the next election — a man by the name of Jim Nixon (I don’t mind tell you his name). I went to him and I said, “How about helping you in this election?” I was a young fellow — we weren’t looking for any money in those days; it was all excitement. So he said to me, “What’s your idea. Aren’t you satisfied where you are?” “Oh, sure, I’m satisfied all right, but I think you fellows are more active. You make a lot of noise, anyway.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: —Highest bidder!

Mr. Loptson: — So he said, "Now, young fellow, I am going to tell you something. Just forget about politics." He said, "In this western country the Liberal policy is the right policy."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You're slandering a dead man.

Mr. Loptson: — And he said, "You're a young man. You better stay with the Liberal party because you'll go further." So I said to him in all sincerity, "If that is the case why don't you join the Liberal party?" (a natural thing for me to ask).

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You'd get the same reception if you came over here.

Mr. Loptson: — He said, "I come from Ontario, and my people were Conservatives in Ontario. I am naturally a Conservative here, not because I think the Conservatives will get any place, but you've got to have an Opposition, and I am too old to go in with the Liberal party. In my party I'm a big shot; if I went with the Liberal party, why I would only be at the tail-end."

I'd like to advise my young friends over on the other side that they are now joined with a fading force. There is no possible future for the C./C.F. in Canada. There is no possible chance for them here in Saskatchewan. They are dying out. The reason why they are dying out is because there is no room for more than two political parties, and we are going back to the two political parties. The philosophy that he profounded was Liberal philosophy. We have two standard parties, both founded on free enterprise, with the Liberals on one side, which is the aggressive party, and if you want to call them Socialist, I would say that they are very near it — certainly they have been advancing plenty of social services, but they are not a party that wants to control the individual. As a matter of fact, Liberalism is founded, and I would say Conservatism, too, is founded on the same principles as our Christian philosophy is, and any political party that varies away from that particular freedom of the individual which is taught and preached by our Christian philosophy, is incoherent with the Christian philosophy, and no one can argue any differently. Consequently, I would like to say to my young friends over there, don't wait 10 years to get out of this political party, as Ross Thatcher did, because you might be threatened with another tar-and-feather. Get out and join the young fellows here to make Liberalism work. That's what you should do.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — You wouldn't be the only one that has done so. Socialism is dying in every free democratic country. The only place that Socialism has a place is in those countries that have to have a totalitarian government; down behind the Iron Curtain. We don't have to have Socialism where free men and women live. It's dead. It was very alive in New Zealand. It's dead there now. It was very alive in Australia, it's

dead there, too.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Yet, 51 per cent of the voters vote Labour.

Mr. Loptson: — It was very alive in the Scandinavian countries, but it never got to the point of planned economy. In my Old Country they are just a little government — they call themselves Social Democrats, sure they do . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Where are the Liberals in Britain?

Mr. Loptson: — They're dead in the Old Country, Britain. And let me quote you some of the big men who have now acknowledge that Socialism is absolutely at a dead end. I have here in my hand something that I would like to read to my young friends over there. I know they have years ahead of them, and I hope you have many years ahead of you.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Oh, they have.

Mr. Loptson: — And for that reason I am concerned about you getting into the wrong camp. Here is a statement made by a very prominent man, Lord Winster who was formerly R.T. Fletcher (that was before he became a Lord) Socialist M.P. for Munston, and Minister of Civil Aviation in the Attlee Socialist Government.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Where did you get that speech?

Mr. Loptson: — Writing in the 'Balmoral Sun' on October 29, 1951, three days after the general election which defeated the Attlee Socialist Government, he had this to say, and I quote:

"Few outgoing Premiers have left No. 10 Downing Street so full of unsolved problems. History will record that another Socialist Government fell, as did those in 1924, and in 1931, through sheer inability to solve its problems, plus administrative incompetence. Attlee claims that the Socialists have cleared up the mess of centuries in those six years, but the facts are that the external situation has no drifted into greater confusion, leaving our prestige seriously impaired."

He is certainly saying the right thing, there.

"The plain and simple reason for Attlee's downfall with his Socialist Government is that it has not one single new idea for getting the country out of the mess caused by applying their old ideas.

"Attlee was leading a Government largely composed of mediocrities who had nothing left to contribute. The pride of Ernest Bevin . . .

Attlee was left with nobody of great ability or personality, save Nye Bevan, who was after his job as leader and Prime Minister. Hence the bankruptcy of Socialism in Britain."

Now, there's a man who had been a Socialist all his life and honestly came out and told the people what he thought. Let's take another one; Lorne Milford, in his speech of resignation as a Socialist peer from the British Labour Party in the House of Lords in 1949 said this:

"I was born free. I have spent the bulk of my life in teaching what freedom means. I am very loathe, at my time of life, to reverse this process and to try to sell the advantages of slavery to a people who were once free.

"The road on which this Socialist Government are travelling leads to a precipice at the foot of which emerges the Totalitarian State."

Mr. Kramer: — Repeat that last line.

Mr. Loptson: —

"I speak for thousands of independent figures who voted Socialist at the last election, who had a keen desire to see social justice, but who are now beginning to think, as I do that such measures as the . . . Nationalization Bill would destroy the whole possibility of . . . social justice."

Now, if you want me to read this other line, I'll do so. There's a man who had been a Labour Socialist for a long time. Let me give you another one, Rhys-Davies, Socialist M.P. for 31 years, and Under-Secretary of State in the Socialist Government. These men are not backbenchers; these men are from the frontbenchers of the Socialist party. Speaking in the House of Commons in opposition to a Socialist Bill providing for the direction of labour, said, (Hansard, March 1, 1947):

"I challenge the new philosophy which has arisen within our Socialist Party. They say to me that if we are to have a planned Socialist economy . . .

(That's the theory of the C.C.F. — planned Socialist economy).

“ . . . that we must accept compulsion of labour. If that is so, I am not having a planned Socialist society. A pair of handcuffs is no easier to wear, if they shine with a Socialist illusion. If a Tory or a Liberal Government had tried to pass such a measure, our Socialist party would have howled them into silence.

“It is no use criticizing a Government for doing this when we are in opposition, if we, when we come to power, do the same thing. The people will not be deceived by such somersaults. A wrong is always a wrong, even when performed by a Socialist. If you tell me that I may bring down the Socialist Government I say, better that the Government should meet its doom than that individual freedom should perish from these British Isles. Socialism and tyranny are the common synonyms.”

Mr. Cameron: — There you have it.

Mr. Loptson: — That’s planned economy for you! From a prominent Socialist M.P., not of the Cabinet. We have another one here, a very prominent socialist, Alfred Edwards, Socialist M.P., who was expelled from the British Socialist party for opposing a Bill for the nationalization of steel, in an article in ‘The Readers’ Digest’ May, 1949, wrote in part as follows . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — That’s a great authority.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, his statement is true. He wrote:

“Until 1945 I shared with my colleagues in the British Labour party an enticing dream of the brave, new world.”

Just listen to that, young fellows!

“ . . . the brave new world which Socialism would bring, a fairer and a fuller life for all.”

That’s what they are preaching now.

Mr. Cameron: — Where do we hear that – a fairer and fuller life for all?

“I have spent years disparaging all the effects of Capitalism, but we have seen the two systems at work, side by side. The man who still argues that socialism is the means of ridding our society of the defects of Capitalism is blind.”

March 5, 1957

Mr. McDonald: — Look at it.

Mr. Loptson: —

“Socialism just does not work. We must find some other means of dealing with imperfections of the private enterprise system. We dare not abandon it.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You don’t know anything more, anyway.

Mr. Loptson: —

“The Socialist Labour party suffers from the curious illusion that the Government possesses some magical power for planning industry.”

Who is that that always talks about “planning industry” in this House.

“The Labour idea of planning is to put some young lady or gentleman from the London School of Economics, without any practical experience, to direct some of our great industrialists, and their plans, put into blue-print form, are carried out by a group of civil servants and Social politicians.”

Where does that fit itself over there?

Mr. Cameron: — And brother, don’t we know it!

Mr. Loptson: — He still goes on:

“The state now owns the mines. The Labour party runs the State. The Trade Unions own the Labour party. The Miner’s Union are dominated by their Secretary, Arthur Horner, the Communist who has announced publicly that if England goes to war with Russia there will be no coal. The Labour Cabinet appoints a personnel of our industrial leadership. Hence, you find that the man in charge of a large regional department of coal is a former taxi-driver, or becomes a leader of a Taxi Union. He undoubtedly has some talent as a Union Leader, but he certainly has no qualifications for running a coal industry.”

He goes on further and says:

“Too many Socialists are prosperous in other lands, including Canada, and envied by toying with the ideal of force. Yet, they are wrong. In 30 years of Socialist organization Russia has not learned how to produce abundance by force. The history of these years of Socialist rule in Britain must be terrifying to anyone who has dreamed the great dream of Socialism – ‘the brave, new world.’

“The abundance that we hope to produce for all can be produced only by hard work, and apparently men will work hard under the spur of only two forces, monetary incentive or force.”

Isn’t that true?

Some Opposition Member: — That’s true.

Mr. Loptson: — Now then, still another big man in the Socialist party, Ivan Powers, Socialist M.P., after having resigned as a member of the British Socialist Labour Party, speaking in the British House of Commons, gave a number of reason for resigning, and concluded a lengthy speech on October 17, 1948, with the following words:

“Socialist Labour members like to think of themselves as coming through a Revolution, and so they are. But what sort of a Revolution is it? The French Revolution at least gave the world the ideals of liberty, equality, fraternity. The slogans of the Labour Party Revolution appear to be utility, priority and austerity.

“The chief problem of the Labour Leaders at all levels, from the chief steward to the Prime Minister, is the men just behind them who want their jobs. And the problem of the Labour party as a whole is that the Communist party wants their jobs, too.

“For long I have hoped that the Labour party’s pledge to send some reform would be the best bulwark against the evil effects of Communism. Today I regret to see that it is no bulwark, but a leaky valve.

“For long I hoped that the Labour party would give political expression to those Christian principles on which our western civilization is based, but I see that where Christianity says, “What is mine is thine”, Socialist Government says, “What is thine is mine.”

Isn’t that true? That’s a Socialist leader.

Mr. Danielson: — That’s just like right here.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I’m a Socialist and am proud of it.

Mr. Loptson: — The hon. Minister of Agriculture says he is a Socialist and proud of it. Then he goes on further:

“For long I hoped that the Labour party would be the best instrument for raising the standard of lie, both material and spiritual, or the poor classes of community, but I see that the Government are bent on levelling down and not levelling up. But the heart of the country is still sound, and when it again has good leadership, it will recover its place in the world. Even though no leadership has come from the Socialist Government and Downing Street in the last three years, the authentic words of Great Britain are still to be heard.”

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Take it as read.

Mr. Loptson: — “ . . . as it was heard after Dunkirk”.

I'll take the next one. Mr. Douglas, J., Socialist M.P . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I've allowed the hon. member to read a great deal of that paper that he has in his hands, more than I have permitted anyone else in the House. I would ask him now to go forward with his own speech.

Mr. Loptson: — I didn't read anything long, Mr. Speaker. These are all different ones; they are different excerpts. And surely, if I have the right to read one, I have the right to read another if it is different from the first one. I think you will find that ruling is right. I am not reading a book; I'm not reading a story. I am merely quoting different excerpts. If my hon. friends have that right, then I should have that right here, too. I won't repeat one single quotation. I haven't got very many more to read, so with your permission may I go on? I would like to.

Mr. Speaker: — How long will it take you to read it?

Mr. Loptson: — I would judge at least 15 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Twenty.

Mr. Speaker: — Without adding anything of your own to the speech.

Mr. Loptson: — I didn't do it . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That was just the beginning.

Mr. Speaker: — You have made no speech of your own whatever, sir.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh yes, oh yes! I congratulated you, anyway. I told you how well you had run your Department. That was my own.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member may complete the page which he is now reading.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, if that is the case I'm going to pick out the most important one. Will that be all right? Can I use the other page if I don't read any on the first one? I've got so many here, Mr. Speaker, all from outstanding and prominent Socialist leaders, and everyone of them is along the same lines as the ones I have quoted. I would like to have my young friend over there just read what the Socialists say about Socialism.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask my hon. friend where we may get a copy of what he is reading from? He has been reading at great lengths.

Mr. Loptson: — This is too valuable to let you have it, but I'll tell you where we can get it. You can write to Responsible Enterprise; Gladstone Murray. It doesn't make any difference where it comes from. The contents are true. Will you deny that?

Mr. Cameron: — Stand up and deny it!

Mr. Loptson: — The contents are true.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read any more. But I am going to say that out of this free political philosophy which my hon. young friend was profounding, there are various political ideas for everyone, and through the years the various types of politicians are created. There are three most prominent classes. First is the statesman, like yourself, Mr. Speaker. I would say you were one of those; men who go out and present a policy to the people as they see it, and don't care a hoot whether they are elected or they are defeated, but they tell the people the truth, and they tell them what they can expect if you were to elect them. And those men usually base their opinion after various sound thinking and consideration as to whether their proposition is possible.

Then we have another politician, which Dr. Chisholm, who is a renowned expert on psychotics — as a matter of fact, Dr. Brock Chisholm was former Director General of the World's Health Organization — warns the people against the crack-pot politicians . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas (Rosetown) — Like yourself.

Mr. Loptson: — That's the men and women who propose ideas that are impractical to practice.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — You've got some.

March 5, 1957

Mr. McDonald: — You've got a lot of them over there.

Mr. Loptson: — Then, you see, we have the third fellow . . .

Mr. Cameron: — An hour and a half of it!

Mr. Loptson: — . . . who is the claptrap politician. We listened to one this afternoon. He tells everybody just what they like to hear, and doesn't give a hoot whether it's practical or not. If he thinks he has an audience he can sway by telling them something that isn't true, why that's what he'll tell them. Anything to get a vote! That's the claptrap politician. There is the statesman, there is the crackpot, and the claptrap.

Mr. Kramer: — The last two, you've got them there.

Mr. Loptson: — Now let's see where my hon. friends fit in. When have they used the 'Regina Manifesto' — the policy of the C.C.F. to get elected? I have yet to see one C.C.F. supporter or candidate, or talked to one, who will admit that they ever saw the C.C.F. Manifesto.

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Opposition Members: — Sit down, sit down!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked a question . . .

Some Opposition Members: — Sit down, sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — He asked a question. I used the Manifesto in Cumberland.

Mr. Loptson: — The Manifesto has been pigeonholed or put under lock and key ever since J.S. Woodsworth died. It has never been a popular document.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Bosh!

Mr. Loptson: — Consequently, my hon. friends couldn't talk the C.C.F. philosophy because, if they had, they would not have got elected. And let me tell you the argument that they used, to give you an idea of what they used mostly; it is a general thing. You know, the greatest story they have in the support of their party is the fact that J.S. Woodsworth, the founder of the party, the only honest C.C.F. leader that you've had was J.S. Woodsworth, though he wasn't a practical one, that is when he was presenting his platform.

Premier Douglas: — How would you know an honest leader if you saw one?

Mr. Loptson: — J.S. Woodsworth, they say, is responsible for the Old-Age Pension. There was nothing Woodsworth could do about bringing in the old-age pension. All he could do was to vote for it. There were 245 members in the House of Commons when this Bill went through, and there wasn't a single member voted against it, and it wouldn't have made any difference whether Woodsworth voted for it or not, it would have been passed, anyway.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — No doubt he supported it like all the rest of them supported it. That's why we give the old man credit for something . . .

Mr. Cameron: — He was the 'father' of it!

Mr. Loptson: — But they get a lot of votes from it. Then, another thing is that they say J.S. Woodsworth was responsible for family allowances. You know, J.S. Woodsworth was dead for three years before anybody ever thought about family allowance.

Mr. Danielson: — That's the C.C.F., of course.

Mr. Loptson: — And yet the people were told that he was responsible for it. Now, let us see some of the other statements. It has commonly been said on the platform that the Liberal party is the highest tariff party in Canada. Of course there has only been one other party in the Dominion of Canada who held Federal power — but what is the truth? Since the Liberal party has been in power they reduced the tariff on automobiles from 42 per cent to 17 1/2 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And increased the cost of living.

Mr. Loptson: — They put farm implements that carried 27 1/2 per cent on the free list.

Mr. McCarthy: — Better get out, Kuziak.

Mr. Loptson: — You can get implements of production — that is farm implements — from any part of the world without paying a tariff. Cream separators carried a tariff of about 25 per cent.

Mr. Cameron: — He knows it, too.

Mr. Loptson: — And they were put on the free list. As a matter of fact they are the only party that has consistently reduced the tariff on goods. That's true.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — Now then, this of course, is a small one, but it has had its effect on some of our uninformed electorate. The speaker told the people that the price of cow hides had gone down terribly; as a matter of fact, he said, "I have a bill for two perfectly good cow-hides that were sold for 18 cents — 9 cents apiece." Every man who had a cow or had sold a hide, in that audience knew that the price of hides had never gone down below five cents a pound for a perfectly good hide, and anybody that . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Must have been a C.C.F. cow!

Mr. Loptson: — Sure it was, a perfectly good cow. And you know, that a cowhide weighs from 50 to 60 pounds, and the price is from \$2.50 to \$3.00. The same gentleman said at the same meeting that perfectly good hogs were selling for 7½ cents per pound, when, as a matter of fact, the floor was 22 cents per pound. That's a fact, Mr. Speaker. These young people should know what is going on here; and they are going to know. It is my duty to bring it to their attention.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lopston: — It is my duty to show to these young people what they are walking into, and how the C.C.F. has been getting elected in the past. Let me take another one, here. A man in the House of Commons here, Hazen Argue . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Who's he?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . on March 5, 1952, said:

"That good eggs in his constituency are selling for 18 cents per dozen."

A wire that same day to his own hometown came back and said that A-Large eggs were 32 cents a dozen, and in Weyburn were 36 cents a dozen. Another gentleman said that he had been on a trip to England, and that eggs there were selling for a shilling apiece. However, a letter from the British Minister produced proof that home-produced eggs were five pence apiece, and if they are imported were only 4 1/2 cents apiece, yet he said they were a shilling apiece.

Another man, very prominent, said that we have lost the greatest market for lumber. Well, we've heard that, even during this Session. And yet that very same year, in 1950, our exports were \$41 million; in 1951 it rose to \$141 million; in 1952 it rose to \$165 million. The same man said we have lost our greatest salmon trade, but in 1953 we sold \$4 ½ million worth of salmon . . .

Premier Douglas: — Yes, by barter.

Mr. Cameron: — Why, what's the matter with barter?

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member said we sold it.

Mr. Loptson: — Now, why have they resorted to that sort of campaigning? Why should they stoop to that kind of campaigning? That isn't the only thing that they use. Here is another gentleman who, on a tour of Alberta, told his audience that the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan made a grant to the municipalities for the hospitals of Saskatchewan of no less than \$16 million a year. I'm going to give you another one.

It is common to hear a C.C.F. say that we have lost the market for hogs, beef, butter, eggs — we've lost the British market. The very time when they wanted the Government to can it and to see our products on the British market, what was the price on the British market? Here I've got it. On almost every item it was worth twice as much on our own market as it was on the British market. Not only that, but we had no surplus to send over to the British market.

Mr. Cameron: — After that they lost their market!

Mr. Loptson: — Here, on August 1, 1953, beef in Britain was 22 cents a pound; in Canada it was 38 cents a pound. Butter in Britain was 40 cents a pound; in Canada it was 58 cents. Cheese in Britain was 23 cents; in Canada it was 28 cents.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Who got the difference?

Mr. Loptson: — Eggs per dozen were 46 cents in Britain; and 69 cents in Canada. Bacon in Britain was 32 cents and in Canada it was 41 cents. And that is the stuff these fellows are peddling through the country.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That was for one short period.

Mr. Cameron: — And we lost their market!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I was amused when listening to the hon. Premier at a meeting at Yorkton. He was referring to horses on the payroll down some place in Quebec, but then he said, "I wouldn't worry about horses on the payroll because I have seen some jackasses on the payroll in Ottawa when I was there." Well you know, it has bothered me. I was wondering who he was referring to. Surely he wasn't calling himself a jackass! But here, the other day, I found the definition from no other man than the Leader of the Social Credit party, and he quoted the same as this:

"When you begin to tie tin cans . . . "

He was referring to the C.C.F. members in Ottawa. Maybe I had better read the clause just before this. After repeated interruptions by Mr. Nicholson, who kept saying: "you can see your own lumber to anybody"; and Mervyn Johnson, the C.C.F. member for Kindersley, saying: "the lumber belongs to the people"; and Ellis wanted to give it away to the United States interests, then Mr. Low lost patience, and he said:

"When you begin to tie tin cans to these braying jackasses' tails they make a lot of noise."

Now I know whom my hon. friend the Premier was referring to.

Well, it is too bad. I don't want to hold you up, but there is an important item that I want to speak on. The Premier, in his speech, made mention of oil development – maybe I had better leave that alone; but he did make mention of industrial development and how it was promoted. I want to say that what has hindered capital coming into Saskatchewan is well known to the investors. I want to quote a statement made by H. Young, who is chairman and manager of the western section of The Canadian Manufacturers' Association – a body of men who would be responsible, of course, to bring industry into this province or any other province. This is what he says:

"A non-favourable industrial climate resulting from restrictive provincial legislation and not lack of capital keeps industry out of Saskatchewan."

Now, I wonder if it isn't possible that the statement of the premier, made recently here in Regina, had something to do with keeping industry out of this province. "At a C.C.F. federal convention in Regina on November 21, Premier Douglas, head of the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan, attacked Canadian industry and business with characteristic violence. He declared that Canada is completely dominated and motivated by profiteering principles, the quick-buck artist and the hucksters . . ." And he went on:

"There is no economic salvation for ordinary people like us without a planned economy . . ."

Mr. McDonald: — Like who?

Mr. Loptson: — Like us, he said, "And the establishment of a co-operative Commonwealth." Now how can you go to a capitalist and invite him to spend his money in this province, in view of a statement of that kind? How can you? You can't get a dollar from me. I haven't got much but I might be able to buy as much as a new desk, and I wouldn't invest that much in you, in the face of a statement of that kind.

Premier Douglas: — You never did.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, we have heard a lot about pipelines. I witnessed a peculiar performance here on the television the other night, and much was made out of some executive of Trans-Canada Pipelines having gotten an option on some shares, and they were condemning the Government at Ottawa because they allowed that. Well now, I would just like to ask my hon. friends sitting over there, particularly the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if he was in favour of this Government giving an option to a director of one of your companies, if you wanted to. I think it is the business of the shareholders and not of the Government as to whether an executive should get an option on shares.

Trans-Canada Pipelines is no different from a thousand other companies. Why make an issue out of it? These men have done much to bring that to a successful conclusion. They owe the Government no money. What has the Government of Canada to do with what the shareholders do about the direction of their company?

Premier Douglas: — The building of part of the line.

Mr. Loptson: — The Government is not building the line . . .

Mr. McDonald: — What about the cement plant?

Mr. Loptson: — Let me ask you about your own cement plant. That is quite a big thing. This man Tanner is supposed to be able to make \$110,000 on this option. Let me just contrast that with what the hon. members of the Saskatchewan Cement Company got, through a guarantee of this Government, and the people of Saskatchewan may have to pay some of it. These men bought 1,200,000 shares in that plant for which they have paid \$1,400,000. They bought property for the plant which is estimated to cost them \$55,000. All in all they had a capital of \$1,455,000. Then of the 1,200,000 shares, they had in escrow 476,000 shares which they will get released at the rate of 20 per cent every year as they pay 10 per cent off the mortgage. Having released this 476,000 shares which will be released in five years. The price of these shares went up to \$3.25 and say, that they got \$3 a share, they could sell those shares for \$2,272,000; the property they have out of the city was \$476,000 or they got for their investment of \$1,455,000 then cleaned up \$1,000,193 before they ever turned a wheel. Now then they get the release . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that it is now 5:30.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Call it 5:30.

Mr. Loptson: — Can I call it in about five minutes?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, call it 5:30.

Premier Douglas: — We have motions to put through following the Speech from the Throne, regulation motions.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I will call it 5:30 then.

Mr. Speaker: — It being 5:30 the House will recess until 7:30 p.m.

Continuing at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30 o'clock, I was about to explain to the House the difference between the set-up of the Saskatchewan Cement Plant with respect to profits made by their promoters and Trans-Canada Pipelines. I have it now in a more concise form, as a result of the recess.

To begin with, the Saskatchewan Cement Plant has a capacity of 850,000 barrels a year. The promoters of the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation Limited, in organizing the company, purchased for themselves 1,200,000 shares for a total price of 1,400,000 and they then purchased property estimated at the value of \$55,000. On commencing construction of the plant the shares on the market increased to the value of approximately \$3.00; as a matter of fact they went up to \$3.25 a share — 476,000 shares had to be left in escrow, which left a balance of 724,000 shares, which the promoters could dispose of at a price of \$3.00 a share. This sale would realize them \$2,172,000. The promoters sold the property which they had purchased for about \$55,000 to the company at a price of \$476,000. These two transactions made it possible for a profit to the promoters of the Company, before a wheel had turned or a bag of cement had been made, of \$1,193,000. On top of this the promoters still had 476,000 shares in escrow which when released at a valuation of \$3.00 a share makes the sum of \$1,428,000. Therefore, the promoters, within that short period after the beginning of the promotion of the Company, had realized a net profit on their investment of no less than \$2,621,000 — that is providing, of course, that the escrow shares would still hold the price of \$3.00 a share. On top of this profit the directors served themselves \$50,000 for organization work, plus \$500,000 which we have not yet had any explanation for.

Now contrast this with a similar plant that was built in Edmonton just the year before, with a capacity of 900,000 barrels per year, in comparison with Saskatchewan Cement's capacity of 850,000. Their capitalization consisted of issuing of 617,000 preferred shares at \$10 a share. Then they issued two million common shares, particular value of \$1, on which there was no value put, and nothing else was required. Why the difference in the financing of these two companies? This Edmonton company went into production March 6 last year.

I want to draw your attention to this blast on the T.V., the other night, where they complained so bitterly about the principal promoter of the Trans-Canada Pipelines, which is eminently much larger than a small cement plant. The great complaint in that case is the fact that the shareholders of that company had given the two promoters an option on shares at \$8 a share, to be taken up within two years. That option was given, Mr. Speaker, long before, or two years before they negotiated the loan from the Federal Government. Now that they have been successful in financing that proposition, which runs into hundreds of millions of dollars, they think that this was giving away public money to them, and the profit, they say, was about \$110,000.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this Government can make a profit for a few promoters here of \$2,600,000 by pledging the credit of this province, which they had to do in order to make this profit, and now holding the bag if it isn't a success; the others holding the profit if it is a success, as compared with this other, which has asked for no obligation from the Government at all. In addition to that they have a clause in their charter whereby, if this cement plant happens to be a success, they can control, within a narrow circle, the shares that have been issued, because no shares can be sold or transferred without the consent of the Directors. It might become, if it is successful operation, a family-compact organization which has been set union up by using the credit of the people of Saskatchewan.

True, I don't know; but in this set-up we are financing, the hon. Provincial Treasurer told us the way it was done — it was done more particularly for the promoters, to save them from paying income tax, or profits tax. Well, if that is the case there should not be any complaint if Mr. Tanner did save a little on corporation tax on the profit that he has made. Anyway, I want to say that there is nothing unusual with this Trans-Canada set-up; and nobody knows that better in this Chamber than the hon. Provincial Treasurer, because I am sure that he has had a great deal of experience in getting promoters' shares that have increased in value considerably after the organization was set up.

Now, I want to read the proposition with respect to this Trans-Canada Pipeline. When the company went to the Government for assistance, last spring, they had invested in that operation no less than \$15,500,000. They pledged that as security for the loan that the Government advanced, and I understand that the terms of this loan were that, if they did not pay whatever money they took to build that pipeline from Alberta to Winnipeg, they forfeited the charter of the company, including all the money that they had invested in it. What security has my hon. friend got, or the Provincial Treasurer? All the security he has is this 476,000 shares which have been set aside as security for the loan of \$5,500,000.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. Loptson: — According to their prospectus — and here is the prospectus, and it was all explained to us by the Provincial Treasurer when he brought in the Bill- the 476,000 shares which are held by the Trust Company are to be released on the basis of 20- per cent of the shares, as 10 per cent is paid off the mortgage. There is nothing wrong with that but I am merely drawing your attention to it. Here they say this is a terrible fiasco; “The Federal Government allows the promoter of this tremendous corporation to make a profit of \$110,000.” Well, I want to suggest to this Government that they had a chance to go into that pipeline business themselves. There was nothing to stop them for taking out a charter. They ought to know all about Crown Corporations, and surely they have plenty of brains — at least they assume so, these men that are doing all the talking on television and in Ottawa. They ought to be experts to run a business of that size, since they seem to know so much about it. This Mr. Ellis and Hazen Argue — why didn’t they go out and organize this company? They had just as much right to do it as anybody else.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The Liberals wouldn’t let anybody else . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You admit it. You had the right to do it, if you had just the brains to do so.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. McMahon tried, but they wouldn’t let him.

Mr. Loptson: — Do you know what they call those C.C.F. fellows in Ottawa? I think the name they have assigned to them is very appropriate: ‘much mouth and little brains’. Well, if they had as much brains as they have mouth, they might have owned this corporation and been in Tanner’s place.

Premier Douglas: — You’re in your element now!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, that is about all I have to say about this business but I want to go back . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Will the speaker permit a question?

Mr. Loptson: — I want to go back to another matter here. I notice that in the Premier’s speech he referred to the Imperial Oil Company. He took exception to some statement that the Leader of the Official Opposition had made, or read, from a statement made by Dr. Link. He was alleged to have been connected with the Imperial Oil back in 1945-46 when this Government was just taking over.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Now you know better than what you are going to say.

Mr. Loptson: — He attempted to contradict his statement by a letter that he had received from the present manager of the Imperial Company, a Mr. McKenzie. Now, I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is a precarious position that the managers of these large oil companies are

in, in this province. They would have to give any kind of a letter that the Premier asks for.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, come now.

Mr. Loptson: — They know that they are behind the eight-ball, that anything this man asks for they pretty near have to give it to him, because they might find themselves with their property appropriated the next morning if they didn't.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's an insult to them.

Mr. Loptson: — I am going to tell you the facts.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, so that my hon. friend doesn't get mixed up or misquoted, the hon. member has just misquoted me and I think the record should be set right. I at no time said I had a letter from the Imperial Oil. I quoted a statement made in Toronto by Mr. McKenzie, the superintendent of production of Imperial Oil, in which he categorically denied the statements of Dr. Link. It was not a letter to me; it was a statement freely given to the press by Mr. McKenzie. I noticed it in the press and had it cut out; but I did not ask for the statement and no statement was given to me.

Mr. Cameron: — What difference does it make?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Would the member permit a question?

Some Opposition Members: — No, no!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I am going to tell you this, Mr. McKenzie, now manager of the Imperial Oil, has no alternative but to please the Premier of Saskatchewan. What are the facts?

Hon. Mr. Douglas (Rosetown): — That's a good question.

Mr. Loptson: — I have the facts here. I have here an original agreement that was drawn up in 1945 by the Department of Natural Resources of this Government of Saskatchewan, dated 1945. Now, what purpose was there for the Imperial Oil to ask for a renewal agreement, or renewal permit, if they did not intend to continue drilling? The evidence is here, and it came right from the Department of this Government.

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. member table that?

Mr. Loptson: — Table it? I am going to hang on to it because it is the only thing we've got as evidence.

March 5, 1957

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member cannot wave something around in this House . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I'll table it if you will give me a copy of it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The rules of the House are specific. If any person refers to a contract and alleges that something is in that contract then he must table that contract or agreement or whatever he is referring to. The hon. member has waved something in the air; has implied that there are certain things in that document, and he must, under the rules of the House, table that document.

Mr. Loptson: — I am going to read a clause of this agreement.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am asking for a ruling.

Mr. McDonald: — You know what's in it.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will be required to table it.

Mr. Loptson: — I am asking, Mr. Speaker, can I get a copy of it after I have tabled it?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Sure. Anybody can.

Mr. Loptson: — Well then, I'll table it. I'll table it if I can get a copy of it. I am going to read the clause.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You'll table it. Period.

Mr. Loptson: — The agreement is evidently according to the terms which were required by the Imperial Oil. But here is the objectionable part, Section 19. Section 19 of this Agreement reads as follows:

“Notwithstanding anything herein contained the Minister may at any time during the period of 30 days immediately preceding the expiration of each period of 12 months of the term mentioned in Article I hereof, give the Company written notice of his intention to terminate this agreement, and upon receipt by the Company of such notice this agreement shall be void and of no effect, provided that the Minister shall compensate the Company for the loss incurred by such termination, the extent of such loss being determined by arbitration to which the provisions of The Arbitration Act of the province of Saskatchewan shall apply.”

That is what drove the companies out of this province, and as a result of this we lost ten years of production of petroleum in Saskatchewan. Now, if you want it tabled I will do so. But I want a copy of it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We'll make one.

Mr. Loptson: — So much for that. I am just about through.

Now I want to go back to where we left off for a few minutes. My hon. friends over there have learned a little bit about Socialism and what it means, and how this Government has been continuously elected. I want to compliment the Premier of Saskatchewan. You know it isn't often a man gets to the top of political science, but my hon. friend, the Premier of Saskatchewan, has reached the eminence of excellency in the art of prevarication, and that is how he is able . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — . . . to elect himself.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must withdraw that statement. The hon. member must withdraw the statement that the Premier has "reached the eminence of excellency in the art of prevarication."

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I proved it, because the statement I read . . .

Some Gov't Members: — Withdraw that statement!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I guess I have said about enough.

Some Gov't Members: — Withdraw that statement!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I insist that the member make an un-categorical withdrawal, otherwise I shall resort to the same tactics and insist that I be allowed to make a qualified withdrawal, too.

Mr. Speaker: — I understood the member had withdrawn.

Mr. Loptson: — I will withdraw it, but I will qualify it.

Some Opposition Members: — No, no.

Mr. Loptson: — The statements that I made in this House were made by the hon. Premier of this province.

Premier Douglas: — The member will withdraw that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will withdraw that statement completely.

Mr. Loptson: —I will withdraw it. I have proved it. Well, anyway there are few Premiers or Leaders of political parties who can get themselves elected four times without ever discussing the policy of his party.

Premier Douglas: — And without ever selling any mouldy hay, or contracts for road work . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Hay? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have held the House long enough. I have a lot to say here, but I am going to leave it for the budget. I am not supporting the motion.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — I want to assure you that I had not intended to take part in this debate, and I hope that you will forgive me for not following in the footsteps of those who have gone before, in the congratulatory notes, which I had intended to make tomorrow.

I do, however, feel that, in view of what has been said by the hon. member for Saltcoats who has just taken his seat, there are certain things that must be said tonight in order to keep the records straight.

We know, everybody knows that the hon. member for Saltcoats and the Liberal party in this province, have done everything they can to keep out of this province the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation.

Mr. McDonald: — That is a lie.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We know, too, that they have endeavoured to keep out every industry that would help to develop Saskatchewan.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Provincial Treasurer has attempted to impute motives on behalf of the Liberal party, and I, too, can stand up here and say that I can categorically deny on behalf of the Liberal party that we have ever taken any steps other than those necessary to protect the interests of the people of this province, and that we have on every occasion . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, are we getting into a debate, or are we on a point of privilege?

Mr. McDonald: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has imputed motives towards the Liberal party, to the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and myself, and as a matter of fact on occasions you have said yourself that I was a traitor to my province, and I am going to . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the member has already spoken in this debate. Is the hon. gentleman going to have another opportunity to speak in this particular debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member has said the statement of the Provincial Treasurer was directed against the Liberal party.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . the Liberal party and the member for Saltcoats.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Sit down and take it!

Mr. Speaker: — That has been done both ways in this House many times.

Mr. McDonald: — And this afternoon . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, to continue with what I was about to say, I have here the official debates of last year, of February 20, 1956 . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . in which we have the official record.

Mr. Speaker: — The Leader of the Opposition has risen on a point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, you haven't allowed me to say to you, sir, that here this afternoon, on several occasions . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must not make a speech on a point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am stating what my point of privilege is, if I may.

Some Gov't Members: — Sit down! Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — You have already stated your point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: — I want to point out to you, sir, that this afternoon on several occasions the Premier of our province was allowed . . .

Some Gov't Member: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — . . . to stand in his place and to categorically deny statements that were made . . .

March 5, 1957

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You have denied that.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and the same privilege should be extended to this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has denied it, and that is fine, and if he wishes to deny it. I have here the official records that show that on February 20, 1956 every single one of them voted against this proposition to allow the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, . . . certainly we did, because you stole the money from the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — If my hon. friend will just take his seat. They talk about the Trans-Canada Pipeline. My hon. friend has tried to compare the Trans-Canada Pipeline to the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation. I have here the official prospectus of the Trans-Canada Pipeline. This prospectus shows very clearly what the situation is, and here you will find on Page 31, options were given to the president of the company, the former Minister of Mineral Resources for the province of Alberta, Mr. Tanner, to purchase 60,000 shares at \$8 a share; to Mr. C.S. Coates, of Texas, 50,000 shares . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Nothing unusual about that.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . to Mr. T.H. Atkinson (a very good friend of mine, personally), a former General Manager of the Royal Bank of Canada, 12,500; to R.J. Wallace for 5,000 shares, and to A.P. Craig for 7,500 shares — a total of 135,000 shares, where they were given an option to purchase them at \$8 a share.

Mr. McDonald: — When?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this option was given some years ago, but when this Bill came before the Parliament of Canada, this was kept from the Members of Parliament.

Mr. Loptson: — Every man had a copy of that Bill.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister has made a statement that is not in accordance with the facts. A copy of the prospectus was tabled in the House of Commons, and that information was available to every member of the House of Commons, if he had gumption enough to go look it up.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this prospectus is dated the 12th day of February, 1957 and the . . .

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and the agreement that I have referred to was tabled in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . prospectus could not very well have been known by the Members in Parliament, over a year, or just approximately a year, ago.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on another point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Okay, let's keep the records straight. On a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Provincial Treasurer has the floor. He has the right to make his speech.

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, but on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I shall continue. On the 12th day of February, 1957 . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I have your attention?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . this prospectus was presented . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Provincial Treasurer is making no charges against the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, I know he isn't sir, and I am rising on a point of order. The Provincial Treasurer said just now that I had said the prospectus was tabled. What I said was that the agreement was tabled in the House of Commons, and was available to all members of the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this prospectus became public . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Not the prospectus.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . on the 12th of February, 1957. The hon. gentleman has said this prospectus was available at the last Session of Parliament.

Mr. McDonald: — I said no such thing, I said the agreement.

March 5, 1957

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the record will show very well what he said.

Mr. McDonald: — Deny it; it is available to you.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, 135,000 shares, unbeknown to any of the members except Mr. Howe.

Mr. McDonald: — The only reason they didn't know it, was they didn't read it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And these men had the opportunity to purchase these shares at \$8 a share, that is at a cost of \$1,080,000. We know what happened. The Federal Government agreed that they would construct this line through Northern Ontario at a cost of \$120 million; they together with the Province of Ontario. We know also that they agreed that they would advance to the Company an amount up to approximately \$90 million, in order that they would be able to continue with this program last year. The Dominion Government was prepared to advance this money up to \$90 million, in order that this project could succeed. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this Dominion Government had not been prepared to advance this money, it is very questionable whether or not this project would have been able to go forward. Well, we know the shares of this Company came out at \$10 a share, \$150 for a unit, including a \$100 bond and the five shares of common stock. Today those shares are being sold on the market at \$25 a share. What does that mean?

Mr. McDonald: — What's wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That means, Mr. Speaker, that these men who were able to get through the good graces of the Federal Government, a guarantee to put up this money, are able today to sell their stock for \$3,375,000.

Mr. McDonald: — They can't sell a share.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — \$3,375,000, the value of those shares. And I want to tell you what's more . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You know very well they cannot sell those shares.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . if they leave it another two years, those shares will be worth from \$5 million to \$10 million.

Mr. McDonald: — They couldn't sell a share, and you know that.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that all he needs to do is to read the prospectus, and I shall be glad to table it if he wants it tabled, so he can read it.

Mr. McDonald: — I don't need it tabled. I had one long before you did.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — On a point of order, I don't think the Provincial Treasurer wants to mislead this House. These shares that were under option are in escrow and are not available for sale at the present.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I object very strenuously to being interrupted. I want to make a little speech. My hon. friend agreed he was going to speak for 20 minutes. I said I would be satisfied with 10 minutes, but if I am going to be interrupted, I will have to have more than 10.

Now, when we come to the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation, when the question came before the House last year, there was absolutely nothing that was not disclosed to every member of the House. At that time we tabled all these documents — I have got them here tonight; copies of them; all these different documents that went to make up any part of the agreement between the Government and the Corporation, between the Bank and the Corporation, between the Government and the Bank.

Mr. Loptson: — Nobody said that he didn't.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — These documents show very clearly, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Nobody said that you didn't explain.

Some Gov't Members: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We showed quite clearly what the situation was. We showed that these people had purchased 1,200,000 shares for \$1,400,000. We showed that certain of these shares were to be placed in escrow.

Mr. Loptson: — How many?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . that certain of these shares were going to be held in escrow, first, on behalf of the investment company which did the financing for them, and secondly, the Government itself took the precaution to see to it that when those shares were released from escrow, they could not be sold. In other words, we wanted to ensure that those people would keep their money in that company, until such time as they had paid off the obligation to the bank.

March 5, 1957

Mr. Loptson: — It's not in the statement.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that has been. My hon. friend says that they could sell the shares at \$3.25 a share. He knows that he was doing a little exaggerating. He knows that the shares of this company have not sold at \$3.25 for more than 2,000 or 3,000 shares. He knows the average price has not been anywhere near \$3.00. He knows that the average price has been but \$2.50.

Mr. McDonald: — What is it now?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He knows that the price listed on the market, yesterday, was \$2.35 and \$2.45 a share.

Mr. Loptson: — This is the lowest they have ever been, too.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, that has been the price for the last four months.

Mr. Loptson: — Three months.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — There has been no change in that price for the last four months.

Mr. Loptson: — It went up to \$3.25.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — In other words, here we have a group of men that were willing to put up their money, and not get any option whatsoever, compared with the Trans-Canada directors who got options on . . .

Mr. McDonald: — \$1 million.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . this 135,000 without money. Mr. Tanner bought one share; he paid \$8 of his own money.

Mr. McDonald: — How much did his wife buy.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — \$8 of his own money, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McDonald: — How many did his wife buy?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . because of the option he got 60,000 shares that he could buy at \$8 a share. Today he could sell those 60,000 shares on the market for future delivery, when he can get them out of escrow, at \$25 a share.

Mr. McDonald: — Now, you're telling the truth.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — There we have it, \$1 ½ million without investment of any sort whatsoever.

Mr. McDonald: — That's not true and you know it. He couldn't sell a share today.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I know that it is true. I know that it is, and I know that the Hon. C.D. Howe mislead the members of Parliament a year ago. You deny that!

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly we deny it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I have here the records of the House of Commons for February 25, 1957. What did Mr. Howe say:

“I apologize for having inadvertently mislead the House.”

Mr. McDonald: — Read it all. Read it all.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . ”But in fact, the hon. members have had the document referring to the operations available to them since May 9, 1956.”

Some Opposition Members: — There you are.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the documents it is true, were printed, but they were not distributed . . .

Mr. McDonald: — They were distributed.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . to the members. The documents were not available to the members until after this debate took place.

Mr. McDonald: — They were tabled.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, why should we waste a lot of time . . .

Mr. McDonald: — I should think . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Let's get on with the business, then.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I just can't get over it! My hon. friend, this afternoon, told us there were three kinds of speeches. I want to suggest that his certainly was in the last category. I just can't think of a better word. I wouldn't use the word myself; it would be un-parliamentary,

but I do suggest to you that his speech certainly fell into that last category.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other things that have been said during this debate that I would like to take time tonight to deal with. I would like, for instance, if my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) were here tonight, to deal with some of the things he said. Shall we take the time?

Well, we have a few minutes, so let's take them to talk about some of the things; for instance, his standing (which I thought a terrible thing) when, with reference to our good friend, whom we on this side all love and regard highly, our good friend the lady member for Regina City (Mrs. Cooper), he told her that she had been lying and repeating a lie. I thought that was most undignified.

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

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You can't raise a point of privilege on that.

Mr. Loptson: — I did not refer to the lady member for Regina . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You sit down! Mr. Speaker, the records will speak for themselves.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and not one statement did I repeat that she had ever said.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, I am not referring to you. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) — the 'babbling brook'.

Premier Douglas: — The other 'dead-end kid'.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I think that we should always try to be just as fair as we can in debate, particularly when it applies to our lady members. I just don't think we should exaggerate. Now, our hon. friend from Regina was criticized for certain things she said concerning the hospitalization plan. She said, for example, that the Liberal party had always been opposed to the hospitalization plan. The hon. member for Arm River denied it.

Mr. Speaker: — Certainly he denied it. We brought it in.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well now, Mr. Speaker, here we have what the hon. member for Arm River said, This is from the 'holy writ', 'The Leader-Post' February 13, 1947:

"Under the new hospitalization scheme, hospitals would lose the hospital grant formerly paid. If the hospitals receive the grant, they would be able to carry on, but without it, operating costs would have to be paid by the municipalities in spite of the \$5 collected from each citizen." Mr. Danielson said.

"Enormous machinery had been set up and a large percentage of the money collected would be used in salaries and expenses incurred in collecting statistics, the member said. The service provided (listen to this) would not be as efficient as the people could provide for themselves through their communities."

Mr. Loptson: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What about the Leader of the Opposition? Well, here we have again, the same source, to which all we can turn when we want comfort:

December 24, 1946: "Health Plan Too Costly", says Tucker.

"The C.C.F. Government hospitalization scheme, which goes into effect January 4, will cost many persons more money than similar services cost under present municipal costs, Walter Tucker, Provincial Leader said in an address prepared to be broadcast over Saskatchewan radio stations.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Enthusiastic supporter!

Hon. Mr. Fines: —

"Mr. Tucker contended that the extension of municipal services would eventually include the entire province and would have provided cheaper hospitalisation for all, as hospital facilities became available."

And then he goes on to say:

Mr. McDonald: — What date?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — December 24, 1946.

"Nothing that this is the procedure being adopted in Manitoba, Mr. Tucker said a special commission of the Rockefeller Foundation had described the Manitoba plan as the most realistic

approach in Canada, that we have knowledge of, for the provision of better health services.”

And then here I have a photostatic copy of a little meeting that was held here, where the Liberal women discussed hospitalisation. What did they say on October 26, 1946:

“The Saskatchewan Government hospitalization plan came in for heavy criticism at a meeting of the Regina Liberal Women’s Association, Friday afternoon, at the Kitchener Hotel. The meeting took the form of a panel discussion on trends in health services. Five women members dealt with various health agencies, and the conclusion of each speaker was against the Government plan.”

Oh, yes! Then we can bring it up-to-date. Let’s bring it right up-to-date. Let’s take the situation last summer. Let’s go back to last summer, in June:

“Dr. Beattie Martin who discussed some aspects of state medicine said: ‘one of the tragedies of this form of practice is that under it doctors have easier hours, a fixed income and no competition. They thus have no incentive to better themselves, or keep up with advances in medicine, so the tendency is to reduce the standard of work.’”

There we are. It has been opposed as recently as June, 1956. My hon. friends profess to be greatly interested in the development for providing nursing care for our aged citizens. I think they all agree that this has been a wonderful thing. I think they will agree that this has resulted in a great deal of security and happiness for our aged people.

Mr. Loptson: — But no other country has it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You agree, do you not? My hon. friend agrees with the . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I am not opposed to the hospitalisation, but no other country has adopted it. Many have opposed it, but nobody has adopted it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — But, Mr. Speaker, because of statements made last year, here we have a doctor, right here in Regina, who says that “since the Federal Government made the pension for those over 70 universal, he felt that the Provincial Government should be equally generous and give universally prepaid health care to all pensioners over 70” . . . ”This C.C.F. Government is spending too much money on old folks’ homes’, and (listen to this)

“a son’s or daughter’s loving care is far more important.”

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, there we have it. There is no question about where the Liberal party has stood; they have always been against it. We know they have voted against it, and we know that there is no question but that today they are very much against it. We know they voted against things like The Farm Security Act; we know they voted against giving the vote to 18-year-olds. We know they voted against such things as The Trade Union Act, which we put into effect. We know they have voted and spoken against the amendments of the Workmen’s Compensation Act to give greater benefit to our trade-unioners . . .

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that at the time of the vote for 18-year-olds, he read a letter from myself in order to vote for his stand at that time.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have got the report here – “forty C.C.F. members vote”, and here we have them. “If young people between the age of 18 and 21 are to be called upon to pay the price of Government, they should have a say in the election, at least”, Premier Douglas said. The Bill was given second reading by a standing vote of 40 to 6. There were five Liberals against the Bill. You can’t get it any clearer than that. Go back to the records!

Mr. Gardiner: — Read my letter again.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): — What has the letter got to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — But after all, you weren’t the Leader of the Opposition at that time; you just assumed that position yesterday. It was only yesterday you assumed that position, so that when you wrote a letter in 1945, you really had no status, and it really didn’t make too much difference what you wrote. But the official Liberal party, as represented by the members, all voted against extending the right to vote. I want to repeat what I said. They voted against the amendments to The Trade Union Act; they voted against the Workmen’s Compensation Act; they voted against The Automobile Accident Insurance Act; they voted against the purchase of the Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company; they voted against the purchase by the Power Corporation of the Dominion Electric, which has been responsible for us being able to extend our electrical development to the state that it is today. They also voted against increased health and social welfare services, and we know that they have been opposed to the most recent development, the road grid system. We know that the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who isn’t sitting in his seat, and the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), sitting in his seat here, both stated that if we would abolish the 2 mills Public Revenue Tax, the municipalities would look after their own problems. It is there in the official records for all to read.

Mr. McDonald: — They took one off, and gave them a bigger one.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few other things that one could talk about. I would just like to talk a little bit about insurance. I expect we will have a good discussion on it, and I don't want to prolong the debate; but my hon. friend from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has been very interested in the amount of business that the Government has been giving the Government Insurance Office. Well, I hope that today he has read the statements. If he had been in the House in previous years he would have known that he didn't need to ask all of those questions, because we always in our Report tell exactly the total amount of insurance on Government vehicles.

Mr. Gardiner: — It didn't wear me out at all.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We have always done that, and again we have given it. May I say that there is no question but that the Insurance Office has saved millions of dollars for the people of this province. We have, for example, today three types of companies doing business in this province. We have our Government Insurance company, we have our mutual company, we have our board companies under the control of the Western Canada Underwriters' Association. They determine the rates. I have here a photostatic copy of a page from the rate book; in fact I have several pages, if you would like to have them. What do they do? They take, for example, farm properties in Saskatchewan. They say that western Canada is divided into two areas for farm property, one area comprising the province of Manitoba, Alberta and the North-West Territories. They set out the rates for these particular areas, and then the second area is the province of Saskatchewan. Do they give rates for Saskatchewan? No, they don't. They say take the rates for farm property in Manitoba or Alberta, and then for Saskatchewan subtract 20 per cent. Mr. Speaker, why should there be a 20 per cent discount on business done in Saskatchewan?

I have here another photostatic copy of another insurance company that does a great deal of business in the west.

Mr. McCarthy: — Which Company is it?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Osler, Hammond and Nanton. I will table it if you like. Anything I quote, I will table. Osler, Hammond and Nanton set out here the rates for farm machinery floaters, farm livestock, farm machinery and equipment, and they set out the rates — annual rate, 45 cents; three-year, 70 cents; minimum premium \$5; three-year, \$10. I am sure my hon. friend from Melville will understand what I am talking about, because the Wawanesa rates are about the same. Then it goes on to say at the bottom: "Risks located in the province of Saskatchewan may be reduced 20 per cent."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that, if you take the total volume of fire insurance business and property floaters, and business of that type that is done in Saskatchewan, it would amount to several millions of dollars a year. I shall have to check the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Insurance, but I would say somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$6 million to \$8 million.

Mr. Loptson: — You are spoiling your speech.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, take 20 per cent off that and there you have approximately \$1 ½ million that is being saved to the people of Saskatchewan as a result of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance.

There has been a great deal of publicity in 'The Leader-Post' about the recent rates for package policies. They are critical because we have come out with a TV program and radio programs and press statements announcing the results of our compulsory insurance. But we hadn't said anything about the package policies. No., Mr. Speaker, the one is something that affects every person in Saskatchewan. It is something which is a matter of general interest, because every person who operates a vehicle must pay those rates; therefore, it is of importance, too. Now, the other is something people don't have to buy. If they don't want the extension policy, they don't have to buy it at all. They don't have to buy it from the Government Insurance office. They can go to one of several companies that are doing business in the province. And yet 'The Leader-Post' has the audacity to write an editorial about it, about the big increase in rates. But, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen a thing — I have written 'The Leader-Post' and asked them to publish the rates of other companies; I have given them the rates of the other companies for this year. I have not seen anything. There may be something tonight; I haven't seen tonight's paper.

I would just like to tell you what they are. For example, we have three companies that do probably 80 per cent of the business in Saskatchewan — the Government Insurance, the Saskatchewan Mutual and the Wawanesa. Last year our rates were fairly comparable; the Government Insurance was probably a little under them. We did probably 50 to 60 per cent of the business last year in Saskatchewan. I find that, for example, for a \$50 deductible in our rural areas, where there had been three years without any claims, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office, last year charged \$16; this year we raised that rate to \$17, a \$1 increase. Those with two years of no claims went up from \$20 to \$24 and the basic went up from \$24 to \$30. But for the Saskatchewan Mutual, what do we find there? Well, they divide theirs into three groups. You see, we haven't got enough statistics yet, that we feel we can divide them into 'select', 'pleasure' and 'business'. Mind you, we have more statistics than all the other companies put together, but still we don't think we have enough to justify breaking them down into these categories. But the Saskatchewan Mutual has their lowest rate for 'select' at \$17, and their

top rate for that group, \$33. Ours goes from \$17 to \$30, but only about 10 to 15 per cent of the people are eligible to get into the 'select', most of them get into the 'pleasure' group. Now there, the rate is from \$19 to \$37, the 'business group' from \$21 to \$41. Our top rate for businesspersons is \$30.

Now, Wawanesa, what about them? Well, they are pretty smart this year. They came along with something different, and I want to congratulate them. I think they have shown some initiative, some foresight. They have said, instead of having just three rates – three-year no claims, two-year no claims and a basic – we are going to give these guys who have had a package policy for five year, we are going to give them a break. So this year, they have got a five-year no claims. They started that out, not at \$17 as we did, for three-years no claims, but for five-years no claims, \$19.

Mr. McCarthy: — What deductible?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Same deductible, \$50.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, I have got a \$25 deductible.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, yes. But you wait until you go to get it renewed, you are going to get an awful jolt. You are going to have a haemorrhage. This year, if you have been five-years without a claim, you are going to be able, if you have a 'select', you will get it for \$34, or if you have a 'pleasure' you will have to pay \$40 for it this year.

Mr. McCarthy: — For what type, what deductible?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — \$25 deductible.

Mr. McCarthy: — You haven't got a \$25 deductible.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh yes, we will still give you a deductible. We will give you a deductible. We will give it to you, but are not advertising it. Frankly, we don't want a \$25 deductible. We would just as soon not write a single \$25 deductible . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Sure, because that's where the most accidents are in, that class.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . it is becoming too costly and the time will come when all will discontinue it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention this because I feel that the daily paper here should be publicizing this. They have not done so up to this time, so I really think that it is something that is quite important and something that we should get some publicity about. After all, I would like to say that this whole question of automobile insurance is something that affects all the people of Saskatchewan. I would like to appeal to all the members on all sides of the House to do what they can to give support to our traffic officers, to our local R.C.M.P. detachments, and to assist them in any campaign to eliminate our accidents. After all, it is axiomatic that people determine their own insurance rates. We must consider that 11.2 out of every 100,000 people died, last year in Saskatchewan, as the result of automobile accidents. I think that we can realize that it is a pretty high rate. Then, we go on to British Columbia, 25.2 and Canada as a whole showed an increase of 12 per cent over last year. I would hope that we can keep this thing out of politics, and that we can all unite in trying to do what we can to save the lives of our people that are on our highways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are dozens of things that I would like to talk about tonight, but I have got to save them because I think maybe I am going to have to say something tomorrow.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Would the hon. member allow a question?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Sure.

Mr. Foley: — I just wanted to ask if the drivers get their own rate. Was there any significance in the fact that the greatest percentage of increase in the \$50 deductible was for the category with three accident-free years? I believe that was my understanding from the same editorial.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Three accidents per year?

Mr. Foley: — No, the greatest percentage increase in the \$50 deductible was in the three accident-free year group.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, that is a very good question, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that when we get into the Crown Corporation Committee we will get lots of questions like this, because those are good questions. The situation there is that, last year, we relaxed our regulations which gave a three-year-no-claims discount. Prior to 1956, we insisted that they must have at least three years with a Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office package policy. Last year we wiped it out, and accepted any kind of a package policy with any company. Up to last year, if anybody had had a claim, we wouldn't give them this three-year-no-claims discount. Last year we said, if you were not responsible for it — for example if your car was parked somewhere and somebody smashed into it, and you came along and you got insurance from it, we will not count that. The result was that 80 per cent of all the people we sold insurance to qualified for a three-year-no-claims discount. Well, I regret to say this,

but 35 out of every 100 of those people that had not had a claim for three-years, last year had a claim; 35 out of every 100. The result was, we found we paid out \$150 for every \$100 we took in, so we naturally had to raise our rates.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would plead with all the members to come into the Crown Corporations Committee prepared to ask any questions. We will have our officials there, and I want to assure you that we will give you all the information we can. We are prepared to do so just as I have done. The hon. member for Melville smiles. I have even given him answers to questions long before I needed to, in order that I could probably help him in asking some intelligent questions; giving him the advantage, I hope – but then I know I am probably building up my hopes beyond reason.

Mr. McDonald: — Your generosity is only exceeded by your good looks.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, may I say, do I need to say, that I shall support the motion!

(The Motion for the Address-in-Reply (Mr. Wood) was then carried, on recorded division, by 33 votes against 18).

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 45 – An Act respecting Conditional Sales of Goods

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, there are no serious changes here, but since there are changes in principle, I would like to just refer to them for a moment.

In the first place it is being provided that only one register shall be kept for the entire province so that in future, anyone wishing to search the title to chattels may make one search and one search only and then, if there is any registered lien or encumbrance against the chattels anywhere in Saskatchewan, it will show up on that one search.

It is intended that the central register shall be kept at Regina. It is provided that each courthouse shall continue to accept documents for filing, and then forward them to Regina for registration. It is intended, and it is provided in the Act, that searches may still be made on application at the local courthouse. A little time, however, must elapse because it is provided that the requisition for the search shall be forwarded to the central registration office at Regina, and the results of the search returned by mail, and also the person searching being advised by telephone where they specify.

or desire to be so advised. It is intended (and this, of course, is a matter of regulation) to provide that the cost of using this central registration shall be the same for people in Regina as it is for people who use the agency offices in the outlying points. The cost will be equalized so that there will be no financial advantage in residing in Regina so far as the use of the Act is concerned; nor will there by any corresponding penalty on those residing in the outlying judicial districts so far as the services of the Act are concerned.

It is also proposed to reduce the period during which a lien or conditional sale agreement will be valid, to three years, unless it is renewed within that period. It is intended (and this is, of course, a new feature) to abolish the freedom from the necessity of registration provided in Section 12 of the old Act, which, as members will recall, states in effect that, where the owner's or vendor's name is painted or engraved or lithographed on an article sold, the lien of the vendor will endure without registration. That section has caused a good deal of loss and inconvenience to the public who have relied upon it, and to the public who were not aware of it.

I may say that all of the foregoing features have been widely discussed with many members of the Bargaining of Saskatchewan. I am very happy to say that they have met with virtually unanimous approval. They have also been discussed with various organization interest in the use of the Act, such as The Farm Implement Dealers' Association, The Automobile Dealers' Association, the solicitors for the various finance companies, who use the Act very largely, and it has met with overwhelming endorsement by these groups; I might say virtually unanimous, endorsement. I would say further that since the Bill provides for fairly substantial revisions in the wording and the phraseology of a large number of sections, there may be questions and suggestions from various interested people for clarification or for slight changes in some of those sections, and it is the intention of the Government that the Bill shall be left in Committee long enough to give a reasonable opportunity for interested people to make specific recommendations or to make suggestions or criticisms relative to any of the amended sections.

I may say that copies of the Bill have already gone out to every law office in Saskatchewan (they went out last Friday) and to all interested people. The present Bill is about the fifth draft and it may still require some more touching-up. I have had one or two suggestions which will be dealt with by the House Amendment in Committee of the Whole.

Those are the principal features of the Bill. The others I think are routine and can be discussed in dealing with the sections concerned. I would be very happy to answer questions about any of the sections, but mindful of the rules of the House. I would prefer not to get into a discussion of the effects of the various sections on second reading. I therefore move second reading, Mr. Speaker, of the Bill.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I don't know whether I understood the hon. gentleman right or not, but if you are going to make a search, could you make a search direct to Regina or would it have to go through your local office?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — No, you don't have to; but you may. People who are accustomed to using the local office may continue to do so; but people who wish to avoid the trouble of going to their local office may do it direct by simply making a phone call to the office in Regina.

Mr. McCarthy: — That would be much quicker, I imagine.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It is a matter of choice to the public.

Mr. L. N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is goods and chattels only; it has nothing to do with land titles. With respect to phoning, would the same thing possibly apply that applies in the case of land titles? Until about two years ago we could phone for a search, and then Land Titles changed their ruling and prevented us from phoning for a search of title, and what has happened to that ruling as far as the outlying areas are concerned is that we are automatically held up in our dealings until such time as the search can be written for and received back by mail. That is not a good ruling as far as people in the outlying areas are concerned; but this can be done by phone apparently.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the hon. Attorney General didn't mean to minimize the importance of some of the sections, but I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that there are very substantial changes in the law as it existed prior to this Act.

There is one thing that rather bothers me and that wasn't mentioned by the Attorney General and that is the fact that it is now, under this proposed Act, possible to register a lien against the land to which the chattel is attached. Now that is quite extraordinary in the law of this province, and as far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that limits that to the chattel purchased by the owner of the land which, of course, wouldn't be quite so bad. For instance, if I am the registered owner of some land and I purchase a chattel on conditional sale, if that chattel is going to be attached to the land and my land becomes encumbered through the lien registered against it, that seems fair because I know that is going to happen. But if I am renting land to someone, as far as I can see there is nothing under this Act that would prevent my tenant from purchasing something on conditional sale, attaching it to the realty, and my land then becomes subject to that lien, and that lien will be registered against my title, which I think is quite a serious thing, and I would be very much against that. It is quite a change of principle. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult right now to get

a mortgage of any kind, and if your land might be subject to various liens of this nature registered against the land, it might make quite a difference when you attempt to get a mortgage. I can see where there would be certain reasons why the registration is a good thing to have.

Another very serious change, as the hon. Attorney General pointed out, is the matter of not allowing a manufacturer, if he has his label engraved in some way on the chattel, to have every right under this Act, without registering a lien. Now at all times it has always been the law – if I am a storekeeper the wholesaler could sell me property on conditional sale or on credit, as the case may be; and if I pass title to a purchaser for value that purchaser does take clear title and the wholesaler has no recourse against the article. But I do not see, Mr. Speaker, why this should be extended to judgment creditors. I can certainly see where a trustee in bankruptcy or judgment creditor, if he is allowed to seize those articles just because there has been no lien registered, will force wholesalers and manufacturers to register liens against everything they sell conditionally to storekeepers and to merchants of various types of articles, and in the long run it is not going to cost anybody money but the purchaser, or the storekeeper, as the case may be, which will come down to the purchaser. That, to me, seems to be a fairly serious matter.

There is another thing that I noticed in this Act, too, Mr. Speaker, and that is a change – I may be corrected on this; but I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the law was that if you removed an article permanently into the province of Saskatchewan you had to register a lien. Now, if you remove it temporarily or any other way, you have to register a lien. That, to me, seems to be an uncalled for hardship on the owner or the vendor of the property, because there are many articles that can be moved in a temporary manner from one province to another, and if they have to register liens it makes it very difficult.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am personally, and I am sure that many of the legal professions are, very happy to have all registrations in Regina. I think that is going to help everybody and with that principle no one, I think, has a quarrel. But I do not think it is quite fair to say that the entire legal profession is in favour of this Bill, because, as the Attorney General pointed out, it only went out Friday. There are many, many people who are vitally interested who haven't had a chance to peruse the Bill and I know I am correct in saying that the Law Society has not given any wholesale approval to it, as I understand that the Committee that studied the Bill has quite a number of questions to ask and they are rather opposed to certain sections.

The principle, so far as the central registration is concerned, is perfectly all right. I am not disputing that; but there are many other principles involved in this Bill, and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if it is fair to rush this legislation through second reading before other members have had an opportunity to peruse and study it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister closes the debate may I just say that, if there is any feeling on the part of the House that you would like this to stand, we would certainly agree; and any member may adjourn the debate and have it stand. We don't want to hurry it at all. Generally speaking, however, there is not much value in second reading in discussing the different parts of the Bill, because the Minister cannot answer; if he answers he closes the debate. So I really think that almost anything you want to discuss, you will have lots of time to discuss in Committee of the Whole, and, as the Minister has said, it is the intention to leave this Bill in the Committee as long as we can. We can let it lie in the Committee. We can deal with some of it and then leave it standing in Committee maybe until we are almost ready to adjourn, so that there will be lots of opportunity to hear representations from various groups.

If the members would like to leave it in Second Reading rather than put it into Committee of the Whole, I am sure the Government has no objection at all, and someone could move adjournment of the debate. I rose because the Minister (Hon. Mr. Walker) was preparing to speak, and he would have been closing the debate.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments of the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), it might be just as well to hold this Bill in second reading in the House, so I would, therefore, move adjournment of the debate on this particular Bill No. 45.

(Debate adjourned)

Bill No. 47 – An Act to amend The Industrial Standards Act

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I need go into any lengthy explanations on this Bill and I, therefore, move second reading.

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I feel, and I think that quite a few of the trade unionists who would feel, that this is a very retrogressive piece of labour legislation. We have been most progressive in our labour legislation, and we feel that this Act ought to be abolished and a Fair Wage Act take its place.

I think this Act more or less goes back to the labour-camp days of 1938, when there might have been a need for it; but it was based more or less on the Hitler regime, who wanted very much to do away with unions and he accomplished that. I think that a Fair Wage Act would cover the workers who are covered by this Industrial Standards Act and would do a very good job.

At the present time I believe the Government are collecting hundreds of dollars of wages for people who have never been in a union and who have no intentions of belonging to a union, and I think that we should bring in a Fair Wage Act which will give some incentive for the workers to go out and get a better wage.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, this Act has been on the books of this province for as long as I have been Minister of Labour, which is almost thirteen years, and this is the first time I have heard such an expression as has just been indicated by the junior member from Saskatoon. I do think he was rather extreme in bringing the name of Hitler into the criticism; but certainly as far as this amendment is concerned, I can see no objection to it. If the member wishes to go further with it, I think he has means of doing so.

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

The Assembly then adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.