

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Wednesday, February 20, 1957**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**REQUEST FOR SPEAKER'S RULING**

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called may we ask for your ruling with respect to an amendment placed to a motion? You will recall that we were discussing it yesterday, and I was wondering if we could have your ruling at this time, before we proceed with the debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yesterday, at the time the amendment was presented, I ruled it out of order. I have, since that time, given a good deal of thought to it, and also I have consulted those who are authorities on those matters. It is a very difficult decision to make, and I do feel that it would be possible to make alterations in the wording of that amendment which would achieve the purpose intended and yet would overcome the scruples that I have.

My ruling stands, but I would like an opportunity to discuss it with the hon. gentleman and see whether or not we cannot . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. The ruling I am requesting at this time is this. If there is an amendment to a motion, will the debate be on the amendment or will the debate be on both the amendment and the main resolution? That is the ruling I want at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I understood the House agreed, when it was before us yesterday, that we would proceed, when an amendment was presented that was not ruled out of order, with the debate on the amendment and the motion. Is that the desire of the Assembly?

**Mc. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, that was the ruling I wanted clarified; but there are arguments for and against proceeding under that ruling of yours because of the fact that once an amendment is placed to a motion, under the ruling that we have been following in this Legislature in past years, it does not allow a member who has already taken part in the main debate to come back and speak on the amendment; and I, for one, feel that no Member should not have the privilege of speaking on an amendment because of the fact he has already spoken on the main motion. For that reason I, personally, am opposed to the ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to make the point clear that it is not the ruling of the Speaker; it is the wish of the House that that procedure has been followed. I understand the Hon. gentleman to say that he is not in agreement with the proposal.

**Mc McDonald:** — That is correct, sir.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, might I ask one question just for clarification. If, in the course of the Throne Speech debate, someone towards the end of the debate should move an amendment to it, under your ruling then, does that prevent all of those who took part previous to the introduction of the amendment from speaking on the amendment?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Please don't refer to it as my ruling. I am trying to get the decision of the House. The correct procedure, of course, is to deal with an amendment and dispose of it before you proceed with the main motion. However, the House has, on previous occasions, decided that that would interfere with arrangements which had been agreed upon with respect to radio time, and at former Sessions has followed the practice of permitting debate on both at the same time, and that did exclude those who had already spoken on the main motion from speaking again on the amendment.

**Mr. Loftson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I realize that you are new in the Chair, but I have been here in this House a long time and I have never known of any member being precluded from speaking on a new matter that came before the House; and if I had spoken on the main motion and somebody moved an amendment which introduced a new subject, then I have never known of my right being precluded from speaking my opinion on that matter. Consequently, when an amendment is moved, then I should have the right to speak on that amendment, providing, of course, that I don't repeat what I have said before on the main motion. I think that if any member here wants to speak on an amendment, he should declare himself that he is going to confine his speech to the amendment; then, when the amendment is disposed of, he should have the right to speak on the main motion. It always has been that way in the past.

**Premier Douglas:** — I agree with the member for Saltcoats, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the custom of speaking on both a motion and an amendment thereto is not confined to this Legislature. It is quite customary in Ottawa I notice from following the debates in Hansard. Sometimes there is an amendment and a sub-amendment, and members are allowed not only to discuss the amendments but the main motion, and usually the debate roams over the whole field of the amendment and the motion. But it doesn't preclude any member, after the amendments have been disposed of, from speaking on the main motion; nor does it preclude anyone who spoke on the motion before an amendment from coming back to speak on the amendment; but the second time he can only speak on the amendment because he has already spoken on the subject matter of the motion.

I don't think we will have any difficulty; but if we think we are going to have any difficulty then I suggest that we vote on the amendments immediately, when everyone has finished speaking on that, and confine ourselves to the motion. I think the practice we have followed in the past, however, makes for a better debate; that is, to be allowed to speak on the motion and the amendments all at the same time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — If I might be allowed to add just one word, Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Premier, that if those who have already spoken in the main debate on the main motion are allowed to take part in the debate on any amendment that might come to that motion, then I am quite prepared to go along with that.

**Premier Douglas:** — The rules of the House are here. No one can prevent that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That has not been the case in the past. When the main motion has been debated any speaker who spoke on the main motion has not been able to speak on an amendment to that main motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I think what my friend is confused about is that when he moved an amendment himself to the main motion he couldn't come back and speak on that amendment, because he moved the amendment and consequently he has spoken to it, since he moved it; but any person who had spoken before him, and before the amendment was moved, could certainly come back and speak on it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Just as long as that is clear.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is thoroughly understood.

### HOLLAND B. BLAINE

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us were shocked and saddened at the news which we received that Mr. Holland B. Blaine, the Director of the Travel Information Service, passed away yesterday.

Mr. Blaine has a wide circle of friends all over the province. He had a great capacity for getting along with people. He was in very good health last week. I saw him as late as Friday when he was downstairs in the cafeteria. He took ill on Sunday and passed away yesterday afternoon.

I am sure that all members will join with me in expressing our sorrow at his untimely death and extending our sincere sympathy to his wife, who has suffered such a grievous loss.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### Debate on Address-in-Reply

The House resumed from Tuesday, February 19, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend, on behalf of all members of the House a very hearty welcome to the students who are here from the University of Saskatchewan and to say how delighted we are to see them here. We will be looking forward to meeting them at the dinner which Your Honour is tendering this evening.

When the Legislature adjourned last night, I was in the process of congratulating the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) on having been converted to the economic feasibility of the South Saskatchewan Dam project. It is quite a conversion when a manufacturing, who in July, 1955, said

**February 20, 1957**

that he agreed with Mr. St. Laurent that the South Saskatchewan Dam is not in the national interest; that we don't know what we will do with the power we will produce, and that he didn't know what we would do with the vegetables we will produce, and that he didn't know what we would do with the vegetables that would be grown on the irrigated lands, now makes an impassioned speech in support of the South Saskatchewan Dam. I want to welcome him into the ranks of those who feel that this project would be a worthwhile undertaking.

I was also in the process of telling the House that there was no conflict between the 60 per cent of the cost of the project which I mentioned and the 25 per cent of the cost of the dam to which the Provincial Treasurer referred. I pointed out to the House that, in the fall of 1954, the Federal Minister of Agriculture placed before us a draft agreement under which the Federal Government was prepared to pay 75 per cent of the cost of the dam itself – roughly an amount of some \$63,000,000. The Provincial Government was to pay 25 per cent of the actual cost of the dam and all of the cost of the main reservoirs, the canals, the lateral ditches and levelling the land – a total cost of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$85 million. The Saskatchewan Government accepted the draft agreement and was prepared to assume the financial obligations which it set forth. However, in April 1955, when the Provincial Treasurer and myself met with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. St. Laurent made it abundantly clear that, irrespective of whatever costs we might be prepared to assume, the Federal Government was not prepared to proceed with the project at that time on the grounds that his Government was not yet convinced this project was in the national interest.

I was delighted a few days ago when Dr. Andrew Stewart, the President of the University of Alberta and a member of the Gordon Commission, made the statement in Moose Jaw that the Gordon Commission rather than being opposed to the dam were in favour of it. I am hoping that, as a result of the report of this Commission and the subsequent data which it will no doubt put in the hands of the Federal Government, Mr. St. Laurent and his colleagues will change their position and that they will indicate they are now convinced this project would be in the national interest. If this is so, I want this House and the people of this province to know that we are prepared to proceed on the basis of the allocation of costs suggested to us by the Federal Government in their draft agreement submitted in the fall of 1954.

My hon. friend made one other remark about the dam that I want to have cleared up. He said that this dam would probably produce more power than the two \$40,000,000 plants which are now being built at Estevan and at Saskatoon. Without detracting in any way from the value of the South Saskatchewan Dam, I think it is just as well to keep the records straight by letting the House know that the Estevan plan alone is designed to produce four times as much power as would the proposed plant for the production of power at the South Saskatchewan Dam. The South Saskatchewan Dam power plant as designed would produce 400,000,000 kilowatt hours per year. The Estevan plant, it is estimated, will produce 1,600,000,000 kilowatt hours per year.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition spent considerable time wandering from the Atlantic to the Pacific to prove that the C.C.F. was melting away like snow before the spring sun. Well, I am not interested in perambulating all over Canada and in analysing election results. I have never seen much value in holding a post-mortem after every election. When the election is over, you might as well let it go. Nor have I spent any time making excuses and alibis if I lost some seats or lost some votes. I haven't done as some hon. gentlemen have done. I haven't gone around explaining that we would have done so much better if it had not been for the Social Credit party. I am making no alibis and no excuses, but I would certainly say that the Leader of the Opposition and his associates, I am sure, cannot find very much comfort out of the election of June 20 last.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We gained.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is true that the C.C.F. vote in 1956 as compared to 1952 showed a drop of 40,981 votes. That is a decline of 14.1 per cent. But the Liberal party had a drop of 44,044 — a decline of 20.83 per cent. One person in every five who voted Liberal in 1952 did not vote Liberal in 1956! May I remind the hon. gentleman that of the fourteen Liberal members who sit opposite, seven of them sit in this Legislature with a majority of less than 200 votes. Those are mainly seats which we won in 1944, which we lost in 1948, which we got back in 1952 and which we lost again in 1956.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — We'll get them back.

**Premier Douglas:** — We will be out after them again in 1961. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, take the vote of June 20 last as being a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to proceed with the election program which we submitted to the electorate at that time. This little card contains the "C.C.F. Program for Prosperity" on which we asked the electorate to return the Government. Because we intend to carry out this program, as we have carried out the previous programs on which we were elected, I want to put it on the records of the House.

“CCF PROGRAM FOR PROSPERITY”

During the next term of office the CCF will:

1. Spend \$100,000,000 on a Provincial Highway Program.
2. Contribute an average of \$3,000,000 a year for Municipal Roads.
3. Increase substantially the Provincial Government's contribution to the cost of Education.
4. Bring up to 65,000 the farms supplied with electricity and double the generating capacity of the Province.

5. Bring natural gas to all cities and intermediate towns and villages.
6. Continue the rapid development of oil, mineral and forest resources.
7. Expand existing drainage, irrigation and reclamation programs.
8. Extend Hospital Plan to include out-patient and other health services.
9. Expand Social Welfare benefits.
10. Continue to attract new industries to provide employment and create local markets for farm products.
11. Protect and improve working conditions of wage earners especially those in low income brackets.
12. The CCF will fight for a fair share of the national income for farmers. In particular the CCF will continue to urge the Federal Government to:
  - (a) establish parity prices for farm products bearing some relation to farm costs.
  - (b) provide cash advanced on farm-stored grain paid through the Wheat Board as a permanent feature of an orderly marketing system.
  - (c) sell Canadian wheat and other farm surpluses by accepting partial payment in currencies of other countries as well as by barter and bi-lateral trade agreements.
  - (d) establish a National Livestock Marketing scheme and set up a Board of Livestock Commissioners.
  - (e) begin immediately the construction of the South Saskatchewan Dam.

The Speech which is now before this House for consideration constitutes the first steps which this Government is taking toward the implementation of the mandate which we have received from the electorate. I think it should be made clear to members that the vote on this debate will indicate whether or not the members are prepared to support this "Program for Prosperity" and the steps which the Government is taking toward its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to review briefly some of the economic developments which are taking place in this province. We must face up frankly to the fact that technological development over the past twenty years has caused a steady decline in the rural population of Saskatchewan. There is no use blinking at that fact. This is a

process which has been going on now for two decades. In 1936 our rural population was 651,274. In 1946 it had dropped to 515,928, and in 1956 it had dropped to 438,999. That means a decline in the first ten years, from 1936 to 1946, of 135,436, and in the second ten years a drop of 76,929. It is absurd to go around saying that the C.C.F. are responsible for the decline in population. The C.C.F. are no more responsible for the decline of 76,000 during the last ten years than the Liberals were for the 135,000 decline in the previous ten years during which they were in office most of the time.

This situation of declining farm population is common to all of North America. In Canada in 1936, the agricultural labour force constituted 30 per cent of the total labour force. By 1956 it had dropped to 14 per cent of the total labour force. During the past six years in the United States, agricultural population declined by 11.2 per cent. If you take predominantly rural States, it has dropped by over 20 per cent. This is the result of a technological revolution in agriculture, which means that the machine has replaced manpower. It does not mean that agriculture is producing less. On the contrary, in this province our farmers are farming more acres of land and producing more food in the aggregate than they did twenty years ago, or ten years ago; but they are doing it with less manpower. Consequently, we have had this decline in agricultural population.

The C.C.F. recognized this situation. The moment the war was over in 1945, we began an extensive program to develop new sources of wealth which would provide employment for those who were displaced from agriculture by machinery. As a result of that our population figures have shown some improvement. In 1936, Saskatchewan's population was 931,547. In 1946, we had dropped to 832,688, or a drop of 98,859. The C.C.F. could not be blamed for that. But by 1956, our population had come up to 880,665, or an increase of 47,977. In other words, from 1936 to 1946 Saskatchewan's population declined by almost 99,000, and in the last ten years has come up by almost 48,000. That, of course, does not account for all our natural increase, but it does show that the economic and industrial development program which has been going on has helped to provide employment to a considerable extent to offset the loss in agricultural population. Consequently we have had a very encouraging growth in urban population. In 1936, our urban population was 280,273. By last year it had increased to 441,666 – an increase in urban population in this province, in a period of twenty years, of 161,393. I'll put it this way. In 1936, 30.1 per cent of the population of Saskatchewan lived in cities, towns and villages, and by 1956 this figure had increased to 50.2 per cent. Slightly better than one-half the people of Saskatchewan now live in urban communities.

When my friend speaks about stagnation and about people leaving the province, he ought to try to get some housing accommodation in places like Estevan and Swift Current, where they have doubled their population since we came into office, and in many of the other urban areas where new industries are springing up and where people are finding it difficult to secure accommodation. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that during the past ten years Saskatchewan has enjoyed a period of industrial development unequalled in its history. Our strong agricultural economy is now being supplemented by a strong non-agricultural economy. That view, of course,

**February 20, 1957**

is not only mine. I refer to an article which was written by Mr. Forbes Rhude, the Canadian Press Business Editor, which appeared in the 'Leader-Post' on December 7, 1956. He said:

“Something of an industrial revolution is taking place in Saskatchewan.

“To the province's rich agricultural scene are being added manufacturing, oil, mining, construction, and probably a vastly expanded forest industry. They give security against the uncertainties of crops and their markets, and come opportunely when farm mechanization is reducing farm population. Industry other than agricultural now accounts for nearly one-half of Saskatchewan production. Ten years ago it accounted for less than one-quarter.”

I was interested in noting that the 'Leader-Post', in a statement contained in their issue of December 31, 1956, made an interesting comment. I think most members opposite will accept the Regina Leader-Post, except those who contend that all the newspapers and radios in Saskatchewan have sold out lock, stock and barrel to the Government; but the rest of them, I am sure, will accept this statement in which the 'Leader-Post' said:

“The Old Year has been good to Saskatchewan, in many respects better than any of its predecessors. This is being substantiated as the complete statistics for economic conditions for 1956 take tentative shape . . .

“Sharing the spotlight with agriculture's recovery is the progress Saskatchewan made in 1956 in the economy's diversification through the growth of non-agricultural industries. The year undoubtedly marks the greatest progress Saskatchewan ever has made in this regard.”

Let me just refer briefly to some of this development which has taken place over the past ten years. Let me begin by referring to the oil and gas development. I was interested in noting that, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke in the city of Calgary, he was reported in the press of January 11, 1957, as saying:

“In oil development alone we have lost ten years because of the attitude of the C.C.F. Government.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's correct.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, let's look at this ten years which we have lost. In 1946, Saskatchewan had 39 oil wells in production. At the end of 1956, we had 2,401 wells, and, as hon. members know, we now have over 2,500 oil wells in production or capable of production.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Still peanuts to what we should have.

**Premier Douglas:** — In 1946 we had 33 gas wells. At the end of 1956, we had



156 gas wells. Ten years ago our production of oil was 136,000 barrels; last year it was 20,700,000 barrels. As a matter of fact our production of oil, last year, in terms of dollar value was \$35,500,000, which was more than the value of all the oil that had been produced up until 1956. In November last, our daily production of oil in Saskatchewan was 82,000 barrels. Mr. Speaker, that is larger than the total daily production of oil was in 1950 for all of Canada. In 1950, the total daily production for the whole of Canada was 80,000 barrels. In November last, we were producing in this province over 82,000 barrels per day.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday quoted from a press statement by Dr. T.A. Link in which he was reported to have said that Imperial Oil got out of Saskatchewan back in 1946 because of the attitude of the C.C.F. Government. I expected my Hon. friend to quote that; but I did not expect him to omit quoting the denial from the Imperial Oil.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What a discovery for you!

**Premier Douglas:** — Of course he might be excused for not quoting it because Dr. Link's statement appeared in the 'Leader-Post' with a four-column heading, whereas the denial from the Imperial Oil appeared on page 15, and was butchered down to about three inches!

**Mr. Lopton:** — They can't help themselves . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — What about your Crown Corporations?

**Premier Douglas:** — The fact is that Mr. W.D.C. Mackenzie, the General Manager of the Producing Department of Imperial Oil in Toronto, denied the statement of Dr. Link and said they left for totally different reasons. He went on to say:

“About 1946, Imperial concluded a five-year search for oil and gas in Southern Saskatchewan . . . The results of that program at that time were very discouraging. For this reason we moved to other prospects north and westward. Shortly after that we found Leduc and exploration in Central Alberta took all our resources and manpower for some time following.”

That statement by Mr. Mackenzie coincides exactly with the statements which were made to me by Mr. Hewetson who, at that time, was President of the Imperial Oil Company. I have no objections to my hon. friend trying to make political capital out of the statement by Dr. Link, but I take strong exception to the fact he did not tell the other side of the story and point out that the Imperial Oil Company had emphatically denied the truth of Dr. Link's assertion.

A very good indication of how oil and gas development is proceeding is the investment which is being made by these companies. In 1955, they invested over \$82,000,000 in Saskatchewan and, in 1956, they invested over \$118 million. As a matter of fact, since the C.C.F. came into office, oil companies have invested in this province in exploration, development, refineries and pipelines, a total of over \$445 million. If you take out of that the \$36 million for the Trans-Canada Pipeline (which cannot be attributed

**February 20, 1957**

directly to Saskatchewan), it still leaves an amount of over \$409 million of Capital which has come into this province to assist in developing the oil industry. The result is that we now have in the province proven oil reserves of some 690,000,000 barrels.

**Mr. Loptson:** — It's about time you socialized it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The story is much the same with reference to the production of gas. All the gas produced prior to 1956 amounted to 20.5 billion cubic feet. In 1956 along – in one year – we produced 19.6 billion cubic feet. We produced almost as much gas last year as we have produced in all the rest of our history. We now have proven gas reserves in the province of some 500 billion m.c.f. (thousand cubic feet).

Lest the gentlemen opposite think that I am unduly optimistic about the developments which have taken place in Saskatchewan with respect to oil production, I refer them to one of the most reliable oil magazines called 'Oil in Canada'. In the issue of November 26 last, this is what they have to say:

“Southeast Saskatchewan Continues to Lead As Crude Oil Expansion Area.”

“Saskatchewan production is expanding much faster proportionately than Alberta, due to the geographic factor of nearness and availability of these markets. At present Saskatchewan production is estimated at 75,000 barrels per day – nearly double what it was a year ago. The producibility building up in the south-eastern sector is forcing its way into markets traditionally served by other production areas. The growth of Saskatchewan production in 1957 is quite likely going to account for one-third to half of all Canadian growth.”

On page 9 of the same issue you will see:

“Saskatchewan Surpasses Alberta in Well Completions in October”

“Saskatchewan well completions during October outnumbered completions in Alberta as activity in Canada's major oil province continued to decline appreciably.”

In the February 4, 1957, issue of the same magazine 'Oil in Canada', you see this large heading:

“Saskatchewan Oil Discovery Top 1956 Drilling Activity as Exports Dominate Production.”

This article stated that in wells drilled Alberta led the four provinces but by a reduced margin. It pointed out that the wells drilled in Alberta in 1956 increased by 12 per cent but that wells drilled in Saskatchewan had increased by 21 per cent. These facts

speak for themselves. Here is a province which is rapidly overtaking our neighbouring province of Alberta as a producer of oil. The best the Leader of the Opposition can say when he gets over to Calgary is that we have lost ten years. Well, he may have lost ten years but we haven't Mr. Speaker! He reminds me somewhat of a Rip Van Winkle waking up and getting the sand rubbed out of his eyes, and saying: "We've lost ten years". But while he has been sound asleep the oil industry has proceeded and Saskatchewan has forged ahead!

Not only is this true with respect to oil and gas production but it is true with respect to all mineral production.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Premier would permit a question?

**Premier Douglas:** — No, Mr. Speaker. I didn't interrupt my hon. friend yesterday, and I am not going to allow him to interrupt me now.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I always let you speak.

**Premier Douglas:** — The hon. member from Saltcoats makes more interruptions than any other person in this House. He can have all the time he wants to make speeches. The trouble is he doesn't avail himself of the opportunity for speaking when he is on his feet. He seems only to be able to speak when he is sitting down. There may be some anatomical explanation for that. I don't know!

Our total mineral production is still soaring, Mr. Speaker. In 1952 our total mineral production was \$49,500,000. In 1956, it is estimated that it will exceed \$114,000,000. Our metallic mineral production in 1956 was \$73,400,000 as compared to \$53,400,000 the year before. Our uranium production almost doubled, going up from \$14,000,000 in 1956 to \$27,000,000 in 1956. With the new Eldorado plant coming into operation at Beaverlodge, and with the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting's new operations at Birch Lake and Coronation, we think that in 1957 the chances are that the total value of our metallic minerals production may reach close to \$100,000,000. Our production of coal continues to rise. Our production of salt, which was unknown as an industry when the C.C.F. came into office, continues to grow. Our production of sodium sulphate plant, has made a very substantial contribution to that industry.

A new industry, not only new for Saskatchewan but new for all of Canada is now well under way. I refer to the potash industry. We have never produced potash in Canada. There is only one place in the United States where it is produced. At the present time there are 3,500,000 acres under disposition. Last year, there were 37 exploratory wells drilled as compared to 24 the year before. The Potash Company of America has leased 12,500 acres in the Patience Lake area near Saskatoon, and the construction of a concentrator will begin this spring at an estimated cost of something in the neighbourhood of \$20,000,000. It is thought it will be in production by the fall of 1958.

**February 20, 1957**

Minerals are becoming an important part of Saskatchewan's economy. If you exclude fuel, it is interesting to note that Manitoba and Alberta put together last year produced \$73,600,000 worth of minerals as compared to Saskatchewan's \$80,500,000. That is why Dr. David Quance, the Canadian Press staff writer, writing from Lac La Ronge is reported in the 'Star-Phoenix' of November 16, 1956, to have said this:

"Known for 200 years as a producer of fish and furs, Saskatchewan's northland is emerging as a mineral-rich land and may make this province one of the continent's leading mineral areas.

"This part of the wheat province is moving underground to bolster its one-crop economy, and government officials predict that by 1960 mineral production will equal the grain crop in value."

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of the province will become increasingly aware of how important these mineral developments have been in our economy. I want to pay tribute to the Minister of Mineral Resources and to his predecessor, who have made a tremendous contribution to the economic life of Saskatchewan by the fine job they have done in getting our minerals developed.

We have also seen considerable expansion in the fields of manufacturing and processing. In 1946, the gross value of our manufactured products was \$168,000,000. Last year it was \$310,000,000 – an increase of 85 per cent. During 1956 there were completed, or under construction, nine major projects representing a capital investment of \$37,000,000, including such important commodities as cement and wire cable, which are now in production, and plants which in 1957 will produce quantities of paper bags, insulating fibre board, hardboard, steel pipe, vitrified clay products and plastic pipe. In addition to these, some 44 new industries have been started and are producing a variety of products all the way from aluminium doors and windows to pre-cast concrete blocks.

Manufacturing now represents just under 20 per cent of the total value of all our commodity production. Option agreements have been signed with two companies interested in the production of wood pulp. An agreement for a block board mill valued at \$2,000,000, which is to be located at Sturgis, has also been signed. The capital investment for some twelve major projects, either constructed, under construction or in the planning stage, will total some \$80,000,000 and will give direct employment to more than 3,500 persons and have a total payroll in excess of \$10,500,000. We believe that with the new manufacturing industries that will come into production in 1957, the value of our manufactured products will rise to about \$325,000,000 in this year. All of this, of course, has meant more jobs, and that is the purpose of stimulating this development. At the end of 1956 it is estimated there were 10,000 persons employed in non-farm jobs which did not exist ten years ago. The oil industry employs about 5,000; uranium about 2,000; other mineral fields, and factories engaged in manufacturing, employ another 3,000 persons.

A good gauge of industrial development is always the amount of money being invested in the province. In 1948, public and private investments in Saskatchewan was \$241,000,000. Last year it had risen to \$514,000,000, which was \$40,000,000 more than the public and private investment in the province of Manitoba. The gentlemen opposite have always said: "Oh yes, but that includes repair and maintenance." If you take repair and maintenance out, we are still \$32,000,000 ahead of the investment in our neighbouring province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Saskatchewan was behind Manitoba right up until and including 1948, but we have been ahead of them every year since.

In this industrial and economic expansion I think some credit must go to the Government-owned Crown Corporations which have made a very substantial contribution in this development.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The woollen mill? The shoe factory?

**Premier Douglas:** — The total investments in these Crown Corporations amount to some \$162,000,000. That is money which the people of Saskatchewan have invested. That is a self-liquidating obligation which will be paid off, and is being paid off each year, from the returns from these industrial enterprises, and which in the meantime are developing the province. The Crown Corporations Committee, of course, will be going over the reports of these Crown Corporations and the audited statements will be tabled in the House. All I can give now are preliminary figures. The preliminary figures show that these Crown Corporations have a surplus before paying interest on outstanding obligations of some \$10,700,000. After deducting the interest payments they will show a net surplus of over \$5,300,000. They have done a total business of \$56,500,000; they have given employment to 4,512 persons, and they have a payroll of \$15,500,000.

Of course, the members opposite have always insisted that we should not talk about Power and Telephones but rather we must only talk about other Crown Corporations. We are very glad to do that. The other Crown Corporations have an investment of some \$9,500,000, and preliminary figures show that they will show a surplus this year of nearly \$1,000,000, or a return of 9.85 per cent on the capital investment. These public enterprises have played an important part in helping to stabilize and strengthen the economy of Saskatchewan. Just look at one or two of them. Let's take the Power Corporation.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You should be ashamed. You shouldn't make such a big profit with a Socialist Government.

**Premier Douglas:** — If the member for Saltcoats would stop hiccoughing, I am sure we would both get along much better!

Let's take a look at the Power Corporation. We set as our goal in 1952 that, by the end of 1956, we would have brought power to 40,000 farms. This figure was exceeded. Power has been brought to 40,300 farms. Last year's program of electrifying 7,800 farms was a record that has never been equalled in any part of Canada

in the history of this Dominion. I don't need to tell this House, Mr. Speaker, what it has meant to over 40,000 farm homes to have electricity. It has put a hired manufacturing on every farm and a hired girl in every farm household. The number of communities served by electricity has gone up from 146 when we took office to 793 today – all enjoying the benefits of electricity. Probably the best criterion is the amount of power being distributed. In 1944 it was 75,000,000 kilowatt hours. Last year it was 657,000,000 kilowatt hours – more than eight times as much.

Gas has become an important feature of our economy. We are now serving over 20,000 customers. In 1956 there was added to the Power Corporation's gas distribution system the cities of Moose Jaw, Swift Current, North Battleford and ten smaller communities. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday wanted to compare our gas rates to those charged in Calgary and Edmonton by companies which put down their pipelines twenty-five to thirty years ago when steel cost about one-fifth of what it costs today and when labour costs were less. These gas companies in Alberta have already paid off their entire capital investment and are now operating entirely on the basis of operating costs. But that development didn't take place in Saskatchewan twenty-five or thirty years ago. We had a Liberal Government in this province then which lacked both vision and aggressiveness. My friends across the way keep talking about Alberta, and I have no wish to detract from the province of Alberta. The province of Alberta has made great progress. They made it because they got rid of a Liberal Government in 1921 and have never let them back in! As a matter of fact, the Leader of the Opposition is one of the most amazing political strategists I ever saw. He talked so much about Alberta all during the last election and at previous Sessions of the Legislature that in three Liberal constituencies the people decided to vote Social Credit presumably because they thought that if Alberta was much a fine place they had better elect a Social Credit member! The Leader of the Opposition has become a St. John the Baptist to the Social Credit party.

I think the best indication of the growing strength of the Power Corporation is the fact that when we took office its capital assets were some \$8,000,000 and today it has assets of over \$148,000,000. Its customers have gone up from less than 13,000 to over 135,000 for power and over 20,000 for natural gas.

The Telephone Corporation has also greatly expanded its operations. Its customers have gone up from less than 47,000 to over 135,000 and its assets from \$16,500,000 to over \$69,000,000. I will not take time to deal with the other Crown Corporations such as the bus company which has provided transportation to a great many communities which did not have that type of service before; the Fish Marketing and Fur Marketing Services; the Trading Posts which have served the trappers and fishermen of the far north; and the sodium sulphate and brick and tile plants which have not only provided employment but have helped to utilize our resources and to make revenue for the people of Saskatchewan. All of these Crown Corporations have played an important part in the economic development of Saskatchewan. In spite of all the ridicule the gentlemen opposite have tried to pour on them, the people of Saskatchewan, I believe, appreciate them, and are going to see that they are kept in operation under a C.C.F. Government.

Mr. Speaker, increasing wealth merely for itself is not enough. The value of increased wealth production is that we can provide more services for more people. One of the reasons we have been able to provide more services is because of this increasing wealth production. The year the C.C.F. took office in this province, our revenue from resource development was a little over \$1,000,000. Last year, our revenue from resource development was over \$20,000,000. We believe the day is not far distant when it will be \$30,000,000. That increasing revenue will make it possible for us to provide more services to our people without having to impose taxes to secure the money. That's why we have been able, for instance, to finance a Hospital Services Plan. That plan, on January 1 last, was ten years old. I think if there is anything the people of the province can be proud of, it is that we pioneered the field of hospital insurance and that we have today probably the most efficiently-operated hospital insurance plan on this continent.

In that ten years the hospital plan has paid out \$138,000,000 covering 16,000,000 days of patient care, and paying the bills for 1,548,926 persons – and I am not including newborn in any of those figures. The fact is that roughly one-third of the cost of the hospital plan has not been paid by the taxpayer either in the form of their per capita tax or in the form of their Education and Hospitalization Tax, but has been paid out of the public revenue of the province as a result of this industrial development and revenue from resource development.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, what a ridiculous statement! You should be ashamed to tell one like that.

**Premier Douglas:** — The same is true of the medical care programs for old-age pensioners, for mothers' allowance cases, for blind pensioners and needy groups, and the free care for those suffering from cancer and from mental illness. The money which has gone to help build new hospitals, to build the Medical School, and to supply the air ambulance service – all of these have been made possible because of this increased industrial development.

It has also made possible a steady increase in our welfare program with the result that, today, on a per capita basis, we stand as one of the first provinces in Canada in terms of the amounts of money we are spending per capita on looking after the needs and the unfortunate.

The same thing is true of education. School grants steadily increased from less than \$4,000,000 a year to over \$12,000,000 last year. It will be proposed this year that we increase school grants again by probably 33 1/3 per cent. This increase, which we hope to recommend to the Legislature, will amount to about \$4,500,000. Increased resources development has made it possible (and students from the University will be interested in knowing this) to set up, in 1949, a Student Loan Fund which has loaned out \$1,206,763 to a total of 4,213 students who required assistance.

The Government has long recognized the problem of local governing bodies, and we have steadily used part of this increased revenue to help them. In the 1945-46 fiscal year, we gave out to the local governing

bodies, \$4,500,000. By 1954-55, we were paying out \$14,500,000 and we will be recommending Estimates to the Legislature, this year, that will pay out to the local governing bodies, \$25,500,000.

A few years ago, the financial critic for the Opposition charged this Government with having built up a standard of health, welfare and education services which our economy would not support. You know, that is a strange inconsistency, Mr. Speaker. During an election the Opposition go out and say that old-age pensions should be higher, mothers' allowances should be higher, everything should be higher; school grants should be higher and grants for roads should be higher. But yet their financial critic told us that we were already paying out too large a part of our budget for health, welfare and education services, and that our economy could not maintain it. He also said that if we had a crop failure, we would be unable to continue to make those payments. Well, Mr. Speaker, time has proven that was not correct. Time has proven that, with our increased industrial development and our increased development of resources, we not only have been able to maintain our standards of health, education and welfare services, but that we are going to be able to continue to increase them as our resources development continues. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we can look over the Saskatchewan economy with a great deal of pride and optimism. I think we shall have great development in the years ahead.

We must recognize, however, that the most powerful forces which affect our economy are beyond the jurisdiction of a provincial government. Our province is in a healthy condition. But no province can be an island if we should be subjected either to a depression on a national scale or if the world should be plunged into another war. Therefore, I think we have to look beyond the province and recognize some of the things which could affect the prosperity which we now enjoy.

The first thing that gives us some concern is the growing inflation which is going on in Canada. Mr. Bruce Hutchison, in an article in the last issue of MacLean's Magazine, said that this inflation has cut our savings in half. People who bought a \$1,000 War Bond during the war years now find that not only has the cash value of the bond dropped but its actual purchasing power has been cut in half. This inflation has hurt people on fixed incomes. They find the purchasing power of their income has been reduced very considerably because of rising costs. I think this inflation is a danger signal which should warn all of us of the need for bold and courageous action and the need for selective restrictions on credit. This does not mean blanket restrictions. I quite agree with the need for credit restrictions on luxury building and on unnecessary construction, but not on the building of homes and on municipal improvements and things which people must have in order to live. I think the time has come when we must have an allocation of essential material to socially necessary projects. Above all we must face up to the fact that we have an adverse balance of trade in Canada. In 1956, we imported one billion dollars more goods than we exported. The difference was only made up by the tremendous investment which comes into Canada. But every dollar of that investment must be repaid, plus either interest or dividends. If Canada is to have a sound economy free from the threat of inflation, we are going to have to get our trade balances rectified.



Most serious of all from the standpoint of people in Saskatchewan is the plight of the agricultural industry about which we must all be concerned. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition spent quite a bit of time going over a sixteen-point platform which he had submitted to the people of Saskatchewan last June, 70 per cent of whom voted against it. It was a program which, if added up roughly, would reduce government income by about \$5,000,000 by wiping out certain taxes, and would increase our expenditures by about \$50,000,000. The people of Saskatchewan knew that you cannot spend \$50,000,000 more and take in \$5,000,000 less. So they voted accordingly.

Then the Leader of the Opposition made mention of several matters that he was recommending to the Provincial Government as help for the farmer. He mentioned farm security, for instance. Liberal members should never talk about farm security. The only power that any Provincial Government had to protect the farmer's home or any other person's home was The Moratorium Act. Let it be said to their everlasting shame that it was a Liberal Government at Ottawa that went jointly with the Dominion Mortgage Companies' Association to the Supreme Court and asked the Supreme Court to declare The Moratorium Act ultra vires.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's only half the story. Tell the rest of it.

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition made reference to the need for farm credit. I agree with what he said about the problem of young men trying to get started in farming today when very heavy capital expenditures are required, and the problem, particularly of veterans who want to become established in efficient farming. Mr. Speaker, that is a terrible indictment of the Government of Canada which today is operating two farm credit programs. One is the Canadian Farm Loan Board and the other is the Farm Loan Improvements Act. Both of those acts and both of those agencies are set up for the very purpose of doing the thing my hon. friend mentioned . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Doing a good job, too!

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . plus the Veterans' Land Administration which is supposed to set up veterans in agriculture. My hon. friend, by his very statement yesterday is indicating the Federal Government for its complete failure to adequately operate those agencies so as to help people who want to become established in agriculture.

What he suggests now is that since the Federal Government, apparently in his opinion, is not doing a good job with the Farm Loan Board, or the Farm Loan Improvement Act, or the Veterans' Land Administration Act, the Provincial Government should set up a Provincial Farm Loan Board. Mr. Speaker, we had a Farm Loan Board under a Liberal Government which operated prior to and in the 1920s. In 1932, the Conservatives, who had come into office in 1929, discontinued the

**February 20, 1957**

operation of the Farm Loan Board. The Liberals came back in in 1934 and were in office for ten years. But did they resurrect the Farm Loan Board? No! When they went out of office in 1944 . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's not true!

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . they left us with a debt of over \$7,000,000 which had accrued as a result of their Farm Loan Board operations.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just like any other mortgage company . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Over \$7,000,000 was left for us to pay.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell the truth . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, whenever I hear them beginning to growl, and to howl and to snarl, I know they are getting hurt.

When the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life was set up, we asked them to look into this question of farm credit. I hope the hon. members have read their report. In their report they suggest that the Federal agencies which are in the field should be overhauled so as to be able to do a more efficient job and a more extensive job than they are doing now. They also suggest that the Provincial Government should make the offer to the Federal Government that we will work with them in extending this program and that we should consult with the Co-operatives to see whether or not there is any way in which we can further assist in providing farm credit. That report is being studied and we are prepared to extend our operations in this regard in any way that seems feasible. But I do want to say to my hon. friend that I couldn't agree with him more when he says farm credit as it is now being administered is certainly not helping the farmers who need credit in this Province.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Do you want to abandon it?

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition quoted the Speech from the Throne, and said that, after we had criticized the Federal Government for not doing anything about the recommendations which have been made by a Committee of this House there was only a "period". That was all. He didn't go on to quote the next paragraph, which included the following:

"The Government will again submit for your approval clearing and breaking, irrigation and drainage programs designed to further develop the diversification and stability of our farm economy."

Perhaps my hon. friend doesn't realize that the British North America Act divides agriculture into two parts. It says that the Provincial Government is responsible for questions relating to production and

that the Federal Government is responsible for matters pertaining to marketing and price. This Government has spent millions of dollars in clearing and breaking land and making it available to new settlers, and on drainage, irrigation and community pastures. There is no problem about production. We have increased the amount of land under cultivation and we have increased the productivity of that land. The best tribute to the production of the farmers of this Province is the great surpluses that we have. The problem is not one of production, but is one of marketing and prices.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The CCF can take credit for that.

**Premier Douglas:** — The gentlemen opposite laugh. Well, if they will listen for a few moments they may learn something, because they have learned nothing in the twelve years they have been here.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Can't learn anything from you.

**Premier Douglas:** — Some of the gentlemen opposite ought to have some appreciation of the problems facing their constituents. The real problems facing the farmers of this Province are as follows:

The first problem farmers face is their inability to sell millions of bushels of grain now stored on their farms.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Where are they?

**Premier Douglas:** — If my hon. friend doesn't know where they are, I suggest that he get out and go through the country and find out where the millions of bushels of grain are instead of sitting down in somebody's office and twiddling his thumbs.

The fact is that our farmers are not able to sell the grain which they have grown. They are not able to get the money to which they are entitled. This is an old story. I don't need to go back to the history of it, but back as far as 1943 I was fighting in the Canadian House of Commons for cash advances for farm-stored grain. At that time I was told by a responsible Minister of the Crown that I was talking nonsense and moonshine.

**Mr. Loptson:** — So you were.

**Premier Douglas:** — The member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) agrees with that. But, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the United States have had payments on farm-stored grain for twenty years. You remember that, in the 1930s, the American farmers went out on a crusade to get cash advances on farm-stored grain. You remember their slogan. Their slogan was: "Let's raise less wheat and more hell." And they did it! They got cash advances and they are still getting them. My constituency runs along the American boundary, and every time I go down there I meet American farmers who have sold their wheat — every bit of it — for \$2.26 a bushel, cash; and they are not getting storage payments for the wheat stored on their farms. I am thinking that the time is coming when Western farmers will have to conduct the same kind of campaign to get a square deal from the Government of Canada.

The second problem which is facing the farmers of this country is that, for several years now, their prices have been going down and their costs have been going up. If you look at the index figures for the years 1951 to 1956, you will find that the index for farm prices has gone down 70.3 points, or 26.2 per cent, and the index for farm costs has gone up by 16.7 points, or 7.4 per cent. Any industry that has its prices go down 26.2 per cent and its costs go up 7.4 per cent would find itself 33.6 per cent worse off. In other words, the standard of living of the Saskatchewan farmer has been cut by one-third. In 1953 the disposable farm income (that is the farmer's cash income less his actual operating costs) was \$502,000,000. In 1954 it dropped \$232 million below that. In 1955 it dropped \$259 million below that \$502 million figure, and last year it was \$127 million below the 1953 figure. Here is this steady drop in farm income; here is this steady rise in farm costs. The only solution the Leader of the Opposition has is to stand up and say: "Well, to help the farmers the Government should reduce its hay-cutting fees." The only people who would benefit by that proposal are the jackasses who eat the hay and who would believe in such a proposal.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It costs \$50,000,000 according to your own figures.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact the basic problem facing not only Saskatchewan agriculture but Canadian agriculture is that we have lost a large part of the world market for agricultural products. Since the end of the war, we have lost it for bacon and for beef and for pork, and more recently we lost a large part of the wheat market.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Where have you been?

**Premier Douglas:** — In 1955 and again in 1956, the United States replaced Canada as the largest wheat exporter in the world. My hon. friends don't laugh about that. Now, why have we got this great surplus of wheat, the largest surplus of wheat ever in our history? There is no surplus of food in the world. It is true that, since the end of the war, food production has gone up, but not quite so fast as the population has gone up, so that today our production of food per capita in the world hasn't quite caught up to the pre-war level. The F.A.O. estimates that slightly more than half the population of the world today are getting a diet of less than 2,000 calories per person, which is the minimum diet necessary for subsistence.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Like yourself, they won't eat bread.

**Premier Douglas:** — We on this side of the House and the Party which we represent have been pointing out for years that the old type of international trading is gone. Since the end of the war, we have urged people to think also in terms of barter and in terms of selling for the currencies of other countries, or by entering into bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements. Well, these ideas have been received in the same way as other ideas we advanced were received, such as when we first talking about a Wheat Board and when we first talked about universal old-age pensions. These ideas were all 'pooh-poohed' twenty years ago. So it was with selling goods for foreign currencies and barter. But the United States, which also has great farm surpluses, has adopted that program. In the past three years the United States Government has sold over \$6 billion worth of farm surpluses, of which \$2,250 million was sold for foreign currency and over \$1,000 million was sold

by a direct barter arrangement involving taking the goods of other countries in exchange.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Why don't they sell more?

**Premier Douglas:** — There is no reason why we shouldn't be doing that in Canada. Back in 1949 the F.A.O. recommended the setting up of an International Commodity Clearing House by which countries with surplus goods such as Canada, would put them into a pool. Needy and under-privileged countries would be allowed to buy them out of the pool and pay either in their own currencies or pay on long-term credit. Why has Canada never acceded to the suggestion of setting up this World Food Bank? Think of what this World Food Bank would have meant in terms of disposing of our surplus farm products, in terms of increased prosperity for our people, but even more important, Mr. Speaker, in terms of providing a great Food Bank which could have done much to feed the under-privileged and underfed people of the world!

Surely we have reached a stage in the world's development when we recognize that peace today is not going to be maintained by arms alone, that the most potent weapons in the so-called 'cold war' are economic weapons, and that we are going to maintain peace in the world only by bringing prosperity and better conditions for millions of under-privileged in the world. The Government of Canada has had no difficulty in finding up to \$2,000,000,000 a year to produce armaments. But it has never been able to accept the principle of setting up a World Food Bank, which would be a positive and constructive measure for maintaining peace and good-will in the world. That is why the C.C.F., in their 'Winnipeg Declaration', said:

“Throughout the years the C.C.F. has maintained that there has been too much reliance on defence expenditures to meet the threat of Communist expansion. One of the urgent needs for building a peaceful world and for extending the influence and power of democracy is generous support of international agencies to provide assistance to under-developed countries on a vast scale.”

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that peace, which is so important to all of us, is contingent not on having more hydrogen bombs that someone else has, but on raising the standard of living of that half of the population of the world which today is living on less than a subsistence diet. As long as there are hungry people in the world there are no real surpluses. Surely it ought not to be beyond the imagination and ingenuity of manufacturing to take these great food surpluses we have in Canada and get them to the hungry people of the world, thereby establishing goodwill, winning their friendship and laying the base of a lasting peace.

I quoted just now from the 'Winnipeg Declaration', and probably I ought to say a word about it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Take it as read.

**Premier Douglas:** — The Member for Saltcoats would like to take it as read; but he is going to hear it read a great many more times. May I also tell him that long after he and I are gone, some of the principles enunciated in that Declaration will be put into effect in the Dominion of

Canada.

**Mr. Loptson:** — We have heard it so often . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — It will be worn out just like the ‘Regina Manifesto’.

**Premier Douglas:** — The ‘Winnipeg Declaration’ was not a renunciation of the ‘Regina Manifesto.’ The Regina Manifesto, passed in 1933 . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He always says it is the same.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . was a statement of C.C.F. principles to meet a condition of deflation and unemployment. Many of the things which we recommended then have since come into being. These include: a publicly-owned central bank for Canada, Unemployment Insurance, a compulsory Wheat Board to handle all the farmers’ wheat and coarse grains, and universal old-age pensions. We are not now in a period of deflation and unemployment. We are in a period of rapidly growing inflation and comparatively full employment. Therefore, in the light of these conditions, the C.C.F. issued its Declaration, and it in no way contradicts the basic principles of the C.C.F. On the contrary, it says that we believe in a planned economy which will coordinate the efforts of public, private and co-operative enterprises in stimulating our wealth production so as to increase human happiness and enhance human life.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Amen.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is no change in policy. In the first speech which I made in this Legislature at the special Session in the fall of 1944, I enunciated the program of this Government. If the hon. member will look up the record he will see that what I said then was that “we would seek to establish a working relationship between public ownership, co-operative ownership and private ownership, and by that partnership we would seek to raise the living standards of the people of Saskatchewan.” That is the policy which we have for Canada, just as we have for Saskatchewan.

I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that unless we have some national depression or an international war, I have great faith in the future of Saskatchewan and its people. In the last ten years we have uncovered new sources of wealth. We now have an opportunity to have one of the best-balanced economies in Canada, an economy in which about half of our production will come from agriculture and about half will come from other sources. We have vast resources to be developed but, most important, we have human resources. We have people who have vision, people who know how to work together, and people who understand the basic principles of co-operative living. I want to say to the young people who are here from the University that, when they are planning their lives, they need not ever sell Saskatchewan short. This province offers tremendous opportunities for any young manufacturing or any young woman to invest their lives in its future development.

I want, on behalf of this Government, to pledge ourselves to two things for this term of office:

First, we shall bend every effort toward increasing the wealth production of Saskatchewan through the development of our resources. We cannot have a bigger slice of a pie until we make a bigger pie. We must increase the wealth production of Saskatchewan if we are to raise the standard of living of the Saskatchewan people. The first and foremost task will be to continue with this development and to produce more wealth from more resources.

The second thing we pledge ourselves to do is to see that that increased wealth production then goes out to benefit more and more people, because a prosperity that is not shared by everybody is no prosperity at all. We propose to use that increased wealth production to expand health programs, welfare programs and educational programs, and to give greater assistance to the local governing bodies for roads and other local services.

To these two tasks we set ourselves, Mr. Speaker. I cannot do better than to conclude with the words of our 'Winnipeg Declaration', which is our statement not only for Canada but also for this province:

“The C.C.F. will not rest content until every person in this land and all other lands is able to enjoy equality and freedom, a sense of human dignity, and an opportunity to live a rich and meaningful life as a citizen of a free and peaceful world. This is the Co-operative Commonwealth which the C.C.F. invite the people of Canada to build with imagination and pride.”

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

**Mr. A.P. Weber (Leader of Social Credit Group) (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like at this time to take the opportunity to extend my congratulations to you on your appointment to your position as Speaker of this Assembly. I am certain you have been placed in your high office with the utmost confidence in your ability to carry out your duties in an efficient and impartial manner.

At this time also, I would like to extend my congratulations to the elected and re-elected members of this legislature.

I would also like to welcome the students from the University and the members of their Parliamentary Forum to this sitting, today. I enjoyed meeting a number of these students at our banquet, last night, and I also enjoyed escorting some of them through the Museum building afterwards. I hope they enjoy their visit with us, and that they find the proceedings today both interesting and instructive.

I also enjoyed the Premier's speech today, but I think some misconception might be taken from some of the remarks he made today. He classified us, or he put us in the same category as the Liberal Opposition on this side of the House. Now, we would like to dissociate ourselves from some of the remarks that he made in connection with some of the policies of the Liberal party. We were not elected on the Liberal platform. I would like it to be understood, Mr. Speaker, that we were elected on our own platform. And he mentioned that the old-age pension supplementary allowance was something that the Opposition were fighting against. Now I would like to clarify our position on that. We are definitely in favour of increased supplementary allowances to our old-age pensioners.

**February 20, 1957**

The Premier also mentioned that he had more or less converted the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the South Saskatchewan River development. Now I am pleased to note that, if he did that and the Government are in favour of it, that is one subject that at least we are all agreed on.

Last night, I was just wondering whether our Premier wasn't being converted. In his speech given to the students from the University of Saskatchewan last night at the banquet, he gave quite a strong talk on monetary reform which they found necessary in the United States during the time of President Roosevelt, and I had to look over several times to make sure that it wasn't Premier Manning instead of Premier Douglas who was speaking. Nevertheless, I enjoyed it very much; and at this time I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. During the course of my address, by a slip of the tongue I said 'Opposition' several times when I should have said 'Official Opposition.' I do apologize to my hon. friend.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 4:15 o'clock p.m.