

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
10th Day

Wednesday, February 27, 1957

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate On Address-In-Reply

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 26, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, wish, first of all, to join with the remarks made by other members of the Legislature is wishing to Mr. Tom Johnston, the former speaker of this House, many years of happiness and good health in his retirement; and, to yourself, Mr. Speaker, it certainly can be truthfully said. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I will have to ask the guests in the gallery to refrain from flashing bulbs during the sitting, please.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It can be truthfully said, Mr. Speaker, that the unanimous endorsement of yourself as the Speaker of this House is a tribute to your personal integrity, your high qualities of impartiality and tolerance, but more than anything else, I feel, Mr. Speaker, an attribute to that quality of your race that is the envy of all other nationalities, a particular kind and fine sense of humour.

I wish to also commend the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply for the very excellent presentations that they made, coming as they did, new members fresh from the rural areas of the province. In my opinion, they were down to earth, objective, and certainly have set a proper pattern for debate in this Legislative Assembly. I, of course, extend a welcome to all of the other new members to the House and some of the old ones who returned to the House.

For the balance of the time allocated to me on the radio, Mr. Speaker, I wish, first of all, to refer primarily to two matters contained in the Speech from the Throne: one is cash advances on farm-stored grain, and, at greater length, the reference made in the Speech from the Throne to the Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income and all implications in relation to that very brief paragraph contained in the Speech from the Throne.

February 27, 1957

In connection with cash advances, it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that the continued restrictions on grain deliveries plague the agricultural industry with a shortage of ready cash to meet current farm expenses, and it is regretted that the request of this Assembly for cash advanced on farm-stored grain has been ignored. It is principally around that particular statement, I believe, that some of the objections of the hon. members opposite are framed, because they opposed a similar resolution in this House a year ago.

I cannot understand why we should not get unanimous support in this Legislature for what appears to me to be a most urgent need insofar as our agricultural economy is concerned. With reference to cash advances, I feel, while it is not a solution to the more basic problem of disparity in meeting farm cash needs in a timely manner. The implementation of such a plan would make for more orderly movement of grain by removing existing pressures on transportation and storage facilities, and certainly would result in greater speed and efficiency in the marketing of grain in accord with market demands for specific grades of grain.

This system has proven its merit by actual operation for many years in the United States. The present method of limited bank loans at five per cent indeed, fails to meet these objectives. Farm organizations, Boards of Trade, rural municipalities and producers have all made representations favouring such a policy. On October 11, 1955, when the matter of cash advances was very urgent (and, of course, it is a growing urgency today), the farm organizations of Western Canada and representatives of the three Provincial Governments went as a delegation to Ottawa. They presented a brief to the Federal Cabinet in which they asked that a system of cash advances on farm-stored grain be inaugurated, and that the interest rate, if any, be kept as low as possible. So, Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous requests for what I consider to be filling a great gap in our orderly system of marketing.

I mentioned that, at the last sitting of the Legislature, the hon. members who then sat opposite, opposed a resolution regretting the fact that the national Government had not taken action in this regard, and at this late date, they still haven't taken action. I assume the hon. members opposite now wish to express a similar regret that the Throne Speech made note of this fact. This matter is of such importance that I feel that this Government would be derelict in its duties and responsibilities to the farmers and people of this province, if some reference were not made to this very serious oversight.

I do not know of a single thing that would more greatly enhance the prestige of the Wheat Board's system of marketing than supplementing that marketing system by a permanent scheme of cash advanced on farm-stored grain. As a matter of fact, I have written to the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe on many occasions – I believe annually for the last four years – pointing out to him the advantages of this to the Wheat Board as a marketing organization, the advantages to the farmer, and the advantages from the point of view of having taxes paid regularly. In view of the concern expressed by the hon. members opposite for the plight of the rural municipalities, you would think they would automatically support a resolution of this kind. It is interesting

to note that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald), in his infancy as Leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, referred to bank loans, or likened bank loans, to a "stirrup pump in a forest fire"; but later on, to my surprise he opposed a system of cash advanced on farm-stored grain and favoured bank loans instead.

It is certainly to be deplored that the farmers must wait, year after year, for some cash recompense on the products of their labour and to meet farming operation costs and to pay their taxes. This fact, coupled with the more serious cost-price relationship, are the prime reasons why many well-established farmers, both young and old, are not leaving the farms. They are leaving the farms in Manitoba, too, Mr. Speaker, and electric hook-up are being, I understand, discontinued there more rapidly than they are in this province. The economic problem not only affects Saskatchewan and Western Canada, but spreads right across the entire Dominion of Canada.

I have an excellent opportunity of appraising the agricultural situation throughout Canada in my attendance at our annual Conference of provincial Ministers of Agriculture when we meet together, and at the Annual Production Conference with the Federal Government, and with farm organizations, and representatives of provincial departments in other parts of the country. All have the same complaint. All recognize that there is an imperative need that something be done to enhance the share of the national income at a higher level to our agricultural industry.

It has been mentioned in this House that bank loans would provide somewhat of a solution. With reference to this, I wish to say that low-interest bank loans, while very desirable, certainly would provide no solution to the more basic problems affecting our agricultural industry. I am in agreement with long-term loans, and agree that they are very necessary; but I certainly cannot agree that either a Federal or a Provincial loan will provide the solution; and it will not encourage young people to take up agriculture under existing conditions. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, talking about loans under existing economic conditions in the industry is like throwing a lead sinker to a drowning man, expecting that it would buoy him up.

The people in rural areas demand, and are entitled to, improved living standards and better services. No amount of provincial subsidization of local governments can ever hope to make up for the loss of farm income experienced over the past years. Insofar as taxation revenue is concerned, both provincial and local governments are dependent primarily on farm income as the major source of such revenue, regardless whether it is a direct levy on the land or otherwise, in this predominantly agricultural province of ours. It all boils down to the simple fact that farmers have the right to expect that their income should automatically increase as farm costs and operation and rural services increase. If this were done, the major problem of local government would be solved. I have heard some of the hon. members opposite speak in high glee and give the national Government great credit for the tremendous industrial prosperity that prevails throughout Canada. I can say to them, Mr. Speaker, if they give the national Government credit for all of the other prosperity that exists in other segments of the economy, then they must recognize the fact that that same national Government must take the responsibility for the depressed condition in agriculture.

What about this question of jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker? I noted an editorial in the 'Leader-Post' recently in which they scoffed at some of the statements made by the Premier in this Legislature in reference to this. They left the impression in this editorial with the general public that the national Government had no responsibility for marketing; that because marketing involves property and civil rights, all of this came within the jurisdiction of provincial governments. I wonder if the 'Leader-Post' has ever realized, or are they hiding the fact, that trade and commerce and dealing in agricultural products in the inter-provincial and export trade is decisively a Federal Government jurisdictional matter! It is for that reason that not a single marketing board on a provincial basis has operated successfully today. We must recognize, too, that the Department of Justice is involved. The 'Leader-Post' mentions "constitutional barriers." They mention subsection 13, of section 92 of the British North America Act, which allocates certain jurisdictions, and that this is the way they are allocated, Mr. Speaker. For years now I have been hearing the Liberal party, including the Rt. Hon. Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, and the daily press here, do a disservice to the agricultural industry in Canada by hiding behind the B.N.A. Act.

It is for that reason that this Legislature unanimously has asked for a national marketing conference at which these jurisdictional problems and other allied problems could be discussed and finally a solution found to them; and this Government has promised its complete co-operation in that direction.

Having spoken about jurisdiction, I wish to move on to the Report of the Select Special Committee itself. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature and this Government would be remiss in its responsibilities if it did not take note of the tedious work done at the last legislative Session regarding this important problem of marketing and farm income. As a matter of fact, it is surprising to note that every single member of the Opposition endorsed the terms of reference setting up that Select Special Committee, and they agreed with this, Mr. Speaker, - and I read an excerpt from the terms of reference to this Select Special Committee:

"(1) Resolved, That this Assembly supports the request of the Provincial Government for the convening of a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference on marketing and farm income."

"(2) Recognizing it is expedient that the views and advice of this Assembly and of farm and other interested competent organizations and persons be available to the Provincial Government for presentation to such Conference, on the following matters:

- (a) declining farm prices, coupled with increasing farm costs and accumulating surpluses of agricultural products which

have resulted in a drastic decline in farm income and which pose a serious threat to Saskatchewan's economy, adversely affecting farm living standards, business activity, rural community life and the provision of municipal and provincial services; . . . ”

They endorsed those terms of reference. They agreed that a conference should be called, and they agreed, too, with the recommendations given to this Government by that Select Special Committee at the last Legislature, unopposed by the hon. members opposite. And now they suggest that these are matters that can be dealt with by a provincial government, within its jurisdiction. Just how contradictory can people get? If there were a little more consistency in these important matters perhaps some of the problems that our hon. members are worried about, and that we are all worried about, could find a solution by a meeting between these two governmental jurisdictions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal a bit more with the specific information that is contained in the report of the Select Special Committee. Let us start at the beginning. I note here a chart contained in the Special Report, which indicates the farm cash income in Saskatchewan, with 1945 as a base period, equalling 100 points compared to other periods since then; and I note that, since 1945 to 1955, farm costs went up by over 55 points, and that in the same period of time, farm prices had only risen by 10 points, meaning a net loss of 45 points since 1945 in cost-price relationships. Is it any wonder we are talking about the 'cost-price squeeze'? I would like to bring to the attention of the House, too, that the national average personal per capita income, outside of the agricultural industry, in 1955, was \$1,200. In the agricultural industry, and to the people in this industry, it was \$200 annually, which again indicates the tremendous disparity at a time when the rest of the national economy is booming. The farm cash income in the period 1945 to 1955 went up and then down. In 1953, farm cash income in Saskatchewan went up to \$744 million. That was our banner year; but in 1955 it dropped to \$447 million, a drop in cash income between those two years, 1955 and 1943, of \$297 million. Are the hon. members opposite going to suggest that we can cut power rates, that we can provide grants to municipalities for services, to make up for that kind of loss? To take a more favourable year – 1956: that year, the cash income was \$595 million, considerably less than 1955, which was a bad year; but still I note a loss in cash income between 1956 and 1953 of \$149 million. My goodness, Mr. Speaker! A provincial government would have to have a river of gold if it was going to subsidize those kinds of Federal policies. It just simply cannot be done.

I would like to make some reference to livestock prices. Livestock prices hit a high, in 1951, of an average for all classes of livestock, in the last six months period of each of the following years: in 1951, the average price per cwt. was \$27.11; in 1952, when we had the foot-and-mouth disease, it dropped to \$17.44, and it has been dropping ever since, and nothing has been done about it. Then in 1956, the average price

February 27, 1957

for all classes of livestock dropped down to \$12.63 per cwt. – more than half; and I want to say that the inventory value of livestock on Saskatchewan farms has dropped down to the same extent. Is it any wonder that farm people in this province cannot borrow money on their assets because of such terrific fluctuations in market prices and inventory value of livestock on our farms?

The hon. members opposite again say we should cut down costs. Well, I want to say to them that while, for example, the Power Corporation has reduced rates on five or six consecutive occasions, the prices of everything the farmer buys has been going up. We have had many more freight rates; and at the same time farm prices have declined. Similarly, since the Public Revenue Tax on land has been removed, the price of machinery has mounted. While I am on the subject of machinery I want to make reference again to a most interesting statement contained in the same editorial of the 'Leader-Post'. The title of it is: "Cannot Be Laughed Off." they are making believe here that the Premier makes light of these problems and that he tries to laugh off many of the objections raised by hon. members opposite. But I would ask everyone listening to me today to try and laugh this one off! Here the 'Leader-Post' says that:

“. . . higher machinery costs which the Province attributes to Ottawa's failure to control inflation represent only a small part of the sum total of farm production costs.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1953, it might be interesting for the 'Leader-Post' to know, the farmers of this province spent nearly \$1,000,000 on farm machinery.

Mr. Kramer: — \$100 million.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, \$100 million on farm machinery, of which some \$10 million were for repair parts alone, which is just a little less than half the total municipal tax bill for the municipalities of this province. Everyone knows that the investment in farm machinery has advanced three times and over, as far as our farm people are concerned, and that is the prime economic problem facing the farmers and which also presents a problem to municipalities and local governments insofar as local services are concerned. And yet the 'Leader-Post' has the audacity to say that it is only a small part of farm operations costs! This is just too silly to even reflect on, Mr. Speaker. If the House wants figures: in 1951, the total investment in farm machinery was \$526 million, against \$186 million in the in the periods 1927 to 1931 – nearly three times as much in 1951; and I would say that farmers have more than that invested in farm machinery today.

I wish to move on now to the question raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) when he asked, "Where did this Report go to?" Well, Mr. Speaker, I should inform the Leader of the Opposition that copies of this Report, as he should know, went to every member of the Legislature here, to all members of the Federal House from western Canada, to all provincial Ministers of Agriculture, and copies were also sent to the

Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe, and the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner. I wrote to Mr. Gardiner on two separate occasions in an endeavour to have him have his Government call a Dominion-Provincial Marketing Conference. If the hon. members would like to have this correspondence tabled in this House, I would be very glad to table it, Mr. Speaker.

Now I would like to talk about another thing that is pretty close to me, and certainly will have a great bearing on the economic future of this province. Before doing so, however, I should report to the House that the only reason that the Report of the Select Special Committee has not been properly utilized to date, is because the Federal Government has refused to call a conference. The hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted to know if it probably didn't go to 'Lower Slobovia'. All I can say to him is that we might just as well have sent it to Lower Slobovia, as to have sent it to the Government at Ottawa.

Mr. Kramer: — No difference.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk very briefly about the Dam. Again I take note, and note with pride, our recent convert to the dam. It is only a little over a year and a half ago that the Leader of the Opposition stated that we should not proceed with this dam; that the Premier, if he had \$73 million to spend, should spend it for building a pulp mill; and a little later in the same address, he said: "Well, the reason that we ain't got a pulp mill is because we haven't got a dam!" So he still was concerned at that time with which comes first, the chicken or the egg. But he was then much opposed, and now he favours the dam; but there is some doubt in his mind, being a new convert and lacking information as to what the percentage share of the Province would be! He said the Premier mentioned on one occasion that the Province would carry 60 per cent. Well, he ought to know that this is for the whole project. He then quoted another statement in which the Provincial Treasurer said that we expected to pay 25 per cent of the cost of the dam itself.

I don't blame him for being confused on this matter, because we were confused, too. We never anticipated that we would have to pay 25 per cent of the cost of the dam itself, because I have it on the good authority of the Hon. Federal Minister of Agriculture, who was speaking in the House of Commons at Ottawa without contradiction by any of his colleagues, and it must be accepted that he was speaking on behalf of the Government of Canada when he said, in the House of Commons in 1949, at the second session, Hansard page 811, (make a note of it, gentlemen opposite) — when he said:

“. . . Whenever it was determined that the project was to be proceeded with, we would build the dam. . . ” ('We', he said). "As applied to the south Saskatchewan, this means that once the Government undertakes to proceed with that project, the dam in the South Saskatchewan River, whatever it costs, will be built and paid for by the Dominion Government."

There are similar quotes, Mr. Speaker, but I don't want to take my radio time to mention them all. Here is another interesting one in which he said, on page 822:

“This Government has been assuming that the water which is put there for the purpose of irrigation and the purpose of power will be utilized by the Province or some agency set up under provincial law. . . . It is the expectation of this Government that the Power Commission will utilize the power . . . ” (We agreed to.) “It is not the intention of the Government to charge rates for water, either for power purposes or for irrigation purposes, which will return part of the capital cost.”

That is Mr. Gardiner's statement made in the House of Commons in the presence of his colleagues, and he has never denied making that statement. So, it was surprising to us, too, when we were called upon to contribute 25 per cent of the cost of the dam itself – and I want to say this to my hon. friends opposite, who do so much talking about high power rates in Saskatchewan: who is contributing to future high power rates? They know, as well as I know . . .

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — The Federal Government!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, that these are some of the things that contribute to high rates, and I will tell my hon. friend why. This 25 per cent is based on the difference of generating power at Pine Falls, Manitoba (which was undertaken many years ago) as against generation by steam at Estevan. The implication is that the people of this province will always have to depend on generation based on steam rates, and this Government is under commitment now to build a \$40 million plant at Estevan, another similar amount for a plant at Saskatoon. We are also prepared to go ahead with the South Saskatchewan Project. The Throne Speech doesn't say, as indicated by the Leader of the Opposition, that we are sitting on our haunches; it says that we are asking the Federal Government to get off of its haunches and to proceed with the construction of this dam as we agreed, despite the fact that we are paying that amount to the dam.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says we haven't done much to convince the people of this province as to the merit of the dam. I have not heard any objections from anyone (no organizations, no one either humble people or prominent people) to the dam, other than the Leader of the Opposition. He is the first public man in this province that I have heard stand up and say that we should not proceed with the dam. It is little wonder that he doesn't understand some of these things, Mr. Speaker.

I notice that my time is going very rapidly, and I certainly don't want to intrude on the time of those who come after me, but much is being said about what the Province should do. What has the Provincial Government done for agriculture? Well, let's take a quick glance.

First of all, this Provincial Government has removed millions of dollars of relief and seed debts from the shoulders of the farmers and the municipalities. That is one of the first things; the next, removal of the Public Revenue Tax, a tax put on by the former administration. Three: aid and encouragement to the Co-operative movement. In 1944, the Department was just a division of the Department of Agriculture, with \$34,000 allocated for it. Today it is a full-fledged Department with some \$350,000 allocated to it.

Mr. Cameron: — Read them a little slower, will you?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Four: a Provincial Government subsidized hospital plan, which has taken millions of dollars of provincial revenue in support of direct benefits to rural areas, and which has reduced the burden of hospital costs for municipalities, particularly with reference to the aged and the incapacitated.

Five: the Government has in a few short years made power available to 43,000 farms in Saskatchewan, an achievement which was never thought possible — and now the hon. members say or insist that we could have done it free of cost to the farmers. It is surprising that we were able to do it at all, to say nothing of the 60 per cent contribution that we have given to farm connections and at the same time reduced the rates on five different occasions. A pretty good record of performance, I would say, Mr. Speaker. Indeed it is a cheap ‘hired man’; it is the only hired man whose wages have been going down in the past year; all the rest have been going up. And there is now, Mr. Speaker, the most generous assistance ever offered to the municipalities in the construction of roads. Even if it were 100 per cent, I am sure the hon. members opposite wouldn’t say it was an advantage to the municipalities. All they would say is that it is just another tax burden that the Province is putting on.

What about agricultural benefits? Since 1949, when we organized the new Conservation and Development Branch, we have spent \$14,380,000 on behalf of water conservation and utilization, land reclamation, forage and pasture development and land clearance programs. A pretty good record of performance, I would say, on behalf of our basic industry.

While the Federal Liberal members for Saskatchewan spend a good deal of their time talking about Saskatchewan’s provincial problems and condemning this Government instead of tending to farm problems at the Federal level, the Liberal members of this House spend their time condemning every progressive move made by this Administration, and also spend a great part of their time suggesting that Federal matters are, after all, really provincial responsibilities. Then, of course, in their minds there seems to be no limit to what a provincial government is expected to assume in terms of Federal, Provincial and Municipal jurisdictions. They spend more time talking about Federal matters in this House in justification of this ridiculous position than any other group that ever sat in this Legislature. My Liberal friends over the years have tried to wreck every worthwhile program inaugurated by this Administration, even at the risk of . . .

February 27, 1957

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was just wondering if the hon. gentleman maybe could say it without reading it.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. gentleman has been reading, I know, but . . .

Mr. McDonald: — He is all right. Somebody wrote it for him. Let him read it.

Mr. Gardiner: — He should be able to say it without reading it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If I would depart from my notes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure them it would be much, much worse for them!

Mr. Danielson: — Pretty good reader, ‘Toby’.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . program inaugurated by this Administration, even at the risk of ruining the provincial economy. They spend the balance of their time trying to pull the Federal Liberal Government’s chestnuts out of the fire, with the result they get their fingers burnt every time; but they never seem to learn. They still hope that there are some people in Saskatchewan who can be fooled by this type of political strategy. Our people know the facts, Mr. Speaker, and the facts contained in the Speech from the Throne speak eloquently of great achievements despite economic and geographical difficulties, and the promise of continued great progress in the future. I will support the motion.

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, we can always depend on a stimulating address from the member who has just taken his seat, and I think even the Opposition, even though he riles them quite often, enjoy listening to the Minister of Agriculture.

I wish to dispense with the pleasantries, Mr. Speaker; however I do want to offer my congratulations to you on the position you hold. As ‘freshies’, I remember quite well we were desk-mates here in the 1944 Session.

Municipalities are having financial problems all over Canada; they are not just confined to Saskatchewan. Comparisons show that our municipalities are no worse off. Indeed, in some cases better off than other provinces where the provincial budget is two and a half and sometimes three times more than the budget in Saskatchewan. Comparisons, of course, do not help our municipalities, and I am sure sometimes our councils lie awake thinking of some new sources of revenue, some new kind of taxes. New taxes are never popular at any time, and certainly not at this time with our inflationary period. Costs are going up. The housewife will tell you on every visit to the grocery store, one, two and three cents are added to almost

every article in the grocery store today. The enormous increase in sugar prices a few weeks ago hit the headlines of our newspapers. Now, there was no justification for that increase, but it appeared to be the most popular thing to do. Everybody is climbing on the bandwagon, and of course they, too, had to get in on that bandwagon.

I think we, as individuals, would do well to study where our tax dollar goes. We are told that almost 75 cents out of every tax dollar finds its way to the Dominion Government in Ottawa, approximately 14 cents to the Provincial Government, and just a little less than 12 cents goes to our municipal governments. I have said to taxpayers who have complained, "Just consider your own individual case"; and I have considered mine. I know I have to pay approximately \$450 in income tax per year. I think, and I am pretty sure, that I pay an equal amount in the hidden 10 per cent sales tax to the Dominion Government. Possible it is more; but I am quite sure it is an equal amount. So \$900 goes to the Dominion Government – seven times more than I pay to my local government, the government that supplies me with all the services that I require from day to day – sewer and water, light, sidewalks, hard-top roads, transportation, police and fire protection, schools, hospitals, medical care for my children and so many other services which I require from day to day.

I think this situation is unfair. I would say, first of all, that I do believe that the average man on the street, the average taxpayer, is paying plenty of taxes today. The trouble lies in the fact that it isn't allocated fairly, and I think much of the trouble stems back to the early 1940s when the councils of that day held that tax line. I don't think there is any criticism coming to those councils. I am sure if I had been on the council at that time (and possibly a number in this Chamber were on the councils at that time), I would have done exactly the same – that is, hold that tax line. Unfortunately, at that time there was some unfound revenue – thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars of back taxes which were coming in, and it was possible to hold that tax line while other levels of government were progressively increasing their taxes. Of course the day came when the councils faced the dilemma of either raising taxes or discontinuing some of the services which the people needed. I think on the whole, generally, councils of the different municipalities are doing a wonderful job today; they are doing a wonderful job of face-lifting all across the province.

I will take my own city. The population has increased I think more than any other city in this province, some of it due to the taking over the town of Sutherland. But in the last few years they have come to realize that community planning means a great deal; it means a great deal not only in planning a proper city and having a beautiful city but also in savings to the community. In the last few years I have seen miles and miles of sewer and water lines, and sidewalks, curbing, planted boulevards, trees, miles of power-line extension, hard-top roads and some gravelled roads. Last year in the city of Saskatoon we opened up a much needed new city hall. I think those who have been inside that city hall will agree that it is one of the most beautiful and functional city halls in western Canada today.

February 27, 1957

The urban centres, of course, have been plagued with the same high cost of education as is prevalent all through the province. The only exception possibly, that the urban centres have had, is the backlog of repairs to their school plants; but the cost of education has been felt in the urban centres, too. Naturally with the trend of population to the urban centres, and the abnormal birth-rate since the last war, our elementary schools have been taxed to capacity. We have had to build many, many more classrooms. I believe that the people of the urban centres generally – of course, there have been some candidates in the provincial election who believe that we should shut down our composite schools, and move all our technical institutions into the urban cities; but I think, on the whole, our people generally agree with the equalization plan of school grants by this Government, realizing that every child, regardless of where it may live, will have a fair opportunity for an education. The situation arises, Mr. Speaker, where we have to build now for our high school population. The bulge is now beginning to move from the elementary to the high schools, and with our ‘tight’ money policy brought about by the Dominion Government, this has brought about another problem to the urban centres.

The capital cost of carrying charges is becoming quite a concern to the urban centres. It means quite a bit on our municipal levy. I am asking that some consideration for these problems, which we have in the large urban centres, be given when the extra educational grants are handed out at this Session.

I could speak for some time about the industrial development in Saskatoon; about the wallboard factory; the fact that we are one of the two largest centres of electrical generating power. Our plant down town is now extended to its limits, and a good start has been made on the new \$40 million plant south of Saskatoon, owing to the mild and open winter which we have had here this winter. I could speak at some length on the potash plant some 11 miles east of Saskatoon. We know all about oil and gas. We read almost every day of the new wells coming in, and the barrels and barrels of oil; the steady increase in the barrels of oil. But those who claim to know tell us that the development of our potash will mean more to the economic development of this province than will oil and gas. When that plant is completed, it is quite possible that Saskatoon will be called upon to provide services, or some services at least, for that plant.

This is the third winter that Saskatoon has enjoyed the natural gas. Despite its convenience, no care needed and its clean fuel, hundreds of our citizens have made a considerable saving each year on the introduction of natural gas. I watched the antics for several years in Saskatoon of those who tried to put, or were successful in putting, obstacles in the way of Saskatoon having natural gas, and I am positive, Mr. Speaker, that had it not been for this Government =, there are hundreds and hundreds of families today who would still be shovelling coal and carrying out ashes, and that applies also to the town of Humboldt.

I could talk at some length of the University Hospital, which just completed one complete year of operation. I think tribute should go

to the administrative staff for its smooth operation in taking over a large institution of that kind, but I want opposite say – and I notice other members of the House have been allowed to plead for mental hospitals, a provincial technical school, and I should be allowed to put my two-pennies' worth in at that time. I realize that there are centres in this province which ought to have a mental hospital. We believe there is a case for a mental hospital adjacent to the University Hospital and the Medical College. We have a very efficient psychiatric staff in Saskatoon, and I don't think we can be denied a mental hospital there in the very near future.

I was very pleased to hear the announcement that the province was going to build a provincial technical school. It seems to me that the Government at Ottawa yet have not realized that our most valuable resource is the human resource. Unless we have professional and skilled workers, we are not going to develop too much of our natural resources. We haven't learned a lesson from the last Great War, where we were terribly short of skilled workers. It is true the Dominion Government are trying in a small way to entice professional and skilled workers through their immigration policy; but it does appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that possibly we could do more in training our own people. We have a very versatile people here in Canada. That was proven during the last war when thousands of men and women who had never seen a machine before, became efficient in operating and did a very good job in our defence program.

I realize there is a shared program with the Dominion Government for vocational training. Provinces are reluctant, of course, to share in some of the programs because at any given time the Dominion Government, without consultation or warning to the Provinces, will withdraw from the shared programs as they did in our physical fitness program, and by all accounts are going to in our vocational educational program and leave the Province to hold the bag.

I do claim that we would like to see this new technical school in Saskatoon. We have submitted a brief. We have been told we cannot expect it because we have too many fine educational facilities in Saskatoon, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, rather than a deterrent I think that is an argument in favour of the school being located there. Many families have moved to Saskatoon because of the facilities there for the members of the family: good elementary schools, high schools, teachers' college and the university. We believe that it isn't fair to break up the family unit and ask some of the members to go elsewhere to get their technical training at some other centre. We believe the accessibility, too, to the university, with its fine facilities, is another good reason. We are not going to get into a 'hassle' with any other centre; we have submitted our brief. We hope it will be considered on its merits and I hope political expediency will not be the determining factor in the location of this school.

I was going to take up the matter which the Leader of the Opposition in his address referred to – the average wage of the worker in Saskatchewan. It is nice to know we have a champion on that side, although

February 27, 1957

I rather think it is just lip-service. We haven't had anything more from the Liberal party – I mean the workers haven't – than lip-service. Of course, it is easy to understand why our average wage is possibly not as high. We have a preponderance of low-paid workers, workers getting the bare minimum rate, and I notice that the Minimum Wage Board has recently held inquiries as to whether this Minimum Wage should be improved or not, and I hope, if they do so recommend, that the Government will be generous with these workers. They have had a pretty tough time ever since the price control has been lifted, and are getting a tighter squeeze today in our inflationary period.

I know there are some farmers who are worrying about where their next dollar is coming from, and perhaps are looking with envious eyes on individuals who can get even \$26 or \$24.50 coming in steady per week. Of course, \$26 or \$24.50 isn't the whole story. The worker is one class of citizen that gets nicked for every last cent on income tax; he just cannot get away from it, and we have to start paying from the beginning of the tax year with no interest rates. But these people even at the \$26 or \$24.50 do have deductions. They do have slight deductions for income tax, and unemployment insurance, and in some cases they are taxed a poll tax, or a sweeter name calls it 'service tax'. The service tax, of course, is unjust because it isn't a tax on the ability of the individual to pay, and although possibly some will say \$5 is little enough to pay for the services they get, yet \$5 to these persons, those who come in from the rural areas to work in our restaurants for the meagre wage of \$26 in our city, it means quite a bit to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am, like the former speaker, encroaching a little on the next person's time. I think the Opposition were concerned that we were losing seats and losing out all across Canada. The Liberal party, of course, their only concern has been to get power and retain power at any cost. We have a philosophy, and as the Premier said, the day will come when the great majority of our people in Canada will come to accept that philosophy. Canada today is enjoying a great economic expansion, but, unfortunately, great fortunes have been made by a privileged few. On the other hand, the income of wage earners has increased much less than our total wealth, while farm income has actually declined. Whole sections of our country have not benefited at all from our industrial expansion. We have no adequate provision for sickness, old age or those with other disabilities who are unable to provide for themselves, and this is what happens when private gain takes precedence over human welfare.

The C.C.F. presents an alternative to the people of Canada. It offers a program designed to ensure that every person, regardless of sex, colour or creed will have full opportunity to share in the nation's progress and to develop his talents in a society free from the exploitation of man by man, or class by class. I will support the motion.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to you, sir, and to those who have spoken before me, on both sides of the House.

As you know, I represent The Battlefords up in the better part of Saskatchewan, northwest Saskatchewan, which is also one of the fastest growing centres in the Province. As it has been my want, Mr. Speaker, to announce an increase in my family at most of the Sessions that I have attended so far, I want to assure you that this year there will be no such announcement; but if you have any worries about North Battleford being one of the fastest, or remaining in the lead as one of the fastest, growing cities, I think that several of my neighbours are making the announcement this year that they are going to continue where I left off.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great city, a great district in North Battleford, Battleford, and the general area around there. Rich in scenery, rich in its people and rich in promise. I would like to say that two of the major contributions, again of the people of The Battlefords this year, were that our North Battleford City Kinsmen's Band again captured first place in Canada at the Western Canadian competitions at Calgary. It was the best in the west — with apologies to Swift Current. Our North Battleford Beaver Baseball Club also topped Saskatchewan, and brought honour to our city.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Speech from the Throne. I would like to say this. On perusing it from end to end I would say that the Speech from the Throne, both in what it says about past accomplishments and what it promises for the future, is as bright and promising as the dawn of a new day. The efforts of those people opposite, Mr. Speaker, are going to be of little use to the people of Saskatchewan in an effort to destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few more things about our city and my constituency. I am happy to announce that, this year, another two highways were completed, entering the city of North Battleford. We have seven provincial highways, and I would like to suggest that we only have one which has not been rebuilt during the last 12 years, and that is the section of No. 40 Highway leading into the city from province of Saskatchewan, and I have high hopes that that section which requires rebuilding in The Battlefords constituency will be rebuilt this year. Also that we will continue with the hard-top highway out on that good broad thoroughfare that goes from North Battleford to Saskatoon, and westward to the Alberta border.

I would like to say that it was with some disappointment that I made a trip to Alberta not too long ago, and I took No. 5 Highway up to Edmonton, and then the main highway down to Innisfail. I want to suggest that there was considerable difference when I proceeded along those highways. We have a \$20-million budget here in the province of Saskatchewan to cover an 8,300-mile highway system. I understand that, last year, Alberta had a \$50-million highway budget, and they have less than half the amount of

highway to build and to maintain. Observing those highways, not only on that particular trip but on other trips, I wonder just where they spend the \$50 million. I would like to hear from our Social Credit friends opposite as to just what happens in a province like Alberta with so much to spend, and the fact that their highways are in such a condition. The tops, Mr. Speaker, are reasonably good, I will say that; but they are pretty narrow in many places. The ditches are a hazard from the Alberta border all the way to Innisfail. There has been no effort made, that I can see, to keep the ditches clear and free, and every mile to Innisfail from Edmonton to me is a death-trap if you happen to have the misfortune to go off that road. It is a maze of telephone and telegraph lines, boulders and other obstructions, so that you haven't got a chance.

Mr. Weber (Meadow Lake): — That's nonsense.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Meadow Lake says that is nonsense; I am prepared to take him in my automobile all the way over that route, and then have him tell me at the end of that time that this is nonsense — and I'll pay the expenses covering that route. There hasn't been a mile of ditch that I have seen that has been mowed, cleared or kept in decent condition, and I am here to say that that is a fact; and if they want to take up time later on to say something about that, they have that privilege. I'd like to hear from them.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — You never drove out on No. 39 Highway, did you?

Mr. Weber: — How did you get to Alberta?

Mr. Danielson: — You've never been down to Weyburn in wet weather.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a little more about the Speech from the Throne. I would like to say, first of all, that I think the members opposite ought to get themselves some new glasses, or wipe off the ones they have. They said there was nothing in there of interest to farmers. Well, I have perused this Speech from the Throne, and I find about half a page in the four pages that it takes — a little better than four pages — that are not of direct, or are possibility of slightly indirect, interest to farmers. I will go into that a bit more later on.

Mr. Danielson: — You don't read the newspapers, do you?

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, the efforts of those opposite to attack the Speech from the Throne have been much the same as their efforts in past years. I had some hope.

Mr. Danielson: — That's too bad.

Mr. Kramer: — . . . when I saw some young men, new faces, that there would be something different than we had in the past; something different than this slavish protection of the Federal Government at Ottawa and nothing else. But that is their function, Mr. Speaker. Those are their

sailing orders, and those are the instructions they must abide by. If they don't, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who runs the Gardiner 'machine' in the province of Saskatchewan, will make short work of them, as he has done with some members in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) yesterday, speaking in this debate, suggested that the reason that our hon. member from Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) was elected was because there was a well-oiled machine. I want to suggest to him that it is not machines that elect the C.C.F. party, it is organization; and the difference between an organization and a machine is the difference between the Liberals and the C.C.F. An organization is a body of people with an objective in mind; a machine is something that slavishly operates by push-button control with somebody behind the scenes.

Talking about machines, I would like to refer you to a couple of documents I have here. These are sheets that were provided to Mr. Argue, M.P. in the House of Commons at Ottawa, giving the names and the amount earned by the people who work for the P.F.A.A. in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, take the year 1954, when the people of Saskatchewan were beaten down by rust and suffered a major catastrophe. What happened? They hired slightly less than 600 people to go about the province from one end to another, to enquire as to whether or not there was a crop failure when you could see a jackrabbit standing up in a wheat field at 300 yards. These people had to go back to some farms four and sometimes five times to ascertain whether or not there was a crop failure, incurring mileage, sustenance and per diem while doing so. And the average payment for about two, three or four weeks' work amongst the whole lot of them was something just under \$1,000. But what did the farmers get, Mr. Speaker? — a maximum of \$500 per farm. This hasn't been increased since 1939, when the farmer's receipts for his wheat were only one-third of what they are today and his cost of production was only one-third of what it is today. Oh, yes! They can take care of their party 'heelers' and their politicians, and their organizers, but they haven't anything for the farmer. And why haven't we heard something, Mr. Speaker, from these people opposite. We have to give the Liberal members at Ottawa credit; they have said something about raising the P.F.A.A. payments, and I understand now they are going to, by \$1.50 on half the acreage.

Mr. Danielson: — How much are you raising the income of the farmers, this year?

Mr. Kramer: Mr. Speaker, I have gone over this list, and it is interesting to note that the addresses that appear in The Battlefords constituency number about 30. Well, if I went over the names and addresses on the list of the Battleford provincial executive of the Liberal party, I would find at least 20 of them on that roster. And that maintains all over the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. If they called a Liberal convention in Saskatchewan tomorrow, 400 of the 600 that appear on these sheets here would be at that convention. And they talk about a political machine!

February 27, 1957

I have another document here; the same answer for the same man in the same House, regarding P.F.R.A., and I want to say this, that in the P.F.R.A. many of its people are doing very good work.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — No!

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker; but there, too, interspersed among those names appear people who do nothing else than do the political odd chores for 'Jimmy' Gardiner and Company. And don't let anyone forget that. There is one man living north of North Battleford (and I'll name him if they ask me to) who drew \$5,000 from P.F.R.A., and besides that he ran his farm and he is also a councillor in his rural municipality. There is another one today, who is running around for the Liberal party organizing Duff Noble clubs.

Mr. Danielson: — He must be a pretty good man, then.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I think the farmers of Saskatchewan use as their yardstick a record of production, a record of performance, and in that record of performance they have learned to measure. They have measured the results of the Liberal party, and they have measured the results that have been given them by the C.C.F. party, and I suggest that the fact that this side of the House has 36 members is the result of their good judgment, in spite of the fancy figures that have been thrown at us from the other side of the House.

I want to take this opportunity of thanking the people of The Battlefords, not only the C.C.F.ers, but also the Liberals and Conservatives that voted for me. The fact that our hon. friend from Redberry was on the air several times may have resulted in an increase in my majority. I want to thank him, too, for his efforts on my behalf.

Mr. Korchinski: — Thank you.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate he didn't get on any oftener, or possibly the Liberals, as well as the Social Credit, would have lost their deposit, which they nearly did. Mr. Speaker, I said that the farmers believe in assessing and using a yardstick. I want to say a little more about this matter of P.F.A.A. It is a compulsory insurance. Some of the hon. members opposite have a lot to say about our Government Insurance. We have the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) every day questioning what the Government Insurance Office is doing here, there and all over.

Mr. Danielson: — Good for him!

Mr. Kramer: — The hospitalization scheme is also compulsory insurance.

Mr. Danielson: — Is that the same thing?

Mr. Kramer: — I wonder what they would say if the Minister of Public Health

had gone about and hired individuals all over the province of Saskatchewan to go from house to house and collect the insurance, as they do in the inspection of P.F.A.A. Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, we use the existing facilities. The municipal secretaries and the town clerks have collected that insurance, and the result is that there isn't a health plan anywhere in the world that is run at such a low cost, and that has such a clean record. It is a matter of using the yardstick, Mr. Speaker, in making comparisons, and that is what the people of Saskatchewan have done, and I suggest they continue to do. They can talk as they wish about their well-oiled machines. I would like to say that the organization that helped to elect me was the results of between 400 and 500 people contributing and working to elect me. That is the way we operate. We do not operate with the funds from those people who have an axe to grind and motives for their own good in mind.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that during the Bracken inquiry into the liquor industry in Manitoba, last year, press reports indicated that the breweries of Manitoba had donated campaign funds to the Liberal party, Conservative party, the Social Credit party; the C.C.F. – no funds, and we are very pleased that this is true.

Mr. Danielson: — They took the whole thing.

Mr. Cameron: — There are no C.C.F. there.

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. The farmers of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan believe that you should have a yardstick with which to measure the results of political parties, and everything else. Where would we be in our livestock industry, and in our wheat business and everything else, if we didn't keep track of what the particular different breeds of animals were doing, the different types and different strains of wheat, oats and barley? Where would we be? I suggest that if we didn't watch those things, we would still be freezing out in the old red barn. And I suggest that politically we would still be back where these people opposite would like us to be.

I would like to say a few words more about the Speech from the Throne. The first paragraph interested the Leader of the Opposition a great deal. I will re-read the paragraph:

“Last year, the third largest crop in the history of the province was harvested. Due largely to low wheat quotas farmers reduced their wheat acreage from the previous year. Continued restrictions on grain deliveries plague the agricultural industry with a shortage of ready cash to meet the current farm expenses. It is regretted that the request of this Assembly for cash advances on farm-stored grain has been ignored. However, on a long-term basis, the most serious threat to agricultural solvency is rising farm costs and falling farm prices.”

February 27, 1957

The Leader of the Opposition said that is all that is said. “Period”; that’s what he said. Well, I wonder now, Mr. Speaker. The next paragraph deals with the Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income. Of course, that wouldn’t interest farmers! No, they wouldn’t be interested in that. Then it says in the next paragraph:

“It is gratifying to note an increase in acreage devoted to forage crops and a corresponding increase in livestock production . . . ”

That wouldn’t interest farmers. Oh, no! That must be something for bankers, and so on!

The next one says something about the South Saskatchewan River dam. Is that of interest to farmers, Mr. Speaker? I would like them to tell me it isn’t. The next one refers to a Conference, last December, with local governing bodies to discuss the problem faced by local governments:

“It is gratifying to note that the delegates to this Conference endorsed in principle the establishment of a continuing committee representing all the participating bodies to study the reorganization and reallocation of finance and responsibilities. It is hoped that all organizations representing local governments will agree to the setting up of the continuing committee.”

That is of no interest to farmers, either!

Now we go on down – there are three, four, five, six paragraphs about oil; then one on fur production which, I suggest, is of considerable interest to many farmers. And then road construction. Of course, farmers are not interest in roads, Mr. Speaker! In spite of the fact that we built, last year, 532 miles of grade and 306 miles of hard-top and bituminous surfacing – farmers wouldn’t be interested in that. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of The Battlefords are very interested in that. The fact that right today throughout the length of my constituency from C.P. bridge to North Battleford, within a very short distance either way they can get to that highway, and I suggest they are very interested in what happens in our highway program. But the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his usual form, says there is nothing of interest to farmers. Northern development of roads – I think they are of some interest to farmers. Then we had two paragraphs on industry. I am not going to mark those as being of interest to farmers, but I suggest that they could be of tremendous interest to farmers, and should be.

Here we have this next paragraph:

“The Government’s objective to serve 40,000 farms with electricity by the end of 1956 was exceeded. Last year’s farm electrification program

brought power to more than 7,800 farms, a single-year record unequalled anywhere in Canada. The farm electrification program will be continued with a view to bringing power to a total of 65,000 farms by 1961.”

No interest to farmers! Well, I suggest that if the Liberals were in power it certainly would not have been, because when there were only 138 farms electrified in the province of Saskatchewan, they certainly wouldn't be very interested.

The next goes on; that next paragraph will be of interest to farmers. In fact, all the way through, Mr. Speaker, on that page: 'Government Telephones' – I think the telephones are of some interest to farmers, too. Indeed they are. 'Clearing and Breaking'. Then we go down to Page 7:

“The University Hospital has continued to improve the quality of medical and hospital care throughout the province. For the first time medical doctors will graduate from the University of Saskatchewan this spring.”

Is that of any interest to farmer? Of course, the farmers are so ridiculously healthy they never get sick; they are not interested in the University Hospital, Mr. Speaker. How ridiculous can these people get in their arguments, I would like to know. They're so busy throwing up a smoke-screen to cover up the antics of 'Jimmy' Gardiner and Company at Ottawa that they haven't time to read the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and they haven't read it.

Now we go on: 'Housing projects for senior citizens'.

Mr. Cameron: — Listen to the auctioneer!

Mr. Kramer: — They did a great deal – and I can outtalk any one of you, too! That is one job I wouldn't like to have, as an auctioneer, to try and get anything for the outfit across the hall!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No bid!

Mr. Kramer: — No bid!

Mr. Danielson: — We're enjoying you very much.

Mr. Kramer: — thank you very much. I am enjoying it, too. Now we go along to the paragraph on housing for senior citizens:

“During the past year local housing projects for senior citizens were completed providing accommodation for some four hundred people in hostels and self-contained housing units. It is anticipated that during the coming year projects now in the

construction, planning and development stages will provide living accommodation for an additional 2,000 senior citizens.”

It is interesting to note that these people who like to talk about what is going on in other provinces, and the extra dollar or two they get in some places, never mention what is being done to provide good housing and care for the senior citizens that mean something over the long haul. I suggest that some of our farmers are going to get old, and already have grown old, and that we are going to get them out of the garages that the hon. member from Redberry mentioned. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the policies of this Government will get them out of those slum conditions much quicker than any policies that any Liberal party in any province of Canada has ever produced so far.

Now, we have something regarding justice, and improving the province's correctional program. Well, of course, that wouldn't be of interest to farmers. They're so well behaved, Mr. Speaker, that they never get into trouble, so maybe the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a point there.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That's not the way I heard it!

Mr. Kramer: — And then we have another paragraph down below here:

“The new 300-bed Provincial Nursing Home, situated on the Legislative Building Grounds, is expected to be ready for occupancy early in the new fiscal year. Fifty beds for rehabilitation purposes will be provided in this Home and will be operated in conjunction with the Physical Restoration Centre.”

No, that wouldn't interest farmers! Then we have the Murray Memorial Library. Of course, if they had their way across the hall there, in a few generations farmers wouldn't be able to read; so that wouldn't interest farmers! That's like the story about “my old French friend up north.” A Liberal politician called on him, Mr. Speaker, and he says: “Thirteen sons I've got here.” The Liberal politician says, “Yes, very good. A fine bunch of boys. How old is that youngest one; he looks like a strapping youngster?” “Well, he's just turned 18.” “Well, my friend, I suppose you have a good lot of Liberal votes for me?” “Well”, he says, “pretty good – all but that last one there, that Pierre. You know, he went to school and he learned to read, and now that little son-of-a-gun he's voting C.C.F.”

Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Bureau of Publications!

Mr. Kramer: — Now, strangely enough this next paragraph that is of no interest to farmers . . .

Mr. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Let the Premier tell the next one . . .

Mr. Kramer: — It deals with the problems of school administration:

“The problems of school administration remain severe. Because of increased costs, the need for more facilities and the shortage of trained personnel, my Government has already announced its intention to recommend a large increase in school grants.”

No interest to farmers, Mr. Speaker, — none at all! Then we have another paragraph concerning education, and then we have another paragraph that says:

“The municipality grid road program was well received, with 200 municipalities participating in the first year. This program will increase in 1957, for which you will be asked to provide additional financial assistance.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is of no interest to farmers! I would suggest too, that if the efforts of the hon. people opposite were effective, they would try to force the farmers to be disinterested. They have done everything (at least up in my area) in an effort to sabotage that municipal grid program which is a boon, a real boon, to all the rural municipalities of the province of Saskatchewan, and is progressing well, I am happy to announce.

Mr. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — If we were in power, we'd build it all.

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, you'd build it all! You know, Mr. Speaker, it amuses me to see the difference in a Liberal in office and a Liberal out of office. It is a strange phenomenon that we have here in Saskatchewan. We have the Liberals in office at Ottawa who could do much for the people of Saskatchewan, but every time the farmers go down and the Wheat Pool goes down to Ottawa, no, everything for monopoly in eastern Canada. Plenty of money to find a pipeline at low cost and low interest rates, but nothing for the farmer. You people have talked on the platform in the last election about what you would do for the farmer, they rolled a lot of small potatoes down the middle of the floor, Mr. Speaker, - a lot of little potatoes. You know, I used to dig spuds when I was a kid and I remember what a thrill it was, when my day would say, “The potatoes are getting ready; you go out and get some.” So out I would go the garden with a fork, and I would pick the biggest and bushiest bush I could find, and dig in the fork. What did I find underneath that great big bush? A whole mass of shrunken up, little potatoes. That reminds me of the Liberal party! So I had to go to a more modest bush that went more to fruit and less to top, before I got some potatoes that were fit to take home.

The difference, I would like to suggest, between a Liberal out of office and a Liberal in office is tremendous, and we have had one of the most amazing performances here in Saskatchewan – a ringside seat – that would do justice to a Barnum and Bailey show! You know, these people say:

“Oh, we can’t give cash advances. No, no! You can’t have parity prices; no, that would never do.” It doesn’t matter what the United States, you know, has 20 per cent of their wheat to market; we have 80 per cent of our wheat to market, and the United States consumes 80 per cent. Well, that is true. Well, let us just talk for a minute about the 20 per cent that we consume, then, Mr. Speaker. That is something that pertains to Canada. It is something that we can do something about. And I suggest we can do this: we can raise it up to a parity price, a price that gives the farmer his cost of production, the cost of production that is recognized throughout Canada, and it is recognized by authorities such as Professor Hope, who is connected with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture; it is recognized by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture; it is recognized by our Pool and is recognized by the people south of the line whose costs of production is lower than ours. The cost of their tractors, their oil, their cars, everything, is less, and yet they are guaranteed over \$2.20 cash for their wheat on the farm or in the elevator. But they can’t do it here. The Liberal party in office, who want to do so much when they are out of office, they cannot do it here. I suggest this, Mr. Speaker. In cold cash figures (and remember we have got it coming for at least these past 10 or 15 years) 60 cents (a very conservative figure), 60 cents more for 20 per cent of our wheat would mean 12 cents a bushel on the entire pool over the last 10-year period. A man who was raising 5,000 bushels or 6,000 bushels of wheat a year would actually be benefited tremendously, and if you took that 12 cent payment on all of our wheat, or 60 cents on 20 per cent of our wheat alone, and distributed it now among the farmers of Saskatchewan, you would be actually doing something for them instead of rolling out the little potatoes, the little grazing lease fees, etc., and all the rest of the things you suggested you were going to do, with even your \$500 bribe on power thrown in.

Premier Douglas: — That they couldn’t win an election on.

Mr. Kramer: — Never before have so many people been promised so much and never before has the Liberal party received so little support. Yes, I suggest that is one thing the Liberal party in office could do today, if they wanted to do something for the people of Saskatchewan and the western Canadian grain farmer. And why don’t they? The hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) said that if we cannot do certain things for the people then we ought to get out. I suggest he go down to Ottawa, and tell the people down at Ottawa that if they cannot do something for the farmer of western Canada, they ought to get out.

Mr. Coderre: — This is a provincial legislature.

Mr. Kramer: — I am debating the Speech from the Throne, or what is in the Speech from the Throne; namely, the fact that we are not getting a pay cheque. The farmer of Saskatchewan is not getting a pay cheque, and therein lies the whole root of our difficulty today.

Mr. Danielson: — You’re doing very well; go to it!

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, there are more things they could do . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You've got steam up now.

Mr. Kramer: — They could provide now — you know, it's amazing. We have heard all the excuses made by the Federal member from Melville, the hon. Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa. He has tried various methods in an effort to continually get support, and now his last resort has been one that reminds me of the old medicine man, coming out of his wigwam through the smoke, and saying: "I see heap big drought coming." If his crystal ball is good, Mr. Speaker, and he really believes that, I suggest that he had better get busy right now and up-date the P.F.A. Act and use it for something other than a political organization machine, and that he raise the maximum payment to the farmers of western Canada to \$1,500 per farm, instead of \$500 per farm — exactly where it should be. When the Act was introduced in 1939, the farmers were paying one per cent into that fund off 60 cents per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern Fort William. For the last 10 years they have been paying one per cent off about an average of \$1.60 per bushel. I suggest that the contribution of the farmer, the compulsory contribution, that is used for political manoeuvring in many cases, has gone up by three times, that his cost of production has multiplied by three times since 1939. Why (and I ask every one of the gentlemen opposite) has not the return to the farmer, the maximum payment to farmers, been increased by three times? That is why they are so madly trying to throw out a smoke-screen, and that is why the 'Leader-Post' has been trying to throw up a smoke-screen for the last three or four months. You know, you don't have to have a crystal ball, Mr. Speaker, to tell what these people opposite are going to be saying. The only thing you've got to do is look at the editorial page and a few of the cartoons in the 'Leader-Post', and you can tell exactly what the Liberals are going to be saying. A month before this Session was open, you knew exactly what they were going to be saying.

Mr. Danielson: — Just like the Speech from the Throne!

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, we knew exactly what they were going to be saying. At one time they used to refer to the 'Leader-Post' as the house organ of the Liberal party, but it seems now that we have the situation in reverse and the Liberal party has become the house organ of the 'Leader-Post'. Boy, what an organ they turned out to be! I'd hate to have any of my organs in that shape!

Mr. Danielson: — It would be a good idea.

Mr. Kramer: — I'd want to see a doctor quick, Mr. Speaker. Well, I was mentioning the difference between a Liberal in office and a Liberal out of office, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a tremendous difference. Talk about Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde! I have never seen, and I don't think history has ever seen, such a performance as these people put on, trying to be one thing, going out among the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan. Not only do they do so on a Federal-Provincial basis, but they do it also on a city-rural basis. These people are telling an entirely different story when they are in the cities talking to labour and when they get out into the country they tell a different story to the farmer. In fact they

February 27, 1957

even change from one rural point to another. I know of Liberal speakers (and some of them were elected, too) who went out to a backward, marginal settlement with a lot of unfortunate people in there on relief and social welfare, and what did they say? They went out among those people and said, “Oh, you people are not getting enough. This terrible C.C.F. Government is just beating you down; you should be getting far more. I will personally see to it that you do get more.” The same day, 10 miles away in a farming community, the same speaker was saying: “Look what this social welfare bill is costing you! Why, these lazy do-nothings up there are reaping all the benefits of your hard work.” That is the difference. . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Would you tell us who you are talking about?

Mr. Kramer: — . . . as I was saying, between a Liberal in one place and a Liberal in another – a city Liberal, a country Liberal, a Federal Liberal, a Provincial Liberal, a Liberal out of office and a Liberal in office. An amazing performance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: — What’s his name?

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on drawing comparisons, and I wouldn’t want to make him appear too ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — Go ahead, go ahead!

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — You and your steers!

Mr. Kramer: — You know, I was reading a little excerpt that a previous member from The Battlefords has recorded in the Journals of this House, and for the benefit of some of the new members who were not here at that time, I would like to repeat it, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that the Hon. Mr. Proctor had made an impassioned speech at one time – that was when I think there were five in the House; and he had said that it wouldn’t be long before they would have to be taking the farmer’s car, the farmer’s horse, the farmer’s cow, and the poor farmers would be out on the road.

Mr. Danielson: — What are you reading from?

Mr. Kramer: — I’m not reading from anything. I’m just telling you. I am not quoting, I am just telling you what happened.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh you’re just telling the story as you go along?

Mr. Kramer: — That’s right. Mr. Speaker, the member from The Battlefords came back the next day, and he said he wanted to assure the hon. member opposite that this was not the case – that the C.C.F. would not take his car, they would not take his horse and they would not take his cow, and neither would they take his bull!

Mr. Danielson: — You started out with a false technique.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, we've had to take many things in the past. . .

Mr. Danielson: — You bet you have!

Some Opposition Member: — You've taken it all the time.

Mr. Kramer: — . . . from the party sitting opposite. Thank goodness the people of Saskatchewan have brightened up since the good old days!

Mr. Coderre: — Are you insinuating they weren't bright before?

Mr. Kramer: — The members opposite can take from my speech what they wish, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: — We can't take anything.

Mr. Kramer: — That's fine, I wouldn't expect you to. Mr. Speaker, I haven't a great deal left to say. I would like to ask a couple more questions of the hon. members of the unofficial Opposition. I remember the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) in his address on the Speech from the Throne, suggested that this Government should give more assistance to municipal authorities, to rural and urban municipalities. I know very well that the hon. member from Meadow Lake was sincere in suggesting this, and he also suggested that the Province of Alberta had embarked on such a program. Well, I want to suggest to him that the time is long overdue for the Province of Alberta to do just that, because the municipal debt in the Province of Alberta, from 1944 to 1955, has gone up from some \$3.55 per capita to what is the high now, or at least fiscal year, of a little better than \$55. To compare figures, the province of Saskatchewan show that in the same year, 1944, the municipal debt stood at around \$44 in the province of Saskatchewan, and now has gone down to \$26.

Mr. Weber: — Tell them who they owe that to.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I'll leave that to the hon. member from Meadow Lake. I would like to ask him, too, why they have not seen fit in Alberta to introduce a comprehensive automobile insurance program, such as we have here. This has been requested by the Alberta Farmers Union on several occasions, and I understood from the hon. member from Meadow Lake that he was very interested in the programs outlined by the Saskatchewan Farmers Union. I would like him to give us some of the facts and figures at some time in the House on what they suggest doing about this low-cost insurance in the Province of Alberta, or why they have not done so.

There are many other things I would like to know, but probably I will have a chat with the hon. member from Meadow Lake and some of the others, some day, and maybe they can explain some of these things to me in private. Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I don't try to explain anything to you.

Mr. Kramer: — I would like them, too, to explain why it is that just across the border from Lloydminster or anywhere else in the Province of Alberta, the average cost for installing farm power stands at around \$1,200. Their rural electrification program in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, is not as much of a problem as it is here. They haven't got the miles per farm to contend with. They have probably a little more than half the farm mileage to construct, and yet this cost to the farmers seems to be tremendous. I talked to farmers in Alberta who have gone completely on propane who are three-quarters of a mile from the line, and who said it would cost them as much as \$1,600 to get the power installed. I would like him to give us a little information on that. They seem to be very anxious to give us information on some of the good things that are being done in our neighbouring provinces, and I would like to hear from them.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose some hon. members are not surprised at the way I feel about the Speech from the Throne. It is an excellent document. As I said, it is a report on past programs that have been outlined by the Party. Since 1944, Speeches from the Throne have indicated that the promises of this party and the programs that have been laid out in provincial elections have been fulfilled. This again shows that this policy will continue throughout the next four years. Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I will support the motion.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): —Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to take this opportunity of saying a few words on this debate. I will, at the start, just add my sentiments to those who have congratulated you, sir on your appointment as Speaker of this Legislature. Also, I would like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. I believe that the mover and seconder, in opening this debate this year (two new members in the House who had never sat in Legislature before) did a marvellous and excellent job, and a lot of credit is due them for the way in which they presented their facts and presented their case to this Legislature. Of course, Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out, they have something to talk about. They don't have to go out looking for something to talk about; so they were able to put up a good case because they had a good case to argue.

I would like to say a few words about my own constituency of Wadena. I shall not dwell on that too long, because I have on numerous occasions before mentioned my constituency.

On the opening day of this Legislature, respect was paid to former members of the Legislature. Among those was a former member for Wadena, Mr. MacMillan. While I did not say so on that occasion when I spoke on behalf of his memory, I wish to take the opportunity now to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the first time I had an opportunity to vote, when I was old enough to vote, I had the pleasure of voting against Mr. MacMillan; but on the last three elections in Wadena, Mr. MacMillan had personally

told me he had the pleasure of supporting me. Mr. MacMillan, shortly before he died, was sick in the hospital, he told some of his friends (and they were much surprised when he told them) that if he was able to be out and around in this last provincial campaign, he would have taken an open, active part on behalf of the C.C.F. He lay in the University Hospital sick; he realized what Saskatchewan had done for the sick people of this Province, after getting inside that hospital. Now, while he said he had supported us silently, he would, had he had the opportunity, have supported us in this last election openly. Mr. MacMillan was a Liberal – a true Liberal, not a back-sliding one; he was a Liberal who looked forward to the future.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — You waited until after he wasn't here to speak for himself.

Mr. Dewhurst: — It's all right for the hon. member from Melville rattling on from time to time in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. He has had ample occasion before now to get up and say something, rather than sit in his seat and rattle away in much the same manner as his father, the hon. Federal Minister does about agriculture, yet does nothing. We are waiting with interest to see what he will say on behalf of agriculture. Surely he should have something to say on behalf of agriculture, and we are hoping that some day he will give the House the benefit of the knowledge which his father has passed on to him, if he is capable of absorbing it.

The Wadena constituency also has the town of Wynyard in it. Wynyard has, for the past four years, been the home of the six-man rugby team of this Province. They have won the championship of the province of Saskatchewan on four consecutive occasions in the past four years in six-man rugby. They have won all their games by a very one-sided score, very handily taken that title in the Province, and congratulations are due the boys of Wynyard, their teachers and their coaches, for the way in which that team has performed in the last four years. It hasn't been always the same players. There has been a change from year to year of players; but the coaches deserve a lot of credit.

Also in Wynyard this year were the High School Boys' Curling champions who won the southern championship, and went into the Provincial finals and were taken out by a high school team in Saskatoon. So the town of Wynyard deserves a lot of credit and congratulations for the way they have promoted sport in that area. Wynyard is a very booming town with all the city facilities – sewer, water, electricity and everything else. Wynyard is truly a point which could be very well suited, in the not too distant future, for some of our industrial expansion. They have some of the best water in the province and a very good location.

In the Wadena constituency in the past few years we have had a terrific lot of flooding, although I am happy to say that this last year or two it is gradually drying up, and a lot of it has been drained by our Provincial Department of Agriculture. We have one lake within the Wadena constituency known as the Ponass Lake which needs to have considerable money spent on it. In 1955, the P.F.R.A. had men around the Ponass Lake area for

the entire summer, putting on a so-called survey for drainage in there. They had led us to believe that they would participate in a drainage of the Ponass Lake area, but as soon as it was too late to have anything done and the election campaign was over, then they pulled out and now they are trying to blame the Provincial Government for nothing being done there. Mr. Speaker, it is a very costly project to drain the Ponass Lake area, and to do a proper job of it. It will cost a minimum of at least a quarter of a million dollars, maybe half a million, to do a proper job. It isn't a matter of draining the water out of the Province; it is a matter of draining the water from there and conserving it in the Quill Lake. I see no reason why it should not come within the scope of the P.F.R.A., and why some assistance shouldn't be coming to that area to help drain Ponass Lake into the Quill Lakes to keep the water level of the Quill Lakes up.

Any of you members who have seen the Quill Lakes will realize that there is a very salty or alkali base around the Quill Lakes. If the water level falls too low, then the wind will blow the salt out of the lakebed into the surrounding agricultural land, and it spoils the land on the shores of the lake. So naturally, the people of the Quill Lake area are very interested in keeping the water level of those lakes high, and the Ponass Lake could quite easily, as far as the elevation is concerned, be drained into the Quill Lakes.

One of the things which has helped my constituency this past few years has been the work and wage projects which were put on by this Government. The work and wages meant a lot of difference to those people up there. It meant the difference between a lot of people being able to carry on, or starve out and get out. It has also meant a lot of difference to a lot of the municipalities in being solvent or being broke. Some of the municipal men have told me that, had it not been for the work-and-wage programs, had they been called on to pay the 25 per cent of social aid, they could not have done it with the lean amount of revenue they had.

Due to flooding conditions, taxes were not coming into those municipalities. In some of those areas there is a terrific backlog of taxes, and that is no fault of the farmers concerned. The farmers are interested in paying up their back taxes, but the thing is beyond their control and has prevented them from doing so. So the work and wages and special grants that have been given by this Government to those areas, I want to tell the Government, is very much appreciated by and large by the people up there, and very much by and large by the municipal councils.

The road grid system has also been a help to those people, because traffic was becoming heavier and heavier on their roads. Some of them are costly to build, and now the Province is stepping in and will pay on a formula basis on the average of 60 or 65 per cent in most of those municipalities. It will vary from maybe a little higher to a little less.

It was very interesting last December, when we had the Provincial-Local Government Conference in this Chamber here, Mr. Speaker. I sat in this Legislature as an observer during the entire proceedings, and, Mr. Speaker, sometimes I find it very difficult to keep my seat for the entire

duration of a session during the afternoon; I want to get out and have a stroll or go down and have a cup of coffee. But that conference was so interesting that I never felt the urge at any time to leave the Chamber. Truly it was a very interesting conference.

The hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) was speaking on the radio at that time, and while I didn't have the opportunity of listening to all of her radio speech, I heard a portion of it. She was lamenting the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had not had the opportunity of presenting a brief to that conference. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will assure the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) he can at any time in this House present the brief here now that he would have presented then. We would like to see what kind of brief he would present.

I would also like to have the Leader of the Official Opposition tell this House how it was that the Larger School Units have taken away hired help on his farm. Some of my municipal men who attended that conference were discussing general municipal and provincial problems with Mr. McDonald, the Leader of the Opposition, in the hotel; and he told them that the Larger Unit was responsible in his area for losing him his hired help. Now, I don't have all the details – I have some of them; but I wish he would tell this House how the Unit was responsible for taking his hired help from him. I am sure it would make very interesting listening.

We will admit the fact that this Government saw fit to put on the Mineral Tax. The Mineral Tax is fair, and it is a just tax, and any farmer who has minerals and if he feels they are worth anything at all, surely they are worth three cents an acre. If they are not worth three cents an acre, then he doesn't have to pay the tax. But the fellows who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, are not concerned about the little fellow who has his mineral rights; they are not concerned one moment about that whatsoever. They are concerned about their big corporate friends, the C.P.R., the Hudson's Bay Company and the mortgage companies who have mineral rights. Those are the ones they are trying to protect; but they always throw up a smoke-screen, saying, "it's the little fellow." It is due to this Mineral Tax being placed on which brought to the farmers of this province the potential value of their mineral rights, and that is why a number of farmers still have their mineral rights, and they weren't hurried into selling them for little or nothing or a mere song to the speculative prospectors buying minerals.

Then, they try to come along and blame this Government because some farmers wouldn't listen to what was being said and did sell their minerals for then, twelve or fifty cents an acre; then they are trying to blame this Government, saying that we should have prevented it. We tried to warn them on every opportunity and every occasion that their minerals were worth something, but due to the farmers having the knowledge that their minerals may be worth something, there is not a chance for them here to manipulate with talk, as was done in the Trans-Canada Pipeline, where a former Minister of the Alberta Legislature made hundreds of thousands of dollars through manipulation of costs. We do not believe that the small fellow should be beat out that way. Their minerals are worth something, and the bulk of

the tax will be paid by the big companies.

Mr. Danielson: — It isn't necessary to take it right away, . . . business.

Mr. Gardiner: — 'Joe' Phelps' speech!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Last night, we were entertained to some extent, for a considerable amount of time, by the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski). It wasn't a new speech that had not been said in this House before. We heard that speech, every year from 1948 to 1952, on one or two occasions during each Session. It is just the same old mulligan, stirred up a little differently, with a different spoonful coming out first. We had heard all that theory about Socialism, Communism and all the rest, and I would just like to take you back to some of his speeches, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature, when he was here on a previous occasion. He was speaking on March 14, in one debate in this House, and I will just read one paragraph from his speech, because his speech doesn't deserve much more recognition. On March 14, 1950, he said:

“The hon. gentleman talked about Mr. Flynn. He got into quite a tizzy about the book ‘The Road Ahead’, and in no time he had arts and the Grain Exchange all tied up in a knot with Mr. Flynn; but he forgot to include Mrs. Bothwell, the librarian of the Legislative Library, and he forgot to include the Minister in charge of the Legislative Library, because today they are promoting the reading of this book of Mr. Flynn's. This is the book I have in my hand. It is from the Legislative Library, and so why not include that with the Grain Exchange? This is a good book. You are not able to refute his arguments, so the best thing you can do is deny them and smear them up.”

And he goes on to condemn the librarian for having this book in the library.

A little later on, the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) put a question on the Order Paper, and on Thursday, March 23, 1950, this question was answered in the House. The question Mr. Wellbelove asked the Government was as follows: “Was the book ‘The Road Ahead’ by John T. Flynn, which was in the Legislative Library, ordered at the request of a number of the Legislative Assembly?” The answer was “Yes.”

“(2) On what date was the order placed? Answer: “February 20, 1950.”

“(3) When was the book received?” Answer: “March 8, 1950.” “At whose request was the book ordered?” The answer: “Mr. B.L. Korchinski, M.L.A.”

If you ever heard anybody who could be so downright dirty, on that occasion, it was the member for Redberry, in 1950.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the member isn't in his seat, and I would ask the speaker to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege. If Mr. Korchinski has anything to say, he should be in his seat, and not the member for Maple Creek, and I will not retract it. I will repeat it – it was a low-down dirty trick.

Mr. Cameron: — You said it was “a low-down damn dirty trick.”

Mr. Dewhurst: — No I never did!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — I will ask you to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member did say “a dirty trick”; he did not include the word “damn.”

Premier Douglas: — The record will show.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Korchinski. . .

Some Opposition Member: — . . . they cut it out of the record . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Korchinski went into the Legislative Library that year, and he asked the librarian if that book was there. She didn't have it, but she said “the Legislative Library was there for the benefit of any of the members, any member, and if the book wasn't there, they would try to procure it.” That book was procured at the request of the member for Redberry. Then to come into this House and call the librarian a “Communist” and associate here with fifth columnists and everything else because of what was in the library, I say once again was a low-down dirty trick.

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): —Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, what did the member say I called the librarian?

Mr. Cameron: — A low-down Communist.

Mr. Korchinski: —Mr. Speaker, I think it is a deliberate lie, and I would like him to take it back.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — He just quoted from the record.

Mr. Cameron: — No, he didn't He can't substantiate that statement, and he should withdraw it.

February 27, 1957

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I will refer the hon. member for Redberry to the official report of this Legislature of March 10, 1950.

Mr. Korchinski: — Please read that. Read it!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You should have been here; he read it.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I do not have to read it again. If the member would keep his seat, he would hear. After the tirade he made last night, Mr. Speaker, he ought to expect somebody to answer him back again.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I still insist upon it, that the member from Wadena withdraw the remark he made.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Withdraw what remark?

Mr. Korchinski: — That I called the librarian a Communist.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I read the statement here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Would the hon. member please repeat that part of his speech in which he referred to the statement of the hon. member for Redberry?

Mr. Dewhurst: — I will read his statement again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gardiner: — It's your statement we want, not his.

Mr. Dewhurst: — It is taken right from the official report of March 14, 1950, while speaking in the debate, the hon. member for Redberry (who is now the same man) said:

“The hon. gentleman talked about Mr. Flynn. He got into quite a tizzy about the book ‘The Road Ahead’, and in no time he had arts and the Grain Exchange all tied up in a knot with Mr. Flynn; but he forgot to include Mrs. Bothwell, the librarian of this Legislative Library, and he forgot to include the Minister in charge of the Legislative Library, because today they are promoting the reading of this book of Mr. Flynn’s. This is the book I gave in my hand. It is from the Legislative Library, and so why not include that with the Grain Exchange? This is a good book. You are not able to refute his arguments, so the best thing you can do is deny them and smear them up. That is the usual Socialist technique. The Minister was quite worried that we had blood-brothers in Ottawa. I am proud to be a political blood-brother to the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent is a fine gentleman . . .” and so on.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, that was a good speech.

Mr. Cameron: — We still say he must withdraw that remark.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I still insist that the hon. member withdraw the remark he made.

Mr. Speaker: — I was unable to gather from the quotation from the speech of the hon. member for Redberry that he did imply that the librarian was a Communist.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I haven't the time to read his whole speech back, but it is in writing here and he can read it for himself. The implication was made, in my opinion. It is right there, and that is what I take from his words.

Some Opposition Member: — Withdraw!

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I still insist that the hon. member from Wadena withdraw the remark he made with regard to my remarks, about me calling the librarian a Communist. He made that remark directly, and I would like him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Wadena has failed to establish that the member for Redberry, in 1950, did call the librarian a Communist, and consequently he should withdraw that remark.

Some Opposition Members: — Withdraw! Withdraw!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Will you fellows shut up and sit down!

Some Opposition Members: — Withdraw! Withdraw!

Mr. Dewhurst: — If he says that I said that he called her a Communist, I will withdraw that. But the implication is there, I think, if you read his entire speech, but I will withdraw the remark I made. That does not alter the fact, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of whether he called her a queen or what he called her, for him to stand in his place and use the tactics he did, and then to find in the Journals when a question was asked, that he was the one who requested them to order that book in the library, it shows pretty small potatoes.

Now the Liberals had a 16-point program which their Leader was offering to this House. The Minister of Agriculture referred to the statement made previously by the Leader of the Liberals as a 'stirrup pump in a forest fire'. Well, I want to say that the 16-point program which they offered to this House is even less effective than that. It is less effective than a water pistol in a forest fire, and I will proceed to show you why I think so, before I am through with my remarks here this afternoon.

In 1953, the farm cash income was, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, \$744 million. In 1955 the farm cash income, according

to the same source, was \$447 million – a drop of \$297 million in the farm cash income. Now they are trying to tell this Legislature and the people of this province that those 16 points would alleviate a lot of the troubles of agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that if we took every cent that is in the provincial budget, both revenue and capital account, and turned the entire amount over to agriculture, it wouldn't make up that drop of \$297, which happened in those two years. And if we turned it all over to agriculture, we would have to discontinue our social aid program, our care for the aged, our air ambulance system, our municipal grants, and all the other assistance. If all that was cancelled and our entire revenue and capital budget of last year turned over to bolster the agricultural income, it wouldn't make up that drop of \$297. So, I say their 16-point program is less effective than a water pistol in a forest fire. It just doesn't go to meet the problem whatsoever.

Taxes, as was pointed out by the member for Bengough (Mr. Brown), are not the cause of the farmers' trouble today. It is one of the things that aggravates the situation, but it isn't the cause. As was pointed out by the member for Bengough (as shown by the Committee that studied all of those farm questions here a year ago) in relationship, the percentage costs of farm operating costs is less today for taxes than it was a few years ago. The thing that is bothering the farmers is their inability to pay. They do not have the ability to meet their obligations. No farmer is asking for handouts; they are only asking for a fair, square deal.

When you consider, Mr. Speaker, that the number of Canadian people in agriculture is steadily, year after year, declining, yet the amount of agricultural production is year after year increasing, surely that proves that agriculture is efficient. If any industry in Canada is efficient, agriculture is efficient, because year after year we are producing more and more good with less and less help, with fewer and fewer farmers; but year after year, also, we are receiving less and less of the national income. As I have pointed out on previous occasions in this Legislature, take a combine which could be bought ten years ago for less than \$3,000, today that same combine is over \$6,000. I will just use the increase from \$3,000 to \$6,000, although it is more than that. That increase alone, if a farmer has a \$10,000 assessment on his farm land, means an additional taxation burden to that farmer of 30 mills per year for a period of ten years, or 300 mills, if he pays for that on the one year's expenses, and that is only one piece of implement which is required in the farming operations.

If we are to have stability for the agricultural economy, we must have parity prices. We must have the farmers' income in relationship to the other segments of society within Canada. There is no reason why agriculture should be always be downtrodden and pushed down. We should have equal income. If the price of our production goes up, so should our income go up. We are not asking for handouts, we are asking just for fairness and for justice. I say we should have a parity price for agriculture, and by parity I don't mean 65, or 75 or 85 per cent of parity, because

parity is only equality and justice; and there is no such a thing as 65, or 75 or 85 per cent of justice. You either get justice or you don't get justice, and under our Federal agricultural policies, we are not getting justice. We should have a parity price, then, to help the farmers so they don't have to rush to try and get their grain out in the fall. We should have a permanent feature of cash advances on properly farm-stored grain, so there is absolutely no reason why it can't be done. The only reason it can't be done is a political reason. It is politics from the party who has the authority to do something for agriculture.

They are continually saying: "Oh, it is this C.C.F. Government which has caused the prices of farming to go up. They are the cause of your taxes going up; they are the cause of your increased cost of production." Mr. Speaker, as was previously said in this House by the Minister of Natural Resources, who do they blame when they are talking in Manitoba about the increased costs? Do the Liberals in Manitoba blame the Provincial Government there for the increased costs of farm operations in Manitoba? No, they don't blame the Provincial Government in Manitoba. It is a very funny thing; the taxes and a lot of the responsibilities in Manitoba are far higher than they are in Saskatchewan. In Manitoba, when the Liberals are talking to the people it is the Federal policy that is wrong, but here where it is less than it is in Manitoba, then it is the C.C.F. Government.

It is about time that they got their heads out of the clouds and got down to earth and really analysed the agricultural problems, and started to do something to help to solve agricultural problems. When we had that Committee in the House, last year, discussing agricultural problems, I think the Committee did a very good job. They assembled a lot of information, and in this book right here is that information, and I would recommend to any of the members of the Legislature who haven't read it that they should read the Report on the Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income of 1956. It is well worth reading, and there are a lot of very good facts in there. This material was not material put there by a C.C.F. Convention. This material was put there by the presentations of the different organized bodies which appeared before us – the Wheat Pool, the Farmers Union, and a host of others, which I won't take the time at this time to enumerate again; and all the material that was put in this book can be shown and substantiated as to where it originated from in the different reports that arose. So it is a very good document on the agricultural situation.

I hope to have more to say on farm problems before this Session is over, but I do hope that all members of this Legislature will do what they can to quit playing politics with the farmers and try and help solve their problems, because they have done too much about trying to mislead the farmers, and the member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), who pounds his desk, is no exception at misleading the farmers.

Mr. McCarthy: — Same to you, my dear boy. The same to you and many of them.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The member for Cannington, Mr. Speaker, has done all he can

February 27, 1957

to help mislead them on the misrepresentations of the facts in here, if I may express it that way.

Now, if we are going to have agriculture in this country as it should be, it calls for a just and fair policy. We can take the history of any nation – the member for Redberry went back through a lot of history, last night; we can take the history of any nation, and you will find that, if any nation in history had a strong well-balanced agricultural economy, that nation was a sound progressive nation; but where a nation had no agricultural economy whatsoever within their confines, and was dependent on outside sources, or where their agricultural economy had been neglected, that nation became weak and ineffective. So I say today we have the chance in Canada to be one of the greatest nations in the world, if we will develop our agricultural economy to the best of its ability, so that it will have a chance to go ahead and really produce.

A few years ago before price controls were removed, we were getting somewhere close to the relationship of our share of the national income. I am not going to concede that we had our full parity in those days, but we were not too bad off. But when the Federal Government removed the price controls and allowed the costs to sky-rocket, then we have no right as Canadian citizens to expect the importing countries, which import our wheat, to pay for our internal inflation. If the Government of Canada will not assume their responsibility to keep our economy on a level keel, but let it inflate, then we as Canadians should pay for that inflation, not other countries which have to buy our agricultural commodities.

Therefore, I say if it is necessary to pay a subsidy on farm products in this country, it should be paid by the Federal Treasury at Ottawa, because they are the ones who have allowed this runaway spiral of costs. As was mentioned by the previous speaker, the member for The Battlefords, at least they could do it on the part which is consumed within Canada. Today they tell us that almost our entire output of beef is being consumed within the Dominion of Canada, and yet beef today is far lower in relationship to price than it was a few years ago. The farmer who raises stock cannot today get the same return for his beef as he could a few years ago. On the one hand, as everything else, the beef has gone down, and the cost of his production has gone up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time is going on, and there is a lot more that could be said on agriculture, and a lot more will be said, I am sure, before this Session is over. In referring back again to the Speech from the Throne, the Speech does forecast progress for the ensuing year. I have here also a copy of the card used by the member for Bengough. I will not take the time to repeat the 12 points which are on that card, but I concur wholeheartedly with what the member for Bengough said when he said that the Speech from the Throne does make provisions for the implementations of the promises which we made to the people last June.

After all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, a Legislature or a Parliament is a place to keep your promises to the p. No party has a

right to go out on the hustings and make promises which they have no expectations of ever trying to keep. We in the C.C.F. have stood up here, year after year, held up our platforms and programs, and shown what we promised the people, and shown what has been done about it. This is what we promised the people in 1956, and on every platform where I spoke, I asked the people who attended that meeting to be sure and take one of these cards home with them to read and to keep and then in four or five years time, when whoever was the C.C.F. candidate (I or someone else) came back to them, to ask the C.C.F. what they had done about their promises of 1956, and we would be only too glad to answer what we had done, tell how we had fulfilled them, or if we hadn't, why we hadn't fulfilled them.

Mr. Speaker, I will assure you that I will support the motion.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 27 – An Act respecting the Operation of Vehicles

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill at least is the largest one that has yet been before the House. It is a consolidation, as members will notice, and in some places there are minor changes to bring the phraseology in line with that which is being recommended by the Committee on Uniform Legislation. There are some changes that are matters of principle, but for the most part they are minor changes in the Act.

There are, however, two or three things which I think are worthy of some discussion: first of all, the change in the licence year. Hon. members will recall that, a year ago, we brought in a special Bill to extend the licences for last year by one month – until the 30th of April – because of the difficulty of our rural people in getting into the towns and villages to get their licences. So it has been decided that, this year, we shall amend The Vehicles Act so as to make the licence yearend permanently on the 30th of April. Licences will go on sale on the 15th of March so the people will now have a full six weeks in which to get their licence plates. Previously, under the old Act, the licences had to be obtained by the 1st of April and they went on sale the 1st of March, so that it is actually giving the people two weeks' additional time in which to get their licences.

Another change I think is worthy of mention is that the Act since its inception has provided that the vehicle must be registered in the

name of the owner. If anything happens that the owner should suddenly pass away, then the licence is no longer valid. This has caused a great deal of embarrassment when, for instance, a vehicle is used by the family – probably to go to the hospital to see the father or the husband, and in the case of his death, they drive the vehicle home and actually the vehicle is not licensed. So we are proposing an amendment which will provide that there will be 30 days of grace after the death of the registered owner of the vehicle, in order that the licence may be transferred.

Another change we are making is something we have never had before in Saskatchewan. We are putting in our Act now a clause which is in effect in practically all the other provinces of Canada. This will provide that, in the event that any vehicle causes bodily injury or death or causes damages apparently in excess of \$200, the owner of that vehicle must present evidence of financial responsibility. The evidence of that financial responsibility may be either a bond, cash security, bond security, insurance or anything else. Today, for example, if any of us went into the province of Manitoba and we were involved in an accident, notwithstanding the fact that we have on our vehicle a licence and in our pocket an operator's licence and a registration certificate, that will not be accepted. In Manitoba they would insist that we carry a pink slip as evidence that we are insured.

Now I wouldn't like to say that this is because we are trying to get even with Manitoba or with Alberta or British Columbia, but we do hope that it might have some effect on getting these provinces to recognize our licence plates and our registration certificates as being proof of insurance. In any event this, of course, will not affect the people in Saskatchewan, excepting those who are not insured, and of course, here they can't get their licences unless they are insured, so that the only ones it would affect here would be those who are operating vehicles without a licence.

There is a fourth change proposed which is probably the most important of all. This is something which we feel is necessary because of the growing toll on our highways. I regret to report that, this year, we had 134 fatalities in Saskatchewan as a result of automobile accidents. This is a great number. We are not the only province, I might say – in the neighbouring province of Alberta unfortunately they had closer to 260, between 250 and 260; British Columbia had over 300; Manitoba, nearly 200. Nevertheless, 134 is still too many, especially when we realize that, in Canada, almost 4,000 people are being killed annually.

Undoubtedly, one of the causes is the drunken driver, the person who drives his vehicle when he is not in condition to drive. I just read something in the paper, today, to indicate the amount of drinking the people in Canada are doing. I noticed liquor spending in Canada amounts to over \$57 per capita - \$57.82 for every man, woman, and child; and per capita spending on tobacco, last year, was \$29.68. We spent a total of \$902 million on liquor, \$463 million on tobacco, or \$1,365,000,000 on these two things, and yet people say we haven't any money to spend for education, where we have only spent \$705 million. So, unquestionably, the people of Canada are drinking a great deal of liquor. I am glad to report that in Saskatchewan our per capital is considerably lower than the national average.

Nevertheless, there are a great many people who are driving their vehicles when they are not in complete control of their faculties. I have no objection to anybody that wants to drink, but I do object to them driving a vehicle which may result in taking the lives of innocent victims.

So this year, we are proposing an amendment in this Act which will require that before anyone can obtain a licence in the province of Saskatchewan he must be prepared to sign on his application for a licence a statement that, in the event he is suspected by a police officer of driving his vehicle while he is impaired by the use of alcohol, he will submit himself to a chemical test, a blood test, or a saliva test, or any of these tests which are becoming standard procedures now in many of our leading jurisdictions on the North American continent.

Under the British system of justice, one thing which I believe we all uphold is the right of any citizen to refuse to give evidence against himself. No one can be forced to go on the witness stand. Even in case of murder, no man can be compelled to go on the stand to give evidence against himself. We are not saying that anyone will have to submit himself to these tests; what we are saying through is that, as a condition of getting a licence the person must sign the declaration that he is prepared to submit himself, and then, if he refuses to submit to this chemical test, his licence will be taken away from him.

Now this is drastic, Mr. Speaker. This is very drastic. Nevertheless, when you see the bodies of innocent men, woman and children –134 of them lying side by side in this province of Saskatchewan in one year – then it requires drastic action. It is not a right that any operator of a motor vehicle shall have to get a licence to drive that vehicle. It is not a right than anybody can have. It is a privilege, and a privilege which they should guard well. And so on the basis that we do have control over the types of people we are going to issue motor licences to, in the future we are going to insist that they sign this statement that they are willing to submit themselves to such tests.

Now, hon. members may wonder where this is. They will find it in Section 67, and again in Section 92(4) – those are the two sections. The first is the one which provides for the issuing of a licence and it says: “The Board shall not issue a licence or permit to any person—who, upon applying for a licence or permit, refuses to undertake in writing to submit to the taking of specimens of his blood, urine, saliva and breath, or any of them, for chemical analysis whenever he is suspected of driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.”

And then the other section provides: “That the Board may suspend or revoke an operator’s, chauffeur’s, learner’s or instructor’s licence if, after an examination of the circumstances, it is satisfied. . . that, when suspected of driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, he refused to comply with the request of a traffic officer, police officer or police constable that he submit to the taking of

February 27, 1957

a specimen of his blood, urine, saliva or breath, contrary to an undertaking given by him to the Board when he applied for the licence.”

I may say that a very interesting experiment has been conducted in the province of Saskatchewan very quietly over the last two or three years. In the city of Saskatoon, under the chairmanship of the Medical Health Officer, Dr. Dantow, there has been a committee at work consisting of professors of the University, representatives of the faculty, representatives of the Department of Chemistry, the Department of (I believe) Engineering, Law, Biology, and members of the Traffic Board, members of the judiciary, and members of the R.C.M.P. They have been conducting experiments. We have, through the co-operation of the Liquor Board, been conducting many tests on various people who have volunteered their services for this purpose, and the findings of this were made public at a conference held in Saskatoon early in the month of December. It was very impressive upon the judiciary, and I might say that even at the present time the work is going forward in the city of Saskatoon, where certain people have been taken into the police station and have voluntarily submitted themselves to these chemical tests. In some instances it has resulted in convictions, whereas in other cases, as a result of the tests, the accused were actually acquitted because it was found that they did not have sufficient alcohol in their systems to justify their conviction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons we are introducing this new principle into The Vehicles Act, which is made up, as I indicated earlier, chiefly of a consolidation and minor amendments. I know there will be many questions arise in Committee on various of these which can best be answered there. I would suggest, however, that if there is any question on the matter of principle, the debate be adjourned in order that we might carry it on at the next sitting of the House.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, the Second Reading of this Bill.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Due to the changes in this particular Bill I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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