

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**20th Day**

**Wednesday, March 13, 1957**

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 12, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate you, sir, for the high and honourable position to which you have been promoted as Speaker of this Assembly. I think it is a very happy choice, because we believe that you will conduct the affairs of this Assembly in a dignified and orderly manner, and we hope that the members won't give you too much trouble in the performance of your high office.

I would also like to congratulate the new members of the Assembly who are serving their first Session in this House. I think they have made a wonderful contribution to the debates and the business of the House in general. I speak, of course, in particular of the members on our side of the House. I think they have done a wonderful job so far, and I can see that, in the future, they will make a much stronger contribution than they are making today.

In looking over the House I see a considerable change from the last Session. The ranks of the Government are somewhat depleted, and we have quite a few more members on this side of the House than we had a year ago, which I think is a good thing, because I think, in the first place, that a good Opposition or a strong Opposition helps to make a better Government.

I would like also to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the able manner in which he presented his budget a few days ago. It is the largest Budget that we have ever had yet in Saskatchewan. I don't criticize it for that at all. So long as the money is properly used, and carefully handled, I think the province can stand a budget of that size.

It is usual at this time, I suppose, to say something about your own constituency. I did not intend to take much time on that, but as the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson) yesterday when he was

**March 13, 1957**

speaking told about the wonderful constituency he had up there (and he has, he is a neighbour of mine, you know) he said it was the best constituency in Saskatchewan. You can hardly expect me to agree with that, although it is a good constituency and they grow a lot of wheat. There is only one thing wrong with it, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned; there are too many C.C.F.'s in that constituency. That is all I find wrong with it. I am situated there, as many of you know, in rather an unique position, with my constituents; I have some very important neighbours, though. On the east I have the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), representing Biggar, on the north I have another Cabinet Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, (Hon. Mr. Nollet), representing Cutknife; and on the south, my hon. friend from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnston). That is not all. I am bounded on the west by the Social Credit province of Alberta. So I am in, I say, a rather unique position, and sometimes people wonder how the Liberals come to hold that one constituency. It is kind of a queer thing, come to think of it. But I want to thank the people of my constituency for the support they gave me in the election last year. I hope that I can live up to what they expect me to do.

We have, as I said, a pretty good constituency there. We have some of the best wheat land in the province, and we have some small industries, too. We have some C.C.F.'s there, too. As a matter of fact, our town is kind of strong C.C.F., because we have a large power plant, owned by the Power Corporation, of course – a very good place too, and a good plan. The hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson) said yesterday that his town, Kindersley, was the first town in Saskatchewan to be supplied with gas by the Power Corporation. That is true. But our town was the first town in Saskatchewan to be supplied with gas, totally produced in Saskatchewan, in any part of Saskatchewan; not produced by the Power Corporation, but by a private company. And I would just like to say that our rates are much lower than those under the Power Corporation.

When I came to this House a few days ago, or when the Session started a few days ago, I listened to the hon. members on the other side of the House, one after the other, speaking, it made me quite discouraged. I didn't feel very good at all. One after another they painted a very gloomy picture of things in Saskatchewan as far as agriculture is concerned. A very dark and very gloomy picture they painted, and, according to them, unless something was done if the Federal Government didn't take some action, it looked as though agriculture was right on the way out. So, Mr. Speaker, I almost had a notion to go home (I was so discouraged) and sell my farm, and try to salvage something from the wreck that the agriculture industry is in, in this province. They almost persuaded me, sir; and I am very glad they didn't, because a few days later the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) presented his budget to this House. I find that he paints an altogether different picture of conditions in Saskatchewan, and I know that his figures must be correct – what he says about general business and what he says about agriculture in particular. I think he painted a very good picture. I am going to refer to some of the things he said here. Now this is in the Economic Review and Outlook of the province, and he says this:

“ . . . Referring first to the provincial economy, I think we can look back upon 1956 with considerable satisfaction and pride.”

Now there is nothing wrong with that. That makes me feel as though we are not quite at the end of our road, yet, and that we may be able to carry on for some time.

“ . . . Preliminary estimates indicate a total net value of commodity output of more than \$900 million, about 12 per cent higher than in 1955.”

Now if that is the case, we are up 12 per cent from the previous year, and that includes agriculture. That does not look to me as though we are on the way out, or as though the economy and the business of the country was on the way down. In fact it suggests the very opposite.

“ .  
.

. The growth in physical output was accompanied by a parallel expansion of the service industries. Consequently, personal income payments rose to about \$1.16 billion, an increase of approximately 14 per cent over the previous year.”

That looks good too; there is nothing wrong with it, and I believe these figures are correct.

“ . . . Per capita-wise this is just about equal to the national average.”

Now, what is wrong with that? If we are equal to the national average, Mr. Speaker, our income must be well above the average in many parts of Canada. I don't think we have anything there to complain about.

“ . . . Personal savings and expenditure similarly advanced, . . . ”

In other words, we saved more than we did in the previous year, and we spent more. That would indicate to me that the country has been prospering. And when we consider that the basic industry of this province is agriculture, I can't see how agriculture can be in such a terrible position.

“ . . . and retail sales registered a gain of almost 9 per cent, compared to the national figure of 7.4 per cent.”

Almost 2 per cent above the national average. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a good report. I think it is a very good report.

This next paragraph deals principally with agriculture:

**March 13, 1957**

“The bumper grain crop produced on Saskatchewan farms last year is valued in the aggregate at \$760 million, the third most valuable crop in Saskatchewan’s history.”

What is wrong with that? We have only had two crops since this province has been formed, according to this (and I believe this is correct), that were in excess of what we grew last year, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a very good thing.

“... With respect to the cattle, hog and dairy industries, extremely mixed patterns in prices and volume of marketings were evident in 1956, but the overall result was an increase in cash income of about 8 per cent over 1955.”

Now, I remember the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) speaking in this House not long ago, was outlining the prices of livestock, and I think the hon. gentleman was speaking of cattle only; but he said livestock was an average of about 12 cents a pound. I noticed today or yesterday in the papers, under the livestock prices, that good cattle were selling in Saskatoon for around \$17 per cwt. and that hogs are in strong demand at \$20 per cwt. That is a long way below the high that we got a few years ago.

**Mr. McDonald:** — \$27 per cwt?

**Mr. Horsman:** — \$27. Yes, but still the price is above the feed, I am quite sure of that. Anyway, there was an increase in cash income from the sale of cattle and hogs, poultry and so on, of 8 per cent over the previous year. So instead of going down on our livestock, we have come up by 8 per cent in that period, and it looks to me as though the farmers must be doing pretty fair on livestock.

“... Farm net income for the year is estimated at about \$400 million, some 24 per cent higher than 1955.”

What is wrong with that? Farm net income, Mr. Speaker, 24 per cent, almost one-quarter better than it was the year before!

I can’t see why the hon. members try to paint such a gloomy picture of agriculture, in view of these facts; and I think they are facts, as laid down in this Budget by the Provincial Treasurer.

“... Due primarily to improved grain marketings, total farm cash income rose to \$594 million, one-third higher than the year before...”

A gain of 33 1/3 per cent on net farm incomes in that year. Is there anything wrong with that?

“ . . . but somewhat short of the previous five-year average.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was sort of amazed you know, when I read this document, to think that the hon. Provincial Treasurer's colleagues, on his own side of the House, don't give him a little more backing on his statements. The next paragraph deals with agriculture, too, but in a little different way:

“In spite of this welcome improvement” (he does admit that it is a welcome improvement) “the farm cash shortage in Saskatchewan has by no means been overcome. Part of the difficulty stems from retarded grain deliveries just at the time when farm expenses normally reach a peak.”

Now, I can readily understand that, too, Mr. Speaker, and so you can for you have farmed in your lifetime. The period from August 1, when the season starts, up until the end of the year, is the season of peak expenses on the farm. That is the time when your taxes come due; you have to harvest your crop, you have to pay help, you have to buy repairs and probably machinery, and it is the time of high expenses. Unless a great deal of grain is delivered in those months, of course the farmers will be short of cash unless they have cash on hand to begin with.

I can remember the years, Mr. Speaker, and so can you, when the bulk of the crop was sold in those few months, and by the time that the end of the year came (that is the 31st of December or around Christmas time), most of the wheat was out of the farmers' hands and on to the market some place, and the invariable result was a drop in prices, and when the wheat got out of the farmers' hands, of course, it started to go up. They had no more control over it then, and it was for such reasons as that, that the Wheat Board was formed. An agitation or demand started among the farmers. They wanted some way of selling wheat and putting it on the market in a more orderly manner, and the Wheat Board was formed for that purpose.

Now, if wheat is going to be marketed in an orderly manner, you would market some 8 per cent per month; that would be 96 per cent of your year's marketing in 12 months. And I notice in the last part of 1956, that only 33 per cent of the anticipated marketings for the year went on the market in those five months. That would explain somewhat why the farmers were short of cash. That was less than 8 per cent per month. In fact it is a little less than 7 per cent per month, but much better than it was the previous year. In the same period in 1955, we only sold 25 per cent of our year's marketing. You will remember that everyone thought there was a real emergency. I know, I thought so. Farm organizations, and farm men and business men met in conferences to try and figure out some way for putting cash into the hands of the farmers, because it did seem like a real emergency, Mr. Speaker. And it was. Added to that was the terrible weather later on, and when there was a chance to sell a little wheat, the farmers couldn't deliver it. But when

**March 13, 1957**

the end of the crop year came, we found that total cash income – as the Provincial Treasurer said, “due primarily to improved marketing conditions” – was up to \$594 million. So the same thing could happen this year. Up until the end of the year, we were in a little better position than we were last year at that time. There is no reason to suppose that by the end of the crop year, we won’t sell as much grain as we did last year.

Now, when we talk about quotas, we are thinking about wheat. We don’t think much about other grains, but there is a lot of other grains marketed and grown here besides wheat. I think that many farmers would be well advised if they would grow a little less wheat and grow a little more of these other grains. There are thousands of carloads of malting barley sold here every fall, and Durum wheat, which has nothing to do at all with a quota, and rapeseed. We grow hundreds of acres of it up in my country; it froze a little this year but the people have been doing very well growing rapeseed. Flax is another thing that is grown quite extensively, which has nothing to do with this quota business at all, and it puts cash into the hands of the farmers. But he speaks here, too, about the lack of uniformity in grain delivery quotas, and it results in a continuing cash shortage for many areas. That is true, and I can go along with the Provincial Treasurer on that. And I think there should be some way of overcoming that thing, that people in one area or one marketing point, might have a five-bushel quota, and a few miles away in another marketing point, they have only two. That makes it tough for those people, and where the quotas are so low. And he goes on to say:

“ . . . it certainly points up the advantages of a permanent system of cash advances on farm-stored grain.”

I would like to say a few words about that, except that there is a motion on the Order Paper dealing with that subject, so it is not debatable at this time.

Other things have been mentioned to overcome this cash shortage and to help out the farmers of this province, advocated by responsible public men. One is the payment of storage on grain stored on the farms. I used to think that the farmers had an argument there. They point out what was the reason that we paid elevator companies storage on grain stored in their elevators, and why couldn’t the same thing be done for the farmers! And you know they have an argument, but who would this help? Now, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, and the same thing applies to cash advances, which I can’t talk about today. From a purely selfish standpoint I would like to see these things done. I would like to see them pay storage on grain stored on the farms. I would like to see us be able to sit down on our farm – we haven’t got a great big farm – but we could take \$350 a month in storage, if it was paid on grain stored on the farm. It would be a very nice income. I certainly wouldn’t be a bit afraid as I think I would get enough to eat off of it, anyway. And I have friends up in that country, and I am sure my hon. friend from Kerrobert-Kindersley has too, who have much more grain than that on the farms.

I have a friend up there who grew 100,000 bushels in 1955, and he had a carryover before that. The storage on that grain would have given him around \$1,000 a month, which would have been a very nice income. But what good would it have done the people who have no crops? What about the people up in the north and northeast part of the province, who have been flooded out for several years, or someone perhaps in some other area that might be dried out? What good would that do to them? Storage doesn't mean a thing to a farmer who hasn't got wheat, neither do cash advances as far as that goes. The people that I feel sorry for, are the people who have had crop failures, not those who have a lot of wheat.

The Provincial Treasurer's statement right here shows that, last year, the farm cash income was \$594 million, and I think it will be as good this year. Something should be done all right to clear up this surplus. And what I said a moment ago- if more farmers would go into growing other kinds of grain, not concentrate altogether on wheat, they could reduce their wheat acreage and still have a cash crop that would be saleable, and it wouldn't have anything at all to do with a quota.

I think, too, that as far as the wheat on the farm goes, the best insurance a farmer can have against crop failure is a couple of granaries full of wheat stored on the farm, if it is well stored.

Now, this next page doesn't look quite so good:

“A further basic difficulty of 1956 was the fact that cost-price relationships in western agriculture continued to worsen. Since 1951, the index of farm prices in Saskatchewan has fallen by some 22 per cent, while farm costs have risen by almost eight per cent.”

Well, that isn't any worse than I thought it was. I thought it was worse than that, because I thought that farm costs had risen more than 8 per cent; maybe not. I will accept those figures; they are probably right; they must be:

“. . . expressed in another way, the parity ratio reflecting the relationship of farm prices to farm costs fell by over 27 per cent.”

Well now this reduction of 22 per cent on farm prices, it wasn't grain prices, not to any extent. Grain prices dropped some, but not to any great extent. The big drop here was the drop in the price of cattle. You will remember, that in about 1951, I believe (the hon. Minister of Agriculture will know) good steers were selling for about 35 cents on the hoof. That was a price that no farmer or stockman ever dreamed of getting for cattle. Sure, we like to take it. I had some cattle then, too, and to run out a little 1,000-pound steer and take a cheque for \$350 was a wonderful thing to be able to do. But I realized at the time, and most stockmen did, that that price couldn't last. They thought that the price was too high, and expected it to go down, and, as

**March 13, 1957**

I pointed out a moment ago, steers that used to sell for 35 cents are now down to about 17 cents a pound, or \$17 cwt. and hogs at \$27 a cwt. That is still not a bad price. I would just like to say to my hon. friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who is a stockman, too – he raises good cattle, the kind of cattle that people should be raising if they are going to grow beef cattle – I think there is some money in it yet, though not as much as there was. I think there is something in it, and I don't think that we are on the road to ruin altogether, yet.

This next paragraph deals with industrial development in the province, and it is a very important thing, too. No one likes to see industrial development in this province any better than I do. It would make more of a diversified economy and make a stronger economy in the province altogether, if we can build up industry the way our oil is being developed. It is all to the good. It says here:

“Fortunately for the provincial economy as a whole, the difficulties in agriculture were...” (which I have just pointed out to you, couldn't see many difficulties)...”were counterbalanced by the continuing growth of non-farm industries. Although agricultural output was close to record levels, it is estimated that these other industries contributed about 42 per cent of the net value of physical production. In view of the growing interdependence of the various sectors of our economy, we might well take note of some of the implications of industrial growth for rural Saskatchewan. First is the general increase in employment opportunities necessary to absorb workers moving from the farm.”

We take men out to the farm and use them all summer and in the fall we have nothing more for them to do, so we turn them loose. Then they come into the city and go into work in industry; they have got to bump somebody out of a job, unless there is a very great scarcity of labour. I doubt if that would make very much difference.

“... Second is the fact that many of the new industrial projects will allow farmers to combine part-time employment with their farm operations.”

I think that is a wonderful thing for the farmers' now wouldn't it be, if you had a slack time in the summer and you could come into Regina and get work in a factory or something like that? As you can see, the hon. Provincial Treasurer is not a farmer himself. He is a good man on the job he is on; I wouldn't want to take it on, I know I couldn't do it. I am also reasonably certain that he couldn't go out and run my farm, either. I don't think he could, because he has never farmed, and doesn't know anything about it. Naturally he



would make the odd mistake. Now, about these farmers who would come in here for a part-time employment, who would feed the pigs while they were gone? Who would milk the cows while they left the farm? Who would do the hundred and one other jobs that have to be done on a farm if a man is farming? Well, you can figure that one out for yourself.

“Third, the rural areas stand to benefit from the goods and services supplied at lower cost by our new industries, . . .”

Well, personally, I see no sign of lower costs from our new industries. It might happen. I see no reduction in costs that I can trace back to any new industry which we have started in Saskatchewan. There may be, but I have seen no sign of it, and I doubt anyway whether any industry that we can devise in Saskatchewan would be anything more or less than on a small scale. Important as these things are, I don't think they could undercut prices by the great industries that produce in mass production. I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, very much. I hope they can.

“. . . and from the growth in markets for farm products provided by rapidly growing urban centres.”

Well, the farmers, Mr. Speaker, would have the bulge on them there, because they would have to eat. If the cities grow, the people have got to eat, and we could supply the eats. That would help some.

“. . . Finally, “(here is the best one) “industrial development is yielding new revenues to the Government to help pay the cost of bringing expensive services to the scattered farm population.”

I will agree with him here that the farm population is scattered, and, if conditions stay as they are and they don't do something to stop the exodus of people from the farms, they will be more scattered than ever in another ten years.

Now, what are these expensive services that the Government supplies to the rural people? I can think of one very expensive service and that is farm electrification. The hon. Minister in charge of that Department spoke about farm electrification yesterday, and, according to his remarks, farm electrification is expensive. The farmers find it expensive too, when they are called on to pay \$500 to have power put into their yards. No one has to tell me that it doesn't cost more to put power into a farm than it does into a house in a town or city. I know that; we all do. At the same time, however, there are other projects similar to this that are done and the price is on an equalized basis, and I think the same treatment should be applied to farm electrification.

**March 13, 1957**

The Power Corporation is in charge of the distribution and sale of natural gas. Gas is piped from the fields down at Brock and Kindersley to Saskatoon, North Battleford and even to Prince Albert, and the price is equalized across the whole area, as I understand it; maybe not quite, but it is very close. I think that is the way it should be, Mr. Speaker. It is the only way that I feel that a product like that could be handled.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The same thing should be done for power.

**Mr. Horsman:** — Yes, I think the same principle could be applied to power. I will admit (as I did a moment ago) that it costs more to put power into a farm than into a city home or a town home; but no one can tell me that it doesn't cost more to take the gas to Prince Albert than it does to take it into Kindersley, just a few miles from the source of supply. Why couldn't the same principle be applied to power?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — It is.

**Mr. Horsman:** — I don't see why it shouldn't. There is just another thing I want to say in regard to power and I picked this out of this Book, too, on Page 11, "Publicly-Owned Business Enterprises in 1956". It is a very good report:

“. . . surpluses of \$10,786,000, about 14 per cent higher than in 1955. The investment of the province, represented by capital advances outstanding at fiscal year ends, totalled \$162,176,000. By far the largest portion of these advances and earnings were concentrated in the Power and Telephone utilities. After making full provision for interest these two companies are expected to net about \$4,773,000.”

Well, that is a pretty good profit, I would say. And here is the statement on the balance of the other Crown Corporations:

“As for the dozen smaller companies operating under The Crown Corporations Act, the statement shows that two divisions incurred deficits. These losses amounted to \$236,000 and are contrasted to the total gross earnings of \$1,180,000 achieved by the remaining companies. The overall result is a return of \$944,000, representing a dividend of 9.85 per cent to the Treasury on its outstanding advances.”

Almost 10 per cent on the advances made by the Treasury to these companies. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the \$500 that the farmer pays to the Power Corporation to get power into his yard is an advance to the Power Corporation. I can't see it any other way. And I think, to be fair about this thing, the farmer should be reimbursed the same as the Treasury. If they were paid 9 or 10 per cent on

that \$500 a year, it would be paid off in 10 years, and they would be satisfied to take that money even though they had no interest in the Power Corporation. I think it could be done. I think it is just as fair one way as the other. That is the way it looks to me, Mr. Speaker. So much for that.

There are many things, though, that I think could be done to help the farmers, especially the young farmers who would like to get a start in agriculture. There seems to be no shortage of money to help industrial firms to get started in Saskatchewan. I say these things are important, these industrial firms; industrial development is important. But I think, being a farmer myself, that agriculture is important, too, and I fail to see any good reason why some money couldn't be advanced to young farmers to help them get started in agriculture. I do not think the risk is too great. There is no trouble to get the money to help out a company that wanted to start a cement plant, either by a direct loan or by a bank guarantee. I am not criticizing these things too much, but I think that, on the other hand, they could be extended to farmers. My hon. friend is smiling at that. As I told you a moment ago, he doesn't know anything about farming; all he knows is his own department.

Now, I am going to speak for a few minutes about something else. Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act was repealed, this Session, and I thought that the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, both paid a great tribute to the opposition, a great compliment, when they said that the reason they took this clause out of the Act was because the Liberal Opposition didn't like it, because we criticized it, and told the people just what bad legislation we thought it was, so they took it out. We weren't mad at that. We have always advocated that that clause should have been taken out of the Act. And by the same token, Mr. Speaker, they should also give the Liberal Opposition credit for the repeal of the Public Revenue Tax. No one ever fought harder for that than the Liberal Opposition did. I remember well when the Provincial Treasurer brought the Bill in to take that Public Revenue Tax off.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Always advocated? The Liberals put it on.

**Mr. Horsman:** — Just a minute, now. We had moved a motion shortly before that, asking for the repeal of the Public Revenue Tax. The motion was voted down in the House, the Government Members voted against it. But in the last dying minutes of the Session, this Bill came in to abolish the Public Revenue Tax. If Clause 8 was removed from The Crown Corporations Act because we didn't like it, I think it would be reasonable to suppose that the Public Revenue Tax was removed, too, because the Liberals didn't like it. And the same thing, I think, should apply on the Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuel. We have advocated the removal of that tax for year, Mr. Speaker, and now. I think they should give us credit for that, too. It is all to the good; I am glad it was done.

**March 13, 1957**

We heard the same old story here yet, about what the Liberals didn't do in the 'thirties, criticism of everything they did or didn't do, and so on. I always feel very sorry for the people who were in a position where they had to carry on a government through those years, and you can ask any man who participated in government activities at that time; you can ask my friend here from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and many other men around this part of the province, the desperate time they had to keep things going at all. And I think it is very unfair for people to get up and talk about the things that could have been done and should be done in those years, when there was no money or anything else to do it with. You never heard the hon. gentlemen opposite tell about the good things the former Government had done, but all about the things they didn't do, or the bad things they did. I have never heard one of them get up here and admit that some former Government built these buildings here, long before there was any C.C.F. And they started the hospitalization plan – I don't mean the present one; but the union hospitals, and I think that was good legislation. They laid out the educational system in this province, the roads, bridges and all these things, but you never hear any of these hon. members over there refer to those things.

It makes me think, you know, of something Mark Anthony said when he was speaking at Caesar's funeral: "The evils that men do live after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." And when you have a group that emphasizes all the weak points and the evils that men do, and never say anything about the good points, naturally the evils are the only thing that they advertise. Too, we still hear this great cry to the Federal Government for help for education, building highways and numerous other things. I don't care where the money comes from. If the Federal Government will give us money for these things, okay. We can take it and we can use it. However, we have a Budget this year of \$116 million, the highest we have ever had in the history of this province, and I think, if this money was wisely used and properly distributed and if the first and most important things were put first, we wouldn't have much trouble with our educational system, for instance.

True, grants have been raised for education, but expenses have gone up just about at the same ratio as advances have, and the proportion of grants towards the expenses of education haven't changed very much. I think that we ought to help ourselves. I believe that grants should be raised. I know they are being raised now; but I believe there are other less important things than education, that we could down expenses on, to some extent, and pay more money where it is really needed, and on things that are really important.

But they sit here and ask the Federal Government to give them grants for education (something no Federal Government has ever done), and money for buildings roads. I think it is all right if you can get it; but the way it looks to me, you are not going to get it, and in the meantime we should do something about these things ourselves. This reminds me, too, about how 'Nero fiddled while Rome burned'. Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

**Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, there was one thing I overlooked when I spoke on a previous occasion in this House during this present Session. I want at this time to extend to the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) my appreciation for his kindness in building me all the nice roads in our constituency. He was very kind to me; but it just happens once – at every election; this is, every election year. So far as I am concerned, I would make the suggestion to the Government that they hold an election every two years; then I would have the best highway system of any constituency in the province of Saskatchewan! I have better roads now than the Premier here, and mine has only been built once. His has been built three times. They do seem to do better work when they get up my way.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — How kind of you, ‘Danny’.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Again we have a Budget Address in this House, Mr. Speaker, that is the 13th one since this ‘people’s government’ came in, and there is one thing I noticed, and it is that every year as every budget gets bigger and bigger, the crown which comes here to listen to his performance gets smaller and smaller. This year was no exception to the rule, Mr. Speaker, because it was the smallest crowd ever. By the way, the civil servants must have been on vacation that day, because even they didn’t come in here. So there seems to have been some slip-up some place. I am going to ask the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), if he is lucky enough to last out this year, spending this \$176 million, that he sees next time that the galleries are all filled, no matter by whom whether they come from the buildings, or any place else.

Well, Mr. Speaker, once again we have advance notice that the Provincial Treasurer is going to set up a new system of ‘gerrymandering’ the Public Debt of this province. That is the second time since 1951. I am very anxious to see what they find out, what this final outcome or picture will be, when it comes before the public one year from now. After all, the public debt of \$222½ million as at December 1, 1956, is \$22½ million larger than a year ago and \$78 million larger than in 1948.

I said last hear, and I say it again, that this is the only Provincial Treasurer in the Dominion of Canada, and I think in the whole world – by the way my friends over there say everything is better here than anywhere else in the whole world; but this is the only Provincial Treasurer who is trying to establish the fact, and he’s trying to do it very, very persistently, that the more money he borrows, the less he owes.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — You have to be smart for that, ‘Hermie’.

**March 13, 1957**

**Mr. Danielson:** — This coming year he is going to borrow about \$50 million. Well, that is all very well if he's going to do it. I don't think we'll have anything to say about it; so he'll go ahead and do that. He pointed out, however, that he borrowed \$7 ½ million (I think he said) not so long ago, and that was all he could get inside of Canada, and there was no hope of borrowing any large amount inside of this country; therefore he was going to go (which he has already done) to the United States for \$14 ½ million. That particularly country, in the view of the C.C.F. not only in this Legislature, but in the Federal House, is a sink of iniquity, where the coupon-clippers and the shysters clip the coupons on bonds from the Canadians, paid from this C.C.F.-Socialist Government's money, which is paid out by the farmers in Saskatchewan, those farmers who are on starvation diets and are ready to quit, according to the C.C.F.

You member for Kerrobert . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Wilkie.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, a Liberal Member, anyway, Mr. Speaker, - he put it very clearly when he said, to listen to these fellows here, he thought the best thing he could do is to "go home and sell my farm and get out while the getting is good". Now, that is a fact. While I was having a bite to eat in the King's Hotel last night, a gentleman came along and sat down beside me; he was from my constituency, but I didn't know it. He said, "I'm selling out. I'm getting out of here. I'm going to do it, this spring." He's not broke by any means, but he said, "anything I hear now is 'blue-ruin' talk all the time. If I can sell out now I can get some money. If I wait a year or two, maybe I cannot sell out at all." And that is the result of this Jeremiah song that we hear every day and every hour of the day, that we are sitting in this House, from the C.C.F.

Well, of course, in this province of Saskatchewan, are more or less dependent for our prosperity on the rural population of this province. The rural population of this province should be commended for the great efforts and the great successes they have made in producing the goods, providing the revenue for even this Government, in abundance during the past few years, without any consideration whatever from this Government. They have received nothing from this Government. They never get anything from them without the Government pretending to give it out with the one hand, and reaching out and taking it back with the other hand. They did the same with the Education and Hospitalization Tax which they were going to abolish - "that "stinking tax", you'll remember. And they did the same thing when they took off the Education and Hospitalization Tax on the gas and greases for farm purposes: \$900,000 taken off, and just about a similar amount to be paid in by increasing the Gasoline Tax by one cent a gallon, to 12 cents a gallon.

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — 50 per cent!

**Mr. Danielson:** — It's juggling. It's juggling of finances, Mr. Speaker, which has no appreciable effect for the people that they pretend to benefit — 'pretend' is the right word, because they never did it. 'Pretend' is something that isn't really done, and that is the case in this particular circumstance. This Government is going to spend altogether, including capital accounts, by borrowing and otherwise, \$176 million during the coming fiscal year. That's a far, far cry from the days just before, or at the time, this Government came in when our total revenue was about \$30 million a year.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — And what did you do with it?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Listen to these men over there. You'd think that we had just about the amount of money to play with that they have. If that had been the case, their criticism would have some point, but today it is pure lunacy and silliness on their part.

I am not going to deal with any more so far as the budget is concerned, because the financial critic of the Opposition did a very excellent job. The best proof, that he did make a good job is that every solitary person on the other side of the House who has been on his feet, has been attacking the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron); and that is the greatest tribute we can have to anyone sitting on this side of the House.

**Hon Mr. Nollet:** — He asked for it.

**Mr. Lopton:** — He's not worrying.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would like to say a few words about Crown Corporations. Many of these C.C.F. "children" are dead and gone. They started to die off, and after they were pretty well all gone, that's when the 'financial wizard' of Saskatchewan started to change his Public Accounts. We have a number of new members in this House, and I don't think they really ever followed the sordid story about these Crown Corporations, so I'm going to give you just a few statements in that regard.

The Provincial Treasurer, last session, on Friday 17, 1956, was kind enough to hand to every member of the House (and I suppose he distributed it all over the place), a certain statement, a summary of results of operations for Crown Corporations from 1945 to 1955. He sets out, I think, the correct figures until he came to the past page. Then he summarizes these figures, and I just want to tell him what he said. He said, "The total surplus was \$8,143,000" (I'm going to leave out the odd figures) "and net losses were \$1,745,000 which left balance of surplus of \$6,398,000." But that is not the whole story, Mr. Speaker. You can check this so-called statement or summary of the Provincial Treasurer, and you will find that he conveniently forgot certain things to put in. One of these is grants to the Fish Board - \$39,880; grants to Fish Marketing Service, \$225,044; grants to Housing Corporation, \$133,100; expenses of finance Office, \$565,472; and interest which the

**March 13, 1957**

taxpayer is paying on the investment on this defunct Crown Corporations, \$2,289,000. There you have it, \$3,249,000; and if you deduct that from the Provincial Treasurer's figures of \$6,398,000 you have \$3,148,000 left of the whole profit of which he speaks.

How are these particular losses being apportioned or how has the loss been allocated? Which one of these "problem children" has been responsible for these losses? Well, the First Board, Mr. Speaker, lost \$4,004; the Housing Corporation, \$42,000; the Tannery, \$70,000; the shoe factory, \$83,000; the wool factory, \$830,000 – totalling \$1,429,000. But the Provincial Treasurer, in addition, appropriated money to cover some of the losses which were created by these Crown Corporations, because certain small assets were sold to governmental departments, when the winding up process was completed – the balance of the assets were valued at twice what they were worth: the Fish Board, \$261,000; the Tannery, \$86,000; the Shoe Factory, \$60,000 - \$407,000.

Now, this \$407,000 is paid by the Provincial Treasurer for these assets that have been transferred to other governmental departments; and they are worse off, insofar as the Woollen Mill is concerned. There's no doubt about that.

This is the history of these Crown Corporations, but the Provincial Treasurer doesn't mention any of these particular items that I mentioned, namely the grants to the Fish Board; grants to the Fish Marketing Services; grants to Housing Corporation; expense to the Finance Office, and the interest. Of course, he doesn't believe in interest; but that does not prevent the people of Saskatchewan from having to pay interest on the money that he borrowed, because it's in there. By the way, during all these years, the Provincial Treasurer has classified these "dead children" as self-liquidating! Well, I think they were. I am sure they were self-liquidating. I think he tried to keep them alive, but they died just the same. So that is the situation as far as the Crown Corporations are concerned.

Well, you can laugh, but you're still keeping on. The Box Factory at Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker, is continually piling up losses without any reason whatever. And what is it set up for? Just for political purposes in Prince Albert political people who, I think, can make probably a very comfortable living out of it at the expense of the taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Part of the Kremlin up there!

**Mr. Danielson:** — We hear a great deal said, Mr. Speaker, about the South Saskatchewan River Dam – in fact it has become a political football in this province.

**Mr. Brown:** — Agreed!



**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Who made it that way?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Would you like to ask me that a little later on?

**Mr. McDonald:** — He's coming to that.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Give him time to think up an answer.

**Mr. Danielson:** — On January 30, the Provincial Treasurer told the press that the Government was willing to pay 25 per cent of the cost of the dam. Here is what he said:

“The province is still prepared to put up \$20 million towards the dam, and we are prepared to consider” (get that word ‘consider’) “looking after the financing of our share ourselves.”

Then we have another statement which differs from the previous statement by members of the Government in one respect. The Provincial Treasurer said: “We are prepared to consider looking after the financing of the provincial share ourselves.” But, in previous negotiations, the province had expected the Federal Government to put up the money and that they would have paid it off over a number of years. Now he says he is going to finance it himself — ‘consider’ financing it himself. Now then, that probably is and probably isn't anything to take into account. As a matter of fact, the question was asked in the House of Commons by the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Studer):

“If I am in order, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. I should like to ask if the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan has communicated with the Government of Canada to say that the Saskatchewan Government is now prepared to consider paying 25 per cent of the cost of the South Saskatchewan Dam in cash, or in cash as the work progresses?”

The Prime Minister replied this:

“I noted a press report in which the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan is reported to have made a statement at a press conference to the effect indicated by the hon. gentleman, but to my knowledge no such communication has ever been made by the Government of Saskatchewan to the Government of Canada.”

Now that is evidently just for home consumption.

In a statement to the press on February 13, the Premier of Saskatchewan goes further. He says this:

**March 13, 1957**

“The Province was willing to pay 25 per cent in cash during each year of construction of the total estimated cost of \$80 million of dollars.”

The Provincial Treasurer said that they would “consider” paying their share; the Premier says the province is “willing” to do it. Now there is a little difference of opinion there. I think they should get together on this thing, Mr. Speaker, and make a public statement.

There is another aspect of the matter, and anyone who has any knowledge of some of the Returns tabled in the House of Commons at Ottawa will know about it, and that is who is going to pay for the penstock in that dam? This is probably a new word, Mr. Speaker, but it crops up now. Penstock is the channel in the dam which connects the water to the electric generating stations. They are definitely a part of this hydroelectric part of this particular dam. These things are very costly, and no decision has been made to date as to who is going to pay for it. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that dam is located right in the centre of the west boundary of my constituency. It is four miles west and two miles north of the little town of Loreburn.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Is it there?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I know more about it than anybody else. I would like to see the dam built. I would like to see it built. Personally, I never have taken any active part in it because no matter what you do, you would be accused of playing politics like these gentlemen over here.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — With your reputation, no wonder.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, my reputation is a darned sight better than yours.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — When you have been elected for 26 years and carried your own hometown 2 to 1.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I do better than that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — He hasn't got a hometown.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Where is your hometown?

**Mr. Danielson:** — If I were you, I wouldn't say anything. You should have the sense to keep your mouth shut.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt, a definite need for that dam. That was recognized by the Dominion Government, after the P.F.R.A. had completed their surveys, and their estimates and their plan specifications for that dam. It was this Government which threw the monkey-wrench into that

dam in the very beginning.

**Some Opposition Member:** — Sabotage!

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Lopton:** — Sure, sure! It would be built now if it wasn't for them, undermining it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Oh nonsense!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you can question my statement later on if you wish. But there's another thing that the Premier said when he made this statement which I just mentioned; that was the last statement I mentioned. I think it was on February 7, the Premier said this:

“The Saskatchewan Government would make no further move to open negotiations with Ottawa.”

What does that mean?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — It means they wouldn't budge.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I think I can prove the reason why, before I sit down, that statement was made. In 1950, this Government engaged the present manager of the Power Corporation, Mr. Case-Beggs. Now, Mr. Speaker, don't think for one minute that I am throwing a reflection upon Mr. Cass-Beggs. I am not qualified to do so by any means. He might be the best man in the world — no doubt he is, as far as they are concerned, because they don't stop in Saskatchewan with nothing but the best in the world, no matter what it is. But they engaged him — and I am not criticizing their attitude; maybe Cass-Beggs is right, but this proves, Mr. Speaker, conclusively that they have accepted Mr. Cass-Beggs' estimation and judgment insofar as the South Saskatchewan River Dam is concerned.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Oh, nonsense, 'Hermie'!

**Mr. Danielson:** — He poured cold water on that proposition from one end to the other of his report. Here is his report, and if the Minister of Agriculture has nothing else to do, some evening, he should take and read that, and it might educate him a little bit. He might find out that there are two sides to every question.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I have read it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Have you read it over?

**March 13, 1957**

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am not criticizing what he said, but Mr. Cass-Beggs, the gentleman who now runs the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, said that “the dam would be of little value for the generation of electric power”. That’s Mr. Cass-Beggs. For quite a number of years, the P.F.R.A. Branch and the Department of Agriculture had conducted investigations and surveys to find a site for the dam (which was very difficult to find) and to arrive at what the cost would be, and the possibilities of whether it could be irrigated by gravity or by pumping the water up so that it could be run on the land. The Government engaged Mr. Cass-Beggs to investigate and report on the value of the project proposed for power Generation. His report in 1950 came as a rude shock, Mr. Speaker, to the supporters of that project. It seriously questioned the value of the project as a means of generating power. On Page 47, it will interest my friends:...

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That’s power.

**Mr. Danielson:** — ...of the 67-page report, Mr. Cass-Beggs reaches this conclusion: “It is probably that” (this is Mr. Cass-Beggs speaking, Mr. Speaker) “The efficient development of the provincial system on lines that did not include the South Saskatchewan River project would, in fact, show economy compared with the all-steam system considered that might be as great, or possibly even greater than the economy now shown in favour of hydro.” That’s what Mr. Cass-Beggs said. In brief, he says that the system of generating power in Saskatchewan which does include the South Saskatchewan River Dam would be more economical than the one that did include the Saskatchewan River Dam. He proceeds on Page 48, with a paragraph which, as he puts, “says that Fort a la Corne might be more economical than the South Saskatchewan Dam.” Fort a la Corne is in northern Saskatchewan below the forks of the north and south branches of the Saskatchewan River: “or the development of the lignite natural resources of the south.” This Government, Mr. Speaker, is now spending millions of dollars to generate the power (and I say this not in a critical way), but they are now today spending millions of dollars to generate power from the lignite deposits of the coals in the southeast part of this province. Just as he recommended back in 1950.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — I’m sure this has nothing to do with hydro.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Cass-Beggs suggested nuclear energy as another alternative. He thinks that natural gas might prove better than the dam. Mr. Cass-Beggs, the gentleman who since has been made head of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, is still ruling out the Saskatchewan Dam as a source of power. About a year ago he addressed the Saskatchewan Division of the Association of Engineering, and in a press report of February 20, 1956, he was quoted as saying: “That the River dam at the Elbow was primarily an irrigation project.” He could see possibilities for hydropower at Fort a la Corne, or on the Churchill River, but regarded the South Saskatchewan Dam as only for irrigation. Now, this is a Cass-Beggs report. Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that all the interest this Government at the present time has in the Saskatchewan River Dam is purely for political agitation and political purposes.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Oh, Baloney!

**Mr. Danielson:** — They have abandoned it. The Premier said they will have nothing further to do with Ottawa any more, so far as this is concerned.

**Mr. Loftson:** — What's the use?

**Mr. Danielson:** — They have gone to work, or as I say, Mr. Cass-Beggs was successful in convincing the Government of Saskatchewan, this C.C.F. Government, that today he was right, because they have accepted every suggestion that he made in his 67-page report which I have on my desk right here — accepted every one of them, and today they are getting sort of lukewarm and now they are cold toward the proposition so far as generating power from the South Saskatchewan River Dam is concerned. Today, Mr. Cass-Beggs, the man who told you what to do (and you did it!) he said that it was only an irrigation proposition.

**Premier Douglas:** — He said 'primarily', too. He didn't say 'only'.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Primarily, but he repeated it time and time again to those who know.

**Premier Douglas:** — 'Primarily', but not 'only'.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Get your words correct.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can call it anything you like. He is convinced that it is only an irrigation proposition.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member cannot misquote a statement from which he is quoting. The statement from which he quoted said 'primarily', and now the hon. member quotes it as saying 'only'. The report cannot be misquoted. The report says "'primarily' and irrigation project" — not "'only' an irrigation project".

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now you sit down!

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker will tell me to sit down if he wants me to.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I take responsibility for every word I say in this House, and I don't need one of those 'gold-dust twins' to tell me. He had the difficult Rawluk inquiry, boy — this is the House of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Don't be so stupid.

**March 13, 1957**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Pretty weak argument, ‘Hermie’!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has accepted holus-bolus the suggestions and recommendations made by Mr. Cass-Beggs – and he may be right; I don’t know. But why don’t they be honest about it? If they are interested in the Saskatchewan Dam today it is purely for political purposes – to use that dam as a club and to deceive the people in the election that is to come. That’s all.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — We couldn’t do that if it was built.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, when you have removed the possibility of generating electricity and hydro-electric power in this province from that project, you have a project that is going to cost you a tremendous amount of money, at least \$105 million, for irrigating less than a half-million acres of land. Contradict that if you want. Then the question is, Mr. Speaker, is it a proper and a justifiable expenditure. I say to you that the Saskatchewan River Dam can only be justified if all the power made available by that dam can be used for generating power and be properly used in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — These fellows are now suggesting to spend \$80 million - \$40 million at Estevan and \$40 million at Saskatoon, and then Mr. Cass-Beggs mentioned Fort a la Corne. Then another thing he says is that there is a certain loss in transmitting electrical energy, which everybody knows. Even I know that.

**Premier Douglas:** — Then everybody must know.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That’s not much, as far as you are concerned.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But he points out that the loss of transmission of electric energy would be to a large extent overcome, if you had the generating plant at Fort a la Corne, the lignite deposits in the south, cheap oil and gas from the west of the province, which is probably common sense. But I say that this Government never told them that. When the rates of the gasoline tax were raised, they waited until after an election. There are many things they haven’t told us about that have happened here since the last election, and previous to the election; many things which have never fully been explained. The Premier should be honest. He should go out and tell the people, and say, “Here, we have completely revamped our policy in regard to electric energy in this province. We are now going forward with our plan. Let Ottawa do anything it likes about the Dam.” They are privileged to do that, but they haven’t even done that. They have the opportunity of building the South Saskatchewan River Dam, but they have committed themselves to an \$80 million expenditure in this province now, in the next few years. It is more than \$80 million, but that is the estimated cost

of the two sources of energy which they are building at the present time. That's the point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It's a good one.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, you bet it's a good one. And you'll wish I hadn't made it public, too.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — We would be waiting a long time waiting for Ottawa!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That shows how little you know.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You never do read the newspaper.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would be interested in knowing that I have been trying for nearly a month to re-open negotiations with the Prime Minister, and I am still waiting for a reply.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What on?

**Premier Douglas:** — On the South Saskatchewan Dam.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What about your own leader — what did he say about the dam? What did your leader say in Prince Albert about it?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Here's what the Premier said. He's always trying to correct me, Mr. Speaker. He said in this statement on February 13: "The Saskatchewan Government will make no further move to open negotiations with Ottawa." That's right in the press.

**Some Government Member:** — As long as you mean the word 'negotiations'.

**Premier Douglas:** — Would the hon. member read the rest of the statement?

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, you can read it when you get up. sure, but you cannot cut out this bit of sentence here. You made a definite statement. You might gloss it over and try to hide the meaning of it in some of the rest of your former statements, but that stands out there like a sore thumb.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — You're off the air, now.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, we've got lots of time.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — As a matter of fact, I forgot all about the air.

**March 13, 1957**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You sure never run out of it.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Come on, Herman.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The ‘Minister of the Bull’ over there, I thought he was going to do something, Mr. Speaker, but it’s just a fake. That’s what he puts on when he goes out to hold a meeting and talk to the farmers. He gets no abuse from them, so he forgets about it and puts on a show here in the House.

The member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) who just spoke, made a wonderful little talk. I just want to say a few things in regard to the things he spoke of. I am going to go into them a little bit further than he did. I just want to start out by saying that as far as the rural problem is concerned, that is a problem. It is all in the marketing of wheat and the shortage of money. There isn’t any other problem that is of as great importance to the people of this province. Marketings of Canadian wheat in terms of grain equivalent during the last crop year, 1955-56 were substantially higher than for the preceding year and well above the 10-year average, 1945-55. The figures are as follows: 1955-56, 308 million bushels were sold; 1945-55, 260 million bushels; and the 10-year average was 272 ½ million bushels. Therefore we see that we marketed about 43 million bushels better in 1955-56 than what we did the year before. The sales during the first five months of this crop year are very encouraging, and I think we will probably be able to sell as much of our grain this year as we did last year. Just looking at ‘The Western Producer’ in my hotel this morning, I noticed an article in the February 21 edition which says, ‘The Grain Marketing Round-Up’. Now, that thing comes from the United States, Mr. Speaker. It is not a Canadian article. It is written in the United States, but it has been printed in full. I am not going to read very much of it:

“The United States Agricultural Secretary Ezra Benson said in a recent statement that the 1957 United States wheat crop may total only 810 million bushels. He forecast exports and domestic consumption in the year starting July 1 will amount to 950 million bushels.

“Benson said that wheat producers in the U.S. signed up 10,700,000 acres in the 1957 winter wheat acreage reserve program of the soil bank. If they take about 3 million acres of spring wheat out of production, the total wheat crop may be about 810 million bushels.”

They have already taken out a certain amount of acreage on the fall wheat production, Mr. Speaker:



“Reasons for increased sales outlook are the reduction of this year’s European wheat crop; the disappearance of France as a significant exporter; a need to build up reserves in many importing countries; a steady upward trend in world population, increased demands for food grains in less-developed regions of the world; increased feed grain demand in European countries because of upward trends in livestock numbers; continued large U.S. expenditures abroad; U.S. commodity Credit Corporation sales abroad; extension by the Export-Import Bank of short-term credit to importers . . .”

“While the credit arrangements of the U.S. program are not applicable to the Canadian market, the other factors apply equally to Canadian sales and would point to a continued strong demand for Canadian grain.”

That comes not from a political source; it is a very factual statement which is a forecast of what we can look forward to during this coming marketing year.

We hear a good many things from the Government side of the House, and many things are said in regard to what the Wheat Board should do and shouldn’t do. Well, it is not a new thing. Probably it is a new thing to the new members of this House; but back in 1954, Mr. Speaker, the Government side of the House did their best to try to persuade the Wheat Board to take over what to them, at that particular time, was an imaginary shortage of seed wheat in the province of Saskatchewan. They demanded that the Wheat Board be enabled or ordered to distribute that seed. That was, of course, in line with their idea and with their continual demand that the Wheat Board should be saddled with all these extra things (which were not the problems of the Wheat Board); because after all, you have this Board, appointed by the Government, who have all they can do now to see the wheat, and they have more than a full-time job to do that, let alone handling money on wheat, or advance anything that is the function of the municipalities and the Government of this province. At that time they decided that the Wheat Board should advance a certain amount of help to the farmers’ seed – as a matter of fact there was no need for any help, but they took it up on the floor of this House. I remember suggesting to the Premier that the problem was just a minor one anyhow, and that \$500,000 would be plenty to take care of the areas which might possibly need assistance. He said, “Oh, that’s no good. It will take \$5 million.” Well, of course he was right! I had to be wrong, since I was sitting on this side of the House! I guessed at it, I admit – but my guess was far, far closer to the mark than his was. After the thing went along, certain action was taken by the Liberal party at a meeting in Saskatoon, and this matter was discussed. A resolution was passed and was printed in the press, and we said that the Government of Saskatchewan should take the necessary steps to see that the farmer would be provided with the seed grain which they needed for their spring seeding of 1954. Well, things went along and it was brought to

**March 13, 1957**

the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (at the time the Hon. Mr. McIntosh) in Regina and he pooh-poohed this resolution of the Liberal party, of course, and he said this about resolutions sent to the Government about making arrangements for financial assistance to farmers. Mr. McIntosh said, "The Municipality Seed Grain and Supply Act makes provision for assisting farmers through their municipal government", I know that – I knew it at that time; but he goes on; "so far this year" (and by the way that was May, 1954) "so far as this year is concerned, there has been no application for seed to date from individuals for assistance in their spring operations".

That was the problem that would take \$5 million.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that is a wild assertion.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's no wild assertion.

**Premier Douglas:** — That \$5 million was advances on grain – not to provide for seed and seed supplies, and the hon. member knows that. He is just drawing on his imagination.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's your imagination.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, if you want to investigate this, I can show you the whole record of it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Go ahead.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Then is this the imagination of your Minister of Municipal Affairs when he tells you . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — He must have been at the Liberal convention.

**Mr. Danielson:** — "Regina ('Special to 'The Star-Phoenix): Hon. L.F. McIntosh, Saskatchewan Minister of Municipal Affairs, commented Friday on a resolution passed at the recent Liberal meeting in Saskatoon. The resolution was sent to the C.C.F. Government for not making arrangements to provide financial assistance to farmers for farm seeding operations, as had been done by earlier Liberal Governments.

"McIntosh said The Municipalities Seed Grain and Supply Act makes provision for assisting farmers through their municipal government to secure the necessary finances for seed grain and such supplies as petroleum products and machinery repairs.

“Many farmers through their municipal governments have taken advantage of this legislation in the past.”

Mr. McIntosh states:

“The Government has always made provision, and this was done again this year, to give financial assistance to farmers in local improvement districts where such assistance is requested. Insofar as this year is concerned there have been no applications received to date from municipalities, nor local improvement districts or individual farmers for assistance for their spring operations.”

The Minister added:

“This legislation has remained on the Statutes for many years” – and we put it there. The Liberals put it there.

Mr. McIntosh concluded:

“And it is generally well-known by both farm and municipal people.”

I want to draw their attention to it in spite of what the Premier says. He is just taking a shot in the dark, and thinks he is going to have something; but he can't do that when I get on my feet, because I know him.

**Mr. Loptson:** — He's missing all the time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now then, we hear continually about the ‘blue ruin’, the distress and the bankruptcy of the farmers of this province. I think the Minister of Agriculture must believe it himself; he has repeated it so often, and so have the rest of the C.C.F. over there. They have repeated and repeated until I think they must believe it themselves. They have suggested certain remedies, and I want to say there are two Ministers on that side of the House who, within the last few weeks, stated certain definite things much be done. He lined them up something like this: (1) he said cash advances should be given on farm-stored grain; at least 75 per cent of the initial price; (2) credit provision should be made to enable every farmer to provide the proper grain storage on their farms; (3) a national Conference should be called to discuss and develop a comprehensive long-term plan for Canada; (4) Mr. Nollet said this: He said farmers should be paid the proper price for their labour so that the industry could make a deduction to provide for an insurance plan, such as crop insurance, unemployment, workmen's compensation

**March 13, 1957**

and pensions for small farmers. He said this: "This is not a new principle; it is a well established in other industries, and it can be done in agriculture." Now these are the four things which he says is a remedy for agriculture, because he had his own friends there; he was talking to the C.C.F. in Moose Jaw, and he no doubt gave them the works, which he often does.

Now then, what are they – first of all he is going to give cash advances on farm-stored grain. Now a dollar is a dollar once you get it through the bank, or through the elevator company. So far as my part of Saskatchewan is concerned, I would say that any person who has wheat on their farm has been able to go to the bank and get the money they needed to get through the winter, and judging by the prosperous indication up in my part of the country, the farmers are not broke by any means. Then he said they should have had assistance from the Dominion Government for more granaries. Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen a bushel of wheat lying on the ground this winter. There might be in some parts of the province, but I haven't seen it in my district; it's all in the bin.

**Mr. Willis (Elrose):** — There are thousands of bushels in mine.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you may have. I am not saying you haven't. I am speaking of my district where there isn't any there. Then the next thing is that the farmers should be paid wages, and he might have something there. The only place in the world where the farmers are paid wages on the farms is on the collective farms.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would not want to misconstrue anything like that. I never suggested that the farmers should be paid wages. I said that if they would get wages comparable to wages paid in industry, farm products would be a whole lot higher than they are now. That's what I said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But here's what you said. "In the fourth instance", said Mr. Nollet, "farmers should be paid the proper price for their labour." But what is the proper price for their labour?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Do you disagree with it?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify that point.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I have just clarified it. The products of farm labour are wheat, cattle, hogs, chickens, poultry and the rest of it – and eggs.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But when you say it to me, that's a wage. I should be paid for my labour.

**Some Government Members:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You wouldn't get much.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, “the farmer should be paid a proper price for their labour so that the industry could make a deduction to provide a free insurance plan; crop insurance, unemployment, workmen’s compensation and pensions for small farmers.”

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That’s the program you ought to adopt.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I say to you, the only place that I know of where they have that system on a farm is on a collective farm. There they get wages for what they do, plus a small part of production, and very small, at that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Russia.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That’s where it is. Now that is the four-point solution to the agricultural problem in this province. Then we have an addition to this because the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) spoke in Weyburn, the other day, and this is dated in the press of March 8:

“Mr. Erb outlined the national policy on agriculture”, (this should be correct)... “which includes the disposal of surplus farm commodities through the acceptance of foreign currency, barter and the outright gift of these surpluses, to backward and need countries.”

Again that is a very familiar chorus – to give away your wheat; give it away. So there are the four things the Hon. Minister of Agriculture mentioned, plus this give-away program of your grain, as the solution that the C.C.F. has for the farmers and agriculture.

**Mr. Loptson:** —There’s nothing to stop them from doing it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Nothing in the world. They could have started with some of their own, to see how it works out.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure. It would help to give his away, but he always wants somebody to pay for it before they give it away.

**Premier Douglas:** — It’s all right to give away...

**Mr. Loptson:** — That’s the Socialist program; that’s the way the Socialists . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What have you got to protect in agriculture?

**Mr. McDonald:** — You haven’t any wheat to give away, ‘Brock’; it won’t hurt you.

**March 13, 1957**

**Mr. Danielson:** — I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, this eternal admonition and arguing, not only here but in Ottawa, and in every place where we sit for two or three months and listen to them, of advertising the distress of the Wheat Pools and the farmers of Western Canada to the world, and indicating that there was no hope for the farmers in Saskatchewan or in western Canada. The only thing we could do was to give our wheat away and sell it for what we could get. Now, that is their solution. You will remember it is only 18 months ago since this country was facing a very tragic and serious situation, and the facts have been very clearly outlined by the head of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I am going to read it to you. This is dated December 14, 1956, and he spoke at Saskatoon:

“J.H. Wesson, Regina, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool president, said Thursday the United Kingdom and other European countries instituted a boycott against the Canadian Wheat Board when exports and farmers’ deliveries had dropped to a trickle from September, 1955 through the winter.

“Mr. Wesson told the Saskatchewan Farmers’ Union annual convention that these countries were convinced that the Canadian Wheat Board would have to lower wheat prices to compete with the disposal plan of the United States. These importing countries borrowed from each other and scraped their bins to the bottom while refusing to buy from Canada.

“This had lasted until the buying spurt in April and since, the Suez Canal crisis broke, and these countries then, with empty bins, were then in a panic wondering if they could get ship space to replenish the badly depleted stocks.

“‘The Northwest Miller’, organ of a private enterprise firm in Minneapolis, had given the Canadian Wheat Board the credit for saving world wheat prices from complete collapse.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — “Mr. Wesson defended the credit deal that had enabled the sale of 45 million bushels of wheat to Iron Curtain countries. He contended wheat should be sold anywhere there was the cash to pay for it, and Communist countries should be extended the same credit facilities as others if they wanted to buy our wheat and did not have the cash.

“Mr. Wesson disagreed with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics” – and here is where I agree with Mr. Wesson 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You don't agree with the other, though?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Wait till you listen:

“Mr. Wesson disagreed with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on the amount of what still on the farms. Without giving an estimate of the amount, he did say that 30 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers had nothing left and getting rid of surplus wheat would avail the farmers nothing.” (Even if you give it away).

“Under the quota system farmers actually delivered the equivalent of 17 bushels for each seeded acre last year, which was more than the normal production of 16 bushels per acre, he said.”

Now there should be no question, Mr. Speaker, in regard to these statements. I just wonder if this eternal cry and advertising of our distress to the world – this time all the C.C.F. members in the House of Commons were on their feet every day howling about this distress; I just wonder if these importing countries didn't know what they were listening to, and said, “We'll just hold off. They'll come for their milk. They're going to have to take our price, and not what they are asking.” These fellows sitting across here should never forget that they are the Government of the Province. They are not any private millers, or private capitalists, or anything. They're the Government of the greatest wheat-growing province in the Dominion of Canada, and when they pass resolutions and make speeches and tell the people of the Old Land, and every place in the world, that we are on the brink of ruin because we cannot sell out wheat at the price of \$1.40 at Fort William, can you blame these countries for holding back and saying, “We'll just wait?” They scraped their bins, they borrowed wheat from each other in order to be able to hand out and see if they wouldn't bring down the price that the Wheat Board has set, which is a reasonable and a fair price for producers in this country.

Now they can protest all they like, but it is a fact that they have contributed, Mr. Speaker, to the distress of the farmer by that very propaganda alone, which has probably caused more damage than any capitalist or any other agency has ever brought to the detriment of the farming population of western Canada.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — They said something about, “the marketing last year”. Mr. Gibbings said something about that at Kamsack not long ago – December 1, 1956. He said that the farm machinery was adequate as we had marketed 17 bushels per seeded acreage in the past year, and in the past 25 years there were only five years that we had marketed more than this, and these were the post-war years. We talk about eight bushels to the acre. Mr. Speaker, I don't need to tell you, but don't forget this, that that is the total cultivated acreage. That is the cultivated acreage on a farm. That's not the seeded wheat acreage; the marketing was equivalent to 17 bushels

**March 13, 1957**

during 1955-56 crop year, on seeded acreage.

Now what about your parity prices? Well, I saw something in a magazine here, and down in the United States they are still figuring on the parity prices and they still haven't come to any real conclusion as to what it really means. But in the evidence that was given before this famous Agricultural Committee in this Assembly, last year, we had a gentleman here by the name of Mr. T.G. Bobier; I think he is Vice-President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, isn't he? Isn't that correct? Yes. And he gave some evidence and he said this:

“The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture has called for support prices at 65 to 85 per cent of parity . . .”

That was the policy at that time; and mind, that is just about a year ago now.

“. . . on agricultural products to be in effect at all times.”

Then later on in his evidence, Mr. Mervyn Woods, who was the counsel for the Committee, questioned Mr. Bobier and Mr. Bobier said this:

“The present initial price on wheat, \$1.40 per bushel, No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead, works out about 75 per cent of parity, according to the Federation's method of reckoning.”

Earlier he said the policy worked out by the Federation was 65 to 85 per cent, and here he said the present price of \$1.40 per bushel works out on the basis of 75 per cent of parity. So we won't worry about that. By the way, Mr. Speaker, that is the initial price. We haven't yet been paid the additional payment. We will have a final payment, and what that final payment will be no one really knows, but I have hopes that it might not be very far from the 20 cents per bushel.

I say again that these people who eternally and at every opportunity, and every day are crying, crying, crying 'blue ruin', 'give away our wheat', and about the distress, that agriculture is on the brink of ruin, are doing no good to farmers in this province. I think that is the biggest detriment that we have. Why should anybody have faith to come to Saskatchewan when you hear that sort of thing? It comes not from the individual, but from the Government of this province. It goes out to every grain exchange and every miller's organization in the world, and they are at liberty to (and no doubt do) take it for what it sounds like; and as a matter of fact, they attempt to take advantage of it and no one should criticize them for trying to save all the money they can, and thereby circle back and pass by this Canadian Wheat Board as long as they possibly can do so, and buy the wheat elsewhere. As has been said by the 'Minneapolis Miller Journal', which represents the milling interests in



the United States, it was the Canadian Wheat Board who did help hold the markets and prevent a disaster in the wheat prices about a year ago.

Sometimes we hear a great deal, Mr. Speaker, from the members opposite about how things have been going in the past, and they are very elated when they can find something like some kind of a snap resolution in the House of Commons, and tell the world that the Liberals voted against so and so and so. They generally move the resolution when they go into supply, or on motions from the Speech from the Throne, and things of that kind, and of course they are ‘trick’ motions, and if by any accident they should go through, why the Government would be defeated, and they would have to resign. But, you see, the Liberals are not the only ones, Mr. Speaker, who have been caught in that position. The CCF. — I have been checking up, and I have it here; February 10, 1956. This is an article from Ottawa, and it says that when the Bill providing loans from the bank for the farmers in the session of 1956 was before the House, every CCF member voted against it. There were 138 votes for it, and 18 CCF votes against it. The Social Credit and Conservatives and all the other members voted with the Government in favour of extending, or passing that Bill, which made it possible for the farmers to get the money they needed during last winter, and last year from the bank, on the security of their grain.

Now, we don’t hear anything about that but that 18 members of the CCF were right, and 130 other members were wrong, according to their deduction. Then, a few years ago, when the settlement of that four-year wheat contract was consummated in Ottawa, we know what the scope of that was; I’m not going to go into that. But the fact remains that the Dominion Government, which was a Liberal Government, saw fit at that time to take \$65 million out of the Treasury and extend it as additional payment to the wheat-growers of western Canada, on that Bill. Every CCF member east of the Great Lakes voted against it. There you have the labour-CCF against the farmers’ interests, and that exemplifies the condition everywhere. Every CCF member east of the Great Lakes voted against that \$65 million being extended to the people of western Canada, provided by the Dominion Government, and many of the western members were not even in their seats when that vote was taken. Now, what would have happened if the reverse had occurred? You would have had a celebration if the situation was reversed. The CCF would have nailed that on to us, had the Liberals voted against anything like that. Why, there would be celebrations; there would be radio broadcasts, and the air would be fuming with this propaganda of what the Liberals think. But we haven’t said anything about it. We don’t want to stoop down to these low-down despicable things . . .

**Some Opposition Member:** —Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and destroy everything that we possibly can. Now, the next time you tell all the policies or all the

**March 13, 1957**

crimes of the Liberals, you tell them about this, too, will you?

**Some Government Member:** — We will.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sure you will. You look like that! Well, I have another file or two, Mr. Speaker. Oh, there's lots of time.

**Premier Douglas:** — How about discussing the budget for a while?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have already dealt with that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It only takes a couple of minutes.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, it all comes from the Government of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and what surprises me is that this 'humanitarian' government, after 12 long years (starting on 13 now) with all their hundreds of millions of dollars that they have had to spend, have not seen fit yet to provide the proper accommodation for the mentally-ill people in this province. I have been listening to some of these humanitarians (so to speak), and they always dwell on 'Humanity First'! but in spite of the fact — and there can be no denying this, Mr. Speaker, because we have the John Howard society report; we have Dr. Osmond's report from the Mental Hospital, and we have a letter which was written by Miss Marion Binning, 315 Main St. No., Moose Jaw. This is not a secret letter. She wrote her expression of opinion, I suppose to everybody else, and this letter happened to be addressed to me. I am going to read it to you. I know if the other fellows could get anything on us, they would read it and print it and put it on the T.V., and everything else. She says here:

“For the past year I have been visiting regularly at the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn. I wonder how many people know the actual conditions there. Do you know that 150 or more persons, are serviced by four attendants and four...patients, and that many wards are not so well serviced.

“Do you know that many of the parole patients are unable to go out because of inadequate clothing, particularly warm coats and outer clothing, as well as under garments to keep them warm? \$50 is the amount allowed for staff uniforms for patient per year and this means next to nothing, particularly when 80 per cent of the patients are forgotten patients”.

**Some Opposition Member:** — Shame!

**Mr. Danielson:** — “Do you know that the hospital cares for 1,800 people with the original accommodation for

600 persons? I know personally on C-3, which is supposed to be one of the best wards, there are 20 elderly ladies sleeping in a closed-in porch without any heating except what creeps in the door-way.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Do you know it used to have 2,500?

**Mr. Danielson:** — “With such inadequate facilities and terrific overcrowding, it seems incredible that the Superintendent, Dr. Osmond, and his staff are able to accomplish the miracles they do.

“In drawing your attention to this serious and appalling situation, which must vitally affect the welfare of our mentally ill, I would like to hear your comments on this matter, and what action you reach.

“Thanking you for an early reply,

Miss Marion Binning  
351 Main St. E.,  
Moose Jaw, Sask.

And by the way, this lady is a business lady, operating Binning’s Store in Moose Jaw – a ladies’ ready-to-wear, hosiery, gloves, etc.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Read your reply.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, if I had it here, I would be glad to. I would be darn glad to do that, as you know, I haven’t got it; but I did reply to the letter. Read your reply. Read the Premier’s reply. He’s got a copy of it. You could go to your office and get it. I can’t do that.

**Premier Douglas:** — I’ll be very glad to give it to you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But, Mr. Speaker, this Government has millions of dollars to put up palatial office buildings for their selling staff of civil servants and for 15 Cabinet Ministers. The Museum cost \$1 million, much of it taken from the Education Fund; \$78,000 was spent for landscaping some 34 acres.

**Mr. Lopton:** — \$125 million.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That will be more than \$21,000 more than last year’s estimate; that’s \$99,000. That is \$27,000 a acre to landscape a parkland which was level as the floor before.

**March 13, 1957**

**Mr. McDonald:** — Scrubbing brick!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Scrubbing brick. But nothing for the mentally sick. They could have taken the \$1 million they spent on this building and put that down in Weyburn, where it was badly needed. But don't forget this. This Government have been in power for nearly 13 years, and they as a Government have had millions and millions of dollars – they've been putting it into their pockets and the taxpayers are paying four times what they used to pay. Still they are not satisfied. They are going to spend \$176 million in this province this year. Is there anything allowed for building additional accommodation for these needy people who are mentally ill? No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard of anything so far. The member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) says 'first things first'. Yes, first things first for the city of Regina. That's all very well. You've had a bunch of CCF party workers over there leaning on their rakes all summer; this has been an election year. I have seen it myself – six men talking, and one man working; in other parts, five men. I stopped my car and looked at them, Mr. Speaker. There seemed to be so many CCF workers profitably employed without anything to do. \$27,000 an acre! Any contractor in this province would be tickled to death to take a contract and to have done the work for \$15,000 – and still you haven't got anything over there. And you're not through. But that's this CCF efficiency, for you!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Planned economy!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Planned economy. Yes, planned economy. They can talk all they like about 1943, Mr. Speaker, when the total revenue of this province was about \$32 million.

**Some Government Member:** — What did you do with it?

**Mr. Danielson:** — We did four times as much as you do with the same amount today.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — Tell us how many patients you had in the Weyburn Hospital in 1943?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I don't care anything about that.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, you don't. You didn't care, that's the trouble.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Let me tell you this. That doesn't excuse you in 1957.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Not a bit.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Jump up and down, lad.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's no excuse for him. He came here and promised a 'heaven on earth' to these sick and ill people in this province. He wasn't even going to tax them – it was to be 'without money and without price'!

**Premier Douglas:** — They are receiving better care than in any province in Canada.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's what you say. That's what Dr. Sigerist said in 1944. Your own appointed Dr. Sigerist said it was the greatest system of medical services in the country at that time, and you didn't put it in, either.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You asked him to come in here to condemn . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — He didn't say that about the mental hospitals, I'm sure.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of what I have said, I'm sure I don't need to tell you that I am not going to vote for this Budget.

**Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, after that impassioned address of the hon. member for Arm River, I am sure that anything I have to say is going to sound most commonplace.

In rising to participate in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my congratulations to the many you have already received from the members of this Assembly, and undoubtedly from friends outside of this House, upon your election to the high office of Speaker of this Assembly. That you are eminently qualified for this high office is demonstrated by your ability and your integrity and your great sense of fairness and impartiality. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that you may continue in this important and honoured capacity for many years to come.

I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the newly-elected members to this Legislature. I am sure they are conscious of the great honour that has been bestowed upon them by the people whom they represent, and I am sure that they are also aware of the great responsibility that they have towards these people. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that they will find throughout these four years the work in this Legislature an enriching and rewarding experience.

I should also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank the hon. Premier for the great and singular honour he has bestowed

**March 13, 1957**

upon me in appointing me as Minister of Public Health. In doing so, he not only honoured me, but also the good people of Milestone constituency, whom it has been my honour and privilege to represent, these past nine years. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that I shall ever prove worthy of the trust and confidence that has been placed in me, and also that I shall prove worthy of my two predecessors, the hon. Premier, and the Hon. Mr. Bentley.

The Budget address, Mr. Speaker, is an occasion to which not only we in the Legislature look forward; it is also keenly anticipated by thousands of people throughout Canada, in the business and financial world, as well as the people living in the confines of this province, upon whose social and economic life the Budget makes an impact.

I wish at this time to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), for the excellent manner in which he brought down a remarkably fine Budget. I believe that, in this instance, the Opposition could agree with me when I say that Saskatchewan had indeed been fortunate in having such an outstandingly able Provincial Treasurer as the Hon. C.M. Fines. But, Mr. Speaker, what distinguishes him as an even more remarkable individual, I think, is the fact that, although his financial ability is recognized throughout Canada and indeed his service has been sought by corporations in Canada, he has chosen to remain with us to serve Saskatchewan and its people, and that so superbly well.

The 1957 Budget, Mr. Speaker, is, if I may use the term, a “corollary” to the Speech from the Throne. What is even more is that the 1957 Budget is the evidence of the good faith of this Government respecting the ‘program for prosperity’ upon which it was elected in 1956. It eminently marks the beginning of the implementation of the CCF program for prosperity. It is not only a balanced budget financially, but it also reflects a balance of expenditures through the various Departments of Government concerned, so that the greatest number of Saskatchewan people may benefit therefrom. And when one considers the expenditures on health and welfare program, the 1957 Budget indeed, Mr. Speaker, becomes a humanitarian one.

The Budget indicates, too, the great economic expansion that has been taking place in the Province of Saskatchewan. Time has indeed proved the correctness of Government policy respecting the development of our natural resources. In the development of the resources of any province, the question is not only how much wealth has been created therefrom, but to what extent have the people shared in the development of those resources.

The aim of this Government is that, in the disbursement of the wealth from our resources, all the people of Saskatchewan shall share therein, and it is on this proposition: that, as our wealth increases, it will

continue to be channelled into programs providing for better health and welfare services for our citizens; better schools and educational standards and greater educational opportunities to agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since I would like to make some further comments upon what the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has stated a moment ago, I should like to get leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

(Debate adjourned)

March 13, 1957

## SECOND READING — THE VEHICLES ACT

The Assembly, according to Order, resumed from March 7, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines:

“That Bill No. 28 – An Act respecting the Operation of Vehicles — be now read the second time.”

**Mr. A .H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, you kind of caught me unprepared here.

**Hon. R. A. Walker (Attorney General):** —Do you want the ‘Leader-Post’?

**Mr. McDonald:** — No, I have it too, ‘Bob’.

**Some Hon. Member:** — He is looking for ‘The Commonwealth’?

**Mr. McDonald:** — On the proposed amendment to Bill No. 27, Mr. Speaker, which is The Vehicles Act, I am just a little surprised at the attitude of the Government in this respect. I am very much surprised at the attitude of the Premier, when he spoke in this debate. One would take from his remarks at that time that by amending The Vehicles Act, we were going to rectify one of the great problems that confront the people of Saskatchewan and the people of other parts of Canada. He mentioned at that time that this ‘murder’ had to be stopped, and I just wondered how on earth we were going to rectify all the problems that are caused through the excessive use of alcohol by amending The Vehicles Act. As a matter of fact, the Premier when he was using what I termed his ‘rattle and his lollipop’ the radio in his closing remarks, was almost overwhelmed. He was prepared to take this issue to the people, but as soon as he got out into the corridor outside the Chamber, he cooled off considerably, and he told the press that “Oh, he wasn’t going to take this issue to the people; not now.” He was going to wait three and a half or four years, and then he would consult the people about this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem as far as the excessive use of alcohol is concerned, and, as I mentioned a moment ago, you are not going to cure that problem by simply amending The Vehicles Act. The excessive use of alcohol affects people in many different ways. Some people, when they have too much to drink want to sing, and other people want to fight, other people go home and beat their wives; other wives go home and beat their husband; some people go out and commit murder, using an automobile or rifle, a knife or a club, or some other instrument to commit murder, and by amending The Vehicles Act, Mr. Speaker, it’s like attacking a



bear with a fly-swatter. This is a tremendous problem that confronts the people on this province and the people of other parts of Canada. I personally think that, rather than spending three years trying to find out what time it is in Saskatchewan, and when we are prepared to take a step (so far as I am concerned) in the suggested amendment on The Vehicles Act, we might be wise to give some time to the consideration of these proposed amendments. I think we would be very wise if we were to set up a Legislative Committee that would take under consideration amendments to The Vehicles Act, but, at the same time, would take under consideration amendments of the Liquor Laws of this province. We have the most outmoded and outdated liquor Legislation that exists any place in the world that I know of.

The Premier and Provincial Treasurer say that we have to amend The Vehicles Act and we have to have all of our citizens, who are old enough and able to drive an automobile, sign a document stating that they are prepared to take certain tests, or otherwise they will not receive a driver's licence. Mr. Speaker, when we go down to buy a driver's licence, or have bought one in the past, we didn't have to sign anything to the effect that we would obey the rules of the road; we didn't have to sign that we would drive on the proper side of the road; we didn't have to sign and say that we would stop at stop signs. Why on earth should we now have to sign away part of our rights as citizens in order to get a driver's licence? And supposing that you were able to wipe out all of the accidents caused through drunken driving by the amendment to The Vehicles Act, you have only scratched the problem as far as the excessive use of alcohol is concerned in any case.

I have before me two or three editorials from leading newspapers in the province, and there is quite a conflicting view as far as the editors of these different newspapers are concerned, but all of them are pointing out that we are not getting at the root of this great problem. For instance, last year in the province of Saskatchewan, we were able to put into our Treasury about \$10 million from the sale of alcoholic beverages, revenues for the province of Saskatchewan. Now the Minister who has brought the proposed amendments to The Vehicles Act into this House is also the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board in the province of Saskatchewan. It is all very well for the province of Saskatchewan to take \$10 million in revenue out of the distribution of alcoholic beverages, but every liquor law that is in existence in the province of Saskatchewan today is being broken daily, and how much are we spending in endeavouring to enforce the liquor legislation of this province? There isn't a beer parlour in the province of Saskatchewan that one can go into where any law is being obeyed.

**Hon. Mr. Walter:** — Come, come!

**Mr. McDonald:** — The Government of the Province of Saskatchewan are prepared...

**Some Government Member:** — Except closing hours.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They are sometimes not obeyed either. The Government

**March 13, 1957**

of the Province of Saskatchewan provides the wherewithal for drunkenness in this province. They provide the medium for the distribution of alcoholic beverages. They take \$10 million out in profits, but they do nothing to enforce the liquor legislation or the liquor laws of this province.

**Hon. Mr. Walter:** — Nuts! You know better than that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's a fact and you know it. You know as well as I do that people daily are going into beer parlours and they are perfectly within the law to sit there until they are so inebriated that they cannot walk out, and then they are smoothed out the door of the beer parlour, but whose responsibility is it to look after them? Does the Government accept any responsibility? They provided them with the liquor; they provided the medium for the public to buy that liquor, and when a man or a woman becomes intoxicated they are sent out on the street and become a public nuisance in many cases, and immediately commit such crimes as murder on our highways, and murder elsewhere.

No, Mr. Speaker, amendment to The Vehicles Act is not what is needed. What we need in this province is a Committee of this Legislature set up to look at legislation and the distribution of liquor in this province, and at the same time, probably there is some need for amendments to The Vehicles Act. But I doubt very much if the proposed amendments are going to have any effect on the highway accidents caused by alcohol at the present moment. The great majority of the people who drink to excess undoubtedly will continue to drive their automobiles while under the influence of alcohol in the hope that they can avoid being caught and having to take any proposed tests that we have in the amendment under The Vehicles Act.

Supposing this amendment went into effect, Union wonder who is going to take all the tests? The policemen or the traffic officers, are they going to have a little handbag in their hand with a needle in it...

**Mr. A. C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Shove it up your arm.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . and take a sample of your blood, take a sample of your urine, take a sample of your breath, a sample of your saliva? Who is going to do all this work; what provision has been made? There isn't any provision, but apparently there is a lot of information available in Saskatchewan and elsewhere throughout Canada and the United States that out to be made available to all members of this Legislature, so that each and all of us can make up our minds freely as to what action we ought to take, not only in the amendments to this Act, but in the amendment of liquor legislation as a whole. I wonder if we wouldn't be well advised to spend a lot of the money that we are using today on radio and T.V. programs, money that I say is being spent for no other purpose than to publicize and glorify the CCF party in this province, public funds, your money and my money. I wonder if we wouldn't be far better advised to take all that money and use it

on an educational program as far as the use of alcohol is concerned. Wouldn't it be better, Mr. Speaker, if we were to have an educational program on the use of alcohol, than it would be for the people's money of this province to be used for such program as "The Life of Riley"; "Amos and Andy"; and the Provincial Treasurer attends the hockey games. I like to either attend the hockey games or listen to the broadcast over the radio; but I despise having to listen to the dribble that runs from the Provincial Treasurer between periods. And, I believe that if the people's money were used in an educational program on the use of alcohol, we would all be a lot better off.

I believe that the proposed amendment to The Vehicles Act is a very poor one. Mr. Speaker, in this Act it says that anyone suspected of driving a motor vehicle must have to take this test. You and I, sir, could be walking down the street towards my car. I could be completely under the influence of alcohol, but you were going to drive me home. Under this Act I could lose my driver's licence, because I am suspected of driving my car. Naturally I would be, if I approached my car with someone else, with my keys. And it would be possible for innocent people to lose their right to drive an automobile in this province. Call it a right, or call it a privilege – I am inclined to believe that it is a privilege to drive an automobile in public. After all, the public highways are built with public money, and I think it is a right that is granted to us to use those highways.

But, Mr. Speaker, that privilege should be left with anyone until such time as they have committed a wrong, or at least until such time as they have demonstrated to the public that they are not capable of driving an automobile. That could be brought about not only from the use of alcohol, it can be brought about by an accident, by age, or for many other reasons such as loss of sight. But under this Act, if you are suspected of driving an automobile while under the influence of alcohol, then you lose your driver's licence. Under any British justice no one was every punished because he was suspected of doing something. It had to be proved that he had committed a wrong. As far as the Highway Traffic Board and the laws of the Act, I think that they are wrong. I can think of several examples where people have been killed in highway accidents in the province of Saskatchewan, and there was a sample taken of the dead person's blood, liver, spleen; and all the tests were made for alcohol. But on the other hand, the person who was probably responsible for the accidents wasn't given any test at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that any person involved in an accident should be submitted to all the tests that are necessary to prove whether they are under the influence of alcohol, or whether they are not.

**Hon. Mr. Walter:** — You can't do it without this.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Certainly you can do it without this. You can do it in the courts, after the accident is over, but you want to do it now just on suspicion.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — You lock the door after the

**March 13, 1957**

horse is stolen.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That is exactly what you want to do - lock the door after the horse is stolen. You provided the alcohol to get the person drunk, you, provided the facilities, and then you want to lock the door on The Vehicles Act.

**Hon. Mr. Walter:** — Bunk. That's silly.

**Mr. McDonald:** — What about all the rest of the Acts that would need amending to take advantage, or to take full stock of the fact that we have people using alcohol to excess, and consequently being a public nuisance?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this amendment, and I hope that this Legislature in its wisdom will set up a Committee to study the alcoholic problems, to make recommendations to this Legislature as to what steps we ought to take (because we all, I am sure will admit that we have a problem), and what steps we ought to take to rectify that problem, and also what steps we ought to take in amendments as far as The Vehicle Act is concerned. But at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the proposed amendment. And again I want to ask the Government to give a good deal of consideration to this amendment before you force it through this Legislature. You are not going to cure by it the problem that you think you are going to cure. So let us take the necessary steps that will come up with an answer to the problem that confronts us. Let us look at all of our liquor legislation. Let us look at the law enforcement of the legislation that we have today, and also let us look at The Vehicles Act at the same time.

If you do that, I feel sure that we can go a long way towards rectifying the problem caused through the excessive use of alcohol, not only those problems that appear and are created on our highways, but the problems that appear and are created throughout the whole province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. D. T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, there are some of the aspects of the Act that I don't feel are in the public interest at this time, and I want especially to draw the attention of all the members to that word "suspected", because after all, in a farming community, it could have very serious repercussions. What in the world is to stop a farmer at harvest time from having somebody going to the Traffic Board or some authority and reporting him as being suspected of driving while drunk? After all, his only means of getting around these days are through car, truck or tractor. And I want to point that out, because the Act states right here, he could be reported under suspicion. I can't agree with that at all.

I want also to place myself on record, as did the Leader of the Opposition, in the fact that I don't think this is solving the problem it sets out to solve. In the first place, if the Government is going to

take the responsibility for prosecuting people under the Act, after they are under the influence of liquor, they should take necessary precautions at the start to amend the liquor laws where a situation like this wouldn't have developed. I don't think we can put the cart before the horse. I think we want to start at the source and follow it through.

**Premier Douglas:** — Has my friend any suggestions as to what he means by that? Is he suggesting that we ration the amount of liquor to each person? I am not clear about what my hon. friend has in mind.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I stated what I suggested there, that I believe the liquor laws of this province should be amended first to create a situation whereby...

**Hon. Mr. Walter:** — In what direction? How?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — . . . such results would not develop.

There is also another thing to which I would like to draw your attention in this Act. Now the hon. Premier is jumping to his feet. I noticed the other night when he spoke, he back-watered. He said he was willing to have the drunkometer test alone. He was willing to drop the urine test, the saliva test and the breath test...

**Premier Douglas:** — The blood test.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Yes, the blood test. I would just point out to you, sir, that, in regard to your blood test alone, there are religious denominations in this province, who I don't think agree with blood testing, and in my own particular constituency that would be the case. I don't think it is within our rights to ask any person, or deny any person the right to drive a car because he will not submit to a test contrary to his religious beliefs. I want to point that out at this time.

The other think that I want to express my own opinion on, and something that I really don't believe in, is the fact that, when your driver's licence is taken away by the Highway Traffic Board, you have no recourse in the Courts. I think that right should be protected, and that right should be kept. If somebody loses his driver's licence and is charged with an infraction, he should have full recourse to the Courts of this land.

As it stands at the present time, I could not support having somebody picked up under suspicion.

**Mr. F. E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words regarding The Vehicles Act. I think we have before us a very serious piece of legislation and (I think I am safe in saying) a rather controversial piece of legislation, if we can judge by the reactions that have evolved from various parts of the province, I have an article . . .

**March 13, 1957**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member is not permitted to read editorials or newspaper articles referring to a current debate.

**Mr. Foley:** — I did not intend to read it, Mr. Speaker. I merely wanted to say that in my hand I have an article taken from a northern newspaper expressing the opinions of about 15 or 20 people in various professional walks of life, in which I think there are as many opinions expressed as there were people approached.

I think that is an excellent indication then there is a great deal of controversy. I believe that everyone of us certainly wish to do something to help solve the problem at hand. There is no question about that. I think however that the means by which this problem can be solved is certainly difficult to decide on.

I happened to read a recent article in 'Time' magazine, which, I think, points out the complexity of the problem. Now, regarding testing the blood of an individual (just to pick out one specific part of the amendment), it is only natural that I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) when she mentioned the health or sanitary aspect of such a test. I note that the Attorney General, in a recent newspaper article, says he is reasonably confident that the Supreme Court would uphold the Government's right to put these tests in the Provincial statutes.

Now, I don't think that we should be attempting to make decisions based on that type of feeling. I think he should know what the Supreme Court will do, before . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — If we knew, we wouldn't need Courts.

**Mr. Foley:** — I think he should be more than reasonably sure of their reaction. I have an article here where the United States Supreme Court was asked to judge on a blood sample taken from an unconscious defendant. The appeal rose in the case of a trucker who was convicted of drunken driving, on the testimony that the blood sample taken from him after an accident tested .17 per cent alcohol. This is a little quote from the 'Time' magazine of last week. It is rather interesting to note that the Supreme Court ruled that the defendant's rights had not been violated as long as the blood sample was removed under the protective eye of a physician.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Better read it to Mrs. Batten.

**Mr. Foley:** — Now, I was rather interested in this quote, because it does, I think, have some bearing on what we are deciding here. I am wondering, in view of that, if such an amendment were passed, would the Government be prepared, or the Highway Traffic Board be prepared, to give

the 'protective eye of a physician' to these tests! Under this amendment, suspects would be asked to submit to tests, and we can, I think, presume that these tests might take place any part of the day or night, and in any portion of the province. It seems to me that this would be an extremely burdensome problem if we were to suppose that this amendment were passed, and we were to further suppose that the hon. Minister of Health would insist that any blood test taken would have to be taken under the protective eye of a physician. It seems to me it would be an extremely cumbersome matter.

Now, I just want, with those few comments then, to associate myself with the other speakers who feel that this problem is certainly weak enough and far-enough-reaching in its effects to warrant very careful study by a Committee before a decision is reached.

**Mr. L. N. Nicholson (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, being 'green' in this Assembly, is this the third and final chance to debate this Act. There is one more opportunity?

**Mr. Speaker:** — It will come before a Committee of the Whole, and then the details can be discussed.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — One reason I asked that, Mr. Speaker, is that there are a number of other things in the Act that certainly I would like to see brought before this Assembly before this debate is adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** — During second reading is the time to debate them. If there are details to be discussed, then they should be dealt with in Committee.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Thank you.

**Mr. K.F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, there is one other point that I would like to have clarified before I am prepared to vote on the amendment, and that is the impression that has been left that, if we vote against this thing, we are opposed to rectifying this mass slaughter that is taking place on the highways. I would like to state that I have no quarrel with the ultimate aim of this piece of Legislation, and because the ultimate aim of it is good, I do not think it justifies the means you are taking. In the words of Abraham Lincoln: "You can't do the right thing in the wrong way".

I think it is also clear that in bringing down this amendment you have by-passed all advice that you might be able to get from law courts, what the Medical Association might be able to advise beneficially for all members, and in so doing, I do not think you are doing the right thing to the members of the House, and to the people of the province.

**March 13, 1957**

**Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I can finish what I want to say, but I shall start. I do want to say, first of all, that I welcome the criticisms that have been brought up during this debate.

When I introduced the Bill, I did not devote a great deal of time. I did not go into the details to the extent that probably I should have done. I had assumed that there was some knowledge of what was back of this. The hon. members will recall that a Committee of the Legislature was appointed in 1954. On this Committee we had the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald); and this Committee recommended, on the second day of April, 1954, to this Assembly, “that the matter of chemical tests for drunken driving be further investigated by the Highway Traffic Board, with a view to bringing in Legislation at an early date to provide for evidence by such tests, if technically feasible”.

Now that was adopted unanimously by the Legislature. There was no criticism. There were no objections. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to the newspaper editorials. I agree with him. This morning I got the Melfort ‘Journal’, the Swift Current ‘Sun’ on one side, and the Humboldt paper on the other, and over here the Grenfell ‘Sun’. I got some more here – the Moose Jaw ‘Times’ supporting it. As far as newspapers are concerned, I would say that they are very much divided. They want to achieve the same objective ultimately, but they see the danger in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the dangers that the hon. members who have spoken see in this legislation, are nearly as serious as the results we are going to have on our highways, if we haven’t got the ‘teeth’ to enforce the legislation which is there now. I want to say that today it is almost an impossibility to get a conviction...

**Mrs. Batten (Humboldt):** — That’s not true.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — . . . for impaired driving.

**Mrs. Batten:** — That’s not true.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, unless you have the right to require tests to be taken, a person, if he is smart today and gets a capable lawyer like my hon. friend from Humboldt, I am sure that she could get anybody off. I am sure the first thing she would do would be to take her client to a doctor, and get the doctor to examine him. I am sure my hon. friends would get the practitioner a certificate that this man suffers from shock, suffers from diabetes, suffers from a great many other things...

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Yes, surely.



**Mrs. Batten:** — How many convictions were dismissed due to lack of proof of drunkenness, in the charges laid for impaired or driving while under the influence of alcohol?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Well, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that fully 50 per cent are dismissed, probably 75 per cent dismissed. I would say too, that in another 75 to 80 per cent the charge is reduced by the prosecuting attorney, because they know they cannot get a conviction.

We have the evidence to show that in the accidents right here in Saskatchewan, involving our 134 fatalities last year, we had 141 drivers involved, and in 43 of those cases liquor was involved. The Leader of the Opposition I think has been most unkind, this afternoon, and I am sure that, when he gets a moment to reflect upon what he has said, he will regret it. He said that in every beer parlour in Saskatchewan, the law is being flagrantly broken, and that not a thing was being done about law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a terrible indictment against our R.C.M.P. I think it is a terrible indictment against the city police forces in Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and our other cities, for any hon. member to get up and to say that the police are doing nothing about trying to enforce the law.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I never said any such thing.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Oh, I took it down, I have got it down here.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny that I said that any policeman was negligent in his duty. I am not sorry for what I said, not in the least bit; but I am not going to have the Provincial Treasurer put words in my mouth. In the first place you don't have a standing patrol in a beer parlour, and nobody would want one.

**Mr. Speaker:** —Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — May I say also that a great deal has been made, this afternoon, about the question of forcing people to take these tests when they are suspected. What would they have us do – wait until after a charge has been laid? How can the police lay a charge until such time as they have evidence? How can you get evidence if you have no...

**Mr. Cameron:** — Don't shoot the man until the police lay a charge.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. Leader of the Opposition should get together with the hon. member for Humboldt.

**March 13, 1957**

He referred to a case where someone had been killed, and they had taken blood out of the body of that person, and suggested that they had got the wrong one, they should have taken it from the driver. How would we get it from the driver under the law as it is today? Under the Criminal Code of Canada (our friend from Humboldt told us the other day) that man could stand upon his rights and refuse to have a blood test.

**Mrs. Batten:** — On the hand he could take it.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that, insofar as law enforcement of any type is concerned, certainly there must be suspicion. For example, the police suspects that a man's brakes are not good because he doesn't stop when he is coming onto a highway, or they suspect that his lights are too high up and they call upon that person to have his lights checked, call upon him to check his brakes...

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Does he lay a charge first?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Of course not. We know the charge comes after that. May I say that I agree with one thing that has been said this afternoon, and that is that this will not solve all our problems. We have never said it would. We are trying to solve one problem. May I say, too, that there are many examples where this has been put into effect.

I have, for example, a list here of States where this matter is being debated on this very day. There are three states today, New York, Kansas and Idaho, where today this legislation is in effect. May I say that it goes much farther than ours does. There you do not have to sign that you will be prepared to submit yourself to a test when required to do so. There the law says that anyone driving a car in the State of New York or Kansas or Idaho, will be assumed to have given his consent to have a chemical test when called upon by the police to do so. In other words, I want to warn my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition; he had better be careful if he drives down through Idaho this year; they can get him.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Probably will.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Once you get into that State, they can just stop you and compel you to submit to the test.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They are more liable to get you than me.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I can say too, Mr. Speaker, that if the legislation which is before the Legislatures at the present time goes through, then my hon. friends will have to watch when they drive in the States of Minnesota, Utah, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Wisconsin, New Jersey and Michigan, and I forget which one it was just yesterday; these things come out every week, and we have been constantly getting the reports of where this legislation is being enacted.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Yes, surely.

**Mr. Cameron:** — In those States that you are speaking of regarding this legislation, does that include all of the tests, or just the drunkometer test?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation we introduced is the legislation which has been recommended by the Administration Motor Vehicles Administrators, and this is the standard legislation. However, because we are pioneering in Saskatchewan, as the Premier indicated the other day, we are quite prepared to drop the reference to the blood tests, to the saliva, to the urine tests, and stay with the drunkometer tests. There are today in existence at least three different types of drunkometer tests, which are quite capable of accurately determining the amount of alcohol a person has in their system. May I say too, that the co-ordination between these tests is very, very close indeed. I have results of thousands of tests which have been made across the United States. I have the results that were made in the city of Saskatoon, by our own University professors, and the co-ordination is very close. So we would be perfectly satisfied to leave it to the breath tests alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many other points that I wanted to mention . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question, please?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Yes, surely.

**Mrs. Batten:** — In these States that are mentioned — as I understand it, there are three States where this legislation has been passed, and the other States are in the process of having it passed, is that right?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Right.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Now in those States, is it not true that that legislation is intended to be for the use of the Courts, if they were trying to base the evidence of drunkenness, is that not correct?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — No, Mr. Speaker, that is the case in 23 States. There are 23 States of the Union besides these. Now some of the ones that I read that have the other legislation are in that 23, but today there are three States in the Union, where it is provided, well I could just read it to my friend:

**March 13, 1957**

“Chemical tests would provide (this is in Michigan) that the results of such a test would be presumptive evidence for criminal prosecution of a person charged with driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.”

And here we have it again, yes in Utah:

“Consent for chemical tests would extend the present law and the comparable code for provision to provide that any person who operates a motor vehicle in the State shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test for intoxication. For refusal to submit to such a test if requested, temporary suspension of his driver’s licence and revocation after opportunity for a hearing are authorized.”

Now that is the type of legislation it is.

There is quite a bit of information I would like to give the House before asking for a vote, so I would move the adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 o’clock p.m.