

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
26th Day

Thursday, March 21, 1957

The House met at 2:20 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

SASKATCHEWAN AUTO INSURANCE SAFETY GUIDE

Mrs. M. J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to draw to the attention of the House a publication in the Saskatchewan Auto Insurance and Safety Guide, which I think is an embarrassment and almost an insult, and certainly an injury, to the dignity of this Legislative Assembly. I refer particularly to Page 36 of this publication, which has today come to my attention, and which I think has been published for some few days. On this page, as reasons given for the revocation of licences, it states:

“Refusal to submit to a chemical test if suspected of driving a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.”

I would draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill introducing this Legislation has not passed second reading let alone third reading, and it has not become the law of the land. I would ask your attention, sir, and the attention of this Assembly, to the fact that it is a basic lesson in civics, or social sciences, or call it what you will, today that the laws of the province are not made by a particular Minister or even by the entire Cabinet, but by this Legislative Assembly. Either the publication is misleading; and, I must say, deliberately so, because surely the people who publish and allow this to become public property must know the contents of the publication, or else the dignity or power of this House is being deliberately insulted.

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I agree with a great deal of what the hon. member says, and that was the reason I asked to have this Act proceeded with early in the Session; but because of certain objections, certain amendments are being prepared, and we have not been able to proceed with it. However, I think we have to make a choice whether or not we are going to have people throughout the province informed as to what the legislation is, and the things which may cause them to lose their licences. Every year we do this, and we have to make certain presumptions. You see, we had to get these printed away back in January in order to get 200,000 or 300,000 copies of this printed and in the hands of issuers of motor licences. We, for example,

March 21, 1957

had to assume that we were going to change the licence year. That is another change which is required, too. And each year we have done that.

I realize that it may be probably taking for granted that the Legislature is going to approve certain legislation. Nevertheless, it certainly is not intended as any slight on the members of this House who were well-informed well ahead of this being published, but rather simply because it is essential, in order that we can give to the people in connection with terms, and things of that sort, and they did not appear in this, then they could very well go before the courts of this province and say here is something that is officially put out by the Government, and there is no reference to it.

So, in order that the people may have a greater knowledge of what the law is, we have had to take a chance on this legislation passing.

CONGRATULATIONS ON 60th WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House for a moment. The member from Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) tells me that a very important celebration is taking place in his constituency at the present moment. Mr. and Mrs. William Rupert, of Codette, are celebrating their 60th Wedding Anniversary, and their family, their friends and their neighbours are gathering to congratulate them and to extend to them best wishes on this happy occasion.

As our population gets older, we are having more and more people celebrating their 50th and some even their 60th wedding anniversary, and this is an excellent opportunity for the Legislature to extend its congratulations, not only to this particular couple, but to all the pioneers of the province who came here in the early days, and underwent the hardships and vicissitudes of those years, and are now celebrating an important milestone of life.

Mr. and Mrs. William Rupert came to Saskatchewan from Perth County, Ontario, as far back as 1910, and farmed at Guernsey, and in 1930 moved out to Codette, where they now live. I know that all the members will want to join with the member for Nipawin in extending to them our best wishes for this important occasion, and express the hope that they will have many years of health and happiness together in the future.

Mr. L. N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing the Rupert family for a good number of years, and they are the kind of people that are true-blue to the

pioneer of Saskatchewan. Very few people have the honour or privilege of living to enjoy their 60th wedding anniversary, so I would like at this time to join with the Premier, and all of the member of this Legislature, in wishing Mr. and Mrs. William Rupert of Codette, Saskatchewan, many more years of good health and happiness together.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE

Moved by Mrs. Brown (Bengough), seconded by Mr. Dewhurst:

“That this Assembly

1. reaffirms the position unanimously taken in the 1956 Session in support of the Government of Saskatchewan’s request for a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference on Marketing and Farm Income, pursuant to which the 1956 Assembly appointed a Select Special Committee in order to obtain the views and opinions of members of the Legislature and farm and other interested organizations and persons, the Report of which Committee was made available to the Provincial Government to assist it in its representations before such Federal-Provincial Conference; and
2. strongly recommends that, in view of the continued deterioration of the agricultural industry relative to other sectors of the national economy and particularly in respect to marketing of farm products and farm income, the Government of Saskatchewan continue to press upon the Government of Canada the necessity of convening a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference which would include representatives of farm organizations.”

Mr. A. L. S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the resolution which I am about to introduce into this Assembly is one that has received considerable discussion and debate in this House over a period of years. It has, in a general way, been discussed already in this session in a general debate; that is, on the Speech from the Throne, and in the Budget debate. But I make no apologies to this House for, at this time, introducing a specific resolution asking that some consideration be given to the future economic welfare of the agricultural industry. I feel that all of us in this House have a responsibility to that basic industry of agriculture in this province, and that we have a responsibility to those people whom we represent, to those people who elected us to this Assembly, to at all times place before the people of the province and before the people of Canada, our views and our opinions

March 21, 1957

respecting that very vital industry, agriculture.

I think it is particularly true that we who sit on this side of the House have a responsibility possibly greater than others in this House have in this respect. We went to the people in 1956 with a provincial program in which we committed ourselves to undertake action which we, as Provincial Government, should do; but in addition to that, I am not going to introduce at this time any partisan note into this debate. I think it should be said on the record that the commitment which we made on behalf of the agricultural industry, was a commitment which we said, if elected, we would undertake to fight for on behalf of that industry. In placing on the record of this House this commitment on behalf of that industry, I will refer to the card which my hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the other day, this little yellow card which we distributed in large numbers throughout the province during the election campaign, and which, as intimated in this House, we on this side of the House carry with us at all times to see that we are fulfilling those obligations.

We committed ourselves at that particular time to fight on behalf of the agricultural industry for the following four or five basic programs:

- (a) establishment of parity price for farm products, bearing some relationship to farm costs;
- (b) provide cash advances on farm-stored grain paid through the Wheat Board as a permanent feature of an orderly marketing system;
- (c) to sell Canadian wheat and other farm surpluses by accepting partial payment in currency of other countries, as well as by barter and by lateral trade agreement;
- (d) to establish a national livestock marketing scheme, and set up a Board of Livestock Commissioners;
- (e) to begin immediately the construction of the South Saskatchewan Dam.

Those are our commitments to and on behalf of the farmers of this province and of the economic welfare of the agriculture industry; so I have no apologies to make at this time in introducing a resolution of this nature.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution is divided into two parts. In the first part we are once again reaffirming the position which we took here in 1956; a position which we have taken in this Assembly on more than one occasion; a position which the Provincial

Government has taken over the years, that, if we are going to undertake to solve the chronic problems that face the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan and in western Canada, yes, indeed, in the whole Dominion of Canada, what is required is that those people who are in the responsible position of administering not only the production end of it, but the marketing end of our agricultural products, sit down around the conference table and try to work out a long-term policy for the welfare of agriculture, as an integral part of our whole Canadian economy.

In the second part we are suggesting that, where the agricultural economy was, relative to the other parts of our national economy, in a position certainly not on parity with them, and in many respects, in a position where the farming industry was unable to provide economic and social necessities for the people engaged in that industry, and in a position where agriculture could well be forced into a virtual state of bankruptcy, the Government should continue to press for a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference. At the time that the Minister of Agriculture introduced the resolution one year ago into this House, asking that this Legislature set up such a Select Special Committee to study these agricultural problems, he placed on the record of the House at that time the position of agriculture relative to other parts of our economy. He placed on the record the precarious position that agriculture was in at that particular time. I do not intend to take the time of the House to review facts which he placed on the record at that time, but I do suggest that the situation has worsened since the time the Minister of Agriculture placed those facts upon the records of this House. The cost-price squeeze in itself has worsened since 1956; that the markets for our agricultural products has not only not improved, but in many respects have shrunken.

I think it is sufficient for the House records at the moment to refer in brief and in part to the report which was submitted by that Special Select Committee to the last Legislature. This Committee verified the facts which the Minister of Agriculture placed on the records at that particular time. It indicated clearly, and beyond the shadow of a doubt, that farm cash and total income had declined substantially both in 1954 and 1955; that farm costs had reached their post-war peak in 1952, and had levelled off the last few years at nearly twice the level of 1945-46. In other words, farm costs had in 1956 practically doubled since the level of 1954. Farm prices had declined relative to industrial wage scales. The farmer at that time (and I suggest it is even more emphasized today) was receiving a smaller portion of the consumer's dollar spent on food. That the situation has worsened since that time, you don't need to take my word for it; possibly the word of the Hon. Walter Harris, Federal Minister of Finance, might carry more weight than the words I might express. Speaking, as reported in 'The Winnipeg Free Press' on March 15, 1957, he said in part:

“Farm prices have not been commensurate with those of industry over the past four years.”

March 21, 1957

We can go on with respect to decrying the portion of the national income that agriculture is receiving in respect to the national income of all of Canada. In 1953, the net income received by farm operators from farm products amounted to \$1,657 million, or 8.63 per cent of the national income. In 1956, the farm net income had increased by some \$2 million over the 1955 level, but even so, it was some \$52 million less than the 1953 level, and in terms of total national income, amounted to only 6.8 per cent. In other words, the percentage of the national income that went to the agricultural industry has decreased by approximately 2 per cent in terms of national income, or decreased approximately 25 per cent in relationship to the share it was previously receiving.

The cost-price squeeze, since 1955-56, has continued to worsen. Since 1951, the index of other farm products in Saskatchewan has fallen by some 22 per cent; while at the same time farm costs have risen by almost 8 per cent. As a result of the increased farm costs and the decline in farm price, the parity index in 1956, which expresses the relationship of farm prices to farm costs, is some 27 per cent below the level of 1951.

I think I have given sufficient data to indicate that the expression we made that the situation today, so far as agriculture is concerned, is worse than it was even one year ago. What of the future? What are the prospects for the future? I think we must take into consideration to some degree, at least, the report which was submitted to the Government of Canada by the Royal commission on Canada's Economic Prospects; a commission better known as the Gordon Commission, which some time ago (I think it was the month of January) issued its preliminary report. In this preliminary report it bases its forecast on certain general assumptions. One assumption is that there shall be no global war; the second assumption is, that there shall be no major depression as we knew it in the 1930's; and the third, that there will be no general change in the economic picture and policy of Canada and of the Canadian Government. Based on those assumptions, it forecasts a continual worsening of the agricultural position relative to the other industries in Canada. It is true that the Gordon Commission concedes and admits that, over the last 10 years, there has been an improvement in farm income, both in an absolute and relative manner; but this situation ceased some three or four years ago, and since that time it did not remain constant or level, but there has been a decline, generally speaking both absolute and relative.

Looking into the future and forecasting the future position of agriculture, it suggests that this trend will continue to even a greater extent. It is true that, in this report, they do not deal generally speaking on a regional basis; but, taking the agricultural industry as a whole in the Dominion of Canada, it indicates that in 1955 agricultural production in Canada represent 12.8 per cent of the national income. They forecast that by 1980 it will have declined to the point where it is 5.7 per cent of the national income. They indicate that at the present time (in 1955-56) there

is 15.3 per cent of the labour force engaged in agriculture. They suggest that in 1980, there will be only 7.6 per cent of the labour force engaged in agriculture. In other words, while they forecast that there will be continued decline of the labour force, percentage-wise, engaged in agriculture, the net return of those people engaged in agriculture will decline relative to the rest of Canada. They forecast that there will be an increase in the national production over the next 25 years, an increase in the national production over the next 25 years, an increase at the rate of anywhere from 2 ½ per cent to 3 ¼ per cent compound interest per annum. They are suggesting that agriculture will not share in that increased national production; and I suggest that, on the present basis that the industry is in and the forecasts of the future, based on some of the assumptions made in this Gordon Commission, it is all the more important that some concrete action be taken at this particular time to improve the economic position of that industry, and, to improve its economic position, particular attention must be paid to the question of marketing and of farm income.

I suggest it is imperative that something be done at this particular time, because if the forecast and predictions of the Gordon Commission are fulfilled to any great extent, it will mean that in the future, agriculture will be less potent a force both in political and economic aspects, and when we reach the state where agriculture as a political force, and as an economic force, has lost ground, if we cannot get it now, then in the future we cannot expect to receive greater consideration than we are at the present time.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time is indeed short, and we must press for some drastic changes in our agricultural policy in Canada, and with particular respect to the marketing of our agricultural products. I think that the report which was submitted to this Assembly one year ago does give the basis, and a good basis, upon which negotiations can be commenced with the Federal Government, and with the other provinces of Canada, in an endeavour to hammer out an agricultural policy which will be in the interests, not only of agriculture, but of the whole Canadian economy. I think it was Abraham Lincoln who said: "A nation cannot live half free and half slave"; and I suggest that a Canadian economy or any other economy, can be for the welfare of all, if you have got part of that economy prosperous and another part of it in a depressed condition.

In undertaking to improve our marketing position in this province, to undertake to improve the welfare of agriculture, I think we must keep in mind at all times as well, the welfare of the national economy, not only in the west but throughout the Dominion of Canada, and, as I have suggested, I do feel that this report does give the basis for negotiation in that respect, not only for agriculture, but for the national income as well.

We have always recognized that there are two problems continually facing agriculture. One, you might say, is an emergency problem

March 21, 1957

to which in the past we have attempted to find temporary solutions and then on the other hand, there has always been the chronic problem facing agriculture arising from the fact it has not received its fair share of the national income over a long period of years. In this we do suggest that attention must be paid to those emergency problems which are facing agriculture at the present time, and that temporary solutions must be found for those emergency problems. We did suggest in this report that one of the temporary solutions to one of the emergency problems might be in the form of cash advances, which is a subject of debate in this House, and which I will not touch upon. Another temporary solution to an emergency problem (if we can construe it as such) might be the adopting of a two-point system in Canada, so that for at least a portion of the grain sold in Canada parity price might be received and as such, a part of that translated back into an increased farm income.

A temporary solution to what might be an emergency situation is the payment of farm storage, and the assisting of farmers to store this wheat on his farm, not only for the welfare of the individual farmer, but that we might assure that the grain under storage will be property protected, and will at some future date be able to be translated into food for the hungry people of the world. But, realizing that temporary solutions are important, that a temporary improvement of the situation as far as agriculture is concerned, is essential, I do not think that we can forget or overlook the fact that we must now, and certainly within the very near future, undertake to lay down a long-term policy for agriculture. If we are allowed to drift, we will see a continuation of the same situation in respect to our marketing. We can refer to the fact that we have lost, with the exception of grain, practically the entire export market for our agricultural products, and the export picture for wheat is certainly not brightening in the last two or three months. As a matter of fact, it has been continually worse over the last few months. When there was some optimistic outlook five or six months ago as far as our export of wheat is concerned, that optimistic outlook has, indeed, declined to a very rapid degree in the last two or three months.

While, from the period August 1 to December 1, 1956, Canadian exports of wheat and wheat flour exceeded by some \$32 million the bushel-level of export in the preceding year, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, and the Assembly will recall, that the period of August 1 to December 30, 1955, was indeed a bad year as far as exports were concerned. I think the interesting point in respect to our exports of our wheat (the last agricultural product that we have any market for at all) is that in the January 1 to March 15, 1957 period Canadian exports have been some 13 million bushels below the level of the previous crop year. So there is some indication that, along with the loss of our other agricultural markets, we are indeed beginning to lose the export markets for our wheat.

As an illustration, the recently announced contract with Poland calls for delivery this year of less than 7 million bushels of

wheat, or about half the amount exported in the 1956 crop year. In other words, we have in that one instance, lost half of a market which we had in the country of Poland, and I suggest that something drastic must be undertaken if we are to hold the limited markets that we have, and drastic action must be taken to expand our markets not only for wheat, but for our other agricultural products as well.

Around this conference table I suggest that a formula must be worked out by which we can obtain an increased share of the world's markets for our agricultural products. Many ways have been suggested, and many ways are suggested in the report which was submitted to the Legislature one year ago. We did in that report suggest that the Federal Government might undertake to accept, for instance, currency of other countries in exchange for our agricultural products; that they might undertake to accept barter in exchange for our agricultural products. Those are two of the suggestions which have been made, and two of the needs and methods which have been used by other countries in expanding their trade, particularly in respect to agricultural products. We could refer to the United States, where by using these two mediums, largely and basically, and also by the extension of long-term credit, they have been able to place themselves in a position where they have taken over from Canada as the No. 1 exporter of wheat. As a matter of fact they have been so successful in that respect that they are today considering in the United States taking land out of their soil bank and putting it into wheat production in order to fulfil commitments they have made in respect to wheat. I suggest that what has been done in the United States in respect to retaining and expanding their export market for agricultural products could, to a degree, at least, be followed by the Government of Canada, and by these means expand our markets for agricultural products, and return to the farmer a cash income for his products which he produces.

I think we must go further than that, however. If we do succeed in getting the markets for our agricultural products, we must see that the people engaged in agriculture do obtain a fair share of the national income, or in other words, that they receive a parity price for the product which they have to sell, a parity price which will bear some relationship to the cost of production, and as such will place people engaged in agriculture on a par with people engaged in other segments of our Canadian economy.

I don't want to weary the House, but I think I should just take one or two moments to refer to what we suggest in our report should be the ultimate basis for an agricultural price support Act, because, I do think, Mr. Speaker, in this report, we set out certain principles and enunciated certain principles which are, generally speaking, true, and which I think should receive very serious consideration from people sitting around a conference table. We suggest in this report that the parity price and the policy of parity has become known throughout Canada and throughout the world. I think anywhere where agriculture is engaged in, there is a

March 21, 1957

principle of equality, but in this report we suggest that the principle of equality should extend even beyond obtaining equality as between industries. We suggest that a means be worked out (and a means can be worked out) by which we can create equality between those people engaged in agricultural industry itself. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is possible, we suggest, and it is desirable and it must be an objective not only as people engaged in agricultural industry but as good citizens, that we must devise a scheme of marketing and of returns to the agricultural producer, so that there will be equity between the industry, and equity within the industry itself. It is only by that means, I am convinced, that we can perpetuate the welfare of the industry; that we can perpetuate the position and that we will have within that industry people who are determined to have a maximum amount of production.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I bring this resolution to the Assembly in the hopes it will receive the unanimous support of all sides; that we will be able, through this medium, to show a united thought and a united desire that we have the best interests of the agricultural industry at heart, and that we are determined to leave no stone unturned to assure that those people whom we represent will, in our time, be in a position that they will be able to take their proper place in Canada, and that they will be able to play their proper part in providing and producing an increased amount of food, so that we as a Canadian nation may play our part in the world's economy, in providing food for those people who need the food. Through that medium the Canadian national will be making a greater contribution to feed that brotherhood of man throughout the world.

I take great pleasure in moving, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Dewhurst, the motion which I read at the commencement of my remarks.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise to second this motion, moved by the hon. member from Bengough. As I have stated before, agriculture is our basic industry in this province. It is essential, if we are going to have sound economy within our province, that we should have a sound agricultural economy.

Realizing, a few years ago, that agriculture was not getting a square deal, or that something was wrong with agriculture, this Legislature agreed to the setting up of a Royal Commission to study the agricultural problems. The Royal Commission made a very exhaustive study of agricultural conditions in this province. Many things were brought to light by the investigation of the Royal Commission. On that Royal Commission, which was headed by Prof. Baker, were very capable men and women. I think a very thorough job was done. The Royal Commission pointed out that we had a lot of uneconomic-size farms in our province, and that in order to have economic-sized farms, some of these farms would naturally fall by the wayside; but I want to say that, unless something is done to stop the trend of increased costs for agriculture and decreased prices for agriculture, we could never attain such a thing as an economic unit, because what was an economic unit

ten years ago, five years ago because uneconomic; what was economic five years ago, today is uneconomic. So it is a vicious circle the farmers find themselves in.

I have no doubt in my mind that a lot of quarter-section farmers, if they were given the proper long-term agricultural policy for Canada, could make a good living on a quarter-section farm, but they would not do it by raising cereal grains. But one-quarter section of land could produce a lot of hogs and other types of livestock, especially if the quarter-section farmer had access to community or co-operative pastures. I believe that, unless we do take steps to get a long-term agricultural policy for Canada, agriculture will continue, as the mover of this motion has pointed out, to find itself in a more depressed condition year by year.

Last year, realizing that things were deteriorating even more so than when the Royal Commission started its investigation, this Legislature saw fit to set up a Special Select committee to invite some farm organizations, or other interested bodies, to bring up-to-date any recommendations on agriculture. It also asked the Federal Government to convene a Federal-Provincial Conference on agriculture, with farm organizations or other interested bodies having the right to have representation at such a conference. We are sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far no conference has been called.

We are continually being told by certain Federal authorities that if agriculture is going to survive, it must become more efficient.; Well, I want to say that agriculture today is more efficient than it ever was. They tell us that one of our troubles is that we have produced five normal crops in the space of three years, and that is why we have such a surplus of wheat. It may be true, Mr. Speaker, taking the long-term average, that we have produced five crops in three years, but it is also true that we have had more than five-years' expenses in those same three years.

I dread to think what would have happened to the farmers in this province if they had not had an over-production. We have had crop failures losses through flood, flood damage, and have been unable to even seed them. At some of the shipping points in my own constituency, in 1954, there was no crop; in 1955, the acreage was greatly reduced and, last year, when the eight-bushel quota was going to be accepted, the Federal authorities saw fit to declare all delivery points open, provided that you didn't deliver more than your specified number of bushels. What happened, Mr. Speaker? I know that, at a number of my shipping points we had a considerable amount of space in the beginning of July, but when trucks started lining up at the elevator at five, six or seven o'clock in the morning, from 60 to 70 miles away, bringing in their grain because their elevators were full, in no time they had the elevators in my area full and plugged up. Consequently, when the new crop came in, some of my farmers have had little chance of

March 21, 1957

delivering grain for the past few years; when the new crop was harvested, we found there was no space to deliver that grain to.

Shortly before I left home early in February, I discussed the grain delivery problem with some of my elevator men. They told me they only had a one-bushel quota at some points, and over half of that was still out; and yet they were not able to take any grain because the elevators were plugged. Now, what are these people going to do, Mr. Speaker. They had no crop to speak of for a year, and when they do have a crop they can't deliver it because the elevators are plugged, due to the lack of foresight by those charged with the responsibility of marketing our Canadian grains.

At the same time no provision is made for them to be able to get security for grain on their farm, as is done in the States, whereby they can get not only the full payment for their grain, but also are paid storage, can get money at low rates in order to enable them to build proper storage bins. I would like to spend some time discussing the necessity for cash advances, but I refrain from doing so, Mr. Speaker, because, as we are all aware, there is at the present time a resolution on the Order Paper dealing with that particular topic. So I believe I may be out of order if I dealt on that point.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — You're out of order right now.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Well, that's your opinion, but your opinion doesn't cut much ice with me.

Mr. Cameron: — You're out of order yet.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, a fellow was in here this morning, and he was saying that at his particular point (just a siding), they have not been able to deliver any wheat since last November. These are fierce conditions. In my own area we have a lot more snow than the average part of this province. Our side roads (or a good many of them) were blocked early in December. If elevator space was available at the elevator, and the farmers are trying to get in one or two loads of wheat, how costly does it become for them, Mr. Speaker, to have to open the road from their farm, back up into their fields, and then from the farm to get up to the main highway in order to deliver their wheat? The whole system certainly needs overhauling.

A year ago this Special Select Committee brought in recommendations as to what should be done, and I would just like (without going into details of them) to list a few of the headings of the recommendations. One of them, as I have mentioned, is "cash advances." Another one was for "farm-storage payments." They suggested, after hearing evidence from a good many organizations and bodies, that what farm storage should be paid on that portion of the farmer's grain which was not able to be delivered under the specified amount of the quota. As an example, if the Wheat Board

had agreed to take an eight-bushel delivery quota throughout the year, and they were only able to take four, the farmers should get storage on the other four bushels.

The Committee also agreed that at the end of each crop year, the Federal Government should assume responsibility for all storage of grain in a commercial position. At the present time the Federal Government has assumed storage charges over a given fixed amount; but the Committee found, last year, through the evidence submitted, that all grain in a marketable position should be assumed for the storage at the end of each crop year, by the Federal Government.

Also the box-car situation which I have been referring to is just as serious now as it was then, and the Committee found that the box-cars were not being distributed properly to the farmers; and also another recommendation was that the farmers should have the right on his permit book, to designate the elevator of his choice to which he would like to deliver his grain, and box-cars be allocated accordingly.

They said also there should be sales on concessional terms, meaning extended loans and credit, or sales against foreign currency, or barter deals. A few years ago, when we sold our grain abroad we were paid in American funds. The American dollar was at a premium over ours. Therefore when the American funds were transferred into Canadian dollars we got the advantage of the rate of exchange; but today, Mr. Speaker, with the American dollar being almost 5 per cent below the Canadian dollar, our wheat is still paid for in American funds and, consequently, when we transfer it into Canadian funds we are getting less again. We get the exchange against us instead of in our favour. These things all add to the increased cost of production, which makes the farmer find himself in an awful position, because the currency is against him, the agricultural equipment has gone up, and a lot of our equipment comes in from outside of Canada, and the exchange rates are against us, so all these things work against the farmer.

I could go on for a considerable time on this topic, but I think it will suffice to say that we, on this side of the House, are anxious that the Federal Government should convene a Dominion-Provincial conference on agriculture at the earliest possible date; at the same time inviting to that conference, all organized farm bodies or any other body which can contribute toward bringing down a policy for agriculture, which will help us stabilize our agricultural economy.

When we stop to look at the statistics, and see that the net farm cash income from 1953 to 1955 had fallen by close to \$280 million, you will realize the amount of purchasing power it has taken away from the hands of the agricultural people of Saskatchewan; and if agriculture doesn't have the money to be able to pay their obligations, to pay their merchants, to pay the small businessman, the implement dealers, the taxes, and so on, then all down the line everyone suffers.

March 21, 1957

I cannot see why it would not be in the best interest of Canada, if no other policy could be found, to guarantee agriculture a parity price and subsidize it from the Federal treasury if necessary. The American Government has done that for the past twenty-odd years, and they have found, through subsidizing all their agricultural commodities over a period of twenty years, it only cost them on the average of one dollar per capita in the U.S.A. for twenty years. I realize that our population isn't as great as the American population, but at the same time, I also believe that it is not necessary to put off the subsidizing to too great an extent if we will adopt a proper, sane export policy, because, as I have mentioned on previous occasions, this last ten years we have allowed our internal economy to become greatly inflated. Then if we are going to try and sell our commodities to other nations, export them to other nations, and another nation has kept its economy more on a stable keel, we have no right to expect, because we have let our economy inflate till it costs us twice as much now, we shouldn't ask them twice as much for the commodity needed to pay our inflation. There should be an export-import board set up whereby goods would be traded for goods and brought back into this country, and any inflation should be taken care of by our own economy.

I could give numerous examples. As an example, if ten years ago, one bushel of wheat was worth three pounds of tea, if we were trading wheat for tea to a tea-producing nation, then today one bushel of wheat ought still to be able to get three pounds of tea; and if in our own economy we have allowed the prices to become different to what they were ten years ago, then our export-import board could regulate the prices accordingly. I don't see any great difficulty in doing that, Mr. Speaker, because it's just a matter of keeping one part of your economy in balance with another part of the economy, and that is what we say when we ask for parity prices. We ask for parity because we do not believe that 20 per cent of Canada's population, directly engaged in agriculture, should get six or seven per cent of our national income.

We hear sometimes that it is the excessive prices of labour which cause the farmer to have his difficulties. If that were true, Mr. Speaker, then the farmer would never have been better off at any time in his life than he should have been in the 1930's. In the 1930's labour received little or nothing for their work, but the farmer didn't find himself well off; he was hard up then. Labour today is getting a far better wage than they were in the 'thirties', but when you consider the fact of agricultural commodities in relation to the cost of production, agriculture is back now where it was in the 'thirties. We are at the stage today, where we are having an agricultural depression in the midst of an industrial boom.

I take great pleasure in seconding this motion and calling on the Federal Government (the only government with the authority to do so) to call a Conference to see what can be done about this. We are not asking in this resolution that these different recommendations, we have made, definitely be adopted; but we are asking that they call a Conference to

to discuss these proposals and different recommendations, and see if we can't come up with some agricultural policy for Canada, whereby agriculture can attain its fair share of the national income.

Mr. Fred Neibrandt (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of this Assembly to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR ROAD DEVELOPMENT

Moved by Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords), seconded by Mr. Thorson (Souris-Estevan):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to proceed with a comprehensive program of financial aid to the provinces that would provide assistance for roads of national and international importance and development roads, and that such a program should be made available to any province immediately that province completes its portion of the Trans-Canada Highway.”

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this motion on the Order Paper, I should like to give you the outline as it appears there before I launch into my talk on this particular subject.

This resolution reads: “That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to proceed with a comprehensive program of financial aid to the provinces that would provide assistance for roads of national and international importance and development roads, and that such a program should be made available to any province immediately that program completes its portion of the Trans-Canada Highway.”

Mr. Speaker, as most of you know, Saskatchewan is going to be the first province in Canada to complete its portion of the Trans-Canada Highway this year. The agreement that was drawn up with the Federal Government at the inception of this agreement, made provision that this program should be completed throughout Canada in 1956. Some provinces have lagged behind badly, and we feel, in introducing this motion, that provinces which have completed their portion should be in a position, while they have their construction men and their engineering staff built up to handle this type of work, to go ahead with other development if they so wish.

Roads are important, Mr. Speaker. Roads to the nation are its lifelines along which wealth, civilization, culture, safety, hygiene are transmitted with certain economic and social benefits. Roads have an important economic advantage that leads to higher productivity and national income. They

March 21, 1957

are considered today as the main pillar for the national economy of advanced nations. Roads transport agricultural and industrial products with speed and economy. They help develop scattered areas by reclaiming agricultural areas and developing mining areas.

Good roads increase vehicle life, reduce maintenance costs, tire wear and fuel consumption. Speed is increased with good roads; hence quick transportation, and as human production is measured in man-hours, so speed results in higher productivity.

The existence of inter-provincial road networks and neighbouring provinces and states in the various areas would enhance tourist trade. Travellers would be willing to spend more time travelling throughout the provinces if they were assured of better roads and good transportation.

To give some indication of the tremendous revolution in road traffic throughout recent years, I would like to cite the increase in motor vehicles following the close of World War II. Statistics show that it took from 1904 to 1928 for the first-millionth vehicle to be registered in Canada. It took from 1929 to 1948, or 19 years, for the second-millionth vehicle to be using our streets and highways. The assembly-line production of motor vehicles following World War II, however, was perfected to such an extent that the demand for these vehicles became so great that the third-millionth vehicle was registered in 1952. In other words, in these four years as many vehicles were manufactured and sold in Canada as in the previous 19 years, or in the 24 years before that. There is no doubt that the fourth million vehicle will already be in sight, if not already here. This proves that, almost overnight, Canada has become a nation on wheels, and it is important that we have all our Federal and Provincial participation in a road program.

I would like to give a resume at this point of the road development and the history of Federal participation in Canada in the Canadian road picture.

The passage of the Canada Highways Act in 1919, under which the Provinces of Canada were to receive \$20 million towards highway construction from the Federal Government, was the first real impetus given to highway construction in Saskatchewan. Under the terms of the Act, the Federal Government contributed 40 per cent of the cost of an approved system of public highways. An amount of \$1,806,255 was made available to Saskatchewan under the terms of the Act. While the amount of the Federal assistance was comparatively small, it did have far-reaching effects. The provincial highway system, substantially as we know it today, was established. The highway engineering staff was developed on a much more adequate basis. Contract highway construction by public tender became extensive, and the highway construction standards were greatly improved. The Province accepted responsibility and assumed the maintenance of the provincial highway system. formerly all highway maintenance had been performed by the rural municipalities, assisted by a small maintenance grant to each municipality. Under the terms of the Canada Highways Act, 1919, which was amended in 1923 to give the Provinces another two years to complete their schedule of highway improvements, Saskatchewan at the end of the fiscal year of 1925-26, had completed 2,000.8 miles of highway, of which 48.7 were

gravelled. The total cost was \$4,997,000, approximately, and sufficient to earn the full amount of Federal aid available, namely the aforementioned \$1,806,255.

Federal aid was also received by the province of Saskatchewan during the '30's, to the tune of \$3,573,364. Federal aid to highway construction was discontinued in 1940, and was not resumed until the Trans-Canada Highway Act of 1949 was agreed to by the Province of Saskatchewan in 1950. Payments received by the Province since that history-making date are as follows: 1950-51, \$392,169; 1951-52, \$905,000; 1952-53, \$1,700,000; 1953-54, \$2,00,000; 1954-55, \$1,900,000; and in 1955-56, \$1,700,000. This year, I believe, Mr. Speaker, there will be a sum of somewhere around \$200,000 to finish up.

It seems to me that there is a definite need for us to carry on such a program. I think everyone in this House agrees that there has been a terrific benefit derived from this Federal assistance, and I want to point out further, that we have very good reason to expect that the Federal Government should maintain a program such as was instituted in this Trans-Canada program, and that they should also enlarge upon it.

Federal assistance to the Province of Saskatchewan in connection with road building has been confined to three periods, 1921-27, then under the Act of 1919, during the depression years of 1930-39, and then on to 1950-55 inclusive, Saskatchewan received approximately \$8,800,000 from the Federal treasury towards the construction of roads under the Trans-Canada Highway agreement. This assistance has been sporadic; it has been very meagre in relation to assistance provided for other forms of transportation in Canada. The Federal treasury has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in wharves, docks, and canals, and we feel that highways are as much of a public enterprise as these projects in eastern Canada.

I know that there may be some argument – there usually is from the other side of the House – that we are making a raid on the Federal treasury, and I don't blame the defenders of the faith across the floor too much. After all, they feel that that's their duty, and we expect that. But I would like to give you some statistics to show that these moneys we hear so much about that we receive from the Federal treasury, are moneys that we contribute to largely in the first place. I would like to point out too, Mr. Speaker, the sale of automobiles and trucks and the trucking business is also a very potent factor in our national economy.

I would like to give you some figures here in the international and inter-provincial highway traffic. A check of the franchise of A-licensed vehicles in 1953 in Saskatchewan showed 2,300 miles of provincial highway in use for inter-provincial service. This represents over one-quarter of the total provincial highway mileage of 8,200 miles, which, incidentally, has been increased to 8,600 miles this year through additions to the highway system.

Secondly, a count of out-of-province public service and commercial vehicles operating in Saskatchewan in 1953 showed over 1,200. No record

March 21, 1957

is available of the number of Saskatchewan truckers operating beyond the provincial boundaries, but it might be assumed that it would be roughly the same number.

Third, motor vehicle traffic crossing the Canadian-United States boundary in 1955 totalled 15.9 million vehicles. This figure includes foreign cars inward 8.73 million, and Canadian cars returning, 7.14 million. Commercial vehicles moving inward, foreign, totalled 387,043; returning Canadian 541,594.

Fourth, based on motor transport traffic statistics for the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia, estimates have been made of truck and bus traffic by vehicles engaged in inter-provincial and international traffic. Estimates are for the year ending June 30, 1956, for Canada as a whole: Trucks weight of goods carried, 10.3 million tons; total ton miles, 4,106 million ton miles; Buses – passengers carried, 28.2 million passengers.

Now the revenue from motor vehicles, tires and tubes in 1955, Federal motor tax on vehicles in 1955, sales tax at ten per cent, total \$91,671,300. Federal tax on tires and tubes, sales tax, approximately \$8,000,000. Total mobiles, tires, tubes at wholesale level, and the ten per cent excise tax on automobiles at wholesale level.

Now if any of the hon. members care to check on these figures, the sources are “Facts and Figures on the Automobile Industry, 1956 Edition,” Page 26, House of Commons Debates, April 5, 1955, Page 2,739.

To give you another bit of insight into the revenue that accrues from the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put this on the record as well.

Direct taxes accruing to the Federal Government in personal income tax was (and these are again in millions) \$1,185 million; Saskatchewan's portion of that was \$4 million. That was in 1955-56. Corporation income based on the Dominion-Provincial Tax Agreement — \$1,028 million, and Saskatchewan's share of that was \$8 million. Succession and other duties – Saskatchewan's portion of that was another one million. Total direct taxes amounted to \$53 million. Indirect taxes – customs duties, Saskatchewan contributed to that \$27 million; Excise duties and taxes, \$66 million; other taxes, one million. The total indirect taxes was \$94 million. The total contribution from Saskatchewan would amount of \$224 million. Again, in 1956-57 the contribution would roughly run at \$211 million. So let no one say, ladies and gentlemen, that, in making the request for Federal aid, Saskatchewan is making a raid on the Federal treasury.

Now I would like to make a comparison with what is happening south of the international line. The Government of the United States has, since the turn of the century, contributed to the building and maintenance of interstate highways. This program has resulted in the beautiful, well-kept highway

system that Canadians envy so much when visiting the United States. Canadian Federal aid has only been extended to the main highways, but in United States not only been extended to the main highways, but to the most remote side roads and market roads. Up to fifty per cent of those have also been maintained by the Federal Government of the United States. Added now to the millions that have already been spent in assisting the States to prepare their road program, neighbouring States to the South, tremendous amounts of money. The immediate neighbouring States – I'll cite those: Montana will receive \$13,526,000; South Dakota will receive \$19,979,000; North Dakota will receive \$10,237,000. These sums will be almost twice as much as Saskatchewan's entire highway budget.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Is that the sort of stuff you peddle! The 'ladies and gentlemen'.

Mr. Kramer: — I am sorry, the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) is not in her seat.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we realize that the hon. members opposite feel it is their duty to come to the defence of the Federal Government whether right or wrong, but it is my hope that they may rise above their narrow partisan policy and support the motion in this particular instance.

I pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous advantages that our neighbours to the South have had in their road-building program, because of the far-sighted initiative of that program. The leadership given there by the national government has been the life and the heartbeat of the entire-road-building program. It is probably one of the main reasons that the United States today, is one of the industrial giants in the family of nations. Their attitude towards their road system was indicated again recently, in the establishment of an additional system of what is termed (and I mentioned it earlier) highway system . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Take it as read, Kramer.

Mr. Danielson: — Who wrote that speech for you?

Mr. Kramer: — Here, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to refer to a condensation of the United States Department of Commerce plans to their super-highway system, and the reasons given to the American taxpayers for this gigantic Federal participation in that highway program. Allow me to point out once again, that the program outlined herein is a new departure over and above the tremendous Federal participation in American highways over the last 50-odd years. I would like to quote from a condensation, put out by the United States Department of Commerce.

“The Federal Government, through the Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Commerce, United States, are engaged in the biggest peace-

March 21, 1957

time public works program ever undertaken in world history; construction of the national system of Inter-State and defence highways, criss-crossing the nation with 41,000 miles of expressways. The Inter-State system will connect ninety per cent of all cities over 50,000 population.

“Most of the routes will be four-lane divided highways, growing to six and eight lanes in the near-metropolitan areas. Even where two-lane roads are built, in sparsely settled areas, provision will be made for expansion to a four-lane divided highway when traffic warrants it.

“Access will be controlled throughout the entire system, with entry only at carefully selected locations. Traffic interchanges, overpasses and underpasses will eliminate all grade crossings, both highway and railway. It will be possible to drive Coast-to-Coast without encountering a traffic light or a stop sign. There will be no commercial facilities with direct entrance into the Inter-State route, but signs will alert the motorist when he approaches connecting roads, leading to gas stations, restaurants and motels.

“The Inter-State system, although it constitutes only little more than one per cent of the nation’s total road and street mileage, will carry 20 per cent of all traffic. Design and construction are being planned to provide roadways that will adequately handle the traffic volumes of 1975, when more than 90 million motor vehicles are anticipated, as compared with 65 million in 1956.

“The need for such a system was first described by the Bureau of Public Roads in a report to Congress in 19239, and was further justified in subsequent studies. Acting on these recommendations, the Congress in 1944 directed the designation of a system so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities and industrial centres; to serve the national defence, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

“The general locations of the routes comprising the system were selected after careful study by the State Highway Departments, and with the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads. Federal aid funds provided for the construction of the system, however, were meagre in proportion . . .”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Does the hon. gentleman want to read much more of that report?

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. McDonald: — He can't talk, so he has to read.

Mr. Kramer: — . . . Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am drawing a comparison here, between what is being done. There is an example being set today. The needs that the United States envisages today are the needs that are going to be facing us here shortly, and the plans that they are placing before the Congress of the United States, condensed here, I feel are of interest to this House.

Mr. McDonald: — We've all read it.

Mr. Speaker: — You have gone a very long way already.

Mr. Kramer: — Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: — You have gone a very long way already.

Mr. Kramer: — I haven't a great deal further to go. It's a condensation, and reading half of it is

Mr. Cameron: — Just table it. We can read.

Mr. Kramer: — Can you? That's a surprise.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Kramer: — You would never think it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Kramer: — “President Eisenhower, in a bold message in 1954, proposed a far-reaching program of highway improvement, including completion of the Inter-State system.

“The Congress, by the Federal Highway Act of 1956, implemented a program by authorizing \$24.8 billion over a 13-year period for construction of the system. The Federal funds are to be matched at a 90 per cent to ten per cent ratio, with the State funds at \$2.6 billion.

March 21, 1957

“Is it going to be worth it, is the question they raise. The answer is pretty obvious on today’s congested highways, and they say “(I’m still quoting, Mr. Speaker), “we have been paying dealing for our inadequate roads”, (and the Americans think that their roads are inadequate), “not just in frazzled nerves and personal inconvenience, and in time and gasoline wasted, but in the price of everything we buy and sell.

“Studies of existing freeways show that their cost is balanced out by savings in vehicle operating expenses in less then ten-years’ time. The safety factor alone, is sufficient reason for building the Inter-State highway system; for one of its benefits will be a saving of at least 4,000 lives a year. Accident rates on freeways are one-third of those on other roads with comparable traffic.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, we too have an accident rate this is mounting year by year in Canada, and I feel that, while our death rate is not nearly so high as the United States, it is very important that we consider that too, in thinking of an all-out national highway program.

“A wide range of economic benefits will result as by-products of the Inter-State system. There will be many more jobs in road building, and great increases in supporting industries, such as steel, aggregate, cement, bituminous materials, and construction equipment and machines. All of this, will have its effect in terms of payrolls and purchasing power.

“Of even longer range in economic benefits will be the developments along Inter-State routes. Existing freeways will tell an inspiring story of economic growth, both industrial and residential. Since an essential feature of the system is the control of access, the factories and homes which will spring up will feed their traffic into the main system only at interchanges, without creating slowdowns, congestion or interference. About 70 per cent of the Inter-State system will be built entirely on new locations, thus creating countless opportunities for business.”

Mr. Danielson: — That’s two more pages.

Mr. Cameron: — Do you have much left yet?

Mr. Kramer: — So, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Take it as read.

Mr. Kramer: — “The advantages the Inter-State system will have for long-range travel, trucks, buses and passenger cars are obvious. Vacation and business travel will take much less time, with great comfort and less strain. Deliveries will be faster. Truck operation will be more productive. The routes will be important parts of production, assembly and distribution lines of business and industry. But, the system will have vast advantages for the cities, too. These broad arteries will go into and through our large cities, helping to wipe out today’s traffic jams, speeding commuters and shoppers from the suburbs. Bypasses will take through traffic around the large cities, separating it from traffic headed downtown.

“The system routes will by-pass smaller cities and towns, providing access . . .”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I must ask the hon. gentlemen to stop reading. The House has been very patient, and has allowed him to read into the record of the House.

Mr. Kramer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is very little more there. I think I have read enough from that to show . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You said there was very little more before, and you have read a full page since.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I’ll say this. We have been following the United States: I would say we have been about 25 years behind them at least.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh go away. We’re ahead of them.

Mr. Kramer: — The problems that have faced them will certainly be facing us in the very near future. Mr. Speaker, I believe . . .

Mr. Danielson: — ‘Sink of inequity!’

Mr. Kramer: — . . . I believe that the time has come, and I was very glad to hear that there were at least some people opposite who were prepared to agree with us in references that have been made by them, both publicly and privately. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there have been some encouraging statements from the Federal House. The Hon. Mr. Winters, speaking in this House not so long ago, gave an encouraging talk, I would say. He indicated that the B.N.A. Act could not possibly have foreseen the tremendous revolution that we have facing us today in our way of life, and I do hope that we are not going to bicker in this House. The Provinces to the east and west of us, have indicated that they are prepared to support an all-out drive for an inter-

March 21, 1957

national system. It isn't only internationally, but in our northern development. A tremendous hinterland to the north of us, not only in this province, but in other provinces, is crying out for development roads.

I feel, in moving this motion, Mr. Speaker, that, if we are going to accomplish something in the near future, if we are not going to lose the Trans-Canada that we already have, we should proceed with an all-out plan. I am not suggesting what the formula is. The second Trans-Canada, yes, is very important. The second Trans-Canada, I hope will beat the No. 5 through the north. I suppose other folks would like to have it further north, and there are others who would prefer it further south. but in any case, regardless of where these routes are, I am not going to suggest what the sharing formula should be; I am not going to suggest how much the contribution should be, but I do think that it is time we stopped hiding behind and bickering about constitutional law, and got on with the job.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the above motion, seconded by Mr. Thorson (Souris-Estevan).

(The motion was agreed to, unanimously)

Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the motion moved by my friend from The Battlefords. I do this because I know it is something of very much concern to the people in my constituency. We have always had road problems in the southeast part of the province. Recently these road problems have been very much accentuated by the development in the oil industry in that part of Saskatchewan. I have been with a number of delegations to meet the Minister of Highways concerning our problems.

Mr. McDonald: — How did you make out?

Mr. Thorson: — I have held a number of meetings in my own area with the people who are most concerned about the roads there, and on every occasion that I had meetings with these people, they indicated that they feel that the Province of Saskatchewan simply hasn't got the money to provide the kind of roads that we want in our modern society, with modern automobiles and trucks. That I suppose, is logically followed by their contention that there should be some assistance from the Federal Government in the matter so much of national importance as transportation, not only on airways and railways, but also on roads and highway. I don't suppose it is very surprising because the people in my constituency, which runs for 100 miles along the North Dakota-Saskatchewan border, are reminded every day of the benefits of Federal assistance in the field of transportation for highways and roads.

Some of the arguments which my friend has just presented, have also been presented to me by my constituents, that after all transportation on highways and roads is a national problem, that inter-provincial trade,

and national development is something that just isn't of local concern but of national concern. I would like to point out, too, that the Fathers of Confederation, when they were designing the British North America Act, could not possibly have envisaged the invention of the automobile and the terrific change it has made in the way people live and carry out their economic life.

I would point out, too, that the principle of Federal assistance for matters of national concern, despite what the British North America Act says, has been followed by a good many Canadians over the past decades. Assistance for welfare services, family allowances, old-age pensions are received from the Federal Government, and none of us deny the value and the benefit of those kinds of programs. The same is true in the field of public health, and to a fairly limited extent in the field of education.

That, combined with the example presented by our neighbour to the south of us, is enough to convince the people in my constituency, and, I am sure, to convince a number of people in all of Canada, that Federal aid for highways is very essential, and that a comprehensive national program of highway and road development is long overdue. I hope that the members of both sides of the House will support this motion . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Sit down then.

Mr. Thorson: — . . . because I know that the people in my constituency are going to wonder how the Liberal party voted on this particular resolution.

Mr. Cameron: — Sit down so we can show you.

Mr. Thorson: — They are going to wonder in light of the fact that within a very few weeks we shall be voting again, and registering our opinion about the conduct of national affairs in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to urge all members to support this resolution, not only for the benefit of Saskatchewan people, but I may even say even for the benefit of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to unanimously.

INTEGRATION AND ADVANCEMENT OF INDIANS

Moved by Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland), seconded by Mr. Meakes (Touchwood):

“That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the interest it has shown in the problems pertaining to our Indian population and urges that the Government take steps to:

- (a) negotiate with the Government of Canada with a view to implementing such programs as will lead to an effective integration and advancement of Indians;
- (b) prepare drafts of legislation tending to place the Indians on a basis of equality with citizens of this province;
- (c) consult with representatives of Indian Bands throughout the province on all matters having to do with the aforesaid.”

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this motion, I would like to say that I believe a solution to the problem of our native Indian people is one of the greatest urgency and importance to this country of Canada, as well as to the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly any action that may be taken to improve the lot and the opportunities of our native Indian population is urgent and very timely.

This Government has indicated genuine interest, I submit, in our Indian and Metis people, and the members, I think, are quite aware of the various programs and projects that are in effect, in so far as the people who are under the jurisdiction of this Government are concerned, and I am sure we are making very good progress. However, we have not made progress in the field where native people living on reservations are concerned, because it is out of the jurisdiction of the Government of this province.

I believe that the programs which this Government has initiated and carried on are showing results; as a matter of fact, very good results. By carrying on these programs we are progressing towards the integration of our province. By that I mean, sir, that in building a good province, a fine province, we must be able to integrate all sections and all communities, so that we have. This Government should be congratulated, also, for continuing to negotiate with the Federal authorities, asking them to implement such programs and projects as will land eventually to a solution of the indigenous native problem.

I know that this Government has pressed for immediate action (and other provincial governments have done the same) to establish some kind of social and basic justice. You may call it economic and social justice, if you like. Members know there has been no such justice since the days of the first white man such as Cartier, who landed in the east, or Prince Rupert and his group in the north. I would add also that this Government cannot solve the problems of these people, because they have been unfortunately treated as wards of the Federal Government. They have been so for 100 or more years. Neither can this Government correct the social and economic injustices which have been perpetrated by a benevolent, paternalistic dictatorship in Ottawa. but to the extent that the constitution of this country, the British North America Act, permits this Government to do something, to that extent. I submit this Government should legislate. There is an opportunity for the Government of the province of Saskatchewan as there is an opportunity for the governments of other provinces, to take action in establishing basic justice.

Some of the hon. members will recall, sir, that last year, I brought in a resolution which was passed unanimously by this House, suggesting to the Government that they take a good look at the situation, yet there has been nothing in the Throne Speech debate, or in the other debates, indicating that anything has been done. However, my information from the Minister concerned is that considerable progress has been made. There probably should have been an announcement, as I would have desired to commend the Government.

One of the reasons why I have brought in this resolution is because I feel that our failure with these people has left a stain on our Christian civilization. We have not treated these native people here in Canada with justice. We have stolen, expropriated, vast and valuable lands and resources. We have concepts in a Christian philosophy of human equality and equality of opportunity. Yet though we may be forgiven for some of the sins of theft, murder and rape of a great and proud American people, we cannot expect history to forgive us if, at this opportune time, we do not act. And I say this is an opportune time.

In case some of the hon. members want an illustration of what I mean, then let me refer to a book by Paul Cain. He relates an incident just over a hundred years ago, in the area which is now called Toronto, where the local authorities, or the Federal authorities (or whoever it was) purchased 260,000 acres of land from the natives for 10 shillings.

Mr. McCarthy: — Terrible.

Mr. Berezowsky: — The hon. member opposite sarcastically says it's terrible. Well, sir, I have some feelings which apparently he has not when he interrupts with "Terrible". It was a disgrace to the people who were in that area to offer an ignorant and an honest people such a miserly consideration of probably a gallon of liquor with 10 shillings, stealing from them a quarter of a million acres of land which rightfully belonged to them.

March 21, 1957

Mr. Cameron: — What year was that?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I can give it to you, if you so desire. I have the book here, and when I am through I will hand it over to you.

The province of Saskatchewan with its hundreds and thousands of acres of agricultural land was obtained in the same way. I am not indicting the people that came in here, the immigrants, or the Government, they probably had to do what they did do; but they gave certain assurances, and the people who allowed the land to be taken away from them, and their resources to be taken away from them, had faith in those treaties. They believed with all sincerity that when the treaties said their children would get all the opportunities of education, that they would get all the opportunities of education. They believed, I am sure, that when they signed those treaties they would be given security as long as the rivers flowed and the sun shone. I really think that they believed they would have such security.

But, sir, are they getting it today? Are they getting the simplest kind of justice today? I submit to you, they are not. They have neither the security, nor have they the opportunities for education, and they have no basic justice. Is it security, when these same people today are being ejected from the reservations because of some historical fact of having been related to a white man? Is it security, sir, for them, when they are overcrowded and kept on these reservations? Is it security for them that they have not the opportunities of education that other people in this country have? Certainly the Government in charge will say, "We provide education through arrangement with institutions." They used to do it through the churches; they still do it. They may make arrangements with this Government to provide some of the education, fully satisfied when that child gets up to Grade 4, or 5, or possibly Grade 8, that is sufficient for the Aborigines. Is that what the natives understood when they signed the treaties, or did they expect to get similar opportunities for education as the rank and file of Canadian citizens have? Those are the questions that come to one's mind.

In short, the natives of Canada were robbed of their land, brought to degradation, established in concentration camps which we call reserves, and thus losing all self-respect, pride, dignity and, in addition, as I pointed out, we have added insult to injury because we have not carried out the Regal contract under the treaties which were signed, and agreed to be carried out.

I say this to this Assembly: There is one law for the white man and there is one law for the native? Yes, right in this province.

Mr. McCarthy: — Why don't you change it?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I'll come to that; it's Federal law.

Take a simple case of drunkenness, and I am going to submit

some facts to you today, sir, to show you that there are two laws. Experience shows that Indians, of course, do not behave any differently from a white man under the influence of liquor. In the same way as we are, they are brought into the courts, and of course if found guilty they are punished for the offence of either being drunk, or for the offence resulting from drinking. From a report, which I have here, submitted by a Mrs. Hesselstine, who was Superintendent of the Women's Jail in Prince Albert for the year 1953-54, I find that the total number of prisoners for that year were 164. I want the Assembly to note that 140 of these were of Indian origin, from various parts of the province. From the community of Kamsack alone, there were 34. It is to be noted from this report, that 85.8 per cent of the convictions of these Indians were for nothing more than drinking. It is to be noted also, that while many of the other offenders were committed for much more serious offences than drinking, nevertheless the average sentence for all these other persons was only 42.4 days commitment in jail, while for the simple offence of drinking the average was 58 days commitment in jail.

To indicate how unfair the laws have been to the Indian people, who are being convicted under the Indian Act, may I point out some specific cases in this report, and I want them to go on record. Here are a few people from Kamsack; there were 11 convictions, 11 brought into court, 10 convictions, all Indian; seven of these convictions were under the Indian Act, for intoxication – one girl age 17; another was the mother of several small children who was sent to jail for three months, and fined \$50, and in default to serve one further month in jail. Under a vagrancy section a girl, 16 years old, was fined \$5 and costs, and in default one month in jail. Here is a youngster, just a young girl, she should be in school yet. For obstructing a peace-officer – and quite often people obstruct a peace-officer; they are not infallible, and certainly some officers don't act towards native people the same way as they do to their own kind; anyway she obstructed him – a girl 17 years of age, was sentenced to four months without the option of a fine. Here was another girl, trespassing, also 17 years of age, fined under the Indian Act \$50 or one month. She had another charge the same day, and they gave her another month.

Just to illustrate what happens. When I say there are two laws, one for our kind, and one for the other kind, though there is no difference between us, being all of us, people, you will find this. Here is a person by the name of Mary (I won't mention the last names) who is convicted, she is age 27, race – Red. (I don't know what kind of race that is, but anyway the report shows her as Red). She was convicted under section 94 of the Indian Act to three months in jail and a fine of \$50, costs \$3.50, and in case of default an additional month.

On the other hand, here you have a case of a girl 18, . . .

Mr. F. E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

March 21, 1957

Mr. Berezowsky: — You will have all the opportunity you like, after I am through, if you so desire.

Mr. Foley: — I just wanted to say, it might help to know the offence in these cases.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Oh, the offence in this case was drunkenness. Most of these I said, or practically all of them, are for drinking, under the Liquor Act, or the Indian Act.

Here is a case of being drunk, but being fined under the city Act; only a fine of \$15 and costs of \$4.75; there was no commitment to jail.

What I am trying to get at is to try and point out that, where prosecutions are carried out under the Indian Act, the punishment in these cases is three months, two months in jail and \$50 fines. On the other hand, other people for the same offence being prosecuted under our provincial, or municipal laws, get away with \$5, \$15, or seven days in jail, or something like that. I don't need to go into all these cases. They are available here, and I am sure that you can look at them, if you are interested to see what happens.

Mr. McCarthy: — Take them as read.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You will find that right through. I will go ahead and read the case history of two persons, very briefly. Here is a woman by the name of Hilda, age 34, Treaty Indian. Back in August 7, 1950, she was found intoxicated, fined under the Indian Act \$25 and costs; January 23, 1951, wandering the streets, fined \$50 and costs; February 18, 1952, intoxicated, 30 days in jail; March 4, 1952, intoxicated, and brought into court and fined under The City Act, \$5 or seven days in jail; April 1, again she is found drunk, and fined by the City of Prince Albert, through the provisions of the by-law, \$5 or seven days in jail. But then on June 21, 1952 she is found intoxicated, and she is brought into court under the Indian Act, and got 30 days in jail.

Mr. McCarthy: — They put her in for her own benefit.

Mr. Berezowsky: — And so it goes on.

Here is a Metis, who doesn't come under the Indian Act, and her name is Doris. she had 36 sentences imposed between July, 1937, and May, 1953, mostly for drinking. Nine convictions were for seven days only, two were for ten days only, most of them for intoxication, which were imposed between 1948 and 1953, after this woman had already had a great many convictions against her.

Now to me it would appear that the magistrate, who tried this

particular case, concluded that a nominal sentence for such an offence was sufficient. But when you get down to the cases at Kamsack, tried by the magistrate there, and all under the Indian Act, in practically every case for a similar offence, the penalty imposed was three months in jail and a \$50 fine, or in default an additional month's sentence.

I have brought up this information because here is something that this Government can do. I have concluded upon perusal of this Act, though I haven't studied it too deeply, that we can legislate, for it says in Section 95, referring to drinking in Section 24. It says:

“No offence is committed against subparagraph 2, of paragraph ‘A’ of Section 93, or paragraph ‘A’ of Section 94, if intoxicants are sold to Indians for consumption in a public place in accordance with the law of the province, where the sale takes place authorizing the sale of intoxicants for a person for consumption in a public place.” “This Section shall not come into force in any province, until a proclamation bringing it into force in the province is issued by the Governor in Council, at the request of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province.”

As I understand, sir, this Government has not yet seen fit to issue such a proclamation. But I think that, upon the evidence (not all of it, but some of the evidence) I have submitted, every member of the Government should be satisfied that it is time that something should be done to correct this basic injustice of one law for the Indian, and another law for the White man. Of course, it may be argued there are restrictions in our Liquor Act for these Treaty Indians. This may be true, but, as I pointed out, in view of the fact that magistrates have no other recourse, but to correct these people off the Indian reserves who are charged under the Indian Act, so they must be so dealt with, where fines and the penalties are much heavier than they are under any city by-law, or under a provincial Act.

When I brought in this resolution, this is what I was thinking of there are at least five things that we as a Provincial Government can do, or we as an Assembly can recommend to the Provincial Government to do. We cannot do those things that are out of our jurisdiction. There are certain things that the Dominion Government should do, and of course, it will be up to this Government to negotiate with them to see how this whole problem can be solved. But here is something that we can do, and I had hoped by this time this year, that we would have had legislation submitted to us – so far none has been forthcoming. I say these people, being people like you and me, sir, should have the right to vote. Just how it will be done is up to the experts in the business; but I say that is a basic right. They live here; they may not pay taxes, due to the treaties that they have; but

March 21, 1957

basically in Canada, living in this country, even if they are on reservations, they, I think, have a basic right to vote.

I submit, secondly, that they must have the same rights under the various laws, whether it is the Liquor Act or any other Act, that I have, otherwise there is no basic justice.

Thirdly, I say that they must have the same benefits and opportunities for education. That is the least that we can do for these people if there is to be equality.

Fourthly, I say that they must have the same benefits under our social welfare legislation. The Government s can worry about where the money is going to come from; I am thinking of people. And I don't see why an Indian on a reservation should be treated any differently from a person, say in Regina, and I will add that I can't see why a Metis up in the Northern Administration District should be treated differently from a Metis down here. I could say something about that at another time, but presently I say that they must have the same benefits, if there is going to be basic justice and equality.

Fifth, I say they must have the same benefits under any public health legislation. Those people have the same right to be healthy, physically and otherwise, as we have. Failing this there is no basic justice, sir! You may call it justice now, but it is not basic.

It may be suggested, of course, that we should begin studying the whole situation. That of course is a farce. I am sure that the Governments of this country, and the Government of Canada, have studied the native problem over the last 100 years. I understand there have been Commissions, I understand there have been parliamentary committees, and I understand, too, that it takes an average of 19 years to implement the recommendations of any such Commission. I think it is Professor Lasco, who is now deceased, who made that statement. I am not happy about any commission, for by the time we get a Commission working, then making a report to Ottawa, by the time the Governments get together, I will be far away in the grave, and the problem will still not be solved. I have no love for Commissions; yet there have been Commissions; there have been investigations, even this Government has had anthropologists or sociologists out in the field. Governments know what the answers are. They know that there is only one answer, and that is to give these people the same basic freedom and equality that everybody else has, and let the problem resolve itself in due course of time. It will never resolve itself, sir, if we are to continue segregating a people on a reservation.

I say that once legislation has been passed to the extent that we have the power to do in a province, that is the proper time to carry on future studies. Then will be the time that you can set up a Committee, or a commission (or whatever you want to call it), because you will have real

problems then. You see, by putting the laws on the Statute books does not mean that the native Indians off the reservations are going to flock and accept the benefits. As a matter of fact, they will tell you today, and you will read in various reports, that they are opposed to any kind of integration, or any kind of assimilation. They want to be left alone. Naturally, what else can you expect them to say? What else can you expect them to say, when they have been degraded, and kept down all these years? I believe that they would rather die; but the problem is not so simply solved. These people are not dying out, as probably many people would have wished. They are beginning to multiply. They are getting so populated on the various reservations that they are being pushed off such reservations. Therefore, though they may argue that they are not happy to our suggestions of integration, the fact is that that problem will have to be solved – not solved by us, they have to find their way. All that we can do, sir, is to open the doors, and say to them, “Here is the province of Saskatchewan where all people have equal rights, and equal justice. If you want to benefit by those rights and by that justice, that is your privilege and right. If you do not, then we can’t do anything about it.” So I repeat: There will be problems, and that is the time, I believe, when these Commissions or Committees can be of value. If there is resistance in a certain part of the province of Saskatchewan, a study can be made how to overcome that resistance. We must be true to these people. We must never again betray them, as we have done in the past.

If we find that there is difficulty in a certain section of the province to establish an educational program, or any other program, these committees could investigate, could report to the respective Governments, and action could be taken. Those kinds of Committees I agree with; should set up, say, a Royal commission, or some other kind of Commission to start studying this whole question, because it has been studied so much that I think too much has been studied.

Even if legislation is enacted (and I hope that legislation will be brought into this House by the time we meet next year), I am not too hopeful that the problem will be solved within, say, two or three years, or even a decade. It may take two or three generations. There is something else I think I should mention in this House, and it is that usually a native Indian, or a Metis, trying to be accepted into our civilization is not accepted. I mentioned on a different occasion that when one of us goes up into the north, or goes on a reservation where there is good hunting, why we are the best of friends, we sleep in the same tent, we go out in the same canoe, we slap each other’s back, and tell each other what good huntsmen we are; but when the native comes into a city, or into a community, he is ostracized; there is no place for him, and it is going to take a little bit of time to solve these attitudes. When we hear that in the United States, for example, down in the south, they have segregation and things like that, we frown at what is happening there, but if we are honest with ourselves, one finds we are no different. We will do as the hon. member from Cannington

March 21, 1957

(Mr. McCarthy) said a while ago. He ridiculed what I said. What I said was not funny. But these are the kind of people we are, not honest with ourselves. So it is going to take a little time, it is going to take a little bit of something we must learn. We have to give a little also. We have to accept those people into our professions, into industry, because your anthropologists and your sociologists will tell you that in dealing with children, the children of the native have just as much potential as your child or my child has; in many cases they are more adept. For example you take mechanics, manipulating with their hands, doing things. They are much more expert than any of the people of European stock. And there is a place for them; but they have to be accepted. There is a place for them, I say, because, when you go down to eastern Canada and eastern United States, you will find those people as builders. There they get into various crafts such as carpentry and you will find they do fine work; but they will never integrate, and we can't force them to integrate, and as I said they will never integrate if we continue to treat them as I know they are being treated presently.

Let me indicate an experience that I have had – I won't say where, or what, but I know this because I have seen it happen. When there is a job to do, a job that one of these natives can do though he may be an expert carpenter, he can't get the job. He is not fit for it, he is just an Indian! He is just a half-breed! You can give him a pick or a shovel, or an axe. Now that is what I am referring to. Those things are happening all the time, and that is why I say our own attitudes have to change if we are going to build a good Saskatchewan, and achieve integration of these people into our society.

I have said all these things because, as I have said before and anthropologists and the other people agree, these people are equal to us. They have a different culture, a different background, but given the same opportunities and building up the same desires, you will find that in every respect they will be equal to us. Though there may be resistance problems, social and economic problems which will face an administration, and ways, of course, will have to be found to overcome these problems. It may be necessary to do a little more in the field where we find the Metis and native population, in education. We have to bring to them opportunities for adult education, mechanical courses. We have to do much more than we are doing generally in other parts of the province. If I am right then it is not a big price. It is not a big price to save 18,000 people in Saskatchewan and 150,000 in Canada.

There will be many problems, as there always has been with indigenous people anywhere. But I do say that, by taking the steps that are recommended in the resolution, possibly – I don't know, but possibly – it may be the beginning of the solution of this whole problem of our once proud native Canadians.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Meakes, the resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Motion, there isn't a lot that I feel I should say. My good friend from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) I think said most of the things that I wanted to say. There are just one or two things I want to mention.

In my constituency we have three Indian reserves. I would like to say here and now, amongst those people the name of 'Bill' Berezowsky is well known, loved and respected. The problem of improving the lot of these Indians and the Indian population, is a large one, and, I would say, with many complications. But I for one, believe that the longer it is put off the worse it is going to be. We must not forget, as members of this Legislature, that these people are the true natives of this country, the country that was taken away from them by the white people.

I believe that segregation of the Indians, when it was brought in, was a mistake. I think the policies of New Zealand in regard to the integration of their native population, was a wise one. I think it has been proved out. Today in their Legislatures, they have representatives from the native people. All of the professions are partly filled with people from the native population. In this way these people are offering to develop and assist in the advancement of their country. I would like to say, as a person who has lived all my life near the Indians (and I have had considerable to do with them) that they are a race of people that have qualities which I like very much. I respect them. But I do think that the method of preparing these people to meet the challenge of society of today is antique, very antique.

First of all, I want to emphasize that this is in no way criticism of the men and women who have dedicated their lives, in many cases, to the educating of these people. Rather, I would say, with these people, it is an impossibility, with the tools that they have, I do think in this regard that I must give credit for within the last year or two I have seen advancements on one of the Indian reserves in my constituency, and I would just like to mention them for a moment.

Last fall we had a new school opened on the Gordons reserve – not an ordinary school; I would say it is more of a composite school, a school where certain trades and home economics and such like, will be taught. I think that that is a very important thing. Our reserves today, in many cases, are so over-populated, that all they are today is a place to live on, rather than for the people to make a living on. With these vocational schools, we are training our young Indians, who are going to have to leave these reserves, to go back out into society; we are giving them training, and I do say there is a lot further to go yet.

As regards this training, I think it is too early to say yet, in my case because they have just started, but I do feel that it is a very important factor. They are being trained, as the hon. member for Cumberland said, not to give them a Grade 8 education and turn them loose, but rather to give them an education, and see that they have the proper health and all

March 21, 1957

the other services. It is going to be very important.

We must not forget that for many years past the Indian has been robbed, cheated, taken advantage of by the white man. The Indian fundamentally is honest, and he is a true socialist. I would like to remind my friends across the way that within their tribes, they live co-operatively. Whatever they have, they share. Possibly some will say that that is a bad attitude. Yet I do know that if an Indian kills a beast, the whole reserve is fed, and I am sure that all my friends who know Indians will agree with me. If an Indian kills a beast or shoots a deer, everybody has meat. I can say that for three winters, I had an Indian and his wife live in my yard. I got along with them good, and I can also say that there are many, many people whom I would rather not have live in my yard than many of the Indians, including possibly some of the members in this House. The Indians are a fine bunch of people.

Mr. Gardiner: — The feeling is quite mutual.

Mr. Meakes: — My house was never locked. At times I had 400 and 500 pounds of meat in the meat-house, and it was always there when I came back. I want to emphasize again that, fundamentally, the Indian is an honest man. He is driven to many of the things that the previous speaker mentioned, not because he is brought up that way, but because he was hungry, because he needed some of the things that he had to steal.

I would just like to mention, that today there is much talk about freedom and democracy. I for one will never feel happy to think that I live in a country, a good country such as we have here in Canada, and that there are some people within this country who haven't got the same rights and the same freedoms as I have. I agree with the previous speaker, in that I think this Government is to be congratulated for what it has done. I agree with the previous speaker I think that one thing that we can do is give these people the right to vote. I agree with the previous speaker that the only way we are going to get to the basic problem is to give these people an opportunity, and start bringing them up to our level immediately.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this motion should pass unanimously.

Hon. J. H. Sturdy (Minister without Portfolio): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

The Assembly resumed, from Tuesday, March 19, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson:

“That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Government of Canada should, without encroaching on the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provinces in the matter of administration and curricula, provide increased financial aid to the various Provinces of Canada for the expansion and equalization of educational opportunities in the primary, secondary and higher institutions of learning.”

“That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

recognizing the serious difficulties encountered by school officials in meeting the ever increasing demand for additional classrooms and in retaining qualified teachers, coupled with an ever mounting tax burden on local ratepayers, recommend to the consideration of the Government the establishment of a Committee of educationists to examine reports and recommendations as a result of research work done by Canadian School Trustees Association under the direction of Dr. La Zerte, to study suggestions concerning a foundation program for education, and to work in co-operation with other provinces in an endeavour to establish in each province a program such as would be incorporated into a policy through which the Federal Government may make unconditional grants.”

Mr. Speaker: — when this debate adjourned, the other evening, I reserved ruling as to the acceptability of the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Qu’Appelle-Wolseley. I now rule that amendment acceptable and in order.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — There isn’t anything that I wish to say on the amendment.

Mr. F. E. Foley (Turtleford): — In rising to second this amendment, I would like to associate myself with Mr. McFarlane and other speakers in this Assembly, who have spoken on matters of education, during this Session. I am sure we are all aware of the problems that we face in education today. The solutions, in many cases, are not nearly as clear.

March 21, 1957

I believe that one of the problems we have is the effort being made by our larger school units throughout the province to meet current expenditures to a certain extent, at least, from current revenues, and I believe that this has been successful or unsuccessful, depending upon the economic picture in various parts of the province. This has brought about problems of school construction, whereby certain areas find it easier to finance the construction of new schools than other areas. It has also made it possible, I believe, for various parts of the province to solve the teacher shortage, by enlarged conveyance routes. The fact remains, however, that the equalization grants as they are now paid have attempted, but I think, to a certain extent at least have been unsuccessful in trying to balance the load on the taxpayers throughout the province.

I know that we all looked forward with a great deal of anticipation to the school grants this year, and hoped that probably they would do more than we should have expected them to do. The fact remains, that while a substantial increase was made in grants, I believe I am right in saying that many of our larger units today will not be able to meet current expenditures from current revenues. Until such time as some legislation is passed, or some action is taken, to bring that about, then we will continue to have educational debts in the province.

This amendment is an attempt to look at this problem more carefully, possibly, than it has ever been scrutinized in the past in this province. We have reached a very important era in education. I have had the opportunity since coming down to chat with various officials of the Department of Education, and discuss the story of education over the past number of years, and I think that we have been fortunate in many respects, in spite of dry years, and varying crop production. I believe that the young people in this province have not had to look with envious eyes to any other part of Canada with respect to the actual educational program. I believe that our school graduates rank with any in western Canada, and that in spite of many difficulties, we have been very fortunate.

I do feel, however, that a great deal more must be done now, possibly, than has been done in the past. We are in a more technical age, more demands are being made upon students by industries, by the professions. We are asking for students of higher academic standing and, as such, the matter of providing the best possible education facilities is certainly one of the uppermost problems today.

Now I, and I am sure, other members, may have more to say on this important matter so, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

((Debate adjourned))

CASH ADVANCES ON FARM-STORED GRAIN

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 19, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thurston:

“That this Assembly, through the appropriate government channels, reiterate its request to the Government of Canada to implement a policy of cash advances on farm-stored grain as a permanent feature of Wheat Board marketing.”

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that I would have to speak this evening, so I was still working on my address, but I think I have enough material here . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, give us what you’ve got, even if it isn’t prepared.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, let us consider very, very seriously the motion that is before the House. I believe there are implications – and I say implications because I personally feel that, after making such intensive studies in the matter, by voting for such a motion would only put the Wheat Board in jeopardy. Now I will, within the next few minutes – and I am not going to take the amount of time that I had planned – tell you the reasons why.

A few years ago I saw the situation where a few farmers were in bad financial straits, and the causes were varied. You will find that some of them were due to over-buying; others were due to (I still say again) of grain; and then possibly other causes would be the improper type of grain. I have a map here of the protein contents of wheat in the province of Saskatchewan. From it you will find that many areas have a high protein content and other areas have a low protein content, with the result that there was a lesser movement of grain in these lower protein content of wheat areas – if that is the way to put it; and you find, at these particular times, people may have been inclined to be a little short of money.

After considering these conditions and realizing it, particularly in my area, because we have an area that has a low protein content of grain, I thought that something should be done about it. So I started looking into the matter and had various discussions with farmer friends of mine – and some of them were not friends, of course; but I found that some were in favour of cash advances and a lot of them were not. But, in my particular area I thought we were very, very much so. But to go on with that, Mr. Speaker, after looking into this question very thoroughly, as I have mentioned, I found that in past years local elevator agents used to give a little cash cheque to the farmer, with the anticipation of wheat movement, and I am sure that some of the old-timers here (if I may use that expression), who have done farming, have found themselves just before

March 21, 1957

the threshing time – I am going back a few years; I can go back in ancient history like the Government has done, back to the ‘thirties and prior to that just before the threshing machine came on the farm – a little short of cash, and we used to go to the elevator agent and the agent, being a good sort of a fellow, would give us a little cash cheque and carry us on until we made delivery.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Illegal, of course.

Mr. Coderre: — I am quite aware that it was illegal, but I am very, very sure, Mr. Speaker, that many of our farmers here in this room have taken advantage of that situation. I say that was many years ago.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Never heard of it.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, they probably wouldn’t admit it, but I do know that has happened. It doesn’t matter, but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that situations like that have happened. On the strength of that, I was practically convinced that a form of cash advances to the farmer was possible.

A few years ago, as probably many of you have heard over the radio and through the press, there was such a thing as the ‘Coderre Plan’ on the question of cash advances. Now there is a rather peculiar story about that. I had been looking into this question considerably and I was convinced – mind you, I didn’t foster it or anything else; but a publicity agent, a friend of mine, happened to come to see me at that particular time and I expounded this theory of mine, just exactly what the situation was, and he said, “That is a pretty good idea; do you mind if I use that?” Well, as far as I was concerned I was sort of getting into the political picture and I thought maybe a little publicity – he was telling me maybe a little publicity – would be a good idea, so I told him to go ahead. So this publicity friend of mine got a few other chaps – I think there were three of them involved. They went out all over the country and were expounding this cash advance or what was known as this ‘Coderre Plan’. Now I felt pretty proud of it, and they were using that name on the radio, and I figured it was a pretty good boost. Of course, sir, I didn’t realize just exactly the complications that they were getting into. However, I took advantage of it. Anyhow these publicity friends went all over the southwest part of the country where there was a surplus of wheat, and they started with one radio broadcast and then a few press publications and they didn’t seem to get a response; so then they started a series of meetings, I presume all over the southwest and probably north – I don’t know where; but apparently they had a lot of meetings and they had little collections. They had tremendous crowds at those meetings – sometimes 10 or 15 people! I don’t know, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Almost everyone in the country.

Mr. Coderre: — Anyhow that situation went on for a couple of months and there was a big hubbub. To this day, Mr. Speaker, I

sometimes wonder who sent that man to me, and whether it was this Government trying to arouse the public to this cash advance situation, or whether it was my good Tory friends in Ottawa who were trying to do something. But all I could see out of it at the moment, and even today, was that it was just a stunt trying to create dissension amongst the farmers of the province.

I am going to show you, sir, where and how they did try to create this dissension, and I say, by trying to push out this cash advance and everything else. However, the program was on for a couple of months and it stopped; I don't know the reasons, but I presume they are quite obvious. Anyhow a couple of months later I got this letter from the guy who started that, and he said he was in bad shape financially; he was talking to the farmers and he got the bug – he himself was short of cash, and for some reason or other he tried to bill me with a bill of \$4,000 or \$5,000 for press publicity. Well I didn't know why I should be billed. I wasn't in the political picture and I didn't know; but he said, "can you do something about it?" Well, I went to see a few of my farmer friends around home who were particularly interested in this shortage of cash, and I asked them about it. I just couldn't get anywhere. So a couple of weeks later I got another letter from him and if I may, Mr. Speaker, at this point – I haven't got the letter with me but I remember this question of quoting coming up the other day reminded me of it – and I have a pretty good idea of exactly what it is; and I understand there are certain regulations that I cannot quote something unless I take full responsibility for the quotation. Well I do take full responsibility for this quotation:

"I have spent a lot of time on this question . . ."

and he goes on and tells me about this cash advance:

"I have spent a lot of time on this question for the farmers, but the response generally is not good. The farmers do not appear to have any problems in that respect. I can see that they are very well satisfied."

Well this gentleman, Mr. Speaker, had been all over a good part of the province where there was supposed to be a surplus. He had been trying to rouse the farm population to that extent as this Government is trying to do that today; and he had no response. But I believe that he was . . .

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): — Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Coderre: — After I am finished speaking, I think you may on that subject, because I think I am quite conversant with it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He'll be out of order then.

Mr. Coderre: — I believe that he was speaking from a more general picture

March 21, 1957

than I had. I mean he had been all over the province; he had seen the picture on this cash advance question. But, personally, I wasn't satisfied, Mr. Speaker. I still figured that something should be done. I felt that I should dig into this subject a little more, so I wrote to many of my friends – and I have some friends, even though the boys across the room may not be friends of mine. I wrote to Fort William. I wrote to Sudbury, Windsor, Ottawa, St. John, N.B., Prince Edward Island . . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — What about Quebec?

Mr. Coderre: — Well, I'll leave the province of Quebec out for the time being; probably being of French extraction, we'll just leave that out for the time being. But anyhow I was explaining to them the situation of the wheat and I wanted to get their views as well. Now before I go on with that, I would like to bring a little point to mind. The duty of M.P.s or M.L.A.s, it doesn't matter where they are, is to try as best as possible to satisfy the electorate. Now whether you are from the east or from the west or from the middle, it doesn't matter; we have to go ahead and do the best we can for that matter. So I just thought I would bring that to mind for the moment. Anyhow, I received letters from these friends of mine and, incidentally, one of them was an M.P.; and another thing that I would like to bring to mind, Mr. Speaker, is that some of these friends of mine were violent opponents of the same political belief that I have; but still I got their point of view in this matter. They all explained to me, in their own words, that the Wheat Board was an institution that was put there for the convenience of the western farmers, and only at the wish of the people of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opinions of these few people gathered from here and there across the country. They have expressed – let's call it the Gallup Poll, if you wish; but these few people have expressed their opinion in so far as the Wheat Board is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Call it the 'Coderre Poll'.

Mr. Coderre: — Now many of them went on to say that many of the CCF Government in Saskatchewan, their CCF M.P.s at Ottawa, had been crying and hollering and mentioning that the farmer this and the farmer that and all that sort of stuff, crying and beefing, indicating, or giving them the impression, that we are dissatisfied with the Wheat Board. Maybe some of the members of Parliament at Ottawa don't think so, but it is giving this impression to the electorate, to the people of eastern Canada. If we believe in democracy we believe that a majority rules and that many people in the parts of Canada where they are not dealing with wheat feel that if we are seeking, for some reason or other, to give the impression to the electorate that we are not satisfied with the Wheat Board, several of them went so far as to mention that, saying, "if you are not satisfied we will take great pleasure in mentioning to our representatives in the House that we can do away with the Wheat Board." And this has been the impression of the electorate where there is no wheat-growing. They are concerned with that; and that is the impression they are getting. They are of

the impression that we are not satisfied about the way the wheat is handled, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason I say personally, I believe that the Wheat Board is a great institution, one that assists all the farmers and business people of this province, and also all the people of Canada. I made it very, very clear on that matter and I, personally, Mr. Speaker, will do everything I can not to put the Wheat Board in jeopardy. I was going to quote a few pages from the Wheat Board Report here, but I see that time is flying, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Oh, there's lots of time.

Mr. Coderre: — But, the other day, the key point of that that hurt me was when the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) of this province got up and said, "You know, in the States they have a cash advance on farm-stored grain." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not denying that. I know they have. I am not going to deal with what they have, or their troubles over there, in the U.S.A., but the hon. Minister goes on to suggest that we should adopt a plan similar to that in the States. There is one thing the hon. Minister seems to have forgotten – or I don't know what he was trying to imply. In the States they have a cash advance, but they have not a Wheat Board; so, therefore, they can go into all sorts of plans without putting a wonderful institution like the Wheat Board in jeopardy. The hon. Minister seems to be more concerned with trying to gain political capital than with trying to firmly assure himself and the people of Saskatchewan that the Wheat Board is a great and wonderful institution and is doing a wonderful job under the most adverse international wheat policies of the other countries. They are doing a wonderful job, and I could go on quoting from the Canadian Wheat Board report, Mr. Speaker, to prove that.

No double many of my friends on this side of the House and on the other side would probably like to have cash advances. Unfortunately, my good friend here from Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) is not here, but he and his associates have between 40,000 and 50,000 bushels of oats. Well I am sure that the hon. gentleman would like to have a cash advance on that. And then we have the hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman); he has tremendous piles of wheat, and I am sure he wouldn't mind having that cash advance. But at whose expense, Mr. Speaker? At the expense of the small farmer who has not got any wheat.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh, come now.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — You don't believe that.

Mr. Coderre: — There is no denying, Mr. Speaker, that across this province about 70 per cent of the farmers only produce 30 per cent of the grain. These are not my figures. These are figures that have been picked up from the Bureau of Statistics or anywhere you wish, and you can find that. That 70 per cent may have 1,000 or 2,000 bushels of wheat on hand, and I believe it has been recommended by your universities

March 21, 1957

or your planning experts that a farmer should have a year's wheat ahead on his farm, so I don't believe that the question of farm surplus is a big problem there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go on speaking at any greater length on this. We have a choice to make here today, and I am sure that, if we go ahead with these cash advances, I would like to ask every member here, Mr. Speaker, to be sure that we are doing the right thing when we support a motion like that. We have a choice to make; let's call it a choice between two evils or two goods – it doesn't matter – we must choose one; but if we choose the wrong one we could put both in jeopardy.

I personally find, Mr. Speaker, that it is not wise to support a motion like that, and I hope that I have made clear what my reasons are . . .

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Clear as mud!

Mr. Coderre: — . . . because if we try to establish a cash advance through the Wheat Board, I am sure that many of the people of Canada who are not directly connected with the agricultural section of Canada would not tolerate that; and, as I have previously stated, the Wheat Board is there at their pleasure.

And another thing, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Wheat Board's advisory council has recommended that yet. For the reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly support that motion.

Mr. Gibson (Morse): — Would you answer a question?

Mr. Coderre: — I'm no expert, but I'll try.

Mr. Gibson: — Well, you were quoting a letter from memory. Will you mind telling us who wrote that letter that you were quoting from memory?

Mr. Coderre: — I said several letters.

Mr. Gibson: — But you were only quoting from one.

Mr. Coderre: — I had written several of those letters. It's a man by the name of Borgaard – I think that is who it was.

Mr. Gibson: — It wasn't Father Branch?

Mr. Coderre: — No.

Mr. Cameron: — Disappointed, aren't you?

The motion was agreed to, on recorded division, by 37 votes against 11.

SECOND READING

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 5, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker:

“That Bill No. 45 – **An Act respecting Conditional Sales of Goods** – be now read the second time.”

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to exercise my right to close the debate, and if I have your permission I will do so now.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to inform the members that the Hon. Mr. Walker is about to close the debate and anyone who wishes to speak must do so now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, there were two or three matters raised in the debate which I think perhaps I should clear up. In the first place, I would like to remind the House that this Bill went through three public drafts, the first of which was submitted to Benchers, some 18 practising lawyers, senior members of the profession; the second again was submitted to them, and also to the Motor Dealers' Association, the Implement Dealers' Association, and the final draft has been sent out to all the barristers in Saskatchewan, some three weeks ago. They were invited to submit suggestions for changes and improvements, and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that there never has been a Bill that owes so much to so many as this one. This Bill has had very extensive discussion and consideration by the people who use it most, the legal practitioners, the mortgage companies, the finance companies, the implement dealers, motor dealers and so on.

There are one or two things which I should say in reply to statements which were made in this debate so far. First of all, I am pleased to know that there is unanimous endorsement of the principle of central registration. That has been the experience that we have had in circularizing the lawyers; there has been unanimous approval by them of the principle of central registration. There were a couple of questions – my notes are fairly meagre, I am not sure if I have them right. One question was, would it be possible to phone for a search. The answer is yes. It doesn't matter where you are in Saskatchewan you can phone the central registry office, you can have a search made, and you can have the answer on the same phone call as to whether or not there are any liens charged against that particular name that you search.

It will also be possible to follow the usual procedure of going to the courthouse and getting a search made by the court officials. The practice among barristers, very largely now is that they don't always

March 21, 1957

go to the courthouse to make a search; they simply phone the Registrar, have it charged to their account and get the information over the telephone.

There is one feature of the Act which was raised and that is the question about dispensing with the name of the vendor and requiring registration, notwithstanding the fact that the vendor or manufacturer has his name endorsed or painted or engraved on the article. That section was taken directly from the uniform legislation. However, we felt there was need for some latitude there, and in circularizing the barristers we asked them to give us their views on it, and we finally got the opinion that registration should be dispensed with in those cases where the possession prepared for submission to the House in Committee, I can assure you now, which will provide that the manufacturer will not be required to register under a conditional sale every article which he passes on to his dealer. However, the fact that he does not register it will not prejudice the claim of any person who buys it from the dealer on the strength of the register. The only people who will take second place to this informal kind of registration (or reliance on engraving the name on the article) are the judgment creditors of the dealers, and the trustee and bankruptcy of the dealer.

It was very strongly submitted to us that the dealer may take good on credit and his credit may not be first class. He may be sued, and these goods would then be taken by the trustee in bankruptcy or the execution creditors of the dealer, and the manufacturer would be deprived of his lien. Well, that lien will be preserved without the necessity of registration. This does not affect members of the general public who buy the article from the dealer in good faith for valuable consideration; it doesn't interfere with their good title. It only protects the manufacturer or the wholesaler against the trustee in bankruptcy or execution creditors of the dealer. That was a point which was made by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). It was also submitted to us by the Dealers' Association and concurred in by most of the lawyers, and is being submitted by way of a House amendment.

One of the members raised the question of registration of a lien against the land, and reference was made to the section which provides for the filing of a form in the Land Titles Office where the goods are not paid for; and the inference made by the member was that this resulted in a lien upon the land, and some question was raised as to whether this was just to the owner of the land. The suggestion was made that this filing of a notice in the Land Titles Office might prejudice the right of the owner of the land, particularly if the land was occupied by tenants. I would draw attention to Section 15 of the present Conditional Sales Act which says: "where the goods have been affixed to realty they shall remain subject to the rights of the seller as fully as they were before being so affixed and shall not be realty so long as the claim of the seller against the goods remains unsatisfied, but the owner of the realty or any purchaser or mortgagee thereof shall have the right as against the seller or bailor or

against any other person claiming through or under him to retain the goods upon payment of the amount owing". This means that, as the Act now stands, the owner of the land cannot claim the goods that were affixed to the land by a tenant. The rights of the vendor of the goods are preserved, notwithstanding the fact that there is no notice to the owner of the land.

This section does not change that principle. I think I should clear up the inference which was made, that this section provided that there was a lien or encumbrance on the land. This section does not provide that the vendor of the goods has a lien or mortgage or encumbrance on the land at all. It only provides that there shall be a notice endorsed on the title, giving notice to the owner, or any purchaser from the owner, that these chattels are the subject of a conditional sale. We must not forget that, under The Mechanics Lien Act, for example, if these goods are permanently fixed to the land, that Act does give the unpaid vendor a claim upon the land itself, and can require that the land be sold by the sheriff to satisfy that claim, even if the goods were affixed by a tenant thereof. This Bill does not go that far. It only provides for a notice to be registered on the title, without any other legal significance. It merely serves as a warning to any person who goes to the Land Titles Office and looks at the title, that there are some goods affixed to that land which are not yet paid for, and the owner of the land may, since he has notice of that unpaid vendor's claim, pay out the unpaid vendor, and acquire title to the goods, or he may require that the goods be removed from the land. And the only remedy which the unpaid vendor has is to remove the goods, unless the owner of the land chooses to pay for them.

There is one other suggestion that was made, and that was about goods removed into Saskatchewan. As the Act presently stands, the vendor of goods from another province, who hasn't been fully paid, and who has a conditional sale registered in the courthouse of the proper Judicial District in that other province, may have his lien defeated by the purchaser simply taking the goods into another province and selling them to a bona fide purchaser for value. This is the law now. The only protection which a vendor, for example, in the province of Alberta has today, is that, within 20 days after the goods are removed into Saskatchewan, if he knows they were moved into Saskatchewan (and he must know that before he can take the benefit of this provision) he can register his claim in the proper Judicial District in this province. If he does it within 20 days, the effect of his lien goes right back to the date when the goods were moved into this province. This means that, today, if you buy a second-hand automobile that has been in this province less than 20 days, and the finance company in Alberta has a lien on that automobile and registers that lien in this province within the 20 days period, the purchaser of that automobile takes his interest subject to that lien. If the Alberta vendor fails to register his lien within 20 days, then, of course, his lien has no effect against the subsequent purchaser.

We are proposing to change that section, in the first place,

March 21, 1957

to extend the time to 20 days, and, in the second place, to give foreign, outside vendors the right to register under our Act, not just within 30 days after the removal of the goods into Saskatchewan, but any time after the agreement is made. This will mean that a vendor in another province can absolutely protect himself against the danger of his goods being moved into Saskatchewan and sold, by taking the precaution of registering his lien in this province as soon as it arises, and then it can't be defeated. By giving to the outside vendor that privilege, we think that we are giving him as much protection as we can give under this Act.

It has been suggested by some that we ought to say that he has 30 days from the time when he has notice of the goods being moved into this province, and it might be fair to a vendor to give him 30 days from the time he has notice of the goods being removed; but I would point out that he may not have notice for six months or a year. He may have been completely careless, negligent, in getting notice. The purchaser may have neglected to make 12 months payments, and then bring the goods into Saskatchewan and sell them and get cash for them. The vendor may have neglected his own interests, and the result would be that, even though the goods may have been in Saskatchewan for a full 12 months and an innocent purchaser may have bought them sometime within that 12-month period, the Alberta vendor would be able to come in and defeat the interest of a bona fide purchaser. We think that, when it comes to a choice between protecting vendors from outside the province, and purchasers who reside in this province, our first obligation is to protect the innocent purchaser who may buy the goods in Saskatchewan. We feel too, that we are not being unfair to the unpaid vendor from Alberta or British Columbia, if we say to him, you could have protected your interest if you had chosen to register your documents at the time of the sale, in this province.

Saskatchewan is the only province which will offer other vendors in other provinces this privilege.

As long as we had in this province 21 registration districts, the only way we could have given that privilege to vendors outside was to have given them the privilege of registering in everyone of the 21 Judicial Districts in Saskatchewan. By virtue of the fact that we will now have central registration, we are able to give them a privilege and a protection which would have been impossible without central registration.

So we say that we have gone farther than any other province in protecting the rights of vendors who are unpaid, and at the same time we have not jeopardized the rights of the people of this province who may buy a second-hand article, not knowing that it is subject to a foreign lien.

The suggestion was made that this Bill had not been submitted to the Law Society. I may say that there was no opportunity to submit it to the Law Society in annual convention, but it has been submitted to the Law Society as far as circumstances will permit. Their individual comments were

appraised and incorporated into the succeeding drafts, and then the final draft was submitted to every member of the Law Society of Saskatchewan, and out of their submissions we will have some eight House amendments.

That may sound like a lot of House amendments, but I assure the House that what we have done in this particular case with this Bill, we have got all of the amendments which we would likely be making from year to year in the next five years. We have got them all now, I think, and they will be incorporated in the Act itself.

I have confidence that this will be the best Conditional Sales Act in Canada. This Act incorporates features which aren't to be found in any other Act in Canada, and these special features that we have incorporated into this Act have met with the universal approval of the people who will use the Act. I am confident it will give the people of Saskatchewan better protection than they have ever had before under legislation of this kind.

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

TIME PLEBISCITE

The Assembly resumed from Monday, March 11, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McIntosh:

“That the detailed results of the Plebiscite on the Time Question held concurrently with the 1956 Municipal Elections throughout Saskatchewan be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Law, with instructions that the said Committee shall have power to pursue its study of the question in such manner as it deems fit, and to report from time to time its observations thereon;

and, further, that, for purposes of the said study, the Committee be augmented by the addition of the following members: Messrs. Walker, Kramer and Cameron.”

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, since the Time Question has first been brought to the attention of the members of this House, I find that we have had a great deal of difficulty in keeping even the clocks around this Chamber running.

As for the question of time in the whole of the province,

March 21, 1957

it seems to me that we have spent a great deal of time. I think we have had three Committees set up now to discuss this problem, and to endeavour to come up with an answer to it. Then last summer we had the Plebiscite taken during the municipal elections, and at that time spent almost \$27,000, and the people of the province apparently made their choice. Now it would appear that the Government is not prepared to act upon the advice that has been given to them by the electorate of this province, and I can see no reason for going back into Committee again. I doubt if you are going to come out of that committee with any concrete proposals, or any actions that this Government are prepared to take.

Therefore, I am not prepared to support the motion asking to set up a Committee, as I can see little of value coming out of that committee. We could quite possibly be out of Session here with the next two or three weeks, and, after studying this question for three or four years, I doubt very much if the Government are prepared to take the necessary action to solve this question. Therefore, I am not going to waste the time of the Legislature in discussing it any further, Mr. Speaker, but I will not support the motion.

The motion was then agreed to, on division.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 70 – An Act to amend the Co-operative Guarantee Act.

Premier Douglas: — This, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill to amend The Co-operative Guarantee Act. As the hon. members know, under The Co-operative Guarantee Act we can place a Government guarantee up to a certain percentage behind loans which are made by The Co-operative Credit Society. This is particularly to help co-operative associations of various types, which borrow money from The Co-operative Credit Society which in turn gets guarantees in varying amounts, most of which are up to 50 per cent of the value of the loan.

This amendment removes the limit on the percentage which can be guaranteed in respect of co-operatives in the far north. We have been endeavouring for the last two or three years, and particularly in the past 12 months, in trying to interest the people of the far north in co-operatives. A Fishermen's Co-operative, a Retail Co-operative, and various co-operatives of that type, which have been of interest to the people in the far northern part of the province have been established.

We have had excellent co-operation from the Co-operative Credit Society, and from the other co-operative groups, particularly the

Federated Co-operative, the co-operative wholesale. But when we asked them to go into the far north and to make the loans there, the board thought they were not in the same position as when they are making a loan to a co-operative in the south in an established community. When we ask them to go up and make loans to people who have had little or no experience in co-operatives, we try to keep some of our staff there to help them, such as at the Black Lake Co-operative, and the Fort Black Co-operative at Ile-a-La-Crosse. We have kept a man here for almost an entire year helping them to run the co-operative, and we are now turning over the management to them.

I think the hon. members will see that the chance of success of a co-operative under those circumstances is not as good as that of a co-operative in the southern part of the province. Yet we believe that if we are ever to help these people help themselves, the co-operative movement is probably the answer. We feel that in loans made to co-operatives of that nature, we ought to be able to guarantee a larger percentage than the 50 per cent. It may be necessary to guarantee 70 per cent, or 80 per cent; in some cases it might be necessary to guarantee 90 per cent or 100 per cent, in order to get a co-operative of that nature started among the native people of the far north.

The details of the Bill I will be glad to discuss in Committee, but that is the general principle. I, therefore, move second reading.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — I would just like to ask a question. Is this going to be confined to the far north, or, after it goes through, will it be applicable all over the province?

Premier Douglas: — No, it will just be the far north.

Mr. McCarthy: — Was there a line drawn?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, the Northern Administration Area.

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, I see. Thank you.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — On the amount that you hand out to co-operatives, are there any specific regulations to safeguard the loans?

Premier Douglas: — Well, we are going to discuss that in Committee, Mr. Speaker. They are subject to regulations. They are subject to being passed, of course, first by the Co-operative Guarantee Board, which makes the recommendations to the Cabinet. They also would have to be passed by the Co-operative Credit Society Board, which will be putting up the money. It is not our money; we simply guarantee a loans made by the Co-operative Credit Society.

March 21, 1957

Mr. Loptson: — But they wouldn't be interested, if the Government is guaranteeing 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the question raised by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) can be answered in Committee.

(The motion for second reading was agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting)

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m. without question put.