

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, February 20, 1958

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN DAM

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the Government a question in view of the announcements that were made yesterday, with regard to the construction of the South Saskatchewan Dam.

I note, in the headlines of the 'Leader-Post', it is said: "Agreement has been reached on river project cost sharing." I would like to ask the Government if there has been any agreement reached between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada as to what finances the Province would be asked to pay, either this year, or over the years it would take to construct the South Saskatchewan dam.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are still being proceeded with and I think it would be unwise at this time to become involved in any public discussions of figures until we have a final settlement and an agreement either signed or ready to be signed. Certainly before any commitment is made, the Government will be reporting to the Legislature and giving all the details. I think my hon. friend can appreciate the fact that when discussions are being carried on, it would probably be unwise for us to bandy figures about.

As I pointed out yesterday, we have reached agreement on the matter of proportionate costs, but the matter of financing, and the extent to which if any, the Federal Government is prepared to assist in financing power development, has still not been cleared up. I hope that, in the very near future, we can make some announcement to the House and then I will be glad to confer with my hon. friend as to whether or not, by a motion or some other way, we can have a full-dress debate on the subject.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. Some time ago, according again to press releases, the Government of Saskatchewan asked the Government of

February 20, 1958

Canada for some \$100 million to be loaned, at a low-interest rate I presume, to develop power in Saskatchewan and to transmit that power. I would like to ask if the South Saskatchewan dam was included in the \$100 million.

Premier Douglas: — Yes. It is not quite correct to say that it was a request. We submitted a brief reviewing the anticipated power load growth and making a case for assistance with reference to about \$100 million. As I pointed out yesterday, over the next ten years the Province will probably have to spend anywhere from \$300 million to \$500 million on power. We thought on the basis of assistance given elsewhere, we had a very good case for asking assistance on about \$100-million worth of power development. Included in that would be the power installations and transmission lines connected with the South Saskatchewan River Development program.

Mr. McDonald: — I don't wish to prolong the questioning, but there is a little information I would like to have. This 100 million, then only covers the power end of the South Saskatchewan development, and in all probability there would be a request, at least, for some financial help with regard to other expenditures that would come under the South Saskatchewan dam, for instance, I could refer to irrigation.

Premier Douglas: — No. There has been no request made for any assistance in the matter of irrigation to date. We have dealt with financing only two things: the Province's share of the dam itself and power facilities and transmission lines.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to read a statement that the Clerk has prepared with respect to all questions. I think it is well that we should all understand and agree as to what questions can be permitted on Orders of the Day and what can't. The question today with respect to the South Saskatchewan dam arose out of something that was said in the House yesterday. It is conceivable that it would be urgent that any misconception should be rectified and, therefore, I didn't raise any point concerning it. However, I would like to read the statement prepared by the Clerk, and if the House deems it advisable, I feel that it might be a matter they would wish to refer to the Committee of Standing Orders.

"The right to ask oral questions on Orders of the Day is conceded. Oral questions have been accepted practice in the British House of Commons for many years, and, more recently, a similar practice has been adopted by the House of Commons in Ottawa. Anyone who reads Hansard must have seen how easily this practice may get out of hand to the dis-

ruption of public business, unless the rules governing it are rigorously adhered to and enforced. It is particularly desirable in view of our radio commitments, that the rules relating to the asking of oral questions on the Orders of the Day be meticulously observed. Therefore, in order that hon. Members may know what criteria of admissibility will inform my decisions, I propose to set forth the fundamental rules which apply, based on my reading of the authorities, Beauchesne and May and, . . ."

With the consent of the House, I will leave this until a later occasion today.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House will agree to go directly to the Special Order, and dispense with this until later today.

(Agreed)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-In-Reply

The House resumed from Wednesday, February 19, 1958, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw City) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McDonald.

Mr. H. Begrand (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, first of all I would like to extend my congratulations to the hon. members from Moose Jaw and Touchwood (Mr. Davies and Mr. Meakes) for the very efficient manner in which they discharged their responsibility in moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure their people back home, and all the people of Saskatchewan, are proud of the way they handled their heavy responsibilities. However, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that time is limited on the air, I am going to get right into my argument right now.

I wish to deal, for the main part of my speech with an important problem which is facing the people of rural Saskatchewan at this time: That is the opening of rural roads in Saskatchewan in winter time. The progress and evaluation in this transition period since the end of the second world war, have, to a greater or lesser extent, affected every person, community, and organization, and local and senior governments. Economic changes and technological advances brought with them many new problems, solution to some of which were prompt and simple, to others prolonged and difficult. The mechanization trend has been difficult to keep pace with. The demand and need for new and better services at community level have changed the whole pattern of rural living. Senior and local governments have their own specific problems to cope with, and many of them are not easy to solve, for every service and extension of services is based on dollars and cents.

February 20, 1958

A little over a year ago, a new organization was formed and set up by the Flat Springs Snow Plow Association and surrounding municipalities in the north-east part of the province of Saskatchewan, to deal with a very important matter. This problem of snow removal, Mr. Speaker, is getting more difficult all the time and, therefore, I feel that financial assistance is required to encourage snow removal clubs to keep rural roads open in Saskatchewan during the winter months. The problem of winter transportation places too heavy a burden on rural residents, and this situation became very acute, two years ago, with the abnormal amount of snow and a very severe winter. The local clubs found it necessary to turn to local and senior governments for assistance and, as a consequence, formed an association which passed a resolution at a meeting of the Snow Removal Club, which was later endorsed at a public meeting, held at Melfort, attended by over 125 people — R.M. officials, Snow Plow Clubs, and M.L.A.'s.

I think that, owing to the shortage of time, I will forgo reading the resolution which was placed before the Cabinet at that time, a year ago. But, I will deal with the policy generally used in Saskatchewan for snow removal on rural roads, in the absence of any clear-cut policy on the part of both the local and senior governments.

Most of the rural roads are kept open by the numerous clubs organized on a voluntary basis, financed by its members, who are all farmers living on farm. In a very few areas, municipal assistance is provided by keeping a very few main roads open. But by and large, the bulk of the work is financed by the club members living on the farm the year around. That is the problem of Saskatchewan today. A few rural municipalities over the years have made an attempt to try out a snow-removal program and purchased some equipment for that purpose; but usually, after one season of operation. The program was discarded as it proved too costly and impractical. From experience gained over the years, it has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the local snow-plow club operating in an area of between 20 and 40 miles of rural roads, the mileage would of necessity depend on the standard of the roads and the severity of the winter. It is the most efficient and satisfactory method of providing snow—removal services at a minimum of cost.

Now what is the legal status of snow-removal clubs in Saskatchewan today? There is nothing contained in provincial statutes, particularly The Rural Municipality Act. Complicated procedure is necessary to register and license such clubs in order to allow them on roads, and yet we must operate to keep community life functioning through the efforts, sacrifice and expense of the present clubs. Rural roads are fairly well kept open to connect urban centres.

If such a centre is served by a highway, the vast majority of farmers have still to reach the highway first. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of rural people are not located on provincial highways. Roads must be kept open to take children to school, to take people to the doctors and hospitals, and to church. Roads must be kept open to haul farm produce to market and fuels and heating oils to schools and homes. In other words, roads must be kept open all winter in rural Saskatchewan.

The gradual and tragic decline in farm income since 1952, and the terrific increase in the cost of living and farm operations, have dealt the community snow-removal service a death blow, and assistance is urgently required if this all-essential service to rural life in Saskatchewan is to be continued. If the clubs that were forced to disband two years ago on account of lack of financial assistance are to survive and continue their work, then we all agree they must have help. I am sure we all agree, too, that the financial position of the farmers, today, has been on the decline, and is getting worse from day to day. Of course that is a Federal responsibility — I'll deal with that later.

Provincial legislation is, therefore, necessary to legalize snow-plow clubs and their operations on municipal roads, which we haven't got today. Provision should be incorporated under The Rural Municipality Act to bring control over the organizations and operations under municipal jurisdiction. I propose that the financing of snow removal on rural roads should be reasonably shared by the clubs and the Provincial Government, because the traffic on rural roads and all users of such roads contribute to licences and gasoline tax revenues. Such financial assistance would create an incentive, and encourage improvement and expansion of snow-removal clubs in all rural Saskatchewan. This proposed plan, Mr. Speaker, would provide a basis for co-operation and arrangements between snow-removal clubs, municipal councils and school boards, in keeping winter roads open, including school bus routes. School boards have the responsibility to see that children are able to get to school, not only in the summer, but in the winter as well. Because of the lack of this important community service, a few school boards found it necessary to purchase snow-removal equipment to keep school bus routes open; but, by far the majority of these roads have been kept open by rural people themselves, at their own expense.

The shift of rural population to urban centres has been a matter of grave concern to both local and senior governments. Various programs have been instituted to induce farmers to stay on the farm the year around. However, in spite of all these efforts, the shift from rural to urban centres has not been entirely checked. In my opinion, there are two main reasons mainly responsible for this situation:

No. 1 — I would call it the 'all-time low' in farm income. If we haven't reached the bottom, we will, very soon, under the kind of Government we have in Ottawa, This has been brought about by the Federal Government's arrogant attitude towards agriculture, their failure to institute an adequate agricultural policy assuring the farmers their fair share of the national income.

No. 2 — The uncertainty of open winter roads.

All other aspects of rural life have been studied and given very good consideration by this Government. I will only name a few of these major developments that have taken place in Saskatchewan under this Government since assuming office in 1944. Rural electrification, for instance, has been brought to every corner of the province of Saskatchewan. The rural electrification program will be almost completed by 1960. Assistance to rural municipalities of the province has seen a tremendous increase since 1945. In 1956, Mr. Speaker, 12,000 miles of a rural grid system of roads got under way. Construction started in co-operation with the municipalities and when completed, it will bring about the best all-weather road system of any province in Canada. The cost of these 12,000 miles of road will be in the neighbourhood of \$60 million. The rural municipalities will pay about \$24 million and the Provincial Government will pay about \$36 million: that is, about 40 per cent by the municipalities, and about 60 per cent by the Government. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks and appreciation to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) and his Department for the highly efficient manner in which they are handling this tremendous program in Saskatchewan.

The same thing is taking place in the field of education, Mr. Speaker. For instance, Government assistance to education has increased from about \$3 million in 1944 to over \$16 million in 1956. The all-important result, Mr. Speaker, talking about education now, is that an increased number of rural children from year to year, are able to complete their higher school education not far from home, and at no great expense to the parents. That is the all-important thing. We are not through yet. We are going to make this better as finances permit. We have gone a long way along that line.

In health fields, Mr. Speaker, the same type of progress has taken place. I will deal only with the hospitals. More and more hospitals have been built in rural Saskatchewan. They are built in towns and villages in order to bring more and more up-to-date medical services closer to the rural people of Saskatchewan. The hospital program, like all the others, has been made possible through very substantial assistance from the Government.

I have only mentioned a few of the major services

sponsored by this Government. There are many others that are a big contributing factor to better rural life in Saskatchewan. We all agree that these services have been of tremendous assistance and value and very much appreciated by the people of this province. However, in order that the rural people of Saskatchewan may take full advantage of these wonderful services the year around, the rural roads in Saskatchewan must be kept open all winter. As I already mentioned, the cost of this important service, up to the present time, has been borne entirely by the farmers themselves, including the purchasing of the snow-removal equipment. Any of you who have had experience with this type of work will agree that the wear and tear on such equipment is terrific, and, therefore, the depreciation is much higher than on any other type of farm equipment. With the decline of farm income, this essential service can no longer be financed by the snow-club members themselves, nor by the municipality, whose only source of revenue or income is the property tax.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I trust that in the best interest of all the people of Saskatchewan, this matter will be given very careful consideration in the very near future, and without any shadow of a doubt on my part. Mr. Speaker, of course I will support the motion.

Mr. John Thiessen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say just a few words on the Speech from the Throne, I want to reverse my procedure of last year. Last year I spoke a few words about what we had in the constituency of Shellbrook; this, I would like to spend just a few minutes on some of our problems in Shellbrook constituency.

In listening to the reading of the Speech from the Throne, I was gratified that the Petrofka bridge was mentioned. Petrofka bridge is very important and is of very vital interest to many of our people up in my constituency, north of there, and people south of that constituency. I would just like to spend a few minutes to tell you just what the situation is like at Petrofka landing.

This ferry will, this season, carry across the river about 6,000 vehicles — that is, in about six months, which is the usual operating season. These 6,000 vehicles do have to do a certain amount of waiting. I have seen autos wait from five, fifteen to twenty minutes, and I have seen them wait two and one-half hours down there, too. Dividing the time of waiting, I would say that these vehicles wait on the average of half an hour each. Half an hour of waiting for 6,000 vehicles is 3,000 hours of waiting on the banks of the Saskatchewan River at Petrofka landing and 3,000 hours of stalling motor cars will take you very close to 100,000 miles of travelling, or the equivalent of tying up seven to 10 average farm cars for a whole year.

February 20, 1958

I don't think we have anywhere in the province where we have a bottleneck of traffic such as we have at Petrofka ferry. When you tie up seven to ten farm cars, there is an awful lot of time lost there. This time could be used for a lot of useful things. That is not the total picture, either. Then you have two months — one month in the fall and another month in the spring, where there is no traffic at all. You can't get across the ice; the ferry is taken out. That means another 2,000 to 2,500 vehicles again have to find other roads, other highways, to go to their destinations, which means another loss of extra miles.

Then, in the winter time, which takes about four months of the season, I would imagine, there are not so many cars take this route, because many people do not like to cross on ice. Lots of times the approaches and the road are slippery and plugged with snow, as my hon. friend from Kinistino (Mr. Bégard) said a lot of our roads are. Therefore a lot of other cars again have to seek passage somewhere else. I have travelled quite a number of times across this ferry, and I don't think I have travelled once that I didn't wait. I have gone to Prince Albert more often, and have never waited to get into the city of Prince Albert.

However, that is not the total picture, either. We have about 40 miles of road leading into this ferry. We have about 20 miles in the R.M. of Blaine Lake, and we have about 20 miles again in the R.M. of Laird. I could be out a mile or two on each one, but it is approximately 40 miles between No. 11 and No. 40 Highways. These roads were built a number of years ago by the Provincial Government, but the maintenance is done by the rural municipalities. I have been approached by the R.M. of Blaine Lake, and they tell me this road is too heavy; they haven't got the equipment and the time or the money to maintain and keep this road in the condition it should be in.

The other road my hon. friend from Rosthern (Mr. Elias) is interested in — it's in his constituency. The Reeve of Laird municipality tells me they are in the same position. Now, when you have some five, six, seven or eight thousand vehicles travelling across roads in your municipality which do not originate there, nor have their destination there, then it means a heavy burden on the municipality.

With our Grit and Tory friends out to try and outbid each other for giving us public works or loaning us money, or allowing us money for these things, I would suggest that our Government leave no stone unturned in getting the very best deal from the people who are in the field, wanting to be elected at the moment, to try and build a bridge in Prince Albert, sure — but build another one at Petrofka Ferry. We need it there. It is very definitely needed by the people of the northern part of the country.

Then I have another problem — transportation again. This is not because we haven't done anything. This is because we did start to build No. 3 Highway. This highway was started last year from Big River to the Shellbrook bridge, and was completed to about east of Eldred. The biggest part of that road used to run on the west side of the railroad there, and has changed now to the east side of the railroad. Many of those people now have a highway on one side of the railroad, the railroad in the middle and another highway on the other side. Some of those people, indeed most of them, are not complaining about this set-up. However, the road now is staked out from Eldred to the vicinity of Canwood, and we are hoping that, when the Minister brings out his plan for 1958, we will get at least part of this road built in 1958.

That is actually not yet a problem, either. The problem is going to arise when we get into the 1959 program, where we hope that the Minister will continue this road on to the Shellbrook bridge. There are two routes this road could go. One is at its present route from Canwood, going straight east to Marchand Grove Corner and then south to the bridge, where it is going at present. Then it could go along the declines, along the railroad and hit the Shellbrook bridge that way. I have had letters, and I have had delegations and private individuals come to see me from the north and the west, who tell me that this road must definitely go along the railroad as we have done from Big River on. My own council, of which I am secretary, sort of put me on the spot because my council is split. One part says it must go round the square as it does now; the other says, "No, we've got to put pressure on to bring it along the railroad." So I tell them, "Well, you leave the M.L.A. in quite a spot"; but just the same the Shellbrook council has done the same thing. They have put pressure on me to put pressure on the Minister to make sure that it doesn't go through the pines. However, I am not going to suggest, nor am I going to say, where that road must or should go; but I would suggest that before any plan is definitely drawn up, the Minister get all the information he can, all the data he can, everything that is available in the interests of this road, and that, after everything is weighed very carefully, the Minister build that road where the traffic would demand it, and where it will be satisfactory to the people. Now, maybe those two things cannot be combined, but if they cannot, then I must say that we should adhere to traffic which would regulate this, because we have also the Cookson road in on this deal, and the Shellbrook council is interested, of course, in having that Cookson road in as a highway. Now, the only thing I want to say, again, is that I hope the Minister weighs very carefully all the information he can get on this road and that it be made available so that we can see what was used.

Then I have one other little problem, this time not on transportation but on communication. By this I mean telephones. You

know, when we are in Regina, coming to the Session and all the rest of it, I can go down to the lobby of the hotel where I am staying, and pick up that phone any time of day or night, and can always get somebody to dial a number. I can also go back to Canwood and I can sit in my own house, and I can phone central there (providing she's open) and I can talk to my daughter in B.C. in about five minutes, which is all very wonderful. We pay about \$32 for a business phone in Regina here, I imagine, for a 24-hour service and also your house phones. In Canwood, for a business phone we pay the same price exactly and get 10 hours of service. We are not complaining about that; but what we do complain about is that we have a lot of area where there is just no telephone at all. All the northern part of my constituency hasn't got a telephone in it. We have talked about various means of getting it there. We have talked about the old set-up that we had on our Legislature books under which you can organize a telephone company and you can sell debentures and build your telephone line.

In this now set-up territory, the area which is just opening up, the people down there haven't got the money to buy debentures to build telephones. I maintain that we got away from a lot of debentures when we organized the school units to build new schools. We didn't use debentures to build our power lines, and I feel we must get busy and study ways and means of building telephones into every area of the province of Saskatchewan. If we cannot give them telephone service to the house we must, I feel, build lines into these areas and possibly put in pay stations for the moment. Anyway, in the long-run I feel we should plan towards this thing and put in these pay lines at the moment and then a little later, put a telephone into every house in the province of Saskatchewan. I will vote for the Speech from the Throne

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, the other day when the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) was opening his address, I think he said something to the effect that the material in the Speech from the Throne could be printed on the back of a postage stamp. I want to say that my opinion is there were many important factors in this document which might have a great bearing on the future development of this province. I refer to the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Following a very worthwhile convention, a Rural Development Council was set up, and I feel sure that a tremendous step forward will be taken in an endeavour to try and adjust our economy to the many changes which have taken place in the last decade, and the many changes that will take place in the future.

I believe that new ideas, better and wiser spending of the tax dollar can be found, if we apply ourselves as citizens of this great province. I feel, too, with reference to the Provincial-

Local Government Conference, that that was a very worthwhile conference which was held here a little over a year ago. Most of us who attended thought it was a worthwhile conference, and when we have the findings of the Continuing Committee from that conference, it ought to provide a better understanding of finances and responsibilities between the provincial government and local government. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that these two items alone are of great enough importance to warrant consideration of the members of this Legislature.

The unemployment picture has already received a good deal of attention in this debate, and rightfully so. The number of unemployed is past the point where all those in responsible positions should be quite concerned about it. I have stated in this House before, that whereas the farming population has been taking a beating from our economy, it would not be too long before the industrial worker would feel the pinch of the many shortcomings of our economic set-up.

The Leader of the Official Opposition the other day in his speech, was trying to make out a case for the extra taxes that were being applied to the farmer, and almost in the same breath he criticized us for not spending millions of dollars in public building. It has been pointed out many times in this House, that a public works program, such as buildings supplied by this province, does very little to solve a serious mass unemployment situation. A very small percentage of our tax dollar remains in the province, and a large percentage finds its way to other parts of this Dominion.

It seems to me the sensible solution to a mass unemployment problem such as we have today, with half a million men and women searching for employment, would be for a Dominion Government to go into a public works program. They have the money at low interest rates, and are able to pick it up again wherever it finds its way in the different parts of this Dominion.

As a worker, I think it rather tragic, with this half a million people unemployed at this particular time, that the two old parties are spending all their time trying to blame one another as to which is responsible for this unemployment situation. The Liberal party is blaming the Tories, and the Tories apparently have unearthed a confidential document which was supposed to be in some Minister's office.

Mr. McDonald: — Did you read it?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — We know all about it.

Mr. Stone: — Surely we don't care, Mr. Speaker, who is responsible at this time for this unemployment situation.

February 20, 1958

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The Liberals caused it.

Opposition Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Stone: — . . . but we are concerned, and should be concerned as to getting some of these people back in full employment. It is quite apparent that they are prepared to cloud the issue, because they have no solution to solve this very uncertain situation.

I also want to mention the national hospitalization plan, and I know my friends of the official Opposition will not concur with me when I say that the people of Saskatchewan ought to be justly proud of the fact that we are nearing the day when we will have a national hospital plan. I think they should be justly proud because they have pioneered this prepaid hospital plan, and proved to the people of Canada that such a plan is feasible and necessary in our way of life.

There isn't anything definite, of course, as to when this plan will commence but I feel certain that, regardless of who wins the election on March 31st, they dare not delay too long in putting this plan into effect.

I think it was quite an accomplishment for the Power and Gas Corporation in bringing gas and the installation of the natural gas to so many citizens in the city of Regina, this year. I saw the installation, of course, in Saskatoon, and it is quite an undertaking. We citizens of Saskatoon, who have enjoyed the benefits of natural gas for several years, the benefits of comfort and economy, are glad to know that many thousands of other citizens in this province are now enjoying this cheap and clean fuel.

I also want to say that I cannot think of anything closer to my heart than the increases given to the mothers' allowance payments since the first of the year.

Mr. McDonald: — They are long overdue.

Mr. Stone: — I have felt for a long time that this group, who are definitely our responsibility, have no one to speak for them, no pressure groups to present their case, have long been neglected. Therefore I fully endorse what the Government has done to assist this group of people. I am sure everyone, and particularly our senior citizens, are delighted at the opening of the new nursing home in Regina. Also with the fact of the news that it is the policy of our Government to progressively extend this kind of services to other centres of the province.

I am sure that the three-week holiday with pay will be accepted very well by a great number of wage-earners in this province. I think most people have come to accept the real need of a holiday period in the fast tempo of our present-day economy. It is very beneficial to employees and, indirectly, to their employers. My only regret is that the Government could not have seen fit to reduce the waiting period from five to three years. I feel that three years is surely long enough for an employee to prove his or her worth to an employer.

The proposed increase in hospital construction grants is going to be very acceptable, especially in the larger urban centres. Despite the fact that we do have in this province the highest bed per capita capacity in this Dominion, there are complications setting in in our larger urban centres owing to the tremendous shift in population, and the desire of people in the rural areas to seek these kinds of services in the larger centres.

Another matter mentioned in the Throne Speech is the increased grants for municipal and school districts, and I am sure this is going to be very welcome, too, to our municipalities. This is brought about, Mr. Speaker, by the extra grants made available under the Dominion-Provincial Tax Rental Agreement.

This Government has promised (and that's one thing — we have always carried out our promises) that as more money becomes available, increased grants will be given to education. The urban centres have their problem in providing for tremendous growing problems in education, and I think it is fair to say that the urban centres, on the whole, have been fairly reasonable and patient, and have accepted the equalization policy of the Department of Education, realizing, perhaps, that the problems facing the rural areas have been more pressing, and that their sources of taxation are perhaps not so good as in the urban centres.

The figures which our Premier gave to us yesterday, in pointing out that the grants made to education last year, over \$16 million, exceeded the total cost of education in 1946 by some \$2 million, I think clearly points out the effect of the inflationary policies of the Governments at Ottawa has had on our school boards. I don't think anybody could be more aware of the inflationary policies than the housewife who, on her periodical trips to grocery stores and other stores where she has to make her purchases, will find in the space of a few days, one to five cents tax go on various items on the shelves.

We've heard a great deal of ballyhoo from the Liberal press, during the National Liberal Convention urging this great party to return to its original philosophy, and they spoke loud and long

February 20, 1958

about the freedom of the individual. There are many hundreds of thousands of young married people today who are mortgaged for the rest of their lives — no escape; slaves to the mortgage companies . . .

Opposition Members: — Oh! Oh!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You seem to think it funny, don't you.

Mr. Stone: — . . . until they are 60 or 65 years of age, when they can possibly burn the mortgage and say, "This is my home."

I certainly do not relish this kind of freedom. There is no excuse in a country which produces all the materials that go into a home, for not having a low-cost rental housing program for its people. We have had a Liberal Government at Ottawa for years, and a Tory Government for almost a year, but the question of current inflation has not been mentioned, let alone any suggested remedies.

Mr. Speaker, I am in the similar position to the fellow who ate the sausage roll. With the first bite he didn't come to the sausage, and with the second bite he bit over the sausage. I am the last of three speakers, and I have explicit orders to be off to give my friends in the corner the allotted time on the air. I don't know whether I came to the meat, or passed over it; but I have, in the few minutes at my disposal, tried to point out why, in my opinion, this is a very important motion before us. Therefore, I will oppose the amendment. I imagine that sometime during the Budget Debate I will have plenty of time off the air. Nobody seems to be in a hurry to go home . . .

Mr. McDonald: — We've just got here.

Mr. Stone: — I will oppose the amendment, and support the motion.

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on the Speech from the Throne in a very able and capable manner. They presented their case. I would also like to congratulate the Premier and the Leader of the Official Opposition for their usual outstanding rendition of their speeches.

However, in seconding the motion for the Address in Reply, the member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) mentioned inflated prices of goods and he attributed this condition to the system of free enterprise. (I am sorry the member is not here.) However, I am going

to quote him, as he mentioned this in his speech. To establish his argument, he made a comparison of prices which farmers receive for their eggs and the prices charged to the consumer for these same eggs. His figures may be slightly exaggerated, but nevertheless he quoted a price paid to the farmers of 20 cents a dozen, and a retail price to consumers of 60 cents a dozen. This spread in price from the producer, according to his reasoning, was caused by our free enterprise system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in our province we have a very successful co-operative organization, which is owned and controlled by the farmers themselves. I find that in the handling of eggs from the farmers to the consumers (who may also be farmers), their prices are the same as those charged by merchants whom the member from Touchwood classified as being so-called 'free enterprisers'.

In our town of Meadow Lake, I might say, the farmers deliver their eggs to the Co-Op egg-candling station, and from this station they are delivered to the Co-Op store for re-sale; and I wish to point out that, in all cases their resale price for eggs is the same as it is in other retail outlets. If such a large mark-up as he claims existed, then surely the Co-Op organization should be in a position to correct the situation without being influenced by our so-called free enterprise system. After all, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier so ably put it, yesterday, "the Co-ops are for use and not for profit." I am very pleased with success of the Co-ops in our province and the expansion that has been made in their organization. It is a great credit to the organization, and I hope that they will continue to have the same success which they have enjoyed up to now.

Many remarks made by the members from the other side of the House have been made in a similar manner in connection with free enterprise. Now our Government is in direct competition in Saskatchewan with free enterprise through their Crown Corporations. I would like to comment, this afternoon, on some of the prices that they charge, as Crown Corporations, to the people of Saskatchewan. I will just take for an example, lumber. Last year, in this house some questions were asked from this Government, and answers were received. I am going to refer to some of these questions, which I am going to quote. I am first going to refer to Question No. 140 and Question No. 141 and the Answers thereto. In no. 140, the question is: "What was the average selling price, in feet board measure, by the Saskatchewan Timber Board, for the years 1948 to 1956 inclusive, for (a) poplar lumber and dimensions; (b) spruce lumber and dimensions." And also question No. 141: "What was the average price paid by the Saskatchewan Timber Board for each year 1948 to 1956 inclusive for different grades of (a) poplar lumber and dimensions; (b) spruce lumber and dimensions?"

February 20, 1958

For reasons of comparison I will only take the last figures — (those for 1956), and I find the following answers:

"The average price paid by the Saskatchewan Timber Board, including stumpage dues and Workmen's Compensation Board assessments for each year 1948 to 1956 inclusive for different grades of (a) poplar lumber (b) spruce lumber is as follows:

(I have just taken the year 1956, which is the last year, for these figures because the Return is too lengthy.)

In 1956 we find that for spruce lumber the price paid by the Timber Board was \$45.52 per 1,000 ft. board measure. In the same year, 1956, the selling price for spruce lumber was \$73.85 per 1,000 ft. board measure. In other words, the Government-operated Timber Board made an average profit on spruce lumber, for the year 1956, of \$28.33 per 1,000 ft. board measure — approximately a 60 per cent mark-up on the sale of this one product.

Mr. McDonald: — Shame.

Mr. Gardiner: — The capitalists!

Mr. Weber: — I would hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, what conditions would prevail in this country if this Government entered into many more fields of business where they have a monopoly, and which are definitely not free-enterprise corporations. Surely, if this Government is as opposed to free enterprise as some of its members profess to be, then they should set a better example in their own Crown Corporations.

Mr. Gardiner: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Weber: — I notice in the Speech from the Throne that they are proposing to set up a Federal-Provincial loan fund and I am very happy to see that come into effect, but I believe it will be some time until its effects will be felt throughout our municipalities.

Today, in Saskatchewan, the municipalities are hard pressed to raise the necessary money to provide adequate services within the field of municipal responsibilities. Obviously this situation is created by the steady decline in the municipal share of the tax dollar which has reached an all-time low in the past few years. I

believe it is necessary to re-allocate the tax dollar if municipal governments are to be given the means to carry out their many and heavy responsibilities. The large urban municipalities have had no great difficulty in securing loans from bond houses; but this is not so for the small urban municipalities. These smaller municipalities have been placed in a position where they find it almost impossible to dispose of their debentures, either locally or through bond brokers; consequently, much desired and many necessary public works projects are not being completed. In such unfortunate municipalities progress is retarded and their citizens are hampered by being deprived of the better things of life. This Government should, in my opinion, set up a revolving fund, or a municipal finance corporation, wherein money would be made available to these municipalities with which to finance these local public works programs, without having to apply for loans from other financial institutions which are reluctant to accept debentures for sale from these municipalities.

Municipalities are the responsibility of our Provincial Government, and Saskatchewan is far behind our neighbouring provinces in helping our local governments to provide services, such as water, sewer and gas. Many of our larger towns and villages are still without those services. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Government make the necessary money available to our small municipalities at once, and, when the Federal-Provincial loan fund is established (which I understand will take place in the near future), these loans could be made available to the municipalities and then the money could be refunded to the revolving fund from the Federal-Provincial loan fund.

According to reports in the press today, there must be an election coming, because we are hearing so much about the South Saskatchewan River dam. This has been a political football in federal elections for quite a number of years, and I can only see it again becoming a political football in this election because, in my opinion, again somebody is going to sidetrack the issue before a final settlement is reached.

In checking over Hansard some time ago, I noticed some of the questions asked by a member from Saskatchewan on the Orders of the Day. One of the questions was as follows:

"Can the Prime Minister indicate what steps are being taken to insure a construction start by December 10th, and would the hon. gentleman also indicate when this Government plans to accept the invitation of the Province of Saskatchewan to discuss the proposal?"

February 20, 1958

The Rt. Hon. J.C. Diefenbaker said this:

"Mr. Speaker, we are ready to discuss the proposal at any time. However, this does give me an opportunity to point out that the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan recently made a statement to the effect that, in the construction of the South Saskatchewan River dam and power project, the Federal Government was now expected to pay everything. That does not represent anything like the basis upon which consideration is to be given to that project."

And further, on the same page, Mr. Diefenbaker continued.

"As far as the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan is concerned we are willing to meet with that Government at any time. I understand that a basis of agreement was determined two years ago. However, within the last few weeks the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan came out with a proposition apparently indicating a change in his point of view, and that the former agreed division was not acceptable, and that the Federal Government was to assume all the cost. We are ready to meet with the Government of Saskatchewan and its representatives at any time.

"Our point of view in regard to the South Saskatchewan River dam and irrigation project is unchanged. We will go ahead, but we do not want the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan to alter the rules between innings."

Premier Douglas: — Has my hon. friend the date of that Hansard?

Mr. Weber: — November 7, 1957. The reason I brought this matter up, Mr. Speaker, is this. We are now in the midst of making another agreement with a new party sitting in Ottawa. We tried to enter into an agreement with the former Federal Government, and at that time, the Province of Saskatchewan made a proposition to the Federal Government which they were prepared to carry out. However, when Mr. Diefenbaker got out onto the platform and was electioneering he was going to be building that dam within six months, after he was elected. Well, not very many of expected

the Conservative party to be elected — and I think the most surprised ones were the C.C.F. party, if not John Diefenbaker himself. And now, suddenly, John Diefenbaker was put on a spot where he had to carry out his election promises; and the C.C.F. was in a position where they found a Prime Minister who had committed construction of this dam. It appears to me that the Provincial Government tried to back-track, because I noticed, yesterday, as the Premier indicated in his speech, that they were going to await the outcome of the financial arrangements that they hoped could be made with the Federal Government, based on a long-term loan.

I was just wondering what arrangement this Government had made previously for financing the dam in case the Federal Government would have accepted their offer. Some time I would like to have our Provincial Treasurer give us a report in the House of the basis under which they intended to finance this project, in case the Liberal Government had given the go-ahead sign in starting the construction of the dam.

The political parties now out in the country are trying to out-promise each other in what they are going to do for the people if they get elected or re-elected; and I noticed, too, in the press the other day, a statement made by the Conservative Government:

"It is expected that a five-year northern development road program totalling \$15 million will be commenced in 1958 under a new Dominion-Provincial sharing agreement."

Then I noticed the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) said:

"Geological reports noted several mineral discoveries in northern Saskatchewan that might be developed into producing mines with road access."

He also stated:

"Northern roads would open up extensive forests and recreational resources in the Churchill River region and north to the Lake Athabaska region."

"From information we have gathered to date" (says Mr. Kuziak) "it appears that a road north by way of eastern Saskatchewan would open up a greater

resource potential and one to western Saskatchewan."

Of course the hon. member and myself have had a little friendly disagreement over the location of this road. However, I would still like to have his consideration when the time comes to build a road into the northern part of Saskatchewan.

This \$15 million program, it is to be understood, is a sharing program between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government, but the responsibility of the location of this road is solely the responsibility of this Provincial Government. It is quite evident that no road program connecting Uranium City with centres to the south could be contained in this program, due to the fact that the construction costs of the Lac la Ronge and Uranium City road has been estimated at \$25 million.

Anyone familiar with the rock formations and the rock ridges in this area will realize the difficulty which would be encountered in the construction of such a road through the shield. During the construction period, which I would judge to be at least ten years, Uranium City and other points in the north would be without overland connections to the south of the province. This road is very essential to those settlements along the proposed west route. Uranium City did not have any roads until uranium was discovered there. However, our Minister of Natural Resources seems to think that if we put the road first, across the shield, then we're sure to find uranium.

However, I feel that a road flanking the south and west of this pre-cambrian shield would be the logical and the sensible road to construct, for the simple reason that, of all the settlements that are in the north, I would safely say that over three-quarters of the population are located to the south-west and west of the pre-cambrian shield. These people are entitled to roads now, not after ten years time with the possibility that the east road may never be completed because we may find that eventually it could be economically impossible to complete. I think those people living in the north are entitled to overland outlets to the south, now. Therefore, I strongly advocate that this road be constructed along the south-west flank of the pre-cambrian shield.

I would also like to bring to the attention of this Government that this road, if it were located on the south-west flank of this shield, would open up areas of timber, lakes, fishing and summer resorts. Road construction into the north along the west part of the province would be quite easy. It has been proven that it is no great feat to establish a road in that area, because some time ago, in fact last winter, a group of men undertook to blaze a road through that country, which they later opened up all the way from

Buffalo Narrows to Lake Athabaska. They opened the road with a snow plow and bulldozer, and, then before the season ended, they transported a considerable amount of goods into Uranium City.

Along this road are settlements, predominantly Metis, who, I would say, are enjoying a very low standard of living, at present. The reason for this is quite evident. I must give the Department of Social Welfare a certain amount of credit for this, because since they have been giving better services in that area, the birth rate has increased and the death-rate has decreased and, consequently, the population has been increasing gradually. Today, in those areas, due to that increase in population, where two people formerly made an existence, today five people are trying to make an existence. This has, of necessity, decreased their standard of living and naturally, the social aid that is required in that area has generally increased from year to year.

If this road was opened up through that area, and timber, pulp wood, lumber and fish could be transported over the road, many of those people, who now have no way of earning a living, could make a reasonable living from these resources; and the Government would benefit by the decreasing amount of social aid which would be required.

I would like to say a few words on agriculture before closing. Again, election time is coming around, and we hear a lot of talk about this so-called cost-price squeeze that the farmer is in. I am getting a little weary of this term 'cost-price squeeze'. I would like to see more action taken by both the Provincial Government and the Federal Government in solving the farmers' problems, and I maintain that it is not solely the problem of the Federal Government to alleviate the burdens placed upon our agricultural population.

I would like to ask the Government of the province of Saskatchewan — what they have actually done to help the farming situation. They are the government closest to the farmers, and they are in a position to handle the farmers problems first-hand. Yet all we hear is the cost-price squeeze, the high cost of machinery and the low prices which the farmer receives for his products.

However, when checking over some of the things that have happened in this province which have affected the farmer, I find some items there that this Government is directly responsible for. One of them is municipal taxation. Another is car insurance; another is the car licence; farm truck licence and farm truck insurance; the increase in gasoline tax, and, as I mentioned before, increased price of lumber which is a monopoly here in the province of Saskatchewan. Last year, during the Session we brought in a motion

February 20, 1958

with several amendments to it regarding parity price. When speaking on the amendment to the motion, last year, I indicated that we should be reasonable in our request to the rest of Canada so that we would receive the consideration which was due our agricultural people. However, the Government at that time brought in an amendment (which naturally was passed with a majority) asking for complete parity price.

Now, I am in agreement with them on that. I believe we should have a parity price; but we should gradually work up to a parity price. I believe that, if we could present a more reasonable request to the Federal Government on behalf of our farmers, we would be more apt to get some consideration. I do believe that the Government would lend an ear if we were reasonable. Once we made a start and proved to the Government that what we asked for was reasonable, we could then work to expand to where we would have full parity price for our farmers. That is why, in my opinion, we should have a two-price system. Many people may claim that a two-price system would be a hardship on our people in Canada by increasing the price of bread. Most of you know what has happened to the price of bread. In our town, local bread, about eight or ten years ago was 11 cents a loaf; today a loaf of bread in the same town is 19 cents a loaf. If you check your wheat prices you'll find that wheat has gone down in price three times during the same period. Therefore, I don't believe that wheat is the big factor in the cost of a loaf of bread. Consequently, I think that the two-price system would be a reasonable request to ask the Government of the Dominion of Canada to institute for our people in agriculture.

I was very pleased to note that the Provincial Government is setting up some provincial parks in Saskatchewan, and very greatly pleased to note that one was going to be established in northwest Saskatchewan. The tourist industry in our country is beginning to be one of our bigger businesses in the province, and, therefore, I am in full accord with the Government in their setting out a program of providing facilities for tourists in the province, and, furthermore, are prepared to do considerable advertising to bring the tourists into our province. There is only one drawback that I would like to mention in connection with these parks, and it is that most of the roads in the areas are not too good. I would particularly like to see the Government establish good roads into all the park areas.

I was going to speak on the Indian vote, but my time is a little bit short . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Take all the time you like, we're going to sit tonight.

Mr. Weber: — I will then say a few words on what my opinion

is on the Indian vote. I noticed in the Speech from the Throne, that the Government proposes to give the Indians a vote. Well, the only Indian in Saskatchewan, today, who has no franchise is the Indian on the reserve, and those Indians are not under provincial jurisdiction. They are under the Department of Indian Affairs, which is a department of Citizenship and Immigration, and they are definitely a federal problem. The only thing that I can see that would affect the Indians in the province, or that they could vote for, would be either for a candidate or for the privilege of using our beer parlours.

At the present time, in my constituency there are quite a few Indian reserves, and Mr. Speaker, I would almost classify them as concentration camps, because the conditions on most of these reserves are, to say the least, very, very poor. The Indian is living on land that is of no value except perhaps for hunting or trapping; but they are also confined to very small areas in which they can do hunting or trapping. Consequently I believe that if we are going to accept the Indian into our society, we must be prepared to do a little bit more for him than just permit him to vote. I think we should be prepared to guide him, to help him and to educate him so that, when he does come off the reserve into our way of life, he will not meet too many pitfalls; also that he will be able to carry out his responsibilities as a citizen.

I have a little statement here from a brief that was submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs some years ago by a Dominion Conference of Indians, one of the statements they made in the brief was this:

"The restrictions and limitations which the Indian Act imposes upon the Indians of Canada are so stringent and so broad in their application that all freedom of activity has been stifled and Indians are reduced to a position of virtual serfdom."

I might mention that, at the present time, the Indians on the reserve, under Sections 40 and 41 of the Indian Act, can't even take their own cow out and sell it without the permission of the superintendent of the agency. That is how strict they are kept within the confines of their reserve. To take those people out and take them into our society, as I see it, will take an awful lot of patience on our part, and responsible bodies who would undertake to educate those people to our ways of life, so that when they joined our society, they would be able to carry on in a normal manner, in co-operation with other citizens.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — In the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. Weber: — In closing, I would like to say this. I am pleased to hear of the progress that this province has made, and it is making some progress to be sure; but, in my opinion, the progress is too little and too late. I believe we should have taken the lead some years ago in industrializing our province. However, now that we are in the situation that we are in, I believe it is up to us to forget our political affiliations and our political opinions and enter into a co-operative effort to make things better in the province of Saskatchewan, not only for ourselves but also for the generations to come.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — In rising to speak on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I wish to add my compliments to the mover and the seconder and the other speakers, and to say that in 1958, with conditions as we have them in the province, the Speech from the Throne is far from adequate in solving those problems.

I want to congratulate my leader for a very excellent analysis of the Speech from the Throne, and for a very timely and worthwhile amendment, because there is no doubt in the minds of the Opposition, and I am sure it will be shared by many on the other side of the House (on your right, Mr. Speaker), that the Speech from the Throne has failed utterly to implement a comprehensive program for agriculture, or a progressive program for industrial development in the face of the unemployment crisis in this province.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) saying a few words in support of the rural folks and their snow-plow problems. I was informed that, eight years ago, when the hon. members on this side of the House had attempted to suggest such things to the Government, they were pooh-poohed. Now I see that the request has become almost unanimous, because the snow-removal problem in our rural areas is certainly a very serious one. In my constituency as in many others, government snow plows remain idle while rural and small village folk attempt to find ways of their own of removing snow from the roads. While I am quite aware of the problems involved in having government equipment move off the highways, I nevertheless feel that more could be done than has been done, and I feel now that the Government may be forced to act in that direction.

As I mentioned a moment ago, the Leader of the Official Opposition brought out some very excellent points in his speech on Tuesday, regarding the Speech from the Throne. The hon. Premier answered him very inadequately on many of those points. For example, the Premier told us that he had figures to show that the Crown Corporations had put \$16 million back into the provincial treasury, and I think he went on to say that they put another \$6 million back in interest, or some manner like that.

Premier Douglas: — Royalties.

Mr. Foley: — Thank you. However, others far more experienced in the field of statistics than I am, have gone to a fair amount of trouble to show that, in the same period of time, the Crown Corporations took \$180 million out of the treasury of this province. I think the matter was well taken care of on a public platform, last year, in the province, and when it was over I think we were all satisfied of that, since, if you subtract \$12 million from \$180 million, you still have some \$168 million left.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — That's how you come to be a Liberal!

Mr. Foley: — Well, I'm proud to be a Liberal, Mr. Attorney General. I hope I shall always be.

Premier Douglas: — You're in a rut.

Mr. Foley: — We have heard a great deal about the cost-price squeeze, but when I listened to the Premier yesterday, I was under the impression that another squeeze might be coming up, and it wasn't the cost-price squeeze. It sounded more to me like a Tory squeeze, because, up until now, the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, have had a Liberal opposition in the House here in Regina, and a Liberal Government in Ottawa, and as a result they were able to spend a great deal of their time blaming the Liberals for all of the evils that exist, both provincially and federally.

The situation now, however, is a little different . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Thank God!

Mr. Foley: — However, we have seen in our democratic progress that changes can take place after a period of time. I want to suggest now that it may not be too long before we will have a change provincially as well, and I don't think this Government need take it for granted, as some of them seem to do, that they will be here indefinitely, because I think even now the storm clouds are gathering for 1960.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Starting early.

Mr. Foley: — I think the provincial agricultural situation today and the plight of our rural people whose tax burdens are getting heavier each year, are coming more and more to their attention.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You've worn out that theme.

February 20, 1958

Mr. Foley: — I believe that in another provincial election, the Government will have a great deal more to answer for than they have had to date. I, for one, will do my very best to see to it, that the weaknesses of this administration are placed before the people in a fair and unbiased manner.

Government Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Foley: — You heard what happened here yesterday in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker. Before the Orders of the Day, I attempted to draw to the attention of the Government the fact that I thought it was an abuse of ministerial powers to advertise a political party in ordinary mail, written by a department in the carrying out of its duties. I did not receive an answer. However, I was told it was government policy to make note of all important events. Well, as far as I am concerned, if the 25th Anniversary of the C.C.F. Party in Canada is a great historical event, we may ask the Government to remember these words spoken by the Premier that this is the policy of the Government, because there are going to be some other historic events within the next two or three years. We in the Liberal Party are hoping very much that one of them will be on the 31st of March.

Premier Douglas: — We'll get a black stamp for that; we'll get a black stamp!

Mr. Foley: — I hope so; I hope you have a large one . . .

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — They'll all be in the morgue!

Mr. Foley: — And I'm going to suggest, also, that another one may come along a couple of years hence.

Premier Douglas: — You can have it sooner.

Mr. Foley: — As for this particular 25th Anniversary, I wonder if they will have anything to celebrate on their 26th or 27th anniversary, and if they will get out another seal.

Mr. McDonald: — It will be an Irish wake!

Mr. Foley: — We have heard Crown Corporations discussed in this province and in this Legislature from a great many different points of view, and, at the best, I think we can say they continue to be a highly controversial matter in this province. It has been proven time and time again, that the monopoly which they enjoy has been the only thing which has made any of them successful. I was rather pleased, the other night, to note that it was a C.C.F.

speaker who brought up the matter of one small portion of our Crown Corporations which was not functioning too well. I refer to one of our local buses.

I know it caught some of us by surprise. I thought it was very broadminded of the other speakers who overlooked it. Nevertheless, I thought it was worthwhile to note that even in the Crown Corporations, we do have some small problems from time to time, and I am pleased to have them brought before the public.

We heard a great deal here, last year, of how the C.C.F. party was going to use its balance of power down east to help the farmers.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — Some balance.

Mr. Foley: — I had hoped that, in this Speech from the Throne, the C.C.F. would use what I might call their 'balance of power' (it is weighted a little on their side) to help the farmer also. However, in spite of all the problems of agriculture today, the Speech from the Throne suggests that we are going to have a Board (I hope it isn't a Planning Board!) to look over farm machinery and pick out the ones which they will recommend to the farmers and the ones which they will not recommend. In all seriousness I believe that this is a worthwhile proposal as far as it goes, because I do believe that there are farm machines on the market today, that are not in the interest of the farmers. On the other hand, I wonder just how much real help, financially, this is going to be to the farmer as opposed to the cost of administering it. I would like to have some information from the Department of Agriculture in the next few days on the cost of administering such a service.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You can vote against it, if you like.

Mr. Foley: — In addition to that, I notice, also, that we are going to extend the community pasture program. I know there have been a lot of politicians put out to pasture in the last few years, and there will likely be a few more. Nevertheless, I want to suggest, in all seriousness, that there must be more that a provincial government can do to help the farmer, today, than is included in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Danielson: — There couldn't be less than nothing!

Mr. Foley: — The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition suggested a crop insurance program. The Premier scoffed at it and said that it is a damning indictment of the federal administration. He went on to say that to start crop insurance in one province, with its limited means, would be to risk bankruptcy. Well, I wonder if the Premier fully understood what is meant by crop insurance.

February 20, 1958

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Do you know what it means?

Mr. Foley: — No, I don't think I fully understand it, Mr. Brown, but I think I understand some of the implications, because I believe this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will the hon. gentleman please refer to other members by constituency rather than by name?

Mr. Foley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — A school teacher should know better, anyway.

Mr. Foley: — Well, if I might refer to the third last paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, I think even the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) will agree that, to lump mining associations, commercial agents and evidence by sound machine in one sentence without one comma, is not such good English either.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, in what other province in Canada would it be more logical to start a crop insurance program than in Saskatchewan? Why should we have to wait until other provinces have done so? There are certain controls which can be exercised to limit expenditures under such a program. I think it is rather a strange admission on the part of the Premier that such a program instigated by a government might bankrupt the country. We could point to a great many other pieces of legislation which, unless certain controls were administered, might bankrupt the country. However, I believe, in the field of agriculture, that this Government has not only been too cautious, but I would like to associate myself with the remark of the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition when he said, "This Government seems to have lost faith in the farmers of Saskatchewan."

I was very interested, when listening to the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen), to hear him comment on grid roads, and it seems to me that, while the aims of the grid road program may be ample, the cost of such a program, as far as the rural municipalities are concerned, in many cases is beyond their financial budgets.

Mr. Kramer: — Whose fault?

Mr. Foley: — It seems to me, too, that there is a tendency on the part of the Government to expect the grid road program and the Municipal Planning Commission to relieve them of many of the burdens of secondary highway construction in this province, which should rightfully be theirs.

The hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) mentioned that municipalities would be required to put up \$24 million, or about 40 per cent, for a period of 12 years, and that in the same period of time the Government would put up \$36 million, or about 60 per cent of the program. This \$24 million to be put up by the rural municipalities, even when it is broken down and when it is equalized according to the assessment and the economic status of the municipality, in many cases is far beyond their means, and many of the rural municipalities who most need the grid road program are the ones who have the greatest difficulty in profiting under this present ratio.

Last year on the 3rd April, I asked for a Return on the matter of electricity and natural gas. I asked this: what was the total number of urban communities in Saskatchewan electrified, and the total amount of money collected by the Power Commission, or the Power Corporation, from 1946 to 1952, and since 1952, I found there were 233 urban communities electrified at a cost of \$174,000 or about \$747 per urban community. That was the cost of electrification between the years 1946 to 1952.

I noticed that, as of December 31, 1952, until December 31, 1957, there were 237 more towns electrified and by now the cost was \$458,794 or about \$1,935 per town, approaching three times as much in the two opposing periods.

It is interesting to note what the cost of rural electrification has been to the farmer in the same period of time, and I want to suggest that the farmer, throughout the electrification program, has borne a great deal more than what rightfully should have been his share of the cost. While we are all pleased to see rural electricity extended (and I am sure all hon. members on both sides of the house will agree that it has been a boon to the farming community), nevertheless the cost has been excessive, and shall I say the scrimping and saving that many of our farmers have had to do in order to put this program in has cost a great deal more in other essential services which they might have enjoyed on the farm, had the policy of this Government been different with respect to rural electrification.

It is interesting to note that the policy of this Government changed considerably in the matter of the installation of natural gas. As of March 31, 1956, the total cost of gas installations, according to Government figures, was \$5,467,000 or \$5 1/2 million. I asked in addition to that, how much was collected from all gas subscribers at that time. The answer was \$266,799 or about one-quarter of a million, or about 20 per cent of the cost of installation, (gas subscribers paid 20 per cent of the cost . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Where does that 20 per cent come from?

February 20, 1958

Mr. Foley: — It's your figures, Mr. Fines.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, would you give it me? Just as a matter of interest I would like to have the information.

Mr. Foley: — I asked the total cost to the Power Corporation of all gas installations made to March 31, 1956, and was told that it was \$5,467,000. Then I asked the total amount collected from all gas subscribers for that same period, which was about \$266,799. Now, from a quick estimate here, Mr. Minister, I calculate that at about 20 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, that's 4 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Something wrong with your arithmetic, Mr. School teacher.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Refer to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Foley: — I guess we'll have to. Nevertheless, the point I want to make is that the cost of gas to the consumer was exceedingly less than the cost of power, both urban and rural; and again I want to suggest that this change in policy was brought about largely because of the efforts of our Liberal opposition in drawing this discrepancy to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan in 1956.

Premier Douglas: — Don't break your arm patting your own back.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — That has been our policy since we started. Do you fellows want to give the gas to a private company? You're opposed to public ownership of gas.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident from the comments from both sides of the House that the present Government is not proud of their record in rural electrification.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — I would like to adjourn the debate.

Premier Douglas: — The farmers are proud of it; that's the important thing.

Mr. Foley: — You'll find out.

Premier Douglas: — Anytime you say.

(Debate adjourned)

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we revert now to the Orders of the Day, and would so move.

RE QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS ON

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker: — If I may, I will proceed to read the notice concerning questions for the consideration of the Assembly. I will begin at the beginning again since I had to break off.

"The right to ask oral questions on Orders of the Day is conceded. Oral questions have been accepted practice in the British House of Commons for many years, and, more recently, a similar practice has been adopted by the House of Commons at Ottawa. Anyone who reads Hansard must have seen how easily the practice may get out of hand, to the disruption of public business, unless the rules governing it are rigorously adhered to and enforced. It is particularly desirable, in view of our radio commitments, that the rules relating to the asking of oral questions on the Orders of the Day be meticulously observed. Therefore, in order that hon. members may know what criteria of admissibility will inform my decisions. I propose to set forth the fundamental rules which apply, based on my reading of the authorities, Beauséjour and May, and of the comments of Speakers Beaudoin and Michener which have appeared from time to time in the Ottawa Hansard.

"Questions not on the Order Paper, which are of an urgent character and relate to matters of public importance or to the arrangement of business are permissible, provided the Speaker has been informed in advance of the question being asked, where possible, and notice given to the Minister concerned. These private notices are given out of courtesy, and to guard against that element of 'surprise' which might well lead to the disruption of the business of the House.

"Questions to Ministers should relate to public affairs with which they are officially concerned, to proceedings pending in the House, or to matters of administration for which they

are responsible. Within these limits an explanation can be sought regarding the intentions of the Government, but not an expression of opinion upon matters of policy. The purpose of a question is to obtain information or press for action, and should not be in effect a short speech, or limited to giving information, or framed so as to suggest its own answer, or convey a particular point of view. Questions oral or written must not contain arguments or epithets, or be controversial in their nature, and the rules relating to questions under notice, as set forth in Beauchesne's 3rd Edition, page 119, citation 295, apply with equal force to oral questions asked on Orders of the Day."

I would think perhaps anything that has happened in the House to this point would be covered by the reference, "Questions not on the Order Paper, which are of an urgent character, and relate to matters of public importance or to the arrangement of business are permissible, providing the Speaker has been informed in advance of the question being asked, where possible, and notice given to the Minister concerned. These private notices are given out of courtesy and to guard against that element of surprise
...

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Speaker, might I ask why notice should be given to yourself?

Mr. Speaker: — You are asking me why a thing is actually in the rules, which is not very easy for me to answer. I suppose there might be the possibility that too many questions might be proposed for a single sitting, and result in the obstruction of business on the Order Paper.

Mr. McDonald: — I think it is only the desire of the Opposition to have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of asking questions, for instance along the line that I asked today. Some announcement has been made either by some member of the Government here, or by the Government in Ottawa that not only we, but probably the general public, would like immediate clarification on, and I think that the rules, as outlined by the Speaker, would cover the situation, at least as far as I can see it at the moment.

Premier Douglas: — I don't think there are any rules actually requiring notice be given to the Speaker or to the Minister of whom a question is going to be asked. I remember that in Ottawa it is usually customary to send the Minister a copy, and send

a copy to the Speaker, not so much because you wanted to, but because if you didn't, the Minister usually says, "I'll look into the matter and answer tomorrow", so it was better to send it ahead of time if you wanted an answer.

In this House we haven't usually followed the custom of giving notice. Because this is a smaller House there might not be such a volume of questions, but I think in the main we won't have much of a problem about it unless somebody starts asking a question of the Minister to explain the Einstein theory on relativity, or the place of Christian ethics in an economic society.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — You referred to giving notice to the Speaker. Do you say that the notice, in the House of Commons, has been given to the Speaker before the question was asked, and also to the Minister before the question was asked? I happened to sit in the House down there for a little while, and questions were asked from all over the House and directed to Ministers. Am I to understand that the members have given notice of these questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — It is a matter of courtesy, and to avoid, or guard against, that element of surprise which might well be an obstruction to the business of the House.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It's just like counting to three first before you say it!

NOTION RE EDUCATION

Moved by Mr. Cameron, seconded by Mr. Foley:

"That, recognizing the growing financial crisis in Education facing local school officials and municipal bodies, this Assembly requests the Provincial Government to consider the advisability of the immediate establishment of a Foundation Program for Education in Saskatchewan."

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this motion, I think we all agree that the problem of education today is foremost in the minds of all Canadians. Certainly I think it is time that we paused to give serious thought as to how the educational institutions can best train our youth to meet the challenge that we face in this complex age. I think, to meet this change, our aim and objectives in

February 20, 1958

education will, of necessity, have to be re-defined. We must come to realize that the world situation today has created new responsibility for education, for the whole educational system. Headlines in every newspaper today draw our attention to the crisis facing education. We can but look at Canada. We think of the fact that one third of the population of Canada is under 13 years of age, and two thirds of our pupils entering Grade VII drop out of school before completing secondary school. One half of Canada's youth between the ages of 15 and 19 years are not attending a school of any kind. Only seven children in every 100 enter university, and only about five per cent, or rather five in every 100, graduate from university. Seven per cent of our students go through university compared to about 20 per cent in the United States. It is estimated the number is some 30 per cent in Russia.

It becomes clear, then, that the curricula must be revised; the relationship between high school and university, perhaps, must be re-adjusted, and an assessment made of the corrective steps that must be taken.

I think there is a second phase to this crisis of education, in which we must like wise alter our thinking, and that is in the matter of financing our schools. Take a look at the financial position of our schools today across Canada, and I think you will find, when we assess that and look at the position of Saskatchewan, that it is running just about the same. It is estimated that in Canada, in the next 20 years, school enrolment will increase three times; 40,000 new classrooms will be needed. At the present time we are some 9,000 short of qualified teachers to staff our classrooms.

Conditions here are very similar to the national picture. If we look at the financial cost in Saskatchewan, the total annual cost of education is \$50 million, and only approximately \$17 million of this comes from the Provincial Government. If we look since 1953, enrolment in our classrooms has increased 11 per cent, but the costs have increased 50 per cent. In 1955, the cost of operating the classrooms alone in Saskatchewan approximated some \$29 million. It is estimated (I think it was the Trustees' Association which made this study, and I don't think they are far wrong) that, in 1960, the cost of operating our schools will reach \$34 million. The cost per student is averaging today about a \$270.

If we look at the financial picture in the reports which are tabled in the Legislature, we find school taxes are soaring each year. Ratepayers are being asked to raise an additional \$1 1/2 million each year over what they raised the year before, and that will continue on each year. Coupled with that are the mounting arrears of taxes all over the province, and they are rising at an alarming rate. School tax arrears in 1955 in Saskatchewan stood at some \$10 million,

and I am sure the position has not improved since then. They are probably a great deal higher than that today.

It is estimated — and I think the Provincial Treasurer (if I am correct in this) is the author of the statement that in the next five years, we will require an expenditure of \$50 million just to build schools in Saskatchewan. These are staggering sums. These are the costs which our local governments today are faced with.

It must be evident to every fair-minded person that education in this province is facing a financial crisis, and I don't think we should hide our head and duck the issue. It is here. Every fact and statistic point to it. I think it is time we began to assess the situation to see what remedial measures we can take.

The Premier, from press announcements which I have read, has stated that the Government has increased the school grant until it has reached, I think he said a proportion of 32, 33 or 34 per cent of the cost. The Government is moving towards the end, over a period of years of contributing, approximately 50 per cent of the cost of education. I can remember a couple or three years back advocating at that time that we should immediately raise the province's contribution to 50 per cent in order to check this trend, and in order to check the mill rates from constantly rising each year, and in order to give the ratepayers an opportunity to catch up with some of the arrears in taxes. I am of the opinion, today, that 50 per cent is not sufficient to meet this crisis in education. I think it falls short of the sums that will be required when we look at the cost of education projected a few years into the future. I think such assistance, while a few years ago it may have looked generous, today is woefully inadequate, and I think we must realize today, more so than at any time before, that education is a social responsibility.

Local districts are no longer educating boys and girls to take their place in the local community. Today, local districts are shouldering the cost of educating these youngsters to take their part in fields far removed from activities of the local community. These students are lost to the local area. They are making no contribution in the local field. They enter the fields of science, industry, commerce, trade and government. Their contribution thus is a national contribution. Therefore, we believe that the principle of federal aid for education is a sound one, and it is sound for the very reason that I have just mentioned. I think we can take courage from this, that the Federal authorities are coming very close to that point of view, and I hope that, before too long, that principle will be recognized across Canada.

We must keep in mind, however, that education primarily

is a provincial responsibility. We have a just claim, I think, on the resources of the Federal Government to help carry the burdens of education, but I don't think we would want the Federal Government to take over the responsibility of education in Canada. I don't believe that anyone has advocated that. I do not believe we would get to first base if we did. So, since we have established the principle of federal aid for education, we acknowledge the principle that the Federal Government should come to the assistance of the provinces by contributing towards the cost of education in each province; but we still must stand by the principle that education is a provincial responsibility. It is just as much a social means of education in the province as in the Dominion.

I, for one, do not advocate that the province take over full responsibility for education any more than we advocate that the Federal Government should do so. I believe that the local government body must continue to be partners with the province. They must carry some share of the financial responsibility of education in the province, but it is only reasonable to assume, I think, that their share should bear some relationship to their ability to pay.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — If you look at the contribution today made by local government and that made by the province, we will find that the local authorities are asked to carry approximately 70 per cent of the burden of education, and the Provincial Government approximately 30 per cent; in that ratio. When you look at it in that way, realizing the field of education today, I think perhaps the relationship should almost be in the reverse, because when we compare the tax revenues of the province and the tax bases above, compared to that of the municipalities, I think we are entirely wrong to attempt to justify that they should bear 70 per cent of the cost and the province should bear only 30 per cent.

I think we have reached the point in Saskatchewan today, where we must consider establishing a fair relationship between the local government bodies and the province as to assuming the cost of education. I think we have reached the point for several reasons. We are getting an increased share under the Dominion-Provincial agreement. If the National Health Plan comes through (and we have every reason to believe it will), that in itself will probably release some \$10 million or \$11 million for other services in the province. With the increased revenue today from development of our resources, oil and gas royalties and industries and so forth, coming in ever-increasing amounts into the treasury, I think it is time we gave some thought to apportioning a greater amount of this revenue into the hands of the local government bodies to carry this burden. I think a fair share of these additional earnings, and this revenue shared by the

provincial and the federal governments, should be passed on to the municipalities, and I think the fairest way of doing that is to establish a Foundation Program for education for which one essential we have is an equalized assessment throughout the province. I think we have arrived at that stage where we have a fairly equalized assessment throughout the province. Then we have the larger school units established, which would aid materially in the operation of a Foundation Program. So I think we have the two basic essentials already here.

I think this changing school situation calls for a complete revision of the grant structure that we have in the province. Some local participation in financing of schools, of course, is essential. I want to emphasize again that the major share of the cost should be born by the Province, because education is a social responsibility. I think it is generally recognized that a satisfactory program of education demands a sound plan for financing the schools, and educational services have to do with various factors other than the classroom. The capital cost of schools, the cost of construction of the classrooms that are needed, the instruction in the classroom, the teachers, the maintenance of the schools after they have been constructed, and even today the transportation of pupils within the larger unit — those four are important factors in the financing of any school program. We need finance to provide each and every one of those, and when this survey is made of the cost of education in Saskatchewan, then it can be based with some relationship, perhaps, to the teacher employed, and in principle the Foundation Program, I think, is simple. It is simple in its operation, and I think it is a means by which we can get a fair relationship between the cost we expect the local governments to assume, and the responsibility of the Province.

A survey is made of all the costs to determine the cost of the Foundation Program in relation to the curriculum. I think it is an excellent time now, because I was pleased to see that the curriculum would be up for revision. We tie in the Foundation Program with the cost of construction of classrooms, the maintenance of such, salaries of teachers, transportation of pupils and all incidental costs necessary to carry out the level of education set out by the curriculum.

As I said, it would be simple to establish and from there on we would have a uniform tax rate for the whole province — one tax rate for all of Saskatchewan. We could vary it and have one tax rate for the rural and one tax rate for the urban — they don't need to be the same. But then we would arrive at a tax rate which we would think is fair and equitable, in order to have the local government bodies assume their fair share of the cost and no more.

February 20, 1958

In areas where the uniform tax rate would approximate the cost of the carrying out of the Foundation Program, that particular area would receive very little, if any, assistance from the Government, and in the lower assessed area, operating at the same mill rate, where the amount falls short of carrying out the financial commitment of a Foundation Program, the Provincial Government would put in the difference.

Thus, I think we would have a better equal opportunity for the boys and girls in the classrooms. We talk about equal opportunities today, but when we think of some larger school units spending \$84 per student and some spending \$229 per pupil, I cannot see how we can classify that as equal opportunity. I think the Foundation Program would set up the base of equal opportunity. With a uniform mill rate and all the factors that go into the running and operation of the classroom assessed, the local government paying its fair share, and the Province taking care of the balance, we would then be assuming our responsibility for education in the sense that it is a social responsibility.

We have sources of taxation which would ask all people of the province to contribute the major portion towards educating these boys and girls to take their place in both provincial and national endeavours.

I think there is room for adjustment, and room for consideration as to the construction of building to be worked out. Some places have it, I understand, that if the construction in a particular unit, in order to accommodate the students at that time, would require an expenditure of money less than the amount received if they should levy a three-mill rate the Government would pay 50 per cent of the cost. If the cost exceeds the amount of money received from the three-mill rate, the Government would pick up 75 per cent of the cost.

I am not suggesting that as a firm arrangement, but I am showing that the Foundation Program has sufficient range and flexibility to it that a system should be able to be worked out that would place the major burden of education in Saskatchewan, where I think it rightly belongs, on the financial resources of the Province itself. But I do think, again, that a fair relationship between the local authorities and the Province has to be maintained.

Under the Foundation Program too, if there is a particular area or larger unit that wants to give extra-curricular activity or activities, or educational standards above those set out in the Foundation Program, they are at liberty to do so, by assessing themselves an additional mill rate over and above the uniform mill rate set across the province. So, not only have we local participation, we retain the local interest in the school, and we give them

a new incentive by putting on a fair basis of sharing the costs between the local government bodies and the Provincial Government itself.

I understand that other members are going to fill in some of the details of the Foundation Program as we see it, and for that reason I am confining my remarks to outlining the principle of it, the need of it, and the fact that the time is ripe to put it into operation.

I will leave with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, and move the motion as it appears on the Order Paper.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down — I did not want to interrupt him during the very able presentation he was making, but he used a figure that I wondered if I had caught it correctly. I understood him to say that it was estimated by the Trustees' Association that, by 1960, the total expenditures on education were (I thought he said) \$34 million. Surely that must be wrong. It's more than that now.

Mr. Cameron: — I think if I had that correctly, that is the cost of maintenance, not the total cost of education. The cost of conducting the classrooms, etc. I have it here: operating the classrooms alone is estimated to be \$34 million.

Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn):

"That Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Co-operative Guarantee Act — be now read the second time."

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor amendment. At the present time the Government, under The Co-operative Guarantee Act, may make guarantees not exceeding in the aggregate \$1 million to the Co-operative Trust Company. At the present moment, though, on any one project, the guarantee is limited to 50 per cent. We find that, in some cases, and only in exceptional cases, the Co-operative Trust Company has asked us to exceed this. Under the Act we cannot do so, and what we are suggesting is that the 50 per

February 20, 1958

cent figure remain in, but that, by order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, it may be possible to exceed the 50 per cent where there is some good reason for so doing.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Do you propose to take the authority to advance up to 80 per cent on a project of Co-operatives? What kind of project would that be? 80 per cent seems like an excessive percentage.

Premier Douglas: — Only by Order-in-Council would it be possible to exceed the 50 per cent. The Co-operative Trust Company, as hon. members know, is dealing mainly with mortgages and with farm loans and things of that nature. Sometimes there are cases where we feel the excess of 50 per cent is justified and we feel that we should have the power under this Act to deal with exceptional cases.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker. I am concerned with the safety of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I would like to point out that this should be dealt with in Committee.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, this makes it possible to exceed 50 per cent. There should be a limit to it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, these Bills were only tabled this morning and it has been physically impossible to read them. Now, it might not be necessary for me or any of the hon. members on this side to speak on second reading on any of these bills. At the same time we are certainly in no position at this point to say whether we are prepared to vote in favour on second reading. We have only had the Bill here since this morning, and, as I say, it has been physically impossible — I feel I am in the position, and so no doubt do other hon. members on both sides of the House, that we have to ask for an adjournment, or at least ask to adjourn the debate on the Bill on second reading in order to give us an opportunity to study the Bill.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, all the Bills were distributed on the day on which they were given first reading, but the hon. members may take all the time they wish. They were distributed last Tuesday.

Mrs. Batten: — They certainly were not.

Premier Douglas: — The Clerk so informs me that the printed copies were distributed when the Bills were given first

reading. I believe that was yesterday morning. If the members feel they want more time, we can leave these second readings until later on. We have no desire to hurry things through, but it means there will be no value in sitting tonight. It is entirely up to the House.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Bills were on our desks yesterday morning, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That's right.

Mr. McDonald: — But it was yesterday afternoon by the time most of the members found the Bill on their desk. As you know, last night we attended a banquet for the University students; we were in Committee this morning, and in the Legislature this afternoon, and it gives very little time for anyone to study them.

Premier Douglas: — And the nominating convention, last night!

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, and the nominating convention, last night. It was a great success. But I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that we would all benefit by having a little more time to go through this legislation before we give second reading to it.

Premier Douglas: — At the moment we are discussing whether or not we ought to adjourn the debate on this altogether. If the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) wants to adjourn the debate, I see no objection to doing so. If we are going to adjourn each of these Bills, then of course, I think we might just as well adjourn the House and not try to sit tonight. We are trying to accommodate the members, as we thought they were anxious to get to work; but we have no desire to ram legislation through.

Mrs. Batten: — I suggest this is a very important part of our work, and we should certainly get down to work and go through these Bills, but I do feel I will have to ask to adjourn the debate on second reading, and I feel I will do so on every Bill that is brought up today for second reading.

Mr. Speaker: — Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the practice of the House provides for 48 hours between first and second readings. It is assumed that most members can look at those Bills in that 48-hour period. Nobody is trying to rush. We are simply abiding by the practice of the House. There is no reason why we cannot slacken down the pace so as to keep pace with the rate at which the members can absorb the information in the Bill.

February 20, 1958

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification on the remarks of the Premier. He just said we should have 48-hours notice. Well, admitted, we have had 48 hours as far as notice on the Order Paper is concerned, but we have not had the Bill in our possession that length of time.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The Rules require only 24 hours between first and second readings.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact the Bills were distributed that afternoon. Had the House not adjourned so quickly, the Clerk tells me everyone would have had the Bill on his or her desk. Anyone who was out that afternoon and who happened to have come back in, could have picked it up.

Mr. McDonald: — But the door was locked.

Premier Douglas: — It could have been opened for you.

Mr. Speaker: — Has the hon. member for Humboldt leave to adjourn the debate?

(Debate adjourned)

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if it is still the intention of adjourning, there is very little value in proceeding with the other Bills, and I would, therefore, move that the House do now adjourn.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.