

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 21, 1958

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

CORRECTION OF PRESS REPORT

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw your attention to a report in the 'Leader-Post' of my speech in the Assembly, yesterday afternoon. First of all, I would like to recommend to the press that they get acquainted with the names of the members of this Assembly, because they did not even get the names correctly. Secondly, some of the statements contained in their report are incorrect. I said that on the road from Lac la Ronge to Uranium City the estimated cost would be \$25 million. The report contained in the press stated that the road from Buffalo Narrows would cost approximately \$25 million.

Another correction I would like to make is that they refer to the people I was referring to along this proposed route as Indians. I did not mention the word Indians in my speech until I spoke on the vote proposed to the Indians by this Government in the Speech from the Throne.

Therefore, I would like to have those corrections made.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-In-Reply

The House resumed from Thursday, February 20, 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. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, in continuing my Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I note the fact that the Trans-Canada Microwave System was completed in 1957 making modern telephone and television communication facilities available to many Saskatchewan residents. In light

February 21, 1958

of this I would be remiss in my duties, I think as a northern member, if I did not call the attention of the Government to the fact that many of our residents in the northern part of the province still have no telephone communication service at all.

In the Turtleford constituency, as of January 31 1956, there were only 453 circuit miles of rural telephone lines and only 323 rural telephones. I approached the Government, last year, on behalf of the farmers in the Glaslyn-Fairholme area, for an estimate of the cost of establishing a rural telephone circuit. The proposed circuit, covering some 30 miles in length and including 26 rural phones, would have cost about \$17,000, or about \$650 per subscriber, according to an estimate made by the Department of Telephones. Now, Mr. Speaker, this amount was completely beyond the reach of many of the farmers in that area, and as a result no further action was taken. I would urge the Government to come to the aid of the rural people of Saskatchewan who have not as yet received rural telephone service. It seems to me that with the policy of this Government in regard to gas and in regard to urban electricity, surely something can be done to assist in this urgent matter.

Reviewing just a little of what I said yesterday, concerning this matter of rural electrification, urban electrification and gas, I would like to review for just a moment Government policy in this connection. In urban electrification, between the years 1946 and 1952, some 233 urban centres were electrified at an average cost per community of about \$747, or about 2.14 per cent of the actual cost to the Corporation. That percentage rose between the years 1952 and 1956 to about 44 per cent of the cost of installation paid by the urban communities, the remainder being paid by the Power Corporation. Until March 31, 1956, the total cost to the Power Corporation of all gas installations was in the neighbourhood of \$5 1/2 million, and, in the same period of time the total amount collected by gas subscribers was about \$266,790. In other words, the subscribers to the gas operated under the auspices of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation paid 4.88 per cent of the cost of installation, the Power Corporation paid the other 95 per cent.

Now what is the story, Mr. Speaker, when we review the policy of the Power Corporation with regard to rural electrification? A Return dated March 5, 1957, sent to the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) gave this information:

"The total cost of rural electrification to the Power Corporation until March 31, 1956, \$40,100,000. The total cost to the farmers in this period — \$20,769,888."

In other words, 51.7 per cent of the cost of rural electrification during this period was borne by the farmers of Saskatchewan, as opposed to around four to five per cent of the cost of power or gas to urban subscribers.

I want to suggest that the farmer has been severely penalized by the power policies and gas policies of this Government; and it is yet another instance where the farmer has been denied his fair and just share of the provincial income. And so I say, in this matter of rural telephones, surely some Government assistance by the Department of Telephones, can be given directly to the rural people of this province to assist in this matter of improving communications in the northern areas of our province.

I note that the Speech from the Throne contains some mention of an accelerated program to attract more tourists to our province and that facilities and accommodations within provincial parks will be expanded and improved. This is welcomed by all of us, I am sure. The tourist trade, especially in the northern part of our province is becoming increasingly important not only from a recreational point of view, but from an economic point of view. I am pleased to see that, each year, our tourist trade is expanding; and I want to urge this Government to give every assistance, and every consideration they can, to improving tourist facilities in northern Saskatchewan, and in particular, to the Lakeside resorts of Loon, Turtle and Chitek lakes, and to resorts at Meota and. Cochin Beach.

I was happy to attend a recent conference of Boards of Trade in northwestern Saskatchewan and to note that a large area of the northwestern part of the province was agreed on the establishment of a wilderness park, occupying some 605 square miles in the Water Hen Lake area. This park would be bounded on the north by the Air Weapons Range, on the west by the Saskatchewan-Alberta boundary, on the south by the chain of lakes and rivers forming the Water Hen River proper, and on the east by the Beaver River. It is a beautiful area of untamed wilderness, clear lakes and excellent game and fishing resources; and it is my hope that this area will soon be officially established as the next provincial park in the province of Saskatchewan.

There are some other important projects in northwestern Saskatchewan for which I would urge your support. The Meadow Lake, Glaslyn and North Battleford Boards of Trade have been very active in the promotion of an all-weather road from Buffalo Narrows to Lake Athabaska. It offers easy access to a great field of northern exploration and development. The trail has already been blazed by enterprising businessmen. It is estimated that the road may be built for as little as five or six thousand dollars per mile,

February 21, 1958

whereas other routes may cost from ten to twenty thousand dollars per mile. We have, of course, the great mineral resources of the area and multiple tourist attractions.

I would also like to press for continued highway development in northwestern Saskatchewan. There is urgent need for another Trans-Canada highway to the northern part of our province, and it is my hope that the Department of Highways will give this route every consideration. No. 4 Highway north of North Battleford — the main artery north to Meadow Lake, from there to Green Lake and into that vast northern territory, has been oil-surfaced as far as the community of Cochin. I would urge the Minister that consideration be given to further extending the oil surfacing next year to Glaslyn, with eventual completion of the road through to Meadow Lake.

I would urge that No. 24 Highway from Leoville south to Spiritwood should be extended south through Hafford to link up with No. 5 Highway at Borden, to give the people in that area reasonable access to the city of Saskatoon; and that No. 55 Highway west from Frenchman Butte be built to the meridian and south to Lloydminster. I want to draw the attention of the Minister, again, to the fact that between North Battleford and the Alberta boundary, a distance of some 110 or 112 miles, we have about seven ferries and no bridges, and while I realize that other bridges are receiving priority, I would like to urge that future consideration be given to a bridge across the north Saskatchewan river at some point between these two spots — between North Battleford and Lloydminster — to serve this area north of the river which has no all-weather access across. As you know, for several months of the year, the river crossings are difficult and dangerous.

I note also in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, reference to the fact that the high school curriculum will be revised in the near future. To those of us engaged in the business of education, to those thousands of high school students throughout the province, I am sure that this will be welcome news indeed, because conditions are changing the demands being made upon our graduate students, changing conceptions concerning the role of the high school in today's society, all must have a bearing on what we teach. However, as curricula change, other changes occur as well, and one of those changes, of course, which we have heard something of from time to time, are the changes in the text books which go with the curriculum. I believe that some tangible form of government assistance should be made available to our high school students throughout the province who are at present faced with a bill of anything from \$40 to \$70 for high school texts alone. I realize, of course, that considerable amounts are being expended for free text books in public schools. Nevertheless, this problem of changing text books is becoming a very difficult one for the rural people in Saskatchewan.

The other day, some question was raised in the Throne Speech debate regarding the status of teachers' salaries in 1944; so much so that the Premier (I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment) had this to say: "In education what a legacy your Liberal government left — dilapidated buildings, thousands of dollars in teachers' unpaid bills from the 'thirties." Mr. Speaker, in the same breath he accused the hon. Leader of the Opposition of many misstatements. I want to present just a few facts on this matter of teachers' arrears in 1944, then I ask you to judge who is guilty of misstatements.

In 1937-38, special legislation was passed by your Liberal government providing for advances to school districts for the payment of arrears in teachers' salaries; and in the years between 1937 and 1944, some \$731,000 was voted by your Liberal provincial government to take care of this urgent matter. Of that amount, over \$600,000 was actually paid out in arrears of teachers' salaries in this province. In fact, by 1944, the vote on the estimates for teachers' arrears was down to \$3,000. Why? Not because your provincial Liberal government was reluctant to pay arrears of teachers' salaries, Mr. Speaker; but because no longer could any notes be located to pay. Requests to the Boards and to the teachers had failed to uncover any further notes that could be paid under this legislation.

Then what happened when the present Government took office? In spite of the fact that no notes were available, for some unknown reason they voted, in 1945-46, for the arrears of teachers' salaries, \$50,000. Why? I have yet not found any necessity for the largeness of that vote. The following year, 1946-47, the vote was down to \$5,000. In 1947-48 it was down to \$1,000; and in 1948-49 it was \$500. In other words, this present Government, between the years 1945 and 1949, voted some \$56,500 for teachers' arrears, and they paid out, in that same length of time, a little over \$6,000, or about 11 per cent of the note. In the same period under Liberal administration, they voted \$731,000 and paid out \$600,000 or 32 per cent of the vote. Who was the most interested in education during those relative periods of time?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Whose problem was it? Who created the problem?

Mrs. Batten: — The taxpayers.

Mr. Foley: — The Premier accused the Leader of the Opposition of misstatements. He said the Liberals left thousands of dollars in unpaid bills from the 'thirties.

Mr. McDonald: — Six thousand dollars!

February 21, 1958

Mr. Foley: — And I want to say that, of the \$8,000, some time during 1945 yet outstanding, this is what the Journals have to say, dated December 31, 1945, appearing in the Journals of March 18, 1946: "Of the \$8,592.58, unable to locate information from teachers or districts, \$1,338; unable to locate teacher, \$1,591; promised by school district to pay arrears, \$3,279; cases where the Department is still corresponding regarding payment, \$2,260; amount of arrears in doubt, \$122.45."

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this is ample evidence of the sincerity and the efficiency of Liberal administration in the realm of education before this present Government took office.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — That's a fine statement for a teacher!

Mr. McDonald: — Sure it is.

Mr. Foley: — Thank you very much, Mr. Willis.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): — You weren't teaching in the 'thirties.

Mr. Foley: — Speaking of 'fine statements' by teachers reminds me of something. I have a circular here, Mr. Speaker, produced for the Department of Mineral Resources by the Department of Travel and Information. I don't think teachers were connected with this one, because this is what it says:

"Yep, it's that doggone mineral tax. Some of them mineral tax arrears go all the way back for 13 years. It sure ain't no way to run a business, either yours or the Government's."

It is just a little circular sent out by the Department of Mineral Resources to remind the farmers of their three per cent mineral tax arrears which go back for 13 years.

I might even say a little more on this matter — the hon. member urged me to draw it to his attention. The farmer is given three months to pay all or part of the arrears; those who fail to make a reasonable payment in 90 days will receive a final notice; those who receive the final notice will be granted six more months to pay their mineral tax arrears, but \$6 will be added to those arrears. It sure ain't no way to run a business!

Mr. Cameron: — Socialists!

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I have one more comment regarding a matter of pressing urgency in one portion of my constituency. For several years now, the Community of Frenchman's Butte in the western

portion of this area has been attempting to secure a historic cairn to commemorate the 1885 Rebellion. Now, since Mr. Herbert left the services of this Government, it is my understanding that no successor has been appointed to take his place as Director of Historic Sites, and I would urge that, in the near future, the Government give consideration to appointing someone to take over the work of that department so that this matter of historic sites in the province can be proceeded with.

In the few short moments left at my disposal, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one more thing. Agriculture is the most important single enterprise or occupation in this province, and as I said yesterday, it seems to me that a great deal more could have been done by this Government since they took office, and a great deal more could have appeared in this Speech from the Throne than the extension of community pastures and the establishment of a machinery-testing program. It seems to me that farm credit is an important matter which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) drew to the Government's attention, last Tuesday.

There is crop insurance, the matter of storage, and a great many other things that could have been done in the field of agriculture. I have already pointed out that the Power Corporation could have done a great deal more for the farmer than has been done, when urban power and gas installations were made at about five per cent of the cost to the subscriber, while the farmers were, on the average, asked to pay over 50 per cent of the cost of rural power installation; and, I understand, in some cases the percentage went much higher. I notice that the cost of gas in this province is excessive; that for 30,000 cubic units in Edmonton it costs \$9.15; in Calgary, \$9.78; and in Regina, \$19.26.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — How about Winnipeg?

Mr. Foley: — The average yearly cost to the householder in these three cities is \$68 per year in year in Edmonton; \$74 in Calgary; \$145 per year in Regina.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — What about Winnipeg, where the Liberals are?

Mr. Foley: — Our Leader (Mr. McDonald) on Tuesday last, moved an amendment to the Throne Address in which, for many reasons, I heartily concur: "That, in the opinion of this Assembly, Your Honour's advisors have failed to implement a comprehensive agricultural program for Saskatchewan, or an aggressive plan of Industrial Development which would provide full employment."

I will vote against the motion, Mr. Speaker, but I take great pleasure in supporting the amendment.

February 21, 1958

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I first want to congratulate the leader of our Official Opposition for the very sincere and very capable manner in which he pointed up the very serious plight facing the people of this province, after 14 years of a Socialist regime, fourteen years during which the individual freedoms are becoming more restricted every day . . .

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — . . . fourteen years in which access to courts is being denied in favour of government boards; fourteen years in which some of the greatest economic bungling in the history of this province has taken place under a Socialist regime . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Who wrote this for you, Mac?

Mr. McFarlane: — . . . fourteen years in which the farmers of this province have been discriminated against until now this Government's only apparent solution is to enlarge community pastures, and turn them out to fend for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are being again asked to endorse a program of Socialism for another year. This Speech from the Throne has been aptly referred to by the Leader of the Opposition as a 'skeleton'. As far as agriculture is concerned, it is a corpse in neon lights. It died in infancy and is wrapped in a shroud of glaring propaganda.

This Government is setting up a new pattern in regard to agriculture in this province. During the last nine years the budget expenditure from revenue account on agriculture has steadily declined. In 1949-50, it was 4.8 per cent; in 1950-51, down to 4.7; 1951-52 down to 4.5; 1952-53 down to 4.1; 1953-54 down to 4; 1954-55, 4.3. Somehow you got up three points there.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — That was election year, wasn't it?

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes, that could have been around election year. In 1955-56, it was down to 3.6 per cent; 1956-57, 3.5; 1957-58, 3.5. The last two years we have only had 3.5 per cent of the provincial revenue budget earmarked for agriculture; the largest and most important industry in this province now and in the future.

When we examine the Speech from the Throne, we find four long pages but we only find 3.5 (the same as your budgets) lines devoted to agriculture, and that is the new pattern of agriculture in this province — a 3.5 per cent government; in other words, 3.5 lines out of four long pages — an elephant dragging in a mouse.

What do they list? What is the cure for the agricultural situation in this province at the present time? All it states is extension of the community pasture program, and that legislation will be introduced to introduce a farm implement act and a Board to supervise the testing of farm machinery. So I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Is this going to help the farmer pay his taxes? Is this going to make young farmers today stay on the land? Is this going to preserve the family farm in this province? Will this put cash in the hands of the small business man in our local towns and villages in this province? Will this help the rural municipalities carry out their programs to build grid roads? Will this put buying power into the hands of the people in this province to alleviate unemployment? No, Mr. Speaker. It is just further evidence of the apparent disregard of this Government for the agricultural economy of this province, which always has been and always will be, our main industry.

This Government has no program for agriculture. Where is the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) when the Speech from the Throne is being drafted? Where is the Minister of Agriculture when farm organizations submit their briefs on the agricultural situation, year after year? Where is the Minister of Agriculture when the budgetary expenditures are being set up by this Government? It would appear that when the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) calls in all the various departments to slice up the financial pie, agriculture is left to the last, and he simply sits in Cabinet and says "Toby or not to be. That is the question."

The Minister of Agriculture in this House has sat on his haunches for 14 years hollering at a Liberal government at Ottawa, or a Conservative government at Ottawa, to do something while he neglected the agricultural economy of this province. He has had no time to prepare an aggressive and practical program for the people of this province. It is little wonder, then, that the Speech from the Throne, as far as agriculture is concerned, has been shot at and missed.

The Premier ignores the plight of the small farmers and businessmen in this province entirely. That is to be expected. The Premier is a good entertainer. He is one of the best after-dinner speakers in this province; but the Premier is not a business man. He is forever telling what should be done, but when his Government should be taking the initiative and setting an example, he backs away. He is the man who stated that the leader of the Opposition made more misstatements of fact per minute than he had ever listened to. He was going to contradict the figures, and he was going to give the facts. Well, we all know how he dealt with the agricultural program we presented. He put on his usual theatrical performance — and that was it. When it came to contradicting the facts in population, what did he say? He said

February 21, 1958

that in the years 1936 to 1946 the population had dropped from 931,000 to 833,000.

This is the Premier's favourite period for figures in population, and it was quite interesting to watch him while he was making these statements and to see the Provincial Treasurer sitting beside him. While the Premier was giving these figures, the Provincial Treasurer was waving his hands, but the damage had been done by that time. And why was the Provincial Treasurer quite concerned? Because he knows that these figures were taken in war years. In 1938, the year before the war, the population was 914,000. In 1946, the year after the war, it was the same as in 1945, namely, 833,000, indicating a drop in that period of 81,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, in that period 79,222 persons from Saskatchewan enlisted in the armed services.

Mr. Cameron: — That's where your population went.

Mr. McFarlane: — What I am very proud to announce at this time is that, in this province, 41.5 per cent of the male population between the ages of 18 and 45 years enlisted in the services of their country. When you subtract the 79,222 persons, who joined the services, from the 81,000 drop, you have a figure of 1,778 persons in that length of time.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. My hon. friend, I am sure, does not want to mislead the House. All persons who were in the services were included still in the population; that information is secured from their families. My hon. friend will also remember that I quoted 1945, and a good number of those were already back; but men in the services were included in the census population.

Mr. McFarlane: — I have the figures here from the Wartime Information Board, and, as I pointed out, the drop in that time was 1,778 persons, or less than the figure of 2,000 people who left this province under your C.C.F. Government for the last year.

Let us look at some of the other statements made by the Premier of this province. At the Industrial Development Conference held in this city in November, 1956, when he was trying to woo industries back after he and his Government had successfully chased them away for the 10 previous years, he had this to say:

"In our province we are producing more food per acre and we are farming more acreage than we did 10 years ago, and yet we are doing it with less people

working on the land. That means, of necessity, a declining agricultural population, not only at the present time but for several years ahead."

He goes on to say:

"Now that is something not to be deplored. If we require less people on the land to produce the same food, or even more food, it simply means that we have those people available to apply their labour and ingenuity for other industries."

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what other industries is he going to send these people to?

Mrs. Batten: — The pulp mill.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McFarlane: — In fact, when we get the information and the Returns, we find out there were 67 less people employed in manufacturing last year in this province than there were before the C.C.F. Government came to power in Saskatchewan.

During the same period, as you know, we had a survey made in 1953, and it was found that, during that time, 40 per cent of the persons engaged in agriculture in this province had left Saskatchewan altogether, and I ask you if those agricultural and economic conditions tend to keep people in the province.

The Premier is labouring hard to leave the impression that we had a great industrial boom in this province. He is trying to gloss over the fact that we have had 10 years of industrial stagnation caused by the very actions and avowed doctrines of his political philosophy, and that of his planners and supporters.

Then, as you will remember, yesterday and the day before there was a little incident which took place in this House. It was drawn to the attention of the Government by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) that the C.C.F. were publicizing the 25 years of the formation of their party by putting stickers on the back of the mails. So we thought we would go back and see what they were celebrating, and what was their doctrine 25 years ago. So I happened to get this booklet, which was tabled in this House. It was tabled in 1943, on February 27th,

February 21, 1958

and signed by Mr. Fines. It says:

"We hereby certify that this is a true copy of the Handbook for Speakers issued by the Farm-Labour Group in 1933 . . ."

Twenty-five years ago, and they are commemorating their 25th anniversary by stamps on the back of letters!

I wanted to find out what the policy of the C.C.F. group was at that time, and here it is:

"The social ownership of all resources and machinery of wealth and production to the end that we may establish a Cooperative Commonwealth in which the basic principle regulating production, distribution and exchanges will be the supplying of human needs instead of making profits."

That was 25 years ago! I want to congratulate them on this, because their whole economic philosophy, the biggest part of their endeavours in this province certainly have showed up their true colours because they haven't made a profit. In fact, I think half of the Crown Corporations they started have not made a profit, and as a result had to be buried under a tombstone of wasted investment. But anyway, they don't believe in making a profit.

Then they had the Regina Manifesto, and you all know what was in the Regina Manifesto. Then they had dissension in their ranks. A percentage of their popular votes throughout the country has been slipping year after year, so they got themselves into a huddle and thought possibly, "We'd better do something about that Regina Manifesto".

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Your slip's showing, too!

Mr. McFarlane: — "We'd better see if we can't make it more popular to the people of Canada." So they got themselves into a huddle and went down to Winnipeg, and came out with what was known as the 'Winnipeg Declaration'. I suggest that all it was that a bunch of Socialists went down to Winnipeg, got into molt like a bunch of old hens and, when their feathers grew in again, they were exactly the same colour as before.

The Premier at these conferences calls all these industrialists in, and he says, "Don't worry, boys, we're not Socialists." So when he gets out in the country, it has to be something different. He has to hold the fort out there. So we have one group entertained in one way, and we have another group entertained in another way.

As I said before, they are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the founding of Socialism, and they say that the 'Winnipeg Declaration' has got away from Socialism: "We're not Socialists any more; we believe in free enterprise, or we have public ownership, or private ownership, etc." But then the latest issue of 'The Commonwealth' (yes, you'll want to clap hard after I read this) — in the February 19, 1958 issue, what do we find? We find Mr. Donovan Swailes, C.C.F. M.L.A. for Manitoba getting up and saying this:

"The policy of the C.C.F. is the same today as it was 25 years ago."

Tell that to your meetings where you are trying to convince them you haven't changed. That was found on the inside pages. What do we find on the back page, on the editorial page of 'The Commonwealth':

"The only way to stop private industry from profiteering is by a system of planning and price control."

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Just listen to this:

"The catch in this, however, is that private business would to a large extent refuse to produce if such an effective ceiling was placed upon their profit."

"So the answer is that where necessary we must move towards public ownership of key industries."

That was on February 19, 1958, and that's your policy commemorating the birth of your party 25 years ago; but I challenge you to put that on the back of the correspondence you are sending throughout the province!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We're not even particular who gets the paper, either!

February 21, 1958

Premier Douglas: — We send it to anybody.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, we are to look over this very important document, the Speech from the Throne. As I have pointed out, and as other members from this side have pointed out, it is absolutely bare as far as agriculture is concerned. Apparently they do not want to recognize the cost-price squeeze facing the farmer at this time. They don't want to measure up to the conditions formulated by themselves by their actions and by their policies, which have lead to this cost-price squeeze.

One of the factors was pointed out by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) this afternoon, when he dealt with the way the farmers have been discriminated against in this province in regard to the power program. Then the farmers want to know why they have to pay on the average about \$500 for power, when it has been brought into urban centres at a much reduced rate. In committee, we tried to find out why interest figures are so high. When we question the activities of different personnel, and wages paid to different personnel, we are told it is not in the public interest. However, on an Order for Return, last session, we asked what the salary was of the Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. We asked about other expenses in the Power Corporation, and this is what we found out: the manager's salary amounted to some \$19,600 — in round figures you could quote it at about \$20,000. What does that \$20,000 represent in terms of the farmer, Mr. Speaker? It simply means that, taking the average of \$500 which every farmer has to pay for power, it would take a block of 40 farmers paying \$500 each to pay the salary of one man in your Corporation. That is one of the things they must have to consider.

Premier Douglas: — It would take a lot of cream cans to pay Donald Gordon, too!

Mr. McFarlane: — Another thing is your power rate. Your Minister of Power (Hon. Mr. Brown) is, I am sorry, not in his seat this afternoon, but he has stated that we have had five different reductions in power rates, and yet it is still adding to our fixed costs as compared to the Manitoba farmer, because our rates here are 70 per cent higher than those in Manitoba. Power is just one of the items which is adding up to the high fixed costs of the farmer today.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — They're a lot lower than the Liberals charged when they were in power.

Mr. McFarlane: — Then there is the mineral tax concerning which some pamphlet on philosophy, written by some of the members probably on the other side, was read to you by the member for Turtleford this afternoon. I refer to the mineral tax of 3 cents per acre. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that has the farmers of this province riled up today, it is the treatment they have had in regard to the mineral taxes on their land over the past 14 years.

There is no province in Canada today that has more confusion in regard to the ownership of the minerals than the province of Saskatchewan at this time. The farmers are being continually taxed for something that neither they nor this Government know that they own. I suggest to you that there is another place which is adding up to the higher fixed costs of farming in Saskatchewan.

Then there is the grid road system, where the farmers through their taxes are helping to pay for the secondary highways of this province, which are the responsibility of the Provincial Government in this province. Secondary highways, if you accept your rightful share of responsibility, should be born by the Government to your right, Mr. Speaker. There again we have a condition adding up to the higher fixed costs of farming in this province.

We have rural taxes for school purposes which have increased 175 per cent from 1944 to 1956. Municipal taxes have risen to three times as high today as they were when the C.C.F. Government came into office. There is a little interesting thing. I think I'll go back to the little book that you had in 1933, seeing you are celebrating the 25th anniversary of C.C.F. policy, and I think I should go back and read some of the statements there. On page 10: they were talking about taxes — the question-and-answer period which was set up by the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) for the information of those who went around trying to elect the C.C.F. Government at that time. The question was this: "Would there still be taxes to pay under this new system?" Here is the answer: "The cost of social services will have to be met. The individual would still have to pay taxes but under our general scheme of financings he or she would be relieved of taxation as it is at the present time." Quite a relief to have it increased three times during the 14 years!

Mr. Cameron: — Relieved of it, all right!

Mr. McFarlane: — Then it says again, on the part in regard to the farmer and his taxes — he's going to be relieved of his taxes so he'd have more leisure time. The question is: "Under Socialism will a man only work six hours a day and a farmer 14 hours? The answer is: "Under a planned economy it will not be necessary for the farmer to work more than six hours a day. There would be no need to; we have the leisure now, only it is not divided up properly. This is what they're celebrating the 25th anniversary of!

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — What's the matter? Don't you like it?

Mr. McFarlane: — Are they doing anything to alleviate the situation of the farmer? We have heard the Premier of this province speaking to groups and saying that we should buy more Saskatchewan products. If we buy more Saskatchewan products, it will help pay the taxes in this province; it will help bolster the economy of this province. Oh, it will do wonderful things, if we just put on this 'Buy Saskatchewan Products' campaign. As all members know, we had a surplus of butter in this province some two or three years ago. The Federal Government offered butter to the institutions of Saskatchewan at the rate of three pounds for the price of two.

As you know, the Provincial Government has quite a few institutions, and so we thought we would see if they took advantage of this offer by the Dominion Government, and we asked a question to see how much butter they had bought for the different institutions in the province for the years 1950 to 1956. We asked how much they had bought for the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn, the Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford, the Training School and the Restoration Centre, and this is going to really make the farmers of this province happy. Today in some districts they have been unable to deliver grain; some delivery points are at the lowest in the history of this province. When they needed extra cash; when they needed income supplemented by the dairy industry, and beef industry, etc, here is what we found out: For Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn from 1950 to 1956, not one pound of butter was bought; not one pound of butter was bought for the Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford; only 31 pounds were bought in six years for the Saskatchewan Training School, and only 528 pounds were bought for the Physical Restoration Centre in Saskatoon. Since 1950, the C.C.F. Government has bought for these four institutions a total of only 559 pounds of butter, valued at \$341 or one year's production of one good cow! Compare that with \$365,000 for newspaper and other advertising for your Saskatchewan Power Corporation! That is just one of the items. We could go on and list a great many more here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, due to the very unfavourable allotment of radio time by this Government, I want to say at this time that the Speech from the Throne, having offered absolutely no security for the farmers of this province again, having absolutely no constructive or no rigorous or corrective program to get the farmers of this province out of their financial situation, I will not support it.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, along with the rest of the people of Saskatchewan, I looked forward very much to this Second Session of the Thirteenth Legislature of Saskatchewan. For, like most of the people

of Saskatchewan, who continue to live in Saskatchewan in spite of our climate, in spite of our drought, in spite of our floods, in spite of our bad roads, in spite of our socialists . . .

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Oh, don't run down our . . .

Mrs. Batten: — . . . I am an incurable optimist.

Mr. McCarthy: — Give the lady a break.

Mrs. Batten: — I had, during the last session, a great deal of difficulty in understanding the reasoning, (if I could flatter the people across from me with such a word), of those members of the Government, who insisted that we, the Official Opposition in this Provincial House of Saskatchewan, should allot them Federal money, should give them Federal policies and programs, in order to restore Saskatchewan to some semblance of prosperity.

I also felt at a loss to understand why I, as an elected provincial Member from the Humboldt constituency, should be required to apologize for something the Liberal Government in Ottawa did, or explain to this Government why they did something that this Government did not particularly appreciate. I felt that, in good conscience, I should be here to represent every one of my constituents, whether they voted Liberal, C.C.F., or Social Credit (and even in Humboldt we have those who vote C.C.F.). I felt that I came here not to tell the Federal Government what to do, but that I was here to see to it that there was as little maladministration in this Government in the province of Saskatchewan as I could prevent, and to see to it that our laws were as just and equitable as I, by my small effort, could make them. I felt that, if I carried out these duties to the best of my abilities, and with a good clear conscience, I was performing the duty for which I was elected.

Therefore, in spite of that tragic election last June, I thought, "Well, something good will come out of this. At least our C.C.F. Government can now forget about Ottawa and get down to the business of doing something for the people of Saskatchewan."

Like the other people who have had the sorrow of listening to the Speech from the Throne, I am very sadly disappointed. I think that, instead of hearing a Speech from the Throne, a program of policy, of plans, I heard a historical document. In listening to the Government members, and particularly to the Premier, I wasn't listening to a Government who had any ideas or plans or hopes of prosperity for Saskatchewan. I was listening to an obsolete debating society of historians, who were not well equipped by education to be historians or by impartiality to be fair in interpreting that history.

I think that the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) described that speech very well when he said it was a "skeleton". But then, I'm still an optimist. (Saskatchewan people do have to be optimists to say here), and I said to myself, "Perhaps, when the Premier of this province gets up, he'll put some meat on that skeleton; he'll give it some blood, some flesh, some sinew; perhaps we have a Government with a few ideas; maybe it isn't dead yet." And then, what happened? Well, Mr. Speaker, this Government put on a wonderful show. For showmanship you can't beat the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Humboldt constituency don't send me here to look at a show, and the people of Saskatchewan don't pay our salaries so that we can be entertained. And therefore I was again downhearted and disappointed even at the fine show that was put on.

First of all, we had the hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) 'man of the people', a union man, a man representing Labour — and all honour to him. Secondly we had the 'man of the soil', again, a man of the people. But doesn't that suggest something to you, Mr. Speaker? Look at that C.C.F. picture. They can't look at people as people. You are either labour or you are a farmer, or else you are the Government, which is everything in this province. So, after the hon. member from Moose Jaw spoke for labour (and he wasn't too happy with what even the C.C.F. had done for labour) and the hon. member from Touchwood constituency (Mr. Meakes), in which constituency I at one time, had the honour of making my own home when I was a very little girl, after he spoke and wept voluminous tears for the poor people who lived there during the 'thirties (and I was one of them) and I felt tears in my own eyes listening to him, it was so deeply moving. But, Mr. Speaker, he didn't have any tears left over for the farmers of the Touchwood constituency today; and there are still farmers in that constituency and in every other constituency in the province of Saskatchewan, who are living on a pittance and your own Royal Commission tells you that. Those are not my figures.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Liberal allegiance.

Mrs. Batten: — What are you doing for those farmers? Have you not even any tears for them? And then, to top off the show, we had the Premier. Along with everybody else in Saskatchewan, I have a great deal of respect for the Premier because of his position, and because of his personality. I regret very much that he is not here to hear all these flattering things that I intend to say about him. And the Premier stood up as "the idealist", and well he should. He is well-trained to be the idealist of the C.C.F. Party, which forms the Government in Saskatchewan. And strangely enough, this Premier of our province, who throughout my short stay in this particular House, reminds me very much of that velvet glove whose silken personality is being continually moved and molded by the iron fist of the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Dictator!

Mrs. Batten: — I hate to have them miss this flattery, but if they can't stay in the House, I can't do much about it. The Premier told us himself, in the House the other day, that his speech was as dessert. Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan have had dessert and nothing but dessert for 14 years; we need some meat and potatoes! Fourteen years of dessert have given us nothing but indigestion and flabbiness of economy. I think the Premier made an apt comparison when he said that the Leader of the Opposition's speech was an "appetizer" — "sour and astringent", and it's time we had a little bit of that life, a little bit of that appetizer in our political life in this province. And if this Leader of the Opposition could be the Premier, he would put that life and that astringency and that appetite into the lives of our people in Saskatchewan so that they could rebuild this sick economy of ours.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — That's wonderful.

Mrs. Batten: — The Premier went on, using as his measure barrels of oil and inflated dollars when speaking of the manufacturing industry, and he painted a very glowing, prosperous picture. And, Mr. Speaker, if I lived as do apparently the Ministers of the Crown in these ivory halls, surrounded by the busy hive of activity that the Government offices produce, perhaps I could be deluded into believing that we in Saskatchewan really have a fine prosperous economy, booming, full of happy and rich people. But I live in a constituency that is being bereft of its young people. We have no room for university students. We have no room for skilled labour because we are losing our population. During the winter months, we have nothing to supplement the incomes of our young people. During the summer months our farm economy is not strong enough to give them full employment. This is not a booming economy, Mr. Speaker. This is not the type of thing that any Premier can speak of in the proud terms that our Premier uses, and be justified in the eyes of his people.

Then, I thrilled, as I am sure everybody on the air and in this House thrilled to the Premier's magnificent voice and his magnificent sentiments, when he ended his speech with that vision of international good will, that further vision of a planned economy that would give everybody happiness. Not only, he said, not only in Saskatchewan, not even national, let us have a planned internal economy!

February 21, 1958

I have heard similar sentiments from the words of men who, too, had beautiful voices, but who were Communists.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That phoney again. Shame on you!

Mrs. Batten: — It is not phoney, and it is true that that planned economy on an international level has always been advocated, strongly advocated, and is still feared because it is advocated by Communists. Yet I have never heard any Communist so confused in economics that he spoke of a planned international economy in a free trade area.

Mr. McCarthy: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — After listening to that magnificent ending, I was more than slightly deflated by my very practical mind, which reminded me of a little story. It has no personal application, but it is about a woman politician, who was a very strong and virile politician, and she went out and she electioneered day and night, and at the end of one heavy day, she came home and she sat down exhausted. She said to her husband, "You know, we've done a wonderful job and we're going to sweep the country." He looked at her wearily and said, "Hell, dear, why don't you start with sweeping the kitchen?"

It is just about time our Government started worrying about our own problems. Those sentiments of international good will are wonderful, but they don't put a cent in our farmers' pockets. It is fine to worry about things outside your jurisdiction and outside your ability to do anything about. It does denote your good will and your noble character; but what does it do for the people who elect you? What does it do for the people who hold you responsible for their economic well-being in this province? And that is where this Government is falling short of the hopes and aspirations of their own followers as well as the other people of Saskatchewan.

There is quite a contrast between that speech and the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. There was no false sentiment in his speech, but there was energy, there was planning, there was a real desire to start, not at the top in some wild dream, but to start in the kitchen, to start on the small family farm, to start in the small town and in the small city, with people who need help, and see to it that the Government does give them some assistance that will enable them to work out their own destiny and their own economic salvation. And that is the theory of Liberalism.

Premier Douglas: — Where has that theory been for 20 years?

Mrs. Batten: — It is always amusing to hear these little side-comments There is nothing we would like better than to put that theory into effect.

Premier Douglas: — You had 20 years in which to put it into effect.

Mrs. Batten: — I was a little young, 20 years ago, to be putting anything into effect of that nature. And you, as Members of this Government, after 20 years, have become a little too old to put anything into effect.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I was more than amused at this little aside, that came up in the House, about this stamp commemorating "this wonderful, historic event" — to quote the Premier and the C.C.F. party. I agree with the C.C.F. in this instance. I think we should commemorate that event, because soon they'll be like the dodo bird and the Russian Empire — fallen, gone! They have no reality in the future. This C.C.F. party has become barren, before it has become old; it has become senile before it has become wise. They have nothing left to give the people of Saskatchewan or the people of Canada.

Like most Socialist and Communist parties, this party was conceived in an age of disillusion and inadequacy, when people thought that even wrong ideas were better than no ideas. And I, as a member of the Liberal party, will take part of the blame for that conception, because we should have been able to give the people something that they wanted, something that we failed to do.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — And then, therefore, instead of staying and thinking their way out of the difficulty with us they accepted blindly these beautiful promises that the C.C.F. party gave them.

The C.C.F. party was born during hard times — during Tory times. Perhaps they expect to have a re-birth. There is no event that is more exhilarating or happy than a birth, be it that of a baby or be it that of an idea, or be it that of a political party. I can thrill along with this Government and C.C.F. party with the birth of the C.C.F. party. It was an exhilarating experience, and because it was an exhilarating experience your C.C.F. party was able to attract many people of the fine calibre and great intelligence. You have been very fortunate. Even since you formed your Government, even in your (shall I say) decadence, you have been able to continue to attract Civil Servants of high calibre and dedicated lives, in spite of the frustrations which they must suffer to be working under a Government of your type. And I want to congratulate this Government for being able

February 21, 1958

to attract people of that type. I want to congratulate this Government for what it has done in the past; what it has done. There are many, many things, Mr. Speaker, that it didn't do.

Premier Douglas: — We have a good record.

Mrs. Batten: — For certain things, such as hospitalization, I give them credit and I feel very great good will toward them because they had the vision and courage to implement those policies, which our people needed.

Premier Douglas: — A good record.

Mrs. Batten: — But what have they been doing since they have implemented those few reforms? Sitting in the seat of complacency — dreaming visions of international plans. Do they not realize the state that the people of Saskatchewan are in? When they are asked for loans to help needy farmers, they call a conference. That is no answer. To set up a commission is a fine thing and a necessary thing for a long-range plan — and I am sure the Liberal Government which will be formed after you people are through will be able to use those findings of the Commission — but what are you doing for the people now? What does this poor document that calls itself a Speech from the Throne, plan to do for the people of Saskatchewan? Have these people on the other side of the House — has this Government, become so insulated from the people that those people are no longer individuals who have need, who need the Government to help them in the country? Are the people of Saskatchewan merely statistics to this Government at this point? Are we merely "things" that a Royal Commission writes about?

There are widows with young children living 40 feet from a power-line and they cannot have power in that home because of the policy of the Power Corporation — this tool of the Saskatchewan Government. It was rather sad to hear the lawyer for Touchwood say (I think he meant well) that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation lit not only the homes of country people, but also their hearts and souls. Well, if we keep on giving Crown Corporations monopolies, and competing with Crown Corporations against private enterprise, we will not only light the souls and hearts of our people, but we will burn them out, because they have nothing left in this province but Crown Corporations and state control.

Mr. Gardiner: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — And it is not amusing. The hon. members on the other side laugh when we speak about curtailment of freedom, as if there were no such word in the English language, or at least not in the

province of Saskatchewan. Last year, as just a simple instance, this Government passed an amendment to an Act, which made it possible for the parents of the children to go to the courts to demand what, under the law of Saskatchewan, was rightfully theirs, the right to an education for that child, even if they had to get transportation money from the school board in order to see that that child got that education. That was a curtailment, but there was no great talk about it. Those things are so unimportant. After all, what is the freedom of a few hundred people! What does it matter to this Government if those people suffer, as long as Crown Corporations are making profits? But it does matter to the people of Saskatchewan. It seems very sad to me that the time has come when that proud banner that the C.C.F. party used to wave, that banner that said, "Humanity First!" now reads, if the Throne Speech can be believed, "Let John Do It!"

Mr. Gardiner: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment, and I would just like to read it. It was moved by the Leader of the Official Opposition, and it says:

"We respectfully submit that in the opinion of this Assembly, Your Honour's advisors have failed to implement a comprehensive agricultural program for Saskatchewan or an aggressive plan of industrial development, which would provide full employment."

I will not support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — In rising to take party in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take very long to discuss the comments of other speakers who preceded me, this afternoon. Certainly I do not intend to get involved in any argument full of mysticism with the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), nor do I intend to try to convince her that her baleful and sorrowful appraisal of this province is wrong. Certainly, I think that, when a member rises in this House to describe the conditions of this province, it doesn't lie in mouth of any member to complain that this is the province that nobody should like to live in; that everybody should like to live somewhere else; that the roads, the weather and all the rest of it make this province an undesirable place in which to live. I should like to tell the hon. member that my Liberal friends who went to Florida now are convinced that this province is a much nicer place to live in than where they went for their holidays.

February 21, 1958

I am not going to try to convince my friend that this is not a sick economy; that there is no program for employment and that this is not a happy, prosperous economy. I think that anyone who can live so far divorced from reality, little impression would be made upon them by trying to present them with facts in this Legislature.

Mr. McDonald: — Where would you find them?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I want to say, however, that her remarks did have a depressing effect upon me, and I am essentially an optimistic soul.

Mr. McDonald: — That's what's wrong with your Government.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I recall, shortly after 1956, one of my friends from the Humboldt area, telling me that the successful candidate there had succeeded in poisoning the minds of some of the people in the isolated parts of the Humboldt constituency about the bogey of Communism, and I assured him that there was no up-and-coming member of the legal profession who would be so naive as to think that the people of Saskatchewan can still be frightened by veiled allusions to Communism in the C.C.F.

I would like to say something about some of the remarks the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) made in this debate, this afternoon. He purported to convince the House that this Speech from the Throne conferred nothing of any value on farm people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McFarlane: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He said that there was nothing in it for the farmer. Well I had read the Speech from the Throne before, so I wondered if there was any substance in what he said, or whether this was just the rantings and hallucinations of a sick mind. I started turning over the pages of the Speech from the Throne, and I find in the second paragraph a reference to the crop and the carry-over and the decline in farm income brought about by the reduction in agricultural prices and increases in farm costs. I think that is a matter that ought to be drawn to public attention.

Mr. McDonald: — Why don't you do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Certainly the Government of this province couldn't fail to note this serious fact.

The second paragraph has to do with livestock and the Government program to assist the livestock industry. The third program has to do with the purchase of farm implements and the Government program to assist farmers in their choice of farm implements. The fourth paragraph has to do with the South Saskatchewan dam and suggests that it may be commenced in the very near future, and that forecast was borne out by subsequent facts revealed in this House.

The next paragraph refers to the Report of the Royal Commission, and suggests that this conference of interested rural organizations was held and that it studied municipal problems and social problems in rural areas. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't do any good, like the Liberal party, to bury one's head in the sand and pretend that these problems do not exist. Other parts of North America are just as seriously afflicted by the problems of agricultural technology as is Saskatchewan. This is the only place in North America where conscious and deliberate study is being made of this problem and proposals being discussed by rural people to solve these rural problems. Other parts of North America, where this problem is rampant just as it is here, are adopting a 'wait and see' attitude, sitting back and doing nothing deliberate and concrete to cope with this situation.

Then the next paragraph reports on the work of the Continuing Committee studying reorganization and reallocation of finances and responsibilities to municipalities. My hon. friends think that that is not a matter that is important to farm people. All of the matters which I have referred to are of vital importance to our agricultural economy.

The next paragraph has to do with winter employment. I suggest that is important to farm people. It has been shown to this House the effect of urban purchasing power on farm markets for food.

Mr. McDonald: — What are you doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The next paragraph deals with the proposal of the Government to ask for funds to provide increases in grants for schools and municipalities. That is a matter about which farm people are very concerned.

Then there is the matter, in the next paragraph, about provision for health treatment for mental illness and tuberculosis, and the fact that this is being asked of the Federal Governments is, I think, of importance to all the people of Saskatchewan and farm

February 21, 1958

people as well. Certainly nothing will be done to provide this equal treatment to all people unless it is demanded and pressed for by this province. This province, however, is already providing this treatment without charge to the people of Saskatchewan. I suggest that is a matter of importance to the farmers.

Production of oil — 37 million barrels of oil is worth noting and is not altogether unimportant to farm people, because a large part of that oil production is earmarked for the farmers' oil industry, the farmers' co-operative movement. A large part of it is theirs and is available to farm people at cost.

I don't propose to deal with all the sections of it, but I . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I suggest that the expansion of generating and transmission facilities of the province is a matter of importance to farmers, who are concerned about getting rural power and having power on the lines when they turn the switch on in their electrification system.

The telephone and television communication facilities — the microwave line is certainly of importance to the farmers. Farmers use telephone services like all people. They have television sets; are concerned about communications — that they should be modern, efficient. The distribution of Salk vaccine certainly is of interest to farmers. The new health regions in the Yorkton-Melville area and the Rosetown-Biggar-Kindersley area, those are practically all farm people who will enjoy the advantages and benefits of that particular program. The increase in hospital construction costs — farmers have to pay taxes in union hospital districts, and have to bear part of the burden of hospital construction costs. And I say that, when the grants for hospital construction of this province go up from a present maximum of \$1,000 a bed to something like five times that amount, it is of significance to those who pay taxes. Increased old-age assistance and disabled persons' allowances are important to farmers. Many of my farm constituents are interested in those allowances. The care and treatment of the aged, nursing homes, assistance and grants to municipalities to provide homes for elderly peoples certainly concern and affect our farm people, and are of interest to them.

Certainly the increase in school grants is of very vital importance to farmers. The new construction at the University, the new Animal Husbandry building costing nearly \$1/2 million, is of vital importance to a sound agriculture in this province. The fact that 247 rural municipalities took advantage of the market road certainly helps farmers.

Mr. Danielson: — They paid for it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The provision which this Government has made to fight against increases in freight rates is a matter which farmers are very deeply concerned with, and this Government is assisting in.

The amendments to the Credit Union and Co-operative legislation, which are going to be proposed, to increase the size and strength of the co-operative movements are of primary importance to farm people. When someone with the myopic vision of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley looks at the Speech from the Throne and says that there are only three lines, or three words or something that affect agriculture, it just shows that the man hasn't got his eyes open yet. I suggest that those of us who can read, who know what is in the Speech from the Throne, are impressed by the fact that this Government has more in this one Speech from the Throne of interest to farmers and of benefit to farmers than was contained in the 10 Speeches from the Throne read by Liberal Governments between 1936 and 1944.

Mr. McDonald: — It doesn't take much to impress a vacant mind.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My hon. friend tried to pinpoint his arguments that we were discriminating against farmers in this province by reference to the distribution of power. Now, it certainly doesn't become a member of a political party that said to the farmers that, if you ever expect to have power on your farm, you better get a windcharger, to criticize or attack what this Government has done in connection with rural electrification.

This province has the proudest record in Canada of electrifying rural homes. There is no other area in the North American continent, of comparable size, that has electrified 7,500 homes in one year. My hon. friends can laugh and heckle to their heart's content, but they cannot change the facts, and those are the facts. I would be ashamed and feel a bit foolish and I would laugh rather giddily if I had such a poor record as my hon. friends. The Leader of the Opposition says that records don't matter. To a man who has no past and who has no regard for the past and the traditions of his party, he can afford to laugh with an empty and giddy laugh as he has been doing.

Mr. McDonald: — If I was half as giddy as the Attorney General, I would take leave. If I had a record like you, I would never mention it.

February 21, 1958

Hon. Mr. Walker: — When I talk about rural electrification I would like to tell you some of the facts about the assistance which this Government has given in rural electrification. If hon. members opposite realized that it takes more to provide electrification than just putting a bulb on the ceiling of the living-room — that it requires distribution lines, medium voltage transmission lines and a high voltage grid system as well (I am sorry that I can't announce to my radio audience that the hon. member for Humboldt and the hon. member for Cannington have withdrawn).

Mr. McDonald: — Fifty per cent of your members are out. Your own members won't stay and listen to you, Bob.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am vary encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the number who are here, because I would have left myself, long before this, if I hadn't had an important engagement here at four o'clock.

In order to produce and provide electricity for rural people it is necessary to have generating plants, high voltage grid, medium voltage grid, distribution system and the transformer and the yard pole. Now, my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley tried to show that the Government was assisting with subsidizing the urban user of power and denying it to the rural user of power. He tried to leave the impression in this House that we were discriminating in favour of the urban dweller.

Mr. Danielson: — Absolutely!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And my hon. friend from Arm River, and the one from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) — I am not surprised that they would agree with such an asinine conclusion. The fact is, that when you purport to provide electrification it is important that you also provide the capital equipment for generation and distribution. And it is important that you provide enough of this equipment to see to it that there will always be electricity to flow in the line when the switch is closed. As a result of a survey by the Power Corporation, it has been found that the right amount of generating capacity to supply a rural home or farm is one kilovolt of power and that the optimum amount to provide for one urban resident is 6/10ths of a kilovolt of power. Now the cost of providing this potential runs at about \$150 KVA average, which means that the Power Corporation must have an investment of \$150 for generating, for every rural power customer, and correspondingly about \$90 of investment for each urban power customer. The same proportions should apply to high voltage grids, medium voltage grids, and that would mean that a further \$150 of capital cost must be attributed for each rural customer of power and a total of \$90 capital for each urban user of power. Now the actual cost of the distribution system to each rural customer is \$950 average, and for each urban

customer \$150 average. That means that the Power Corporation makes an investment of \$330 for each urban customer and \$1,250 for each rural customer. The farmer reimburses \$500 of that \$1,250, which leaves \$330 for the urban customer and \$750 for the rural customer as representing the investment of the Power Corporation in providing that power. Now, that is saying nothing at all about the increased line losses that result from distributing electric power in widely scattered rural areas, and over sparsely settled rural areas. But as for capital cost alone, more than twice as much has been invested by the Power Corporation for every customer in the rural areas than is invested for each customer in the urban areas.

My hon. friend's claim simply does not stand up in the light of truth. My hon. friend's claim is one which, I can only conclude, is deliberately calculated to leave an impression which is not correct. It is deliberately calculated to try to create the impression that this Government is favouring one section of its customers as against another. The fact of the matter is that, when you look at the figures, you see there is no truth whatever in that contention.

Some complaint was made about the difficulty of organizing rural telephones in this province. I would just remind my hon. friend that there are problems in connection with rural telephones, but this province of Saskatchewan has the highest percentage of its rural residents with telephone service of any of the three prairie provinces. Our record is much better than either Manitoba or Alberta in that regard.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — That was true before the C.C.F. came in.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That is still true, my friend. Something was said about the assistance this Government gives to agriculture — 4 per cent, I think it was said, of the budget. Well, if my hon. friends choose to wear blinders and close their eyes to the things which benefit agriculture, if they choose to close their eyes to the increases in school grants, and all the other things which are of value and use to the rural people, then I am sorry, but I am afraid there is nothing we can do for them. But if they want to limit their consideration merely to the amount of the budget of the Department of Agriculture, then they shouldn't say very much about it, because, presently, it is some 4 per cent of the total budget; but when my hon. friends had a chance to divide the pie they gave agriculture less than half a million dollars out of a budget of more than \$25 million, or less than two per cent of the budget of that time; and I would say that in those times, when this province produced the greatest part of its wealth from agriculture, an even larger

February 21, 1958

portion of the budget should have been spent by the Department of Agriculture than today. The fact is it was less than half as much.

My hon. friend may get some cheap political advantage by going out to some of his constituents, and saying that he protested against the payment of a salary of \$20,000 to the manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I don't know whether my hon. friend's constituents will be taken in by that kind of hokum or not, but I say that, if you compare the salary that is presently being paid to the Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation with the salary of management in any comparable corporation in western Canada, either of a public or a private utility, you will find that we are not overpaying the manager in this province. You couldn't get a man of the qualifications and capacity of our present manager in the ordinary market-place for less than twice that sum.

Mr. Gardiner: — A recent C.C.F. candidate . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And there are some very good people who have been C.C.F. candidates, my friend. You compare the salary of management for the Calgary Power Company and you will find it is more than twice as much. The B.C. Electric is considerably more than twice as much; and, as a matter of fact, we are paying our manager too little for the responsibilities and for his capacity in that job. You can't save money for the people of Saskatchewan by employing second-rate or incompetent people to manage multi-million dollar enterprises. If the people of Saskatchewan want to have second or third-rate people in these positions, they will pay for it mightily through mismanagement and inefficiency.

Mr. Gardiner: — They've got that now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Something was said about this grid road program being a burden on the ratepayers of rural municipalities and I think the figures are that these rural municipalities will contribute, altogether, about \$24 million to the building of this grid road system, and the Provincial Government will spend some \$36 million, if the present estimates are correct. Well, this is a problem which the municipalities never had when the Liberals were in power. The municipalities in those days didn't have to worry about spending money on a grid road program, because there just weren't any!

Mr. McCarthy: — How do you know?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I was around. As a matter of fact, I probably reached the age of discretion about the time my hon. friend passed it.

Mr. Gardiner: — I didn't know you'd reached it yet, Bob.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I think most rural municipalities are quite happy about this grid road program. They are happy to spend \$24 million and get a \$60 million program out of it. As a matter of fact you don't have to take my word for it; you can take the word of the municipal councils, an overwhelming majority of whom have come in and applied for this program. Nobody has told them they have to. They have chosen to, and they are happy about it.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. McFarlane) said something about school taxes going up 175 per cent; and with his usual one-eyed objectivity he forgot to look at what the other side of the picture is — what the Provincial Government does about education. Oh, 175 per cent increase in school taxes, but a 900 per cent increase in the contribution of this Government to assist in the administration of local education.

He said something about teaching and salaries and so on, back in the 1930's, and I have no idea whether he was a teacher or not. Perhaps it was his desk mate who said something about education, and I don't know whether he was a teacher at that time or not. I know something about teaching in those days. I know something about how difficult it was to get paid your salary. I recall that I used to have to wait sometimes from the first of January until August for my salary, because from the previous year's, the December 31st, grant still wasn't paid by the Provincial Government to the school districts — not just a month or two after the school term or grant term, but eight and nine and ten months. And this government in Regina, under the Liberals, was financing itself up to a year on the money which belonged to the school teachers of this province. They were not able to pay the grants. They were using the money for other things, and the school teachers of this province, out of their meagre earnings of \$350 to \$400 a year — their money was being taken by a compulsory savings process of the most vicious kind by the Liberal government, to finance the public affairs of the province.

I know, too, that teachers went without their salary for years and years. I remember one time when my school board told me that of my \$40-a-month salary they could only pay me \$20 in cash and that I could take the other \$20 in the form of a note; but they said, "It is not quite that bad, because we have made an application for you for relief at the municipal office, and they will give you \$7.50 a month, and we would only owe you \$13.50.

Everybody who knows what the facts were in the 'thirties knows those things, and for my hon. friends to get up here and try to say that the Provincial Government relieved the school districts of these

February 21, 1958

notes by paying them for the school districts, he is either saying something that he doesn't know, or he is saying something which he knows is untrue, because the Liberal government in this province did not relieve the school districts of the cost of those outstanding teachers' notes.

Mr. McCarthy: — How could you pay them then?

Mr. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the figures I used were from the government records, and they show that a Liberal government voted \$731,000 for teachers' arrears in salary, and paid out \$600,000 of that amount; and they paid out no more because they couldn't locate any more notes. They not only paid the notes, my hon. friend, but they paid four per cent interest on those notes.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Who paid four per cent interest on them? Well, for the information of my hon. friend, the fact of the matter is that "an amendment was passed to legislation, in the year 1940, the session of 1940, to provide that the Government may lend to the Board of Trustees of any district such moneys as are necessary to enable the Board to pay moneys still owing by it in respect of salaries payable to teachers before the first day of January, 1935." "And furthermore, you will note that the rate of interest with respect to this loan is five per cent per annum," so that the school districts not only had to pay the interest on the teachers' notes, but they had to pay five per cent per annum to the Provincial Government who lent them the money to pay off the teachers' notes. As a matter of fact if the school district could not pay the note, provision was made for the Provincial Government to deduct it from their school grant. That's how you helped the school districts in this province in 1940. It is all very well for a party which believes that there is no such thing as a record to take something out of context and quote it, either through ignorance, not understanding what the provision was, or with an attempted wilful deception of the people who are listening.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's what you are doing right now!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — To quote something out of context and pretend that something existed . . .

Mr. Foley: — Exactly what you are doing now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . which everybody knows did not exist at that time.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's exactly what you are doing at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there isn't any question about what I am doing, because I am reading a letter signed by the Deputy Minister of Education to one of the school districts at that time.

Mr. Foley: — What date?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It is March 28, 1940.

Mr. McCarthy: — Table it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I can table it if my hon. friends want to see it. So there is no question about what the facts are, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They'll say the same old thing next year, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I do not wish to get involved in any acrimony or discussion with the hon. members opposite. I felt, this afternoon, that I would like to take the opportunity, when speaking in the Throne Speech debate, to give somewhat of a review or an outline to the House of the policies of the Attorney-General's Department during the past years. I must plead provocation for my remarks up to this point. I would like to express those policies, also, with a view to indicating to the House how they will be projected into the next fiscal year.

First, I would like to say that, in keeping with the indexes of business activity which has been referred to from time to time, the volume of work done by the judicial system of Saskatchewan continues to increase. Compared with the five-year average for the years 1952 to 1956 inclusive, each category of judicial work, except Queen's Bench trials and District Court trials shows some substantial increase. The number of trials is down slightly. The total number of writs of summons issued, in 1957, as 12,743 compared with the five-year average of 11,386. The number of District Court and Queen's Bench trials was 794 — down slightly from the five-year average of 829. Miscellaneous applications to the Court were 4,517 compared with the five-year average of 4,236. The number of Surrogate Court actions for 1957 amounted to 3,834 compared with a five-year average of 3,776.

These indicators, I suggest, show a general growth of business and commercial activity in Saskatchewan. One might say that the number of Surrogate Court applications merely reflects the number of people who have died, but the fact is that it is actually a reflection of the number of deceased persons who had estates that were worth probating, during that, year; and the experience is that the number falls off sharply in periods of severe depression. Like-

wise the number of actions commenced falls off very sharply in periods of general bankruptcy and insolvency.

For the purpose of the record, since there is no other way of making this information available to the House as our Department does not issue an Annual Report, I would like, with the consent of the members, to table the statistics for the last five years, which are merely a duplicate of those reported by the Culliton Committee as well as the statistics for the year 1957, so that hon. members may compare the 1957 figures with those of the period, 1952 to 1956. This table sets out all the judicial districts of the province. So with your consent, Mr. Speaker, I lay these on the table.

Mr. Speaker: — Do you have copies available for all the members?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I can have copies sent to all the members, or it can be put on the records in my speech.

Mr. Speaker: — Very well, we will include the tables with the transcript.

Summary of Judicial Activity for each Judicial District for the years 1952-56, inclusive

	<u>Writ</u>	<u>All Trials</u>	<u>Miscellaneous Applications</u>	<u>S.E. Applications Probate or Admin</u>
Arcola	550	52	213	564
Assiniboia	489	15	310	358
Battleford	3991	155	626	1348
Estevan	971	53	814	740
Gravelbourg	580	103	970	452
Humboldt	1297	71	577	784
Kerrobert	689	31	290	471
Kindersley	349	16	267	428
Melfort	2469	111	896	945
Melville	1422	240	925	541
Moose Jaw	2839	375	1942	1274
Moosomin	1017	66	745	990
Prince Albert	4427	263	2033	1115
Regina	14274	789	5460	2351
Saskatoon	12711	873	2022	2302
Shaunavon	391	47	433	427
Swift Current	2305	121	704	1213
Weyburn	1003	92	664	628
Wilkie	1199	47	197	502
Wynyard	748	338	415	588
Yorkton	3211	288	678	960
	56932	4146	21181	18881

Summary of Judicial Activity for each Judicial District for the year 1957

	<u>Writ</u>	<u>All Trials</u>	<u>Miscellaneous Applications</u>	<u>S.C. Application Probate or Admin</u>
Arcola	139	4	53	97
Assiniboia	87	3	86	69
Battleford	618	16	105	288
Estevan	320	19	286	143
Gravelbourg	174	37	122	85
Humboldt	306	27	102	151
Kerrobert	126	2	41	87
Kindersley	64	-	28	102
Melfort	481	23	175	208
Melville	321	43	132	114
Moose Jaw	679	69	367	285
Moosomin	167	5	-	132
Prince Albert	1098	59	185	222
Regina	2805	188	1243	500
Saskatoon	3329	122	1089	470
Shaunavon	65	9	41	80
Swift Current	712	42	88	246
Weyburn	344	14	114	131
Wilkie	183	11	69	112
Wynyard	126	57	108	109
Yorkton	599	44	83	213
	12743	794	4517	3834

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, a Committee of leading lawyers and judges was appointed late in 1956 to study and review the administration of the judicial system of Saskatchewan. First of all I would like to say something about the composition of that Committee. We felt that since the procedures of the Courts and the laws governing procedure are a highly technical and complex subject, it was desirable to have on that Committee those people who make their living from dealing with these problems. We hoped, also, to get from the Committee some general advice and suggestions affecting the broad relationship of the citizens and the judicial system. For advice on this technical problem, we were very grateful for the many suggestions which the Committee made. We also obtained advice and suggestions affecting the broader, and the social relationships of the judicial system and the people.

February 21, 1958

In October, the Committee presented its report. I want, on behalf of myself and on behalf of the Government, to express gratitude for the work which was done by Mr. Justice Culliton and the other Members of the Committee for the inspiration and the energy which they brought to this task. They will not be rewarded in money or in a financial way; their only reward will be the satisfaction and gratification which they derive from knowing that they did a conscientious job, and that their report has been the stimulus for a good deal of public interest, and particularly of interest among the legal profession on this subject of judicial reform.

I would like to outline briefly some of the recommendations which were contained in this report, although every member of the House has received a copy of the report. I do not propose to deal in detail with the recommendations or to outline in particular the legislation which will be introduced, later in the Session, to implement some of those recommendations. But I would like to deal with some of the general recommendations of the Committee.

The Report emphasized that the concept that the administration of justice should be kept near the local level, and I quote:

"Economy cannot be the dominant motive for circumscribing the scope of judicial agencies which most intimately serve local areas", said the Committee.

The Government concurs in that statement, and I quote it to emphasize the policies of the Government, which we will propose at this Session, will take fully into account this principle; but the inference must not be taken, and it was not so taken by the Committee to mean that no modification in the establishment or structure of the judicial system should be made. In fact, the Committee said this:

"It urged that economies in the operation of the Districts may be effected within the policy now being pursued by the Attorney General, without detrimentally affecting services being rendered."

I would like to give the House some particulars of these policies now being pursued. There is the policy, first, of assigning one sheriff to more than one judicial district; and secondly, there is the policy of getting the work of the judicial district done by part-time employees in rented quarters.

First let us look at the sharing of sheriffs. The Melville Judicial District, which does about five per cent of the judicial work of the province and the Yorkton Judicial District which does practically the same percentage, will get along, now, with one sheriff. He handles both districts — roughly 10 per cent of the sheriffs' work in the province of Saskatchewan. Kerrobert, Kindersley and Wilkie, which, between them, account for about three per cent of the judicial work in the province, now get along with one sheriff. Gravelbourg and Assiniboia, which have a combined percentage of about five per cent of the judicial work in the province, have one sheriff between them. Swift Current and Shaunavon with a combined percentage of around seven per cent, are now handled by one sheriff. Wynyard and Humboldt, which, between them, have about 11 per cent of the judicial work, are both managed by the same sheriff. There are several other judicial districts in the province where the amount of work is so small that combinations could, and will, eventually be effected. It is the policy of the Department, however, to take advantage of retirements to effect these reductions; and it has not been our policy to let out, or lay off, surplus staff without knowing we are going to be able to use them some place else.

Several of the other districts which have a very small amount of work and to which we will be looking in the future are; Arcola, with half of one per cent of the judicial work in the province; Estevan, with 2.4 per cent; Melfort, with 2.9 per cent; and Weyburn with 1.7 per cent. I want to make it abundantly clear that by referring to these figures neither the Department, nor the government has any intention of depriving the people of those communities of their judicial services. The point I am trying to make is that we will do what we have done other places, and that is, we will provide the services that are presently provided at much greater economy to the treasury of Saskatchewan.

There are two objections to this business of simply combining judicial districts and giving two districts, or three districts, to one sheriff. In the first place, whole districts must be assigned. You cannot have a district assigned to two sheriffs, or three sheriffs, or divided, as the Act presently stands. There is no other alternative but to assign entire districts. This means that it is impossible to make the most effective combination of work and personnel. It also means that it is often, then, difficult to locate the sheriff at the centre of the district which he actually serves, since, when you combine two districts, you have to decide in which one you are going to station the resident sheriff.

The result is that if you look at the map of the judicial districts of this province, you will see that the sheriff

at Yorkton, for example, has to serve an area 80 miles north of Yorkton and some 90 miles southwesterly towards Regina. In fact, he has to come to a point within 20 miles of the city of Regina because the Melville district ends up here just east of No. 6 Highway, only 20 miles from Regina. In the case of Kindersley, Kerrobert and Wilkie, the combined judicial district served by one sheriff, you get this situation. He must travel 120 miles to serve the villages of Tuberoso and White Bear in the southeast corner of his territory, and that is only 40 miles, or only one-third as far, from the city of Swift Current, where there is also a sheriff. He must also serve Red Pheasant, which is 80 miles from Kerrobert and only 15 miles from Battleford, where there is also a resident sheriff. These extra mileages make it necessary to retain additional sheriffs — more than we would need. It also adds to the cost of litigants in their judicial work; it increases the cost to the public as well as to the treasury of the province.

You might ask, Mr. Speaker, why we can't just chop up the Melville district and put part of it in the Regina sheriff's district and part in the Yorkton district, for instance. Well, if you do that it has very important side effects. If you chop up the district, say, of Melville, and put part of it in Regina and part of it in Yorkton, it means two or three things. First of all, you cannot do this just for the convenience of sheriffs. It would mean that the public would have to change the place in which they do their judicial work, if the boundary was altered. It would mean that the amount of work that would be done in some of the districts would become so small that it would be impossible to justify maintenance of those judicial centres on any rational or sane basis of public expenditures of money. So, by combining judicial districts, we have now affected a saving of some \$20,000 or \$25,000 to the taxpayers of the province.

It is hoped to introduce amendments to The Court Officials Act which will make possible further savings. We have gone about as far as we can go without changing the Act and giving the sheriffs a different kind of jurisdiction.

The second economy which the Committee referred to, undoubtedly was the experiment which was conducted at Kindersley, last year. Kindersley, in 1957, did half of one per cent, approximately, of the litigious judicial business of the province. We were renting a building for which we were paying \$3,000 a year in rent and we have two employees — a sheriff and one other. The total annual cost of the judicial centre was something in the vicinity of \$12,000 a year. A new arrangement was made whereby the Secretary of the Credit Union does all the work of the judicial centre and provides the office space (and a very fine space it is) for a total

remuneration of less than \$2,000 a year. This has resulted in a saving of some \$10,000 a year, and I have no doubt that this saving can be duplicated in half a dozen other places in the province, if we get a change in legislation, which we will be submitting to you in due course.

This also provides one other advantage. It makes it possible now, for the Government to give serious consideration to the establishment of judicial services in some communities where they are not presently being provided. It was simply impossible to justify the expenditure of \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year in some of these smaller cities and towns of the province, when you can provide the service adequately and well for one-tenth of that amount. We are now able to give serious thought to extension of services wherever it would appear to be justified. I should say, however, that nothing will be able to be done effectively along these lines until the new legislation has had a chance to work out and we can get our staff adjusted to the new situation, and all the "bugs" are taken out of the changes.

I want to say that I don't think the Government could continue to justify an expenditure of \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year in some of these smaller, less busy, judicial centres unless some reform is made in the manner of providing services.

Another point which the Culliton Committee drew to the attention of the Government was the severe maldistribution of work among the District Court judges, and among the various District Courts through the province. For example, in 1957, the present Queen's Bench judges in this province presided over 351 trials, or an average of 50 trials each. The eighteen District Court judges presided over 443 trials, or an average of 24, or half as many, each. Notwithstanding this low average by the District Court judges, those District Court judges in Regina and Saskatoon presided over, between them, 122 cases, or almost 30 per cent of the total in the province. The remaining fifteen District Court judges held an average of 15 trials each. Indeed, there were several District Court judges who had less than half a dozen during the year. So that there will be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I am not of the impression that trials are the only work which judges do. That comprises a small part of the judges' work, but the other work which they do is, roughly, proportional to the number of trials which they conduct.

The first major recommendation of the Committee was that we should deal with this problem. They suggested that, first of all, there were three measures which should be undertaken to cope with this problem. First, it recommended that additional District

Court judges be appointed in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. This has already been done. The Committee also urged that we have a greater flexibility in assigning District Court judges to their districts. They recommended, for example, that two or three districts could be presided over by each judge. If we take the Saskatoon judicial centre as the norm, we find that the two District Court judges there, in 1957, each conducted 35 trials. To achieve this average, it would be necessary to combine, for example, in the southeast part of the province, the judicial districts of Moosomin, Arcola, Weyburn and Estevan, and then you would only have half as much work being done by that judge as each of the judges presently are doing, say in Saskatoon. Or if you combined Battleford, Wilkie, Kerrobert and Kindersley — an area extending from the South Saskatchewan River to Uranium City, and almost a third of the width of the province — you would still get less than the optimum work load for a District Court judge. There is just no way, unfortunately — we thought this was the solution to this problem until we got into it; but, unfortunately there is just no way of equalizing, or even approximately equalizing, the work of the District Court judges by that method.

It is, therefore, proposed to bring down legislation at a later date, permitting the District Court judges to have a province-wide jurisdiction. This is the only way that you can equalize the work load. You get a situation, then, something similar to that existing in the Queen's Bench Court. This has been done for many years in the province of Alberta, where the province is divided into two districts, and all the District Court judges for the northern district have jurisdiction throughout that district; and likewise for the southern district. However, in this province it would be feasible at this time to make just one district of the whole province. That will mean that those District Court judges resident in the smaller communities will be able periodically, to come in and relieve the judges in the busier cities, without actually leaving their home communities.

However, in Saskatchewan, we would not encourage what happened in Alberta. In Alberta, the District Court judges all tended to reside and congregate in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. We think that here we can prevent that happening, and we intend to encourage by every way possible and by legislation, if necessary, the District Court judges to continue to reside in the scattered judicial centres of the province.

The Culliton Committee, thirdly, proposed that this work load maldistribution could be partly solved by increasing the jurisdiction of the District Court judges. This proposal, they argued, and rightly so, would equalize the work load, and it would also permit litigants in the smaller judicial centres to get more frequent

opportunities to appear before the judge — better service. I think both of those contentions are valid. It is proposed, therefore, to submit legislation to provide this, to meet this end. In the event that there is still insufficient work for the District Court judges, we must face the fact that some reduction in the number is inevitable. We will, therefore be proposing legislation, later in the Session, to effect such a reduction.

The Committee recognized that there are serious anomalies and discrepancies appearing in the law from time to time on highly technical matters — matters which do not come in for very much public attention but which, nevertheless, are of serious and vital importance to the people concerned. These things are sometimes brought to the attention of the Government by the Law Society or by individual lawyers or judges writing to the Government, and for many years lawyers in this province and in other provinces have been asking for some kind of formal machinery to be established to facilitate the transfer of this information to the department of Government concerned. They recommended, therefore, that a Law Reform Committee be established in this province.

We do not propose, at this time, to involve the Treasury in any additional expense in the functioning of such a committee, but we would be very happy if the lawyers and the judges would designate a list of nominees who would be willing to serve on such a committee, if they were appointed. And, if such a group of voluntary members can be got together, we are prepared to designate one of the law officers of the Department to act in a part-time capacity as secretary of such a committee. I am convinced that such a committee could perform a useful service, although it would not be an onerous duty to serve on the committee — a matter of meeting once or twice a year to consider proposals or to consider complaints that have been sent in to the committee, direct the secretary to do some research, some study on the problems and then the committee, either through the Law Society or directly to the Government or to the department would make its recommendations for the consideration of the Government.

Saskatchewan will be the first province in Canada to take this step which has been so long advocated by lawyers all across the country.

Some of the other recommendations of the Committee were directed to the judges and to the Federal Government, and copies of the reports have gone forward to the Federal Government and to the judges. Of the proposals directed to the Government of Saskatchewan,

February 21, 1958

I have already indicated some of the principal ones, and I have already suggested that many of them will be implemented. Several others will be implemented, which I will make reference to on second reading of the Bill.

About half of the specific recommendations directed to this Government will find their way into legislation at the current Session of the Legislature. The others will be the subject of continuing study.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn my attention to the work of enforcing the Criminal Law, the work of the Magistrates and the justices of the peace.

The House may be interested to know that, in 1956-57, of all the criminal prosecutions and prosecutions under Provincial Statutes and municipal by-laws, the case-load was divided as follows: The Court of Queen's Bench heard 46 cases; the District Court Judges' Criminal Court had 64 cases; Provincial magistrates disposed of 14,232 cases; and Justices of the Peace disposed of 26,625 cases.

You will note from that, that the Justices of the peace disposed of almost twice as many as the other tribunals taken together. And so that the House will have detailed statistics, Mr. Speaker, on the work, on the distribution of these cases, itemizing the principal sections of the Criminal Code and Provincial Statutes under which these prosecutions were made, I would be happy to place this table on the record, so that it may be printed with Hansard, if there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: — Is consent of the House granted?

(Agreed)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS
for the period April 1, 1956 to March 31, 1957

	J.Ps's		Magistrates		D.C. Judges		Q.B. Judges	
	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Conv.</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Conv.</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Conv.</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Conv.</u>
<u>Offences Under</u>								
Sec. 221 C.C.C.	33	33	27	25	3	2	-	-
Sec. 222 C.C.C.	18	17	23	19	-	-	-	-
Sec. 223 C.C.C.	487	485	393	372	4	1	2	1
All other C.C.C. cases	1210	1182	3703	3432	30	24	31	17
Other Fed. Offences	1233	1231	879	855	20	11	11	9
Total Fed. Offences	2981	2948	5025	4703	57	38	44	27
Liquor Act	4093	4066	1683	1590	1	1	2	1
Vehicles Act (Speeding)	2394	2394	530	516	1	1	-	-
Vehicles Act (All others)	9876	9862	2695	2555	2	-	-	-
Highways Trans. Act	389	389	19	14	2	2	-	-
Ed. & Hospital Tax	64	64	54	50	-	-	-	-
Sask. Hos. Act	180	180	47	47	-	-	-	-
Fuel Petroleum Products Act	458	458	43	42	-	-	-	-
Stray Animals Act	6	6	1	-	-	-	-	-
Recovery of Wages Act	5	5	18	16	-	-	-	-
Game Act	280	280	34	32	-	-	-	-
All other Prov. Statutes	235	230	364	282	1	1	-	-
Total Prov. Offences	17,980	17,934	5,488	5,144	7	5	2	1
Municipal By-Laws	5,664	5,659	3,719	3,593	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	26,625	26,541	14,232	13,340	64	43	46	28

February 21, 1958

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The large number of cases handled by the justices of the peace cannot help but impress us with the importance of the work which justices of the peace do in this province. Saskatchewan has been very fortunate in the high quality and calibre, in the high standard of fairness and competence, of the justices of the peace, which we have had. In a widely-scattered population, living under frontier conditions as we have in this province, the justice of the peace is a very vital pillar in the community. Even today, with better transportation facilities, we look forward to continuing to have capable and competent men of integrity to offer themselves for this position in each community. However, as the province progresses and becomes better off, we always hope to try and improve the quality of services to our citizens. In frontier days, I suppose, the man who could read and write became the local schoolmaster and now we hope to provide for school teachers, people who have specialized qualifications and university educations. Likewise, we require advanced training for our agricultural representatives, our social workers, and so on.

Where freedom and liberty of the people is concerned, our people demand, and have a right to expect, that the very best skill and training shall be available to them in their justices. For this reason, we have added to the number of trained and salaried magistrates in the province during the past year. On April 1st last, we have eight full-time provincial police magistrates paid out of the provincial treasury. In addition, there were two magistrates paid by the city and in addition to that there were also two more whose salaries were shared by the province and the municipalities — or making a total of twelve. In addition to these twelve, there were four part-time magistrates.

During the current year, the Province has assumed responsibility for paying the salary of all magistrates in the province. This will cost some \$30,000 extra, each year, and it will relieve the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Swift Current and Weyburn of their respective portions of that burden. The number of full-time magistrates in the province has, during the past fiscal year, been increased from 12 to 17, and the number of part-time magistrates has declined from four to two. Some further increase in the number is provided for, in 1958. The amount of the use made of provincial magistrates has, however, risen in a spectacular way. Final figures for the current fiscal year will not be available for some months yet. We have, however, Royal Canadian Mounted Police reports of prosecutions each month, and I will refer to them in a few moments.

Early last year, the R.C.M.P. were requested by this department to use the services of salaried magistrates wherever possible, except in those cases where serious inconvenience would be caused to the public and in such cases as involve inter-provincial transport workers and transients and others. At the same time, each magistrate

was asked to work out a weekly or fortnightly itinerary which would take him to every detachment point in his district, and this itinerary was supplied to the R.C.M. Police with the request to which I have already referred.

As a result of these steps, there has been, as I have already said, a phenomenal increase in the percentage of work done by trained and salaried magistrates. In the first nine months of the present fiscal year, of R.C.M. Police cases, the percentage handled by salaried magistrates has risen from less than 20 per cent to more than 78 per cent of the total. These results, in my opinion, are very satisfactory. The few days delay which is occasioned by the accused having to wait until the magistrate comes to town, gives him a chance to consult with his friends, perhaps with his lawyer, and to reflect upon the plea that he should enter and the defence which he should conduct. The holding of regular trials at scheduled times and places gives some formality to the Court's proceedings, and some publicity, which, in my opinion is an essential ingredient of trial and punishment. Trained magistrates, accustomed as they are through adjudicating upon hundreds of cases a year, are in a position to apply a more or less uniform standard — I don't say uniform penalties, I say a uniform standard — of judgment in applying penalties to convicted persons. This, I am pleased to report, has put an end to the all-too-prevalent complaint of people who have been convicted and who didn't really know that they had ever been in court. They thought they had been fined or put in gaol by the police, not recognizing the informality of the Justice of the Peace Court as being a court of law.

We will probably never have enough trained magistrates in the province to take care of all cases, desirable as that might be. It was not possible for me to forecast this program to the House, last year, because so many preparatory steps had to be taken that it was not by any means sure that the program would get under way during the current fiscal year at all. It has been done without any conspicuous increase in the expenditure of money, and has been done simply by organizing the magistrates and the police to make the best use of one another.

Reference was made in His Honour's Speech to the Government's intention to extend our program of legal aid to persons charged with offences and who have no funds to conduct their own defence.

I would like to say something about the legal aid now provided by the Provinces. For several years now, since this Government came into power, the Crown has paid the fees for defence counsel when assigned by the trial judge to the case. The fee was set at \$50 per day in murder cases, and \$25 per day in other cases, in the Queen's Bench and District Court judges criminal court. The fee of \$50 per day

February 21, 1958

applies only in murder cases. In addition, the Crown assures that the witness' fees and transportation fees of all witnesses on behalf of the accused persons will be paid. Also, the copy of the transcript of the preliminary hearing is supplied to the counsel for the defence, and that amounts also to a substantial item. In all such cases, however, the fee which the counsel accepts must be accepted by him in lieu of all fees for that service. He is not permitted to collect also from the accused to supplement this small fee provided for this service by the provincial treasury.

The Canadian Bar Association at its 1957 annual meeting devoted a good deal of time and discussion to this problem, and it would appear, from the discussions and the contributions made by lawyers of other provinces, that Saskatchewan now leads most of the other provinces in Canada in providing these services.

There is another type of very helpful assistance available to accused persons in Saskatchewan which is provided gratuitously by the members of the Law Society. At several judicial centres, principally the larger judicial centres, a panel of lawyers, who have volunteered to serve without fee in defending impecunious accused persons, is available. It is working very well particularly in the Magistrates' Court, where this financial provision does not apply. The principal defect, however, of both of these schemes, is that adequate coverage is provided in rural areas. Now that these cases in rural areas are being tried by magistrates, we hope that it will be possible to achieve some uniformity in applying these benefits in rural areas also. The principal defect or shortcoming of the free system provided by the Law Society is that it is only available in the principal cities, the larger cities, of the province. I think that we ought to aim at not only spreading this service out more widely, but also making it more efficient by providing it at an earlier stage in the proceedings, before it actually gets to the Judge at the preliminary hearing stage. The services ought to be available from the beginning, and that is one of the shortcomings we hope to remedy in the immediate future in this regard.

The problem has, however, been considered ameliorated during the past six months or so, because of the fact trained magistrates are hearing most of the criminal cases in the province now. It is not an uncommon thing to see a situation where a constable who has no particular legal training, lays a charge, the accused pleads "guilty" and the magistrate on asking the accused about the circumstances and hearing his story, instructs him to enter a plea of "not guilty", and on the police presenting their evidence, the magistrate acquits the accused.

There is not any longer such a serious risk of people being convicted simply because they do not know what their rights are. That is only a beginning. This legal aid service must be available for serious offences in rural areas as well as in the cities. And it is proposed by the department to invite, besides the hon. members of the Legislature, members of the legal profession and other persons interested in the solution to this problem, to meet some time early in the new fiscal year to discuss and to work out ways and means of remedying these shortcomings. The Government has no hard and fast ideas as to what should be done. We are prepared to do what is reasonable, what can be done, without any waste of public money, and what can be done that will give the benefit of this service to all areas of the province. If we are to attain a more democratic administration of the machinery of justices, there must be no longer a disparity in the weight which the Crown bears against an accused person in the Criminal Courts of this province, and the lack of legal aid is the chief factor which might contribute to that kind of situation.

Mr, Speaker, I propose to have something further to say about judicial reform when I present several pieces of legislation to this House, and something further to say about the administration of the Department, perhaps during the Budget Debate. For the present, I only want to say that, in my opinion the Attorney-General's Department together with all the other departments of this Government, are concerned, and vitally concerned, with the welfare and liberty of the people of Saskatchewan. Everything that is done, everything that is put forward in this Legislature by the Attorney-General's Department and by all of the departments in this Government, are put forward with the end in view that they will result in a substantial improvement in the standard of living of the people and in the standard of welfare and well-being which they enjoy.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I, unreservedly, oppose the amendment of my hon. friend opposite and will support the motion.

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak this evening at all. I just wish to ask for permission to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS

Co-operative Guarantee Act

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn):

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

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — I have now had an opportunity to peruse the proposed amendment, and there is nothing in the proposed amendment that I object to, particularly. As I understand it, it is merely to allow the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to allow a guarantee of over 50 per cent to be made. Perhaps the only observation is the usual one that we on this side of the House make which is that the power should be in the hands of this Assembly rather than the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. However, I assume that this amendment is made at the request of the Credit Unions and for that reason I will not object.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Credit Union Act, 1956

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there is no overall principle involved in these amendments to The Credit Union Act. There are a series of amendments, all of which have been asked by The Saskatchewan Credit Union League. I can run over them. They are, however, really a matter for Committee.

The first amendment, for instance, provides that the Co-Op. Trust Company and Federated Co-operatives will have power to use credit unions for banking purposes. It also gives credit unions the right to act as an agent for the Cooperative Trust Company. We are also asking for an amendment which will increase, in the case of municipalities, the amount which can be borrowed from the credit union. Hon. members remember that, some time ago, we amended The Municipal Act so as to allow municipalities which wanted to, to use a credit union for their bank. These municipalities, at certain seasons of the year, require fairly large credit. Under the present Act there is a limit which

makes it almost impossible for municipalities to use the Credit Union, because it cannot get the large amount of money which it needs. We are proposing, for the municipalities only, raising the amount of money which they can borrow on a short-term basis.

We are also providing some changes in the matter of reserves, which I think can be discussed better in Committee. These reserves have to do mainly with the credit unions that have a checking system, those that have assets of over a million dollars. One final amendment which gives the credit unions, an organization like the Credit Union League, the right to make a contribution to a national Credit Union organization. The hon. members know the credit unions for some years have been anxious ultimately to get not only a provincial credit society, but to get a national credit society with a federal charter. Just as now, the credit unions are able to make deposits with the provincial Credit Society, and thereby help each other. This would allow the provincial Credit Society to make, in turn, a deposit with a national organization. This is a preliminary step to this end. Until they get this charter, the idea would be to set up a national organization to press for such a national charter which would give those authority to join such an organization, and to pay into it.

I think any other details could probably better be discussed in Committee of the Whole, and I would, therefore, move that this Bill No. 3 be now read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Highways and Transportation Act

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, these amendments deal largely with a reclassification of our highway and road system in the province, but, in order to do so, you will note there is a transfer of some of the sections dealing with definitions which have legal interpretations. These we are adding to the old section of definition and are providing for a new classification.

I might point out that when we were working on this problem in the Department, the Canadian Good Roads Association, on which I have a member of my staff working, provided a new classification system for Canada. This was done at the request of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics who were having difficulty in relating the various types and various classifications used in the different provinces.

February 21, 1958

Saskatchewan is the first province to adopt the recommendations of the Canadian Good Roads Association, but in discussing this matter at the Good Roads Convention, last fall, with a number of the other Ministers, I believe that this will become fairly general all across Canada. It will make it much simpler for us to compare work that is being done in the various provinces, when we have the new classification set out.

The other matter we are dealing with here is providing for penalties where stock is allowed to run at large on a provincial highway. You may recall that, a few years ago, we brought in legislation dealing with this matter, but only provided for the impounding of stocks. It is not proving too satisfactory for those who are endeavouring to administer the Act, and we are now providing for a penalty in cases where animals are allowed to run at large, unattended, on a highway system.

That covers what we deal with in this amending Bill, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, they could be more fully dealt with as matters in Committee. I would therefore move second reading of Bill No. 7.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 8 — An Act to Amend The Pipe Lines Act, 1954

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the Bill to amend The Pipe Lines Act is a very simple amendment to provide, that where a Board of Arbitration has given an award for access to property in connection with a pipe line, the award may be registered in the Land Titles Office even though it is an easement and not a title. Details of the Bill can be discussed in Committee. I move the bill be now read the second time.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable difficulty in the administration of this Act. I believe, or at least I have run into a considerable number of cases where people have been waiting for actually years in order to get paid for an easement in the case of pipe lines. I don't think that is too satisfactory. They are not paid any type of compensation for that long wait; there is damage to the crop and so forth, and this thing just waits until the Government, at its leisure, gets around

to paying them. In a number of cases they have had to supply legal counsel to get compensation and I cannot see why merely an award will, or can, be registered and then people can be allowed to go in and enter on the land before an easement has actually been prepared, or the survey made. I understand that would be the case. Actually the only thing that would register is the award which would tie up the entire title until an actual easement could be prepared and executed. I think that would encumbrance a title. I think it would delay proceedings, and I am quite sure it wouldn't help the farmer who owns the land, or whoever he may be, to get compensation any earlier. I certainly cannot see how I can support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Minister is about to close the debate. Anyone else wishing to speak may do so now.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the Bill actually has, I believe more to do with the privately-owned pipe lines than with the publicly-owned pipe lines under the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, though it can apply to both. The amendments were requested by the industry, and the question of speed of settlement will certainly not be affected by this, except that it might be improved in this way that they can get a settlement and get an easement. Previously, if they had to go to arbitration over it, and wanted their award registered in the Land Titles Office, they had to get a title to the land which, in the matter of pipe lines, is not the best way to proceed with it at all. I think this will help the situation. If there are problems in connection with administration, why that's another question altogether.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 10 — An Act respecting the Superannuation of Members and Employees of The Workmen's Compensation Board

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act, being brought in at the request of The Workmen's Compensation Board and its employees. As you know, the various superannuation Acts have been brought in line over the last few years — the Civil Service Superannuation Act; the Act which governs the Power Corporation; the Saskatchewan Government Telephones and so forth. This Act is the last one to be brought into line. I think possibly much

February 21, 1958

of the detail could best be discussed in Committee.

However, I just want to cite an example as to one change that is being made: Section 11. Under the present Act, the employees have been paying 4 per cent into the fund. To bring it in line with the other Acts, you will see that those who commence employment under the age of 30 pay 5 per cent, between 30 and 40 they pay 6 per cent; between 40 and over, they pay 7 per cent.

There is another change that will be noticeable when we get to it — Section 14, sub-section (2), where the present maximum pension is \$2,000 per year. That amount was in all the other Acts, but they have gradually been increased to \$4200 per year. In this Act, we will be raising the amounts of pension payable by \$20 a month, and it will take several years before they get up to the maximum of \$4,200 a year. These are the last important changes in the Act, and with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 10.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Did I understand the Minister to say the pension had been increased to \$4200 in the other Acts as well? Is that the same figure in the Acts we have amended in years gone by?

Mr. Williams: — Yes, they are belatedly catching up to the other Acts, which are at a maximum of \$4200 — they may not be up to that now, but they go up \$200 a year. That will eventually be the maximum.

Mr. McDonald: — They go up \$200 a year, whereas they go up \$20 a month here.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Yes, we're trying to catch up — we're a little late. It's really \$240 a year.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

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