

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 24, 1958

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
Before the Orders of the Day:

TRIBUTE TO OLYMPIC COACH

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to give recognition to one of our native sons, one who has been one of the greatest competitors in the field and track events, and has given unstintingly of his time and efforts to produce some of the great young stars in the field and track in recent years. We have a few men and women who do good work amongst their youth — not too many, unfortunately, and these people often go unheralded for their efforts. Therefore, I would like to recognize and congratulate Mr.'Bob' Adams on his valuable work in being chosen as coach of our Canadian Olympic team.

QUESTION RE LIQUOR LEGISLATION

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an article that appeared in 'The Leader Post' of February 22, 1958, under the heading, "Cookson Raps Liquor Laws". I would like to ask the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board, if it is the intention of the Government to take any notice of the complaint of the Chief of Police of this city, in that the liquor laws might be revised in this Session.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Well, Mr. Speaker, we do, of course, constantly take into consideration the opinions expressed by Chiefs of Police and other people in prominent positions. We have, of course, taken notice of certain requests made in the city of Saskatoon, last year, by the Leader of the Opposition and, may I say, by the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). We have noted with much interest their desire to have The Liquor Act amended, and the Government is giving very serious consideration to this question. No doubt something will be announced in due course.

February 24, 1958

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-In-Reply

The House resumed from Friday, February 21, 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 amendment thereto by Mr. McDonald.

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, last Friday, this House listened to three speeches from the Official Opposition, and immediately following that the Hon. Member from Hanley (Hon. Mr. Walker) very adequately replied to every one of them. So I will not this afternoon take up any time in replying to the speeches made by hon. members opposite.

The Speech from the Throne is a very important and elaborate document. It has, however, been dealt with from one end to the other by members on this side of the House, and I see no reason why I should begin to repeat so many things that have already been said. In regard to the Speech from the Throne, only to say something different from what hon. members opposite are used to, and that is that, in the C.C.F., we have a program that we present to the people of this province whenever there is a general election, and we make a commitment to our people that, if elected, we are going to carry out and fulfil the pledges that we made to our people to the end of that Legislature.

This is being done progressively, year by year, and that is one thing that seems to be difficult for the members on the Opposition to understand, Mr. Speaker. We have a record . . .

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Of broken promises!

Mr. Howe: — These records are available to anybody, and when we go to the people for their endorsement, we want to go to them on the basis of our record, because we have fulfilled our commitments that we made to our people, and we say to them, "We are prepared to go once more on another commitment to our people."

Mr. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — What about in 1944?

Mr. Howe: — The Liberals, on the other hand — in fact it leaked out the other day, that they have a brand new policy now, that they want to forget all about the record of the Liberal past. They want to bury the past because it is so bad, which I intend to try to deal with later on. We, on the other hand, want to establish a record and when we go to the people we'll say, "Here is the record of the C.C.F.! We ask you to put us into office again on another program that we expect to fill in the following Legislature."

The thing that I wish to speak about largely is the crisis facing the agricultural people in Canada.

Mr. Lopton: — That's the C.C.F. Party.

Mr. Howe: — I do so because I do believe that that is the key problem that we have to solve, and in prefacing my remarks I want to remind members that we have gone through a crisis. I am referring now to the last war, and I want to remind you of the crisis that was faced by the British people. When the German air force was almost going to obliterate the British people from the island, the British Prime Minister got busy and spoke to the people of Britain, and he said to them: "We shall have to fight on all fronts, on ground, in the air, on the ocean. Yes, we shall have to fight on our shores and our beaches." He said, "I have nothing to offer you except blood, sweat and tears."

During that same period we had a part to play in that crisis, and the Prime Minister at that time, the late Mackenzie King, got busy and talked to the people of Canada. What did he say that we must do in order to complete and win a victory in the war? He said this, on December 6, 1943:

"Now that we have reached the stage where our total production is used to fight Germany and Japan, all sections of the community can expect, while the war lasts, to continue to improve their standards of living."

He goes on:

"Farm prices out of line with other prices at the start of the war have been adjusted upwards, so that farm income was in a better balance with income of other groups. Farmers were reasonably anxious about their post-war prospects."

He goes on to say this:

"If, to help win the war, the farmers are asked to accept a ceiling on prices, we believe they are entitled to a floor on their prices to ensure against an agricultural depression after the war," said Mackenzie King.

Well now, that is a very fine statement. During the war these price controls brought about stability to the economy of Canada. Everybody accented it as a war measure and as a measure to bring about stability and efficiency in order that we could prosecute the war. But Mackenzie King refers to the post-war period, and he says, and pledges the people, that they are prepared to put floor prices under commodities to avoid an agricultural depression in the post-war period. Well, what came of that? A mouse, I think. The Agricultural Prices Support Act introduced by 'Jimmy' Gardiner — that is what came out of that as an instrument to stabilize prices to the farmers. They voted, or provided \$200 million that was going to be used to stabilize

February 24, 1958

farm commodities, and according to the reports by the Price Support Board at Ottawa, it is found that from 1946 to 31st March 1957, a total of \$94 million had been used out of that \$200 million to stabilize or carry out the function of that Act. But \$70 million of this money had been used during the foot-and-mouth disease crisis. You will remember that embargoes were placed on livestock. We couldn't ship any livestock to the United States. We couldn't ship them to the markets here in many areas. Many herds were destroyed, and \$70 million was used during that foot-and-mouth period. When you deduct \$70 million from \$94 million, we find that only \$24 million had been used, over a period of 11 years, to stabilize farm commodities under the Agricultural Prices Support Act.

I don't know what words to use to describe this situation. However, it certainly has been a dismal failure and it is no wonder that the Liberals want to forget about their record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — They don't want forget it.

Mr. Loptson: — They're proud of their record.

Mr. Howe: — As I mentioned, price control has stopped and I don't believe that we have ever had such a well balanced prosperity in Canada before, as we had during that period of price control. But of course when the war is over, big business gets busy: they want to remove all these restrictions on business . . .

Mr. McDonald: — That will chase industry out!

Mr. Howe: — They want to remove the price controls on these commodities. These people begin to lobby in the House of Commons. Too many parliamentarians lent their ears to their tone. The C.C.F. kept pounding away and fighting and fighting day in and day out, asking the Government to maintain those price controls: but no! Gradually and progressively, price controls were removed from one commodity after another, and want to make this plain right now that the only group in the House of Commons which ever fought for the maintenance of stability and price controls in this country was the C.C.F. I am sorry to have to include the new group in the corner, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Don't be sorry . . .

Mr. Howe: — They have been very kind to me, this group . . .

Mr. Loptson: — That's why we're playing 'political poker'.

Mr. Howe: — But I always believe in laying the cards on the table, and when it becomes necessary, I must say what I think is true. So there we have it: one of the greatest betrayals, I think, of the Liberal party in this country.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Howe: — I know, Mr. Speaker, that I shall not begin to complete what I intended to say this afternoon. We have a Conservative Government now, or we have for awhile; and, of course, they have to do things a little different. They repealed this useless Act that was placed there by the Liberal party, and put in another Act there with just a little different name, but the substance is the same, Mr. Speaker, much the same.

Mr. Loptson: — That one was made for the C.C.F.

Mr. Howe: — One is just as invalid as the other. It was really interesting to note that during the debate on that Bill, the previous Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was always on his feet and arguing that his Bill was better than this one.

Mr. Loptson: — He was right.

Mr. Howe: — So when the time came to vote as to which bill we would have, the Liberals didn't dare to vote against it.

Mr. Loptson: — The C.C.F. didn't, either.

Mr. Howe: — The C.C.F. tried to improve it so that it would do something for the agricultural people of Canada, but in vain.

Mr. Gardiner: — You have the balance of power.

Mr. Howe: — No important amendment was allowed. Consequently the Bill went through. It excludes the main commodities we produce in western Canada. It excludes wheat, oats and barley, the main crops that are produced by the farmers in Saskatchewan. They are not included in the Bill, Mr. Speaker. So I say it is empty; it has no value.

It reminds me of a joke, Mr. Speaker, that I believe Jake Schultze told in the House of Commons . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Yet he voted for it.

Mr. Gardiner: — This should be good.

Mr. Howe: — . . . when he tried to describe the value of this Bill. He said one day there was a very fat lady walking down the street, and behind her were 2 little boys. Along she comes to a little scale where she could put a coin in to be weighted. She gets on the scale and the little boys start peeking around, and it only registered 60. So one boy said to the other: "Why, is that all she weighs?" The other boy looked at her and said: "I believe the bag is empty".

So is this agricultural stabilization Act of the Conservative Party. It is exactly as empty as the Act passed by the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Gardiner.

There is just one more thing I want to deal with. There are many things I would like to deal with, but there is one thing I want to draw to the attention of members of this House and the people of Saskatchewan,

February 24, 1958

and that is the conference that was held here in Regina, last fall. That to me was really a historic event. It was one of the most representative gatherings, I believe, that has ever met in the history of Saskatchewan. This morning I went down to the library to get a list of all of the official delegates who were here representing official organizations, and I find that there were 24. There were 24 official delegates representing 24 different organizations in Saskatchewan. I think that is remarkable. Then we had, too, observers which were almost as many as the delegates who attended the Conference. The thing that is important to me is that the C.C.F. Government in this province have always tried to keep in close touch with all the people in Saskatchewan on every level of local government.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Some effort!

Mr. Gardiner: — They sure don't appreciate it.

Mr. Howe: — This is a demonstration of how we are determined to meet with these local government representatives to discuss the problems that face every level of government in this province.

Mr. McDonald: — And do nothing about it!

Mr. Howe: — And the Liberal members opposite, whenever they get up to speak, are talking about the tenure of this Government, and saying that we are not doing something to help to start young farmers out on the farms. I am not so sure that we would be doing a kind deed to any young man or woman to send them out in debt to try to farm and make a living under the conditions of agriculture today.

Mr. Gardiner: — Shame! Shame!

Mr. McDonald: — Shame! Not much faith in farming.

Mr. Loptson: — Chasing farmers off the land.

Mr. Howe: — The point I am coming to now, Mr. Speaker, is that, at the concluding hours of this Conference, representatives of all these local groups in this province came to one conclusion. No matter what hon. gentlemen opposite may think, this representative body in Saskatchewan came to one conclusion. Having discussed, as we had, all the problems of education, roads, hospitalization, and all the problems of social welfare, it was recognized that, unless we can improve the financial status of our agricultural people in Saskatchewan, we are not going to need to do very much planning. So they recognize, even though hon. members do not recognize, the responsibility of the Federal Government in seeing to it that agriculture has a right to demand that we get a reasonably fair share of the national income in this country, and be on an equal basis with other citizens of this country.

Here is what this Conference finally concluded: 'This Conference go on record as recommending deficiency payments be paid from the treasury of Canada on wheat, oats and barley delivered to the Canadian Wheat Board

payments to be based on at least 20 cents per bushel for wheat, and an appropriate amount on oats and barley, delivered in the crop year 1955-56, the end of which marketing period was May, 1957.

"And further, realizing that the big drop in farm income has been in the above grains, deficiency payments apply also to the 1956-57 deliveries, when that marketing period ends."

That goes to prove, if nothing else does, that all worthwhile people representing local governments in this province, agree with us that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to see to it that agriculture gets a fair share of the national income in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need tell anyone what I intend to do about that insignificant amendment.

Mr. Gardiner: — Nothing!

Mr. Howe: — I certainly shall vote against the amendment, and I am very happy to support the motion.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take my part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to compliment the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) and my seat-mate, the hon. member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), on the fine job they did in moving and seconding the Address-in-Reply. I think they have been, indeed, a credit to the constituencies which they represent.

I would like to preface my remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, by drawing your attention to some reports that you read in the paper and hear on the radio, which would lead you to think that governments were some munificent organization which out of their largess distributed funds and gave gifts to the people. We all realize that this is entirely false, that all government does is spend the people's money for them. The true criteria, I feel, of how good and efficient a government is, is how well they can spend this money for the people and how they can foster the well-being of the people under their control economically, socially or morally, and that they can give a far-sighted leadership for the future. I think, in this regard that the Government of Saskatchewan has a very enviable record.

I would like first, Mr. Speaker, to commend this Government on its leadership along the line of public health. We are all very glad to see, at this time that a prepaid hospitalization plan is being introduced into Canada.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — That was supposed to be free.

Mr. Wood: — We hope it will be coming very shortly, at this time, and we are very proud to be able to point out, as was pointed out in the Speech from the Throne, that this program was originally

February 24, 1958

pioneered in this province some 11 years ago. It is no accident, my friends, that the hospitalization program, which is now being accepted throughout all of Canada to a more or less degree was pioneered here in C.C.F. Saskatchewan, and that the only other province that has had a program of its own and was ready to go when this Bill was first brought down a couple of years ago was British Columbia, where we have a very strong C.C.F. opposition. These two provinces have sowed the ground.

We in Saskatchewan have gone a little further in our health regions where we have a program for preventive medicine, and down around Swift Current, way in Health Region No. 1, we have gone still a step further by having instituted there an active prepaid medical health program whereby, to all intents and purposes, all your doctors' bills are paid by the plan. In regard to your X-rays at the hospital, your cardiograms and so on, if they are done at the hospital on the referral of a doctor, or if you are referred out of region by a doctor, half of the cost of your treatment is paid; or if you are caught unawares in an emergency sickness while you are away on holidays, half of the cost of these things is paid on the basis of what it would cost if they were done in the health region itself.

As I have said here before, I think that although the Saskatchewan Government does subsidize this plan and is responsible in sponsoring it primarily, a good deal of the credit for its success is due to the Health Region Board and the Health Region staff in Swift Current Health Region itself. In fact, to the people of Swift Current it is entirely incomprehensible why other parts of Saskatchewan do not get in there right away and see if they cannot institute something along the same line for themselves in their own health region. This health region program is very popular with the people of our area.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — That's what you tell us.

Mr. Wood: — At this time certain trouble has arisen in regard to the conflict with another prepaid health plan, namely that of the non-operating railway employees. And, at the present time, they are being compelled to pay twice for the same services. I believe this is a very serious situation. It is unthinkable, so far as I am concerned, that a satisfactory Government program should be expected to abdicate the plan that they have in operation, in preference to any private plan covering only a small sector of the people; and yet this small minority is definitely being penalized at the present time. I feel very strongly that, if their union officials are not able to get them redress it is up to the Government of this province to see what they can do, by negotiation or otherwise, to see that this double taxation is lifted from these people.

I notice in the Speech from the Throne that there are some 20 housing projects for our senior citizens now in operation in the

province, and some 26 in the process of completion. I think our Government is to be strongly commended on the program they have carried out in assisting in the building of these projects and in the part they are doing, to help out with the maintenance thereafter. I think, again, that the local government bodies are also to be complimented on the way they have shown the initiative of going ahead and using the money that is loaned by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for this purpose.

I think our Government is also to be complimented upon the opening of the Geriatric Centre here in Regina. I think these nursing homes are filling a real need in the province, and there is a great deal more need in this field of operation. While the housing problems of our older people, who are more or less able to look after themselves, are being, to quite an extent I believe, filled by such housing projects as the Prairie Pioneer Lodge in Swift Current and other such ones throughout the province that I have just mentioned, I understand there is a long waiting list of those who want entry into these nursing homes. I think that, if we could just look behind some of the names on this waiting list, we would find there is lots of hardship entailed for those who are waiting for a place, for those who are not able to care for themselves in the ordinary manner. We feel there is a real need for more of these nursing homes, and we think there is a special need for one in the southwest corner of the province. And need it be said that I think we could use one very well in Swift Current?

I see that my time is drawing to a close, Mr. Speaker, and I am afraid that I shall have to curtail some of the things I had intended to any this afternoon.

Mr. Gardiner: — Go ahead.

Mr. Wood: — But I do want to say something about taxation. Last week, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) compared the taxes per capita of real property in Saskatchewan with that in other provinces. He obtained his figures, I expect, from the year book of "The Citizen Research Institute of Canada". There was another set of figures in this year book which he did not quote, namely, that the gross debenture debt per capita at December 31, 1955, was \$201.30 in Alberta, \$98.81 in Manitoba, and only \$77.52 in Saskatchewan. He forgot to quote those figures.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Very conveniently.

Mr. Wood: — Now while these figures quoted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition deal with all real property in Saskatchewan, I think that a more fair yardstick to be used in connection with rural property, is to quote taxes on a per-quarter-section basis. After all, when you start quoting taxes on a per capita basis, I don't think anyone using that form of levying taxes would last very long in a municipal office. And I think it is quite understandable that perhaps the farmers of Saskatchewan should have to pay higher taxes per capita

February 24, 1958

than in some other places because, especially in the southwest of the province, Saskatchewan is more noted for its large farms than for its dense population.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this whole argument regarding quoting per capita figures on farm taxation, reminds me of a conversation I had with a neighbour of ours, quite some years ago. I told him he got more rain than I did. He was just starting to put up quite an argument when I told him that he should get more rain than I did, he had more land. But looking up the annual reports of the Department of Municipal Affairs of the three prairie provinces, I find that the latest figures available to me show that, in Manitoba, the taxes per quarter-section were \$134.40; in Alberta, \$115.90, and in Saskatchewan \$86.40.

I think the real trouble at this time is not a matter of high taxation in Saskatchewan; the real trouble is the lack of ability on the part of the Saskatchewan farmer to pay the taxes that are levied. There has been rather, I think, a pitiful argument put up by the hon. members across the floor in trying to pin the blame for this on the Saskatchewan Government. We will know that matters concerning trade and commerce are beyond the control of this Government; and, unless the Federal Government wakes up, or unless we send enough C.C.F. M.P.'s from the west to wake them up for us, and keep them awake to the real needs of the western farmers, things are liable to get worse instead of better.

At the present time, as we have heard, the average net income per farmer in Saskatchewan is \$1,905 per annum, or approximately \$36.63 per week. Less than one-third of the farmers of Saskatchewan receive this amount or more. Two-thirds of the farmers of Saskatchewan receive less than the average. We must have parity prices for our farmers, or deficiency payments, if we are to be able to carry on in this province.

It is this lack of finance for our farming community which is underlying many of the difficulties of the Government of this province in trying to bring in suitable services and suitable roads and so on for the farmers of this province. And let me point out, in passing, that the situation at the present time for labour is not too rosy either. There are far too many of our working men who are trying to support a family and pay rent on \$200 a month. There are far too many in this province that I know of, and you'll find them throughout all of Canada for that matter. And what hope is there in store for them? Suppose we do get these parity prices or deficient payments; suppose that labour is able to increase their wages. Immediately the prices rise, and they are blamed for this same increase. What we must have is what the hon. member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe) was just referring to. We must have price control and while the C.C.F. Government in this province is not able of itself to institute these controls. I feel that this Government has been able to hold aloft a torch to light the way to economic freedom for all, that is seen throughout the North American continent.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support the amendment, but I do support the motion.

Mr. Nicholson: — Before the hon. member takes his seat, I would like some clarification of the municipal figures he used, please.

Mr. Wood: — I'll send them over.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to extend my congratulations to those speakers from both sides of the House who have preceded me in this debate, particularly to the mover and seconder of the Address, both of whom I believe did a very excellent job — one speaking in behalf of labour, and the other speaking so eloquently in behalf of agriculture.

I wish, also, to congratulate the opposition on its valiant but futile attempt to criticize the soundness of the Throne Speech. It has always been a puzzle to me to understand why hon. members opposite don't understand the division of responsibility between the Federal and Provincial governments. They know as well as I know, as well as every farmer in Saskatchewan knows, that provincial governments are responsible primarily for production, that national government is responsible for research experimentation and marketing, particularly of farm commodities that go into interprovincial and export trade. And none of their political tactics of endeavouring to focus attention on this administration, as though somehow we were to blame for the cost-price squeeze.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Sure you are.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And that somehow, now, we are to subsidize the mistakes of the federal Liberal government.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — You are obstructing the sale of wheat.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is beyond understanding, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan will accept that kind of criticism for exactly what it is worth.

Mr. Loptson: — It's the truth.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, the hon. member for Saltcoats keeps repeating over and over, in the hope that probably he can convince himself, if no one else, that some of his arguments have some basis of fact. I wonder why this is so.

Mr. Loptson: — I was convinced long ago that you are no good.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, now that agricultural problems are in the forefront and my hon. friends

February 24, 1958

opposite, being of a guilty turn of mind, and no this is a federal election campaign, they hope, somehow, that they can distract attention from the failure of the Federal Government and place the responsibility here.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — You think John is all right, do you?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I propose, in the time at my disposal, to deal with some of their criticism which has absolutely no basis in fact.

Mr. McDonald: — Tell us about John.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition suggests that the Throne Speech, insofar as agriculture is concerned, doesn't indicate any clear-cut agricultural policy. Again, they are the only people in Saskatchewan who don't know of the clear-cut agricultural policy followed by this administration since the time it came into office, and well supported with assistance programs and well supported by expanded extension services that never existed in the time of their administration.

The long-term agricultural policy was clearly explained many years ago . . .

Mr. McDonald: — And never heard of since.

Mr. McCarthy: — Tell John about it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and I have repeated it many times since — oh yes, my hon. friends opposite keep on meowing just like a cat that has a cup full of milk, but still keeps meowing anyhow; but I am going to show them, and the people of this province that their arguments have absolutely no basis at all. I merely point out that when this administration took over we had an agricultural budget of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$600,000. That budget is well over \$5 1/2 millions at the present time.

Mr. Loptson: — Six hundred thousand out of over \$100 million?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I am going to tell you plenty about it before I am through, sir, and you can have an opportunity to speak when I am through.

Mr. Loptson: — Do you mean to say there is only \$600,000 out of . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Out of curiosity I went over their Throne Speeches of the previous Liberal administration, and to anyone in this province who doesn't believe me, I suggest that he go to the library and take a look at some of those old Throne Speeches completely barren of any constructive policies for the agricultural industry of this province.

Mr. Loptson: — Surely you are making a mistake on those figures.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I suggest, too, that anyone who wishes to do so should look over the Throne Speeches in regard to agriculture since this administration come into power . . .

Mr. Loptson: — What have they got to do with us today?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and they will readily see the programs and policies that have now materialized into great benefit for our provincial agriculture.

Our policy had two primary purposes. One was by all means — by extension, by earned assistance programs and other means and through other agencies, to bring about a greater degree of agricultural stability in the province; and, secondly, by promoting a sound land-use program to increase our overall production in the province of Saskatchewan. That was the primary basic objective of our overall agricultural policy.

How have we gone about putting this policy into effect? First of all, I wish to relate and take some excerpts from the Throne Speeches of this administration over the past few years, and I will make very brief reference to them just to drive home the point that hon. members must have neglected reading these Throne Speeches, when they say this Government has no agricultural policy.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In 1947, the Throne Speech announced the establishment of 36 agricultural representative districts and the setting up of district agricultural representative boards and local municipal agricultural committees as part of an overall co-operative extension program between the provincial Department of Agriculture, the University of Saskatchewan, and the Federal service. It was the first time that we have ever had a co-operative integrated program between these various Government agencies, including the University. I might say, that when we took office in this province we only had a small number of agricultural representatives, many of whom were living in the two main cities, Saskatoon and Regina. This program represents a dispersal of agricultural representatives into the areas of the province by district, in order that they could more adequately serve our farm people.

Mr. Loptson: — They were doing a good job then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The 1947 Throne Speech announced the organization of a Conservation and Development division in the interests of stabilizing livestock production. It records the

February 24, 1958

establishment of 11 secondary service districts. Legislation for programs weren't in existence in 1944 were ushered in and brought in by this administration.

We can take a look at the 1948 Throne Speech announcing agreement with the Federal Government on irrigation development and the addition of an irrigation division to the conservation and development aspect of the Lands Branch at that time. And I might say, that up until 1948 the previous provincial government had no program or no agreement with the Federal Government on irrigation. And I want to say right here that the previous administration never did any irrigation, and they never did any drainage, as a responsibility of the province. That is correct. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) looks at me — this is 100 per cent correct.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — "Toby or not to be."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And they had no program to carry on extensive drainage, irrigation and dry-land reclamation work.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — You're all wet!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And yet they have the audacity to stand up and say that we haven't any agricultural policy!

Mr. Lopton: — We did drainage work in 1922.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If the hon. member for Saltcoats went right out in the rain he would say it was dry — and he is dry.

Mr. Lopton: — I know; I did some draining, myself.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The voices opposite sound pretty hollow and dry in this Chamber, echoing as they do, little bits of nothing.

Mr. McDonald: — We're getting a lot of nothing now.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The 1948 Throne Speech also announced the transfer of all agricultural lands from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture in order that those lands could be administered in conformity with a long-term policy land disposition. I will say more in regard to the result of the policy. A long-term Crown land pasture lease policy was instituted in order that the primary objective of our over-all policy could be achieved. It was the first time that a lease agreement was provided to our Crown grazing leases that would encourage them to improve the carrying capacity of their leased land.

Also announced in the 1948 Throne Speech were grants to agricultural societies to provide accommodation for agricultural vocational short courses, and new veterinary services.

The 1949 Throne Speech announced a further expansion of the Irrigation and Reclamation division to the status of a full-fledged Branch of the Department of Agriculture, now known as the Conservation and Development Branch. This Branch alone, Mr. Speaker, in the year of our freak floods, spent over \$3 million in behalf of drainage reclamation.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — That's when you exploded the dynamite.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The 1949 Throne Speech also mentioned that there were local agricultural committees co-operating with the ag reps in almost every municipality in Saskatchewan; again a notation of progress in the implementation of the broad long-term policy that I mentioned at the outset.

I wish to mention at this point another significant factor which, I believe, has been of greater help to the farmers of this province than anything else that could be done in my Department or in any other department. In 1945, the Throne Speech announced the establishment of an integrated power network for the province; and our Opposition friends of that day opposed it bitterly right up to the end, Mr. Speaker.

In the 1949 Throne Speech it states that "the Legislature will be asked to approve legislation for a long-term rural electrification program." Compare that, Mr. Speaker, with the 123 or 125 farms that were electrified up to 1944.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — One hundred and twenty-six.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, 126 — give or take one or two; it doesn't make any difference. But, as a result of this program announced in 1949, very nearly 50,000 farms have been electrified. Power has been of immeasurable benefit to the rural areas of this province and represents no ordinary task. This is an extraordinary accomplishment occurring as it does in a sparsely populated province, devoid completely of any natural advantage in regard to hydro-power development. It is indeed an accomplishment. My friends know of the great popularity amongst our farm people of our rural electrification program. It is for that reason they constantly pick on it, and hope that, somehow or other, they can create antagonism, against rural electrification; and they hope that every time a farmer pays his bill for electricity, somehow or other he will associate that with the cost-price squeeze, when, as a

February 24, 1958

matter of fact, the farmers' electrical costs are the only costs that have come down in this period of Federal Liberal inflation. And my farmer friends well know that the cheapest hired man they have on the farm today is the electric service that is now available to them.

Mr. Loptson: — It is still 50 per cent higher than Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — My friends aren't going to fool anyone at all in this province. The farmers of this province realize the facts far more, and have a better understanding of current matters, than members opposite themselves have.

Mr. Gardiner: — Don't worry about us.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In 1931 it was announced that cash payments would be made to Crown lessees on the Crown units, and, Mr. Speaker, I am glad now to turn in a different direction, and indicate the progress that has been made in terms of actual expenditures for the various Branches and the policies associated with them.

I would like to mention in regard to clearing and breaking there was spent in the Lands Branch alone, or provided, \$5,182,000 in behalf of lessees for clearing and breaking on Crown land. Much has been done in the establishment of young farmers in the agricultural industry, and, without interest payments on their part. I believe this is a good policy, and is one of the best that has been inaugurated anywhere for the purpose of establishing young farm people who have limited financial means. In addition to this expenditure, the Lands Branch has paid out, since the inauguration of our provincial pasture program, \$812,000 for acquisition of land and improvement for pastures, and at the moment, starting from one provincial pasture in 1944 we have now well over 20 provincial pastures. I want to say that there are over 20,000 farmers in Saskatchewan who are benefiting either as a result of the establishment of provincial pastures, or of co-operative pastures where we also assist, and also in the disposition of land for individual units. The assistance in stabilization of some 20,000 farm units I say is a matter of some merit, Mr. Speaker.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Under our earned assistance policy for co-operative pasture development, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$300,000 has been paid out through the Agricultural Representative Branch to assist co-operatives in the establishment of well over 80 cooperative pastures and fodder projects. In addition, there are many other earned-assistance policies — too many to enumerate. I hold here in my hand, for the benefit of hon. members opposite, our book of policies. It is approximately 16 inches long, and I would say about 10 inches wide and about 1 1/2 inches thick and is crammed full of policies

and programs associated with each Branch of the Department. I suggest to the hon. members opposite that they read some of this information and that they also read the Annual Report of the Department.

Mr. Gardiner: — Send it over then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I don't think it would be of much effect, however, because people who are politically frightened and politically desperate are not prone to reading, Mr. Speaker. They only hope they can win some support by their type of negative criticism.

In the Conservation and Development Branch . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Read on!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . in behalf of drainage, irrigation and dry-land reclamation there was spent some \$11,848,000 since this agency became a full-fledged branch in 1949. This has also been of tremendous benefit to many thousands of farmers in our province. Regarding the Agricultural Representative Services, I am glad to say that, as a result of the expansion of this service, I need only mention that Saskatchewan now ranks among the top provinces in the number of boys and girls we have in the 4-H Club movement.

The Plant Industry Branch has the responsibility for implementing our forage crop program and has been of material assistance in providing forage feed at cost to the farmers throughout the province. The thousands of farmers who have received forage feed through the Department under this policy will certainly tell the hon. members opposite that the Department has very firm and beneficial policies for them.

I would like to take a moment to indicate by one example, the interest of our Department in a more stable and balanced agriculture. This example is in the Plant Industry Branch. A year ago, the experimental farm at Swift Current had a new variety of alfalfa seed — Rambler alfalfa. They gave to us 123 lbs. of this seed in order to multiply it. We took this 123 lbs. of seed to California, where we placed it under contract with a grower there. We got back, a few weeks ago, 52,000 lbs. of Rambler alfalfa. Now I don't know whether hon. members opposite know of this new variety or not. When I sit down I am going to send them a pamphlet about Rambler alfalfa. It would have taken at least six years to have multiplied that much seed under climatic conditions here, so we pushed this very suitable variety of alfalfa forward by a number of years as a result of action taken.

I just mention these things, in passing, to indicate to the hon. members opposite that it doesn't look as though

February 24, 1958

the Minister of Agriculture has been "sitting on his haunches". I am not particularly notable, Mr. Speaker, for sitting on my haunches.

Mr. Gardiner: — What are you sitting on?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And the hon. member posed the question too: "Where was the Minister of Agriculture when the budget was drafted?"

Mr. Cameron: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Cameron: — He was out in his pasture.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It would have been just as foolish to have asked: "Where was General Stonewall Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans?"

Mr. McDonald: — The same place as the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He thought he had a point when he referred to the announcement in the Throne Speech of the setting up of an amendment to the Farm Implement Act, providing for the setting up of a testing organization and the administration of the Act by a Board. He said: "Why, this Farm Implement Act isn't going to help the farmer; it is not going to help the cost-price squeeze." I wonder if the hon. member thought that it was intended to help the cost-price squeeze! I want to say to him that that Act was not intended for this at all. It was intended to deal with a field of service that comes completely within the jurisdiction of the province; and I am going to say here, that it is one of the most forward steps that has been taken anywhere, by any province in Canada, or perhaps any state in the Union.

Mr. McDonald: — Who gave you the idea?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The matter of testing farm machinery under actual working conditions and field conditions will be of immeasurable benefit to our farmers. It will mark the first time they will have available to them results of the testing that will be taking place under actual conditions. I have always felt that a farmer had every right to this protection, particularly so in view of the fact that in a high year over \$90 million was spent by Saskatchewan farmers for machinery and implement repair parts. It is little enough protection, and I am sure this Government's action in setting up this testing organization will go a long way towards improving the usability of machinery for our farmers, and certainly will prevent the sale of faulty new rakes that come on the market periodically . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You were going to do that four years ago.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . from being placed in the hands of the farmers with no benefit and often at a complete loss to them.

The hon. members opposite made some slighting reference to the statement in the Throne Speech to the effect that our livestock population was at the highest point in Saskatchewan history. The reason it was mentioned, Mr. Speaker — and I am very proud of it and was very proud to be able to announce it — is that when this statement was made in the Throne Speech it means that the policies I have tried to outline very briefly to the House have been successfully implemented.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The response has been good. Just to indicate to hon. members what this means in terms of getting greater agricultural stability; it might interest hon. members to know that the value of sale of livestock products by Saskatchewan farmers, last year (1957) reached \$155 million, compared to \$151 million in 1951 when cattle prices were almost double what they were in 1957. Therefore, this increase in livestock numbers and record in marketing and the \$155 million income from livestock products was certainly a tremendous contribution to the stability of farm income in this province, particularly since we had a short crop this year. This is the kind of crop insurance that is within our field of jurisdiction in the province and I believe we have done well to achieve such an advance.

The hon. members overlook another significant fact in the Throne Speech when they ridicule the expansion of our community pasture program. I am very proud that, this year, we have an opportunity of expanding our community pasture program in the interests of better balance in our agriculture, particularly in the northern area.

The hon. members overlooked a further statement contained in the Throne Speech (and the hon. Premier has made a reference to it), indicating that we anticipated, and we were hopeful, that, when the matter of financing of the South Saskatchewan project was to be finalized, we would begin the construction of that project. This will entail a tremendous financial outlay to the province. To give hon. members some indication of what this means in terms of financing . . .

Mr. Loftson: — It shouldn't cost you anything.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and the part that the Department of Agriculture will play in it, the Provincial Government is assuming a financial obligation in the nature of some \$25 million towards the dam itself. This was the 'extra' put in by Mr. Gardiner and continued by the present administration.

Mr. Lopton: — Why should it cost you anything?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Thirty-six million dollars for works beyond the dam which are recognized as a provincial responsibility, and then something in the neighbourhood of \$20 million for the power plant, making a grand total of approximately \$81 million. When one considers that in conjunction with the present Power Corporation's expansion program, committed as they are to an additional \$80 million outlay in generating capacity at Estevan and Saskatoon, a person gets some idea of the financial problems faced by this province, and it is only in regard to the financing that this project is held up at the moment.

Now we would have been foolish, in the Department, to have barged out on a tremendous expenditure in any other direction, knowing that perhaps we would be committed to this project. Hon. members opposite know that; it was mentioned in the Throne Speech. However, they endeavour to make capital out of it and belittle the fact that we are expanding our community pasture program. In this 'wait-and-see' interval on the South Saskatchewan, I was very pleased that the Department was able to have an expanded program in the field of community pasture development.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) took a trip into the stratosphere when he was speaking. He seemed to be inspired by Shakespeare's Hamlet "To be or not to be; that is the question."

Mr. McDonald: — "Toby or not to be?"

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — First of all, I want to inform the hon. member that he had the spelling of my name a bit wrong. It is not 'Tobe'; it is not 'Tobie' — those names are for girls incidentally. It just happens to be 'Toby', so his reference, in his clumsy attempt of applying some of his Shakespearean interpretations, was not altogether apropos.

Mr. Cameron: — That's it, Toby — "Toby or not to be."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — As far as the agricultural policies of this Government is concerned, it is not a question of to be or not to be. It is the story of good programs and accomplishments, with great promise of much more to be in the future.

Mr. McDonald: — Too little and too late.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley wishes an answer to his question "to be or not to be" he might find the answer in the minds of his own constituents which, in Shakespearean language, might be as follows:

"Whether 'tis nobler in the minds of men to suffer the slings and arrows of misinformation, or remove the cause of it."

Mr. McDonald: — And there it is today!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I think my hon. friends . . .

Mr. McDonald: — They'll remove you, Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . have pretty clearly indicated that as far as the Liberal party is concerned, either in Saskatchewan or federally, it is not "to be"!

Mr. Loptson: — That's what you think.

Mr. McDonald: — You've had your course, Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I say this . . .

Mr. Loptson: — It won't be long now.

Mr. Cameron: — Where was Toby when the lights went out?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . it is plain ridiculousness on their part; their suggestions, for example, that we should now subsidize the cost-price squeeze. I have been doing a little fast calculating, and I find that, if we took all of the provincial revenues including the liquor profits, the hospital fee, all of them, and dumped it all in the pot, we couldn't touch the loss of income to Saskatchewan farmers as a result of national policy. For example, to indicate the fluctuations in farm income in this province from 1953-1955, the farmers of this province experienced a drop in cash income of \$296 million; on the other hand, our total provincial revenues run somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$53 million. We could give it all to the municipalities, give it all to the farmers, and it wouldn't begin to touch the loss of income they experienced in just that short period of time from 1953-55, and it hasn't improved since then. Are the Liberal members opposite going to exonerate, or do they expect us to exonerate, the national government for the fact that the price of wheat to the farmers, since 1947, has dropped by 42 cents a bushel?

Mr. Loptson: — You were as much responsible as anybody.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Figure it out, Mr. Speaker; figure out the loss . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Your give-away policies were responsible for it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . to the farmers. Little wonder those people over there want to attract attention away from the true facts of the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to a few press clippings

February 24, 1958

in my concluding remarks.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, go on!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I have in my hand an item which appeared in the 'Leader-Post' of February 20, and it is headed: "Lost voters will return to the fold." It tells of a Liberal nominating convention down in the Estevan constituency, and the delegates to the national convention were reporting. Here is what they had to say:

"The new national Liberal farm policy was almost a replica of the recommendation on agriculture of A.H. McDonald, provincial Liberal leader, as made at the convention."

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Let's look at them. I have another press report, or several of them; you will note what I hold in my hand is bits and pieces of press reports — like the Liberal farm program — just bits and pieces. On the back of it, Mr. Speaker, here is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition had to say when addressing a Federal nominating convention . . .

Mr. McDonald: — I thought you said we stole your program!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is amusing, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Lopton: — You must have been reading it often; you have it about worn out.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — "Mr. McDonald told the audience of approximately 175" — that's not very good.

Mr. McDonald: — That's more than you get, Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He said the Conservative Party is to blame for the conditions as they are today. In the Legislature he says we are to blame. He had better make up his mind as to who is to blame.

Mr. McDonald: — It's the same thing. You are just an old Toby anyway.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And this is what he says, further down. He said that the cost of handling grain must be reduced . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Read it all.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and the farmer paid a price which will

guarantee cost of production, plus a fair profit.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And what do you see on the other side of the page in the 'Leader-Post'? Here is an announcement made by the national leader of the Liberal party, Lester B. Pearson; and it says: "Liberals pledge \$1.50 wheat support."

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They pledge a support price of \$1.50 for wheat on the basis of No. 1 Fort William, which is 15 cents below the price at the present time. Some Liberal policy!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wouldn't want the Minister to misinform the House, and if he will take the time to read the article he has in his hand, he will find that the price of \$1.50 would be initial payment, as given by Mr. Pearson.

Premier Douglas: — No, no!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, you're all wrong!

Mr. McDonald: — Read it all! Read it all!

Mr. Cameron: — Read it!

Mr. McDonald: — I challenge you to read it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is clear that it is a support price.

Mr. Cameron: — We challenge you to read it all.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The price of \$1.50 for No. 1 Northern basis Ft. William means a drop of 15 cents a bushel compared to the price we are now getting, and on the basis of 300 million bushels marketed, it would be a loss to the farmers of Saskatchewan of some \$45 million.

Mr. Danielson: — Tedious repetition.

Mr. McDonald: — We challenge you to read it.

Mr. Cameron: — Come on, read it.

Mr. McDonald: — You're ashamed to read it.

Mr. Danielson: — Ashamed to read it, that's right.

February 24, 1958

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It's a well known fact that both the Liberal party and the Conservative party . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Nobody can believe you anyhow.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . are against parity prices. They believe in 'flexible' prices. They believe that when the farmer has a lot to sell he shouldn't get anything for it, and when he doesn't have anything to sell, then he should get a lot.

Mr. Danielson: — You're talking to John, now.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am going to read, now, to prove this point, a statement by the present Minister of Northern Affairs, Mr. Hamilton. He is speaking in his constituency and he said that 100 per cent parity prices would eventually ruin the small farmer.

Mr. McDonald: — That's your Tory friend.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — These people believe in the law of supply and demand, Mr. Speaker. We don't believe in the law of supply and demand . . .

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — Or in the law of gravity?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will hon. members please discontinue the crossfire.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I appreciate that kind of applause, Mr. Speaker. We believe that, if farm costs are rigid, farm prices must be held in a rigid relationship to those costs. We believe that the law of supply and demand has no place in modern society, and we feel that manipulating prices and adhering to the law of supply and demand will not solve our agricultural problems, it will make them worse. When one scrutinizes the records carefully, one will find that there is no relationship between quantity of agricultural production and price.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The farmer is caught in the squeeze. You could put the price of wheat down to 50 cents a bushel and, in light of the present high costs, he would produce all the harder to try to meet that added cost of production as against his low price. Then, too, what is this theory of supply and demand? Is there any validity to it whatever? It just simply means that we must make food scarce in order to improve farm prices. This means then, that only those consumers who have got the money to pay for food will be able to buy it should it become scarce and the price high to the farmer. The whole thing is outdated; it is ridiculous; it has no validity insofar as controlling the volume of production is concerned; but the old parties still believe in that system.

We believe that if farm prices were held on a parity basis, it would not necessarily increase the incentive to production for the reason I have just mentioned. And if we do have increased production, what of it? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it isn't the surplus agricultural commodities that are the problem at all. The problem is we haven't the common sense to market these food commodities and bring them to the areas of the world where they are greatly needed.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is well recognized by everyone that this problem faces humanity, particularly in this war of ideologies as well as stomach hunger; and we have not as yet, as a nation . . .

Mr. Loftson: — Why don't you take the job and give it away.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . either here or to the south of us, taken the attitude that we should use our surplus food commodities to feed hungry people. We could increase, and we ought to increase, our production in order to meet that most desirable objective.

I sometimes wonder why, if surplus food commodities are a danger and are a burden on society and a headache to governments, we continue to spend money on agricultural research, on experimentation and extension services to our farm people to encourage them to increase their productive efficiency. It just doesn't add up and make sense at all.

I think, today, two things are necessary. One, as mentioned by the hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe), price control; farm costs must be controlled and farm prices must be brought up in relationship to those farm costs. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that a comprehensive national marketing and farm income policy for Canada, and a comprehensive crop insurance program, must all be provided for in one plan to stabilize farm income from one end of this country to the other. We have to think, not only in terms of price; we have also to think more in terms of farm income. Natural hazards bear very significantly on farm income. Therefore, provision must be made for a crop insurance plan, workman's compensation benefits and all of those benefits that are now well established in industry and that have not as yet reached the agricultural industry.

I believe that it is first necessary to put enough money in the agricultural industry as a whole price-wise in order to make it possible to make suitable deductions based on the volume of marketing from each farm unit. In order to build up a fund to provide crop insurance in the event of crop failure, it is in that manner that we can overcome what is a very real problem —

the problem of relating a proper parity income to every farm unit by putting enough into the industry to take care of natural hazards and then deducting sufficient to build up a crop insurance fund. The big unit operator would, of course, contribute more to such a fund, and, therefore, bring about some equalization or a redistribution of money, within the industry in order to give our couple who are gainfully employed in the agricultural industry, the same degree of income security as is now enjoyed in other areas. I am sure that a program of this kind is practical and feasible. I am certain of it. If we, as a nation, can spend as much as we are spending, in defence programs, and in many other directions, surely it is logical and common sense to provide this type of income security for a group of people who represent the greatest potential market for industrial and consumer foods within our own country.

I feel, that we are to some extent working in that direction; and it is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that federal election issues are of real concern; they are real issues too.

Mr. McDonald: — You wont be here.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It means, that — and I don't mean to say this is a biased political way — if the people in Ottawa, whether they are Tories or Liberals, had a progressive viewpoint, these results could be brought about.

Mr. Lopton: — Better get rid of the C.C.F.ers.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We have had the unhappy situation that, so far, both of the old parties have had to heckled and pushed along by a small splinter group in Ottawa.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, no!

Mr. Cameron: — I thought it was a major political party.

Mr. Danielson: — The splinter group!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. members take some exception to that. If this is not correct, why did not the previous Liberal administration, in 22 years of office, find a solution to the problem of agriculture. Why didn't they?

Mr. Cameron: — I didn't know the C.C.F. was a splinter group.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want to add that the C.C.F., after all, is made up of people who had former political affiliations . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You were kicked out.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition ought to know

how hard it is to have a young viewpoint heard in his national convention; and it is those kinds of people who get frustrated and who come to our government.

Mr. McDonald: — You are the frustrated ones, all right.

Mr. Loptson: — They're used to it in the other party and then they go over to you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, just another word before closing. I want to make a correction. The hon. members opposite mentioned that the C.C.F. members in the House of Commons had voted for the new agricultural stabilization Bill.

Mr. Loptson: — So they did.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's not correct. They voted against it. Of course, the hon. member for Saltcoats doesn't even know that two Liberals had the courage to vote against it, too. Our friend Walter Tucker voted against it.

With that correction, Mr. Speaker, and since the amendment has no basis in fact not only with reference to agriculture but also with reference to industrialization; and in light, or the encouraging announcement in the press, yesterday, that a business firm in Regina is erecting a \$1 3/4 million office building in Regina proving confidence in the future of this province and a realization that the economy of this province is expanding both economically, industrially and agriculturally, I am voting against the amendment and for the motion.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like first to take the opportunity of congratulating the mover and seconder in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The people of their respective constituencies have every reason to be very proud of the way they handled themselves in the Legislature. They both pinpointed continuing and expanding programs announced in the Speech from the Throne, and made intelligent remarks on each.

Following those we have had some members, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald). The Leader of the Opposition, of course, as usual, and exactly as he has done over the past three or four years, followed a destructive form of criticism, pointing out that the Speech from the Throne is only a 'skeleton'. Of course we had other remarks, too, that the Speech from the Throne is only a bit of dessert, and what the people of Saskatchewan want is some meat and potatoes!

February 24, 1958

I want to take a look at the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and judge it in the light of the C.C.F. program that was placed before the people in June, 1956. I am glad that somebody ahead of me followed that very same line. I believe it is my duty, and it always has been the duty of the C.C.F. Government, to follow closely the promises that they made in an election . . .

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Read the newspapers!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . and then continuously throughout the term of office, over the period of four, or it may be five years, saw to it that year by year they fully implemented those promises before their term of office expired. So I want to look over the Speech from the Throne and check it in the light of those promises made in 1956.

I want to take the first one — Promise No. 1 — made in our program in the year 1956. We promised to the people of Saskatchewan that we will spend approximately \$100 million in the building of a provincial highway system, during the term of office. Now, let us take a look at the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne first mentions the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway program. This is one item on which I wish to compliment and congratulate the Minister of Highways. When I look over the Trans-Canada Highway system and the amount of work that has been done in the other provinces of Canada, I see that we in Saskatchewan, have taken again another 'first' in the Dominion of Canada: we have completed the Trans-Canada Highway system.

In looking over the provinces, one of the first, Newfoundland, hasn't paved a mile of road yet, although it has 554 miles of Trans-Canada to do — a Liberal Government, yes! Another one, Nova Scotia, also has not a mile of paved highway on the Trans-Canada Highway system. Maybe there again the Liberals were in power too long. But then when we go, for example, to Ontario, that province has completed about a third of their system. Alberta is fairly well on the way for out of some 282 miles, they have completed 214. British Columbia, with 568 miles, have completed some 274 of the Trans-Canada Highway system, while we in the province of Saskatchewan completed the Trans-Canada Highway system, last fall, and celebrated the occasion.

The Speech from the Throne announces the willingness to expand further all the highway programs at an even greater pace. If that is continued, I am positive that, over the next term of office, we will not only implement that promise, but will even go beyond it.

Promise No. 2 made to the electors of the province of Saskatchewan in the year 1956 was to contribute \$3 million a year for municipal roads. What has the Speech from the Throne to say in this particular connection? It says:

"A new policy of assistance to urban municipalities on highway routes through urban centres has been announced and will be in operation during this fiscal year.

"It is encouraging to note that 247 rural municipalities, 11 local improvement districts, and 14 towns and villages participated in the municipal grid road program last year. The progress which has been made in the construction of the all-weather market roads has been considerably in excess of expectations."

and that the program will be even extended in the coming year.

When the Leader of the Opposition talks about it being only a skeleton, and another member of the Opposition says that the Speech from the Throne is just a bit of dessert, and what the people of Saskatchewan want is more meat and potatoes, I want to refer to some cold facts in connection with grants or aids to municipalities, particularly under this point of contributing \$3 million a year for municipal roads. Let us look at the record of the previous administration and compare it to the present time. I want to see how much meat and potatoes were given to the rural municipalities in their day, and how it would compare today.

Premier Douglas: — It would be mostly gravy.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say it is gravy by the time I get through with it. It's only going to be dried bones and potato peelings that were given to the rural municipalities and the rural areas of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cameron: — Here we go again.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I remember a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that I made a very similar analysis of the contributions made to the rural areas of the province by the Liberal administration in the last six years that they were in power, or in the last six Speeches from the Throne that they brought down. I'm going to compare in the form of an average, what they contributed with what we contributed this year, and I am going to compare our contribution with their last

February 24, 1958

year of contribution. I'm going to give them a terrific break, because the only time they did do anything was in an election year, and their last year was, of course, an election year.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — So I'm going to compare our contribution to their contribution made on the average of the six years, and then I'll give them the benefit of the doubt and compare it to their last year.

Mr. Ross McCarthy: — Give your election years, too, while you're at it!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, while I was electioneering in the Federal election, last year, I did have some councillors of some of the municipalities question me as to the amount of grants given to them. On a number of occasions I was prepared to point out to any councillor in my constituency that in this particular year, the coming year — or if you want to take it the year before — if we make a comparison, I am prepared to make this statement and wager odds, that we will give more grants to the building of roads in any municipality in my constituency, this year, than was ever done by the Liberal Opposition in all the years they were in power in the history of the province. Mr. Speaker, that would seem to be a very fantastic wager to put up, but I knew that, well, I may have to pay out on one, but I'll collect on the other eight or nine or 10 municipalities. I spent a few hours checking up, and I have the figures for the year 1957-58, and since the year is not yet completed, the figures are not up to date; but I am going to use those that have already been approved, and will be paid over to the rural municipalities of my constituency. I am going to compare this to what was granted by the previous Liberal Government, and I have the records over the past six years. In Rural Municipality No. 273 (and I believe that is Sliding Hills in my constituency) out of the six years, the Liberals gave grants during three years — \$270 one year, nothing the next year — they didn't need any more roads; the next year, nothing; then in 1942-43 they gave \$200, and then the last year, election year, they boosted it away up to \$400. Anyway, the total is \$870.

Now, I checked, this year, under this supposed-to-be 'skeleton' Speech from the Throne, this year we have already approved, and the municipality has got, or will get, from this Government, \$46,700. In other words, if I compare it to the average of the six years as far as this municipality is concerned, it would take the Liberals to be in power and read 233.5 Speeches from the Throne to give as much as we gave

in one year. Yet they have the gall, on the other side, to get up and say, it is only dessert; we want meat and potatoes! Well, I can tell you we're giving them meat and potatoes.

Mr. Danielson: — Have you got the \$1,600,000 you stole from the municipalities in there?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Now I'm going to compare it to the last year — I'm going to give you the benefit of the doubt. I'm going to compare it to an election year when the Liberals were really generous. If I compare it to that, it would take 116.5 election years under the Liberals to do what we did in one year.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They won't last that long.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That's meat and potatoes. Now, I'm going on to the next municipality: No. 274, the R.M. of Good Lake. If I compare it there during the six years they contributed in road grants to the municipality, \$2,375. This year alone we gave to this municipality \$32,700. If you compare it on the average, the boys opposite would have to be in power for 81 years to meet that, and if I take their last year again, a generous year, the 1943-44 election year — that's when they gave them a little bit more. If I compare it to that it would still take 45 Liberal Speeches from the Throne to equal one C.C.F. Speech from the Throne.

We go along to the next one, No. 274, which, I see did not get a nickel's worth of road grants under the Liberal administration for five years, and then in an election year, bang, comes a \$500 grant. During this year, from the C.C.F. administration, this municipality received \$23,000 in road grants. If you compare it on the average, the Liberals would have to be in power 230 years to pay or contribute to this municipality what we have given then in this particular year. Then again, if I compare it to the last year they were in power, the only year they gave any road grants, even then it would take 46 Liberal elections to equal a contribution by this Government.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that in 1952 we took the Public Revenue Tax off what they used to collect for years and years. Yet they talk about their generosity to the rural people of Saskatchewan! I had to laugh when the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) was up and talked about drainage. I was a municipal clerk in the northeast part of the province for some 17 years, and complete and total responsibility for the building of draining ditches was the responsibility of the municipality. They had everything loaded on the municipalities when they were in power. Now they are generous— just about as good as 'Mike' Pearson. For 22 years we couldn't budge those fellows in Ottawa. Inside of a few

February 24, 1958

minutes, after losing an election, they are the most progressive and generous political party in Canada. What a joke!

Mr. McCarthy: — You'd better tell John about it!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — John isn't any better. As far as I am concerned, when we talk of 'John' or 'Mike', the only difference is one skins you from the toes up and the other fellow from the head down. I'm going to give you some more figures. The boys across the road need facts, not nonsense; so I'm going to give them facts. I'm going to pick the next rural municipality, No. 303. That is a municipality I used to be secretary-treasurer of for 17 years.

Mr. Lopton: — Too bad you're not on the radio . . .

Mr. Danielson: — They should have had you on the radio.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — In six years the Liberal administration paid this municipality \$1,325 of 'meat and potatoes'. In this year, this municipality, from this Government, has received \$16,000. If you make the comparison, the Liberals would have to be in power 80 years to equal one C.C.F. Speech from the Throne. If I take the election year, it would still take 26 election years under the Liberals to meet it.

Then I go on to the next one: No. 304, the R.M. of Buchanan. During the six years, they contributed \$1,350; we, this year, contributed to them \$18,500. If you compare it, and take, as I stated, the average, it would take 85 Liberal years to compare with what this municipality has received from this Government, this year. Then again, if I give them a break and take their last year, an election year, it would take 37 elections to equal what was done by the C.C.F. this year.

I'll go on to the next one: No. 305. Oh, that reminds me — a very strong Liberal reeve used to be in that R.M. In fact, he used to be a member of Parliament. During the six years they contributed to this municipality, \$1,247; the C.C.F., this year, has made a contribution of \$15,000, and if again you make that comparison with them, it would take 72 years of Liberal rule to compare to our contribution, and if I give them the benefit of the doubt — that is, the election year contribution — it would take 30 years.

R.M. No. 333: if the comparison is made here, in this particular municipality they gave a very large, generous grant in an election year of over \$6,000 — I don't know why. Yet if you compare this one again, it would take 21 Liberal years to meet the contribution that we made this year; and if I take the last year that they were in office and make the comparison, it would take 42 years.

Let us now take a look at the totals. I am going to take all the totals of the municipalities in my constituency, and see how fair they were treated by the previous administration. In the six years, the Liberal administration contributed to my whole constituency, to all the municipalities, \$21,000, or an average of little better than \$3,000 a year. This year, to all the municipalities, this Government has contributed \$233,900. If I make a comparison again on the average, compared to what we gave this year, it would take the Liberals to be in power 71 years to meet the contribution given by this Government.

Then the Leader of the Opposition says, "Oh, it isn't anything; it is just a bare skeleton". Well, I'm going to tell you it would take 71 Liberal skeletons to take one C.C.F. skeleton.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — If anybody takes the last year, election year, and compares the totals, it would still take them 46 years. Therefore, the bet that I was making last year with some of the councillors — no wonder I had no takers. I was prepared to wager odds that in this particular year we would contribute more to any of the municipalities than the Liberal administration had contributed to them throughout the whole of the history of Liberal administration in the province of Saskatchewan.

Looking at the third promise we made in 1956, let's; again check on how we are doing on that one. The third promise is: "to increase substantially the Provincial Government's contribution to the cost of education". Of course we hear considerable about education these days. I want to read what the Speech from the Throne has to say in connection with education:

"In accordance with the policy of passing on to local governments a share of increasing provincial revenue, provision will be made for again increasing school grants."

Now let's take a look. We made that promise in 1956, and, in the year following immediately after the election, we increased our contribution to education considerably, and when the supplementaries are added to these, it will show we increased our overall expenditure on education over the previous year by some 36 per cent. In this Speech from the Throne it is stated that it will be further increased. I realize that some members of the Opposition have brought up and no doubt others will be bringing up the gag that they have used over the last few years of blaming the C.C.F. administration for the increase of school and municipal taxes. I can recall, one time, when I was over

in Manitoba, across the border. My constituency is not very far from there. I was over there campaigning and, at the end of the meeting, a farmer got up in the hall and says: Mr. Kuziak, I would like to ask you a question". I said, "That's fine". The question he placed before me was: "What are the school and municipal taxes like in Saskatchewan, because here in Manitoba they're unbearable". I thought that was a good one. I thought the C.C.F. alone was to blame for increasing school and municipal taxes. So before I answered, I laughed, and asked the farmer whether I could ask him a question. I said, "Have you ever asked any of the Liberal candidates, or Liberal M.L.A.'s of Manitoba why school and municipal taxes are so high in Manitoba?" He said, oh yes, he had. I said, "What was their answer?" He replied that the answer, of course, was that the costs of everything have skyrocketed; that since the lifting of price controls, costs of school materials and municipal goods, tractors, and everything you buy has doubled and tripled and multiplied itself by four, and therefore, taxes must go up two, three and four times. I said, "Yes, that's the truth; but I wanted to know because in Saskatchewan, the Liberals there blame the C.C.F. for the increased school and municipal taxes."

Surely, Mr. Speaker, some of the young members over there in the Opposition, some of them school teachers, one a member of a learned profession, surely to goodness they know better, or is it that they believe the people of Saskatchewan are so ignorant and gullible that they can give them this nonsense and that they're going to fall for it? Well I see they haven't in the last two elections. You cannot use statements that have no facts behind them. I have blamed, in the past — the Liberals do it in Manitoba, and I will do it again — the increased cost of all commodities in our province, in Manitoba, Alberta, in fact throughout the Dominion of Canada, on the late Liberal Government at Ottawa. Actually, if you trace it down and take a good look at when it started rising, it began in 1946 when the Liberal Federal administration, supported by John Diefenbaker of the Conservatives, and Solon Low, the Social Crediter, lifted price controls, because they said it would give freedom to the Canadian people. I am telling you it really gave them freedom; they've got the freedom now to pay three or four times as high as they paid prior to 1945.

I realize there is a federal election campaign on today, and I believe that we must speak some on federal matters because it means life or misery to the people of Saskatchewan. I see in the newspapers and particularly in Parliament, that our Prime Minister of Canada found it 'unbearable' and, therefore, had to have the election. I am going to say that I believe he found it unbearable because he had to implement his promises to the people to bring about, for example, prices for the people of Saskatchewan, and other promises which he made, and if he did that he would have to go back on the commitments of some

of his friends to the vested interests and so he had no alternative. He had either to fulfil his promises to the people of Canada, or go back on the promises and commitments of the old Conservative party. So what does he do? He's got to go to the election and wash these promises off and get a new mandate. That's all it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after these few remarks and some of the friendly suggestions I have made to the Opposition, I am going to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 24 — An Act respecting the Sale and Testing of Agricultural Machinery

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — This Bill is an Amendment to The Farm Implement Act, and there are two principal changes. One is an amendment to provide for a Board to administer the Farm Implement Act and also direct the affairs of the testing agency. The other one provides that any implement company which has its office outside of Saskatchewan will have to have a principal agent in the province. The other one, of course, makes provision for the farm implement testing organization. There was provision for an engineering committee to test farm machinery in the existing legislation. We carried it a step farther, and put the Act under the administration of the Board, and we are setting up, I think, a more elaborate testing service than was envisaged in the original Bill.

With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate on the Second Reading on this particular Bill. Like most of the members, I think I welcome the setting up of machinery to test farm machinery and to clarify the law governing, the sale of farm machinery. However, there are quite a few new principles and ideas introduced in this Bill, and I am sure some of the other hon. members would like an opportunity to make a further study of the law that is being changed by this Bill in connection with the licensing and in connection with the vendors, particularly, as it applies and might affect these vendors in very small centres throughout this province. For that reason I would like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Leave granted

Several Members: — Agreed.

(Debate adjourned)

UNIFORM TIME

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend the Statute Law

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker it is with some hesitancy that I make any statement about the effect of Bill No. 27. Hon. members will recall that there has been a good deal of study given to the matter of making

the time uniform in that first of all, serious attempts were made to have the time made uniform in the two respective time zones. Last year, a proposal was made in a Committee of this House to make the time uniform throughout the whole province, adopting Central Standard Time from the fourth Sunday in April to the fourth Sunday in October, and Mountain Standard Time throughout the province for the remainder of the year. I may say that this proposal of the Committee was endorsed by the House, and the Government was given directions to prepare legislation to submit at the next following Session, to implement those proposals.

This Bill provides the amendment to the Interpretation Act which is necessary. It also provides the necessary amendments to the other Acts — the Municipal Acts, the Weekly Half-Holidays Act, the Factory Act, the Liquor Act, and so on. I may say that, in this province, no attempt is being made to do what was attempted in the province of Alberta, namely to make it a punishable offence to keep your clock set at a different time than those set out in the Bill. So far as this Bill is concerned, no attempt is made to make it a punishable offence to keep some other time. However, the Bill does require that, for official purposes, the time will be as prescribed in the Bill.

It is hoped that this will result in a good deal of convenience for the people of Saskatchewan, and I recall that, last year, there was not a vote on straight party lines on this proposal. I am confident that, if the proposal is implemented for a year so as to give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to try it out by actual demonstrations, and if it is not satisfactory, or appears that it fails to bring about a solution to this problem, the Government is still prepared to look again at the question.

I may say, too, that the legislation is in no way the result of a certain plebiscite that was held in Saskatchewan a year or two ago. With those words of introduction, Mr. Speaker, I move Second Reading of Bill No. 27.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — There are quite some changes in this Bill, and there are a lot of statutes that are revised as a result of it. It may be all right for the legal profession, but from the layman point of view it is very complicated. Because of that, I would like to give it far greater study than I have been able to yet, and I would like to move the adjournment of this Bill at this time.

(Debate adjourned)

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Fuel Petroleum Products Act are not very far-reaching this year. There are no really important matters of principle involved.

February 24, 1958

We have been asked to amend a couple of sections, because the Attorney General's department think there is a weakness in the description of the purple fuel. There is one other section which we propose to amend as the result of certain prosecutions undertaken during the past year.

We found that there were four cases where prosecutions took place where, before the sentence could be meted out, the farmer had sold the truck. As you know, the sentence today provides a minimum fine of \$25 and costs, and it also provides for the impoundment of the vehicle. Well, of course, if the vehicle gets sold, it can't be impounded. So, in order to put the people on a par, it is proposed that where the vehicle has been disposed of before the trial takes place, the minimum penalty, in that case, will be \$50 instead of \$25.

Those are the only amendments this year, so I move that Bill No. 5 be now read the second time.

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

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend the Hotel Keepers Act

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which has been passed in the other provinces of Canada, and it is to set out clearly the responsibility of the hotel keeper for the cars which are parked by the guests.

This makes provision that, if the proprietor of the hotel maintains a parking area and makes a charge for it, or where the hotel keeper or his employees accepts the keys of the car and put the car away for safekeeping, then the hotel keeper is definitely responsible. But, in all other cases where a hotel keeper, for example, has a vacant lot which is used for the clients to park their cars, then, if someone breaks into the car and steals the belongings of the guest, the hotel keeper will not be responsible in that case. It is just clearly to set up what the responsibility of the hotel keeper is.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this is a very slight amendment to the Liquor Board Superannuation Act. At the present time the Act makes provision that if an employee wishes

to have his pension increased prior to the time of the old-age pension coming into existence, he may do so. In other words, the idea is to try to level out his income throughout his lifetime. But because he gets the additional old-age pension at age 70 years, that means he will be getting, normally, an increase in the amount of his income. So, provision has been made in the Act whereby the amount of the pension can be reduced in those later years, but he will get a greater amount earlier. Now it refers in the Act to the \$40 a month, and all we are doing in this particular amendment is to remove the reference to the \$40 a month, because the Federal Act has been amended on two occasions in the last year to raise this pension now to \$55. I would move second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Telephones Act, which merely gives us permission to borrow more money.

We are getting up very close now to the present limit of \$40 million, which was established back in 1953-54, and we are requesting that that figure be changed to \$65 million, which will enable us to continue with our program for another three or four years.

Section three refers to the fact that one dollar in lawful money in United States be deemed to be the equivalent of one dollar in lawful money of Canada. Apparently there is something in here, as far as the Treasury is concerned, that makes it necessary. And I see then, the coming-into-force clause that is requested — that it be deemed to have been in force since the 20th March, 1953, is also necessary.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move that Bill No. 11 be now read the second time.

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

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Rural Telephone Act

Hon. Mr. Williams: — This is an amendment requested by the Rural Telephone Association at their convention, held last September, to the effect that everything having gone up in price, their repairs and their material and everything also cost more.

At the present time they are able to spend up to four per cent for other projects insofar as their subscribers are concerned; and they can levy for that four per cent without any reference at all to the Minister. They request that the four per cent be increased to eight per cent and that, after that amount, between eight and twelve per cent, they would require permission from the Minister.

I see that sub-section (2) also has, in the fourth line, the words 'long distance charges', That refers to the cutting off of telephone service, Mr. Speaker. At the present time, rural telephones can be discontinued for non-payment of rental; but we want to put in there 'rental or non-payment of long distance charges'.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend the Rural Telephone Act be now read a second time.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No, 13 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act

Hon. Mr. Williams: — That is an amendment to The Trade Union Act, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we have the Labour Relations Board consisting of seven people. Two members are nominated by the employers, and two by the general public. From time to time, we have found one or sometimes two members cannot attend the meeting — they meet once a month — the second Tuesday of every month. As a result, while they may have a quorum present, possibly the people who should be represented are not given full representation.

So, if in the event of sickness, or for some other reason it happens that one of those individuals cannot be there, we are merely asking that one alternate for each of the employer,

employee or public representatives be appointed, who will have the power to act when the regular members are not able to attend the meetings.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 13 be now read a second time.

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

Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, we are back with the usual amendment for the twelfth time. I think, to extend the period of time from April 1, 1958, to April 1959 for wages which were in effect in 1947, may not now be reduced below that amount until 1959. We do this each year on legal advice. But the most important thing here, of course, is Section (a) at the bottom of the page, which gives the Minister the power to hold the hours of work to 12. We do find that some employers are liable to keep their employees on duty, continuously, 14, 15, sometimes 18 hours a day, and the employees have no redress other than to stay on duty or they are liable to lose their jobs.

This merely says that the Minister may put a ceiling on the number of hours that can be worked, except in the case of unforeseeable or unpreventable circumstances that could cause serious interference in the normal operations of the undertaking. We don't want to be unreasonable, and in the event of an emergency, of course, a permit from the Minister would not be required.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 14 be now read the second time.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Provincial Parks and Protected Areas Act

Hon. A.G. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — The amendments here are for the purpose of improving the administration of provincial parks. There is no particular major change. The following are some of the minor changes:

Providing for the leasing or purchasing of lands for public parks. Another is re-defining the various uses of parks or protected areas. Another amendment is authorizing the Minister to enter into agreements for the establishment and operation of any facilities or furnishing of any services for the public convenience. Another one is for providing the regulating of land use in the parks and protected areas; that is the authority to be able to zone the areas an public beaches and commercial areas and so on. Another amendment is providing for the control, and regulating the use, setting out the extinguishment of fires in the parks; and another one granting certain powers to conservation officers in the course of their duties in the park areas.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 17 — An Act to provide for the Prevention and Suppression of Prairie and Forest Fires

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — We are recommending here, the complete revision or The Prairie and Forest Fire Act and then bringing in certain amendments.

I am going to go over some of the more important amendments in this Bill. One is requiring property owners to take effectual means to prevent fires from spreading even on their own property. Two, providing for supervision of fires set out by rural municipalities, councillors, on road allowances and so on. The third item includes fishery officers, game guardians, field personnel of Saskatchewan Forest Products, guides under The Game Act, road construction men, land inspectors and park managers in the list of Fire Guardians in case a fire commences in their area. Another amendment provides for persons other than employees of the Department of Natural Resources who fight a fire in order to prevent its spread, to recover the cost of fire fighting as may seem reasonable to the Minister of Natural Resources from the party responsible for the setting of that particular fire.

Another change or amendment requires persons in charge of forest operation, surveying, prospecting, drilling or exploring parties, and guides of fishing or hunting parties, to familiarize themselves with the provisions of this Act and the regulations, and placing the onus on the person in charge to see that every person under his charge is familiar with the Act and the regulations.

Another proposed amendment prohibits fire near sawdust piles. Another amendment requires persons conducting operations in the forest to maintain satisfactory fire-fighting equipment with them. Penalties are provided for persons unlawfully destroying or defacing any notice posted under this particular Act.

With these few remarks, I move second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Forest Act

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Forest Act. It is actually certain changes in the boundaries of the forest areas. Practically every year there are changes, and there are five changes here.

First, there is a quarter-section that is withdrawn from the Carrot River Provincial Forest and, of course, turned over to Agriculture for agricultural purposes. There are nine and a half sections of forest land that are being added to the Duck Mountain Provincial Forest, from Agriculture. Another half-section is being withdrawn from The Fort a la Corne Provincial Forest into agricultural lands. Two parcels of forest land near Torch River block and Pierce Lake area are being added to the Provincial Forest, and another half-section of land is being withdrawn from the Porcupine Provincial Forest over to Agriculture.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 18

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act, 1954

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, at the present time, second-hand furnaces cannot be sold according to the actual wording of our Fire Prevention Act. We wish to relax those restrictive conditions

February 24, 1958

due to the fact that, with gas coming in, so many people are converting to gas and, according to our Act, they could not dispose of their old furnaces. We want to make it possible that that can be done quite legally and without any difficulty. That is all this particular amendment means: It would allow the second hand furnace to be disposed of, providing, of course, they are in good condition.

With that explanation, I would move that the Bill be now read a second time.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 46 — An Act to amend the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, this amends The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, which deals with the issuing of licences and so forth to tradesmen in the various trades in this province. Perhaps I can best explain the reason for it by illustrating what brought it about. A few months ago, we found that two persons writing one of the exams in the southern part of the province, had somehow got hold of the examinations beforehand. When we found that out, we wished to cancel both of their Journeyman's papers, both their licences for that year. One man sent his in without any trouble. The other sought legal advice and apparently was told to tell the Department to forget about it. He defied us. He would not turn in his licence at all, and we found that we really could not force him to.

This amendment is here in order that if similar circumstances should occur at some future time, we will be able to take appropriate action. Obviously, people who cheat during these examinations should be subject to some penalty. We were able to penalize one, but we could not penalize the other.

With that explanation, I move this Bill No. 46 be now read the second time.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend the Noxious Weeds Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This is an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to The Noxious Weeds Act that permits raising the charge for noxious weed control on lots in cities and towns.

With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Open Wells Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In moving second reading of this Bill and in explanation of it, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities have asked us to amend The Open Wells Act to put the onus of responsibility on the owner of the property where an open well or excavation exists, whether livestock are lawfully running or not. I assume that because of the abandonment of farmsteads, the danger of open wells, the S.A.R.M. asks us to provide this amendment.

With that explanation, I move second reading.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of a Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, in moving and in explanation of this Bill, the purpose is merely to increase the grant from the Department to a Veterinary Service District where the area of the district is larger than the average, or where the cattle population of the district is below average. This would, similarly, permit a municipality to contribute more for veterinary services.

With this is explanation I move second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Provincial Lands Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In moving second reading, Mr. Speaker, the amendments don't represent any change in principle, and they are submitted as a result of the experience in the administration of The Lands Act. They are almost too numerous to outline in detail, although I can give the members the reasons for them. I think the amendments can better be discussed when the Bill is in Committee of the Whole. With this explanation, if it is acceptable, I would move second reading.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend the Conservation and Development Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Similarly, Mr. Speaker, these are amendments proffered to the Act as a result of administrative experience and to make the administration's use of the Act more practical. I think the amendments represent no departure in principle, and I believe can better be discussed in Committee. I would move second reading of the Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 25 — An Act respecting the Taking and Recording of Evidence by Sound Recording Machine

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 25 represents a new departure in the recording of evidence in courts; only one other province in Canada has legislation on this point, and that is the province of Nova Scotia.

Hon. members will recall that, last year, it was promised in the Speech from the Throne that this legislation would be introduced at that time, but time was short and we weren't able to finally settle on the provisions of the Bill until too close to the end of the Session to be able to submit it. However, the time was not lost. The Department has been conducting experiments over the past six or eight months with various types of equipment for this type of mechanical

recording, and we are now in a position where we have tested all the known brands of equipment, and are almost to the point of making choice. It is hoped that we will have some of this equipment in operation in the Regina judicial centre before the end of the present fiscal year, and the plan is to completely equip the new Courthouse in Saskatoon with sound recording machines.

I could make it clear that these machines are not intended to supplant the court reporters, they are not intended to replace the court reporters, but are intended to supplement their notes. In the interests of accuracy and in the interests of greater speed in transcribing the evidence, we feel that this represents a worthwhile step in this direction.

I would be prepared to discuss the individual sections in Committee, but the principle of it is to authorize the taking of recordings by sound recording machines. If we get this underway in Saskatchewan within the next few weeks, as we intend to do, and as we hope to do, this will represent another 'first' for Saskatchewan.

With those remarks I move Second Reading of Bill No. 25.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 26 — An Act providing for Certain Temporary Changes in the Law

Mr. Speaker, this is a traditional Bill. We have had it, I think, every year for the last ten or fifteen years or maybe even longer. It provides, simply, for tenants to be able to go back onto the land after the tenancy has expired and up to July 31 next year to remove grain that was harvested in 1957. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading, to the Bill.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I had thought the House might sit tonight. We have run through these second readings much faster than I had anticipated, and there are only a few bills in the Committee of the Whole. Now we can sit this evening and take Item No. 1 Second Readings. The Provincial Treasurer can go ahead with the Automobile Accident Insurance Bill and then take two or three other bills that are in Committee of the Whole. I imagine the whole thing, though, won't take more than half an hour to an hour, and I doubt if it is worth bringing the members back for that purpose.

February 24, 1958

So, unless there is any strong feeling that we should sit tonight, I think I would move that we adjourn.

Before moving it, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour if you would draw to the attention of the members that we have advised the cafeteria downstairs that we would be sitting, and, therefore, dinner has been prepared. Members who can do so are urged to have dinner here so that the cafeteria won't think we're crying 'Wolf! Wolf!'. Sometime when we want them, they might not prepare dinner for us. I move the House do now adjourn.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m.