

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 25, 1958

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

TABLED DOCUMENT

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the Day, if you will permit me at this stage, I omitted to table a document, yesterday and I am asking the permission of the House, this afternoon, to permit me to table it and allow it to become part of the proceedings of yesterday.

I didn't want to take up any time of the House to make any explanations, but I referred yesterday, to the Rural Development Conference and the representation at the Conference, official delegates from the various local governments, also the observers, as visitors, from other organizations. Together with that, one thing that I did read yesterday, via the resolution which was passed by that Conference, which is also on this document here, I did not want to take the time of the House yesterday, to enumerate them so I am hoping I can table it, today.

(Agreed)

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed from Monday, February 24, 1958, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw City) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McDonald.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to the debate yesterday, I first pointed out to the Assembly some of the destructive criticisms emanating from the Opposition with respect to the Speech from the Throne. We have had such remarks thrown as "the speech is nothing but a skeleton". Another remark was that "it is nothing but a bit of dessert to the people of Saskatchewan, and that it did not contain any meat or potatoes for the people of the province".

February 25, 1958

So I pointed out yesterday that I would like to take a look at the Speech from the Throne in the light of the C.C.F. program that was presented to the people of Saskatchewan in June, 1956, and on which we received a mandate of the people. In fact, I want to point out that, down through the years, immediately after presenting our program to the electors of Saskatchewan and after the election getting elected, at every Session of the Legislature the Speeches from the Throne have been planned in the light of the promises that we gave the people. I want to say that even the budgets are always prepared by this Government in the light of the promises that we had given to the people prior to the election.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — How about in 1944?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — So I took the opportunity yesterday, and I will continue on it today — in fact I'm going to summarize it a bit again. I believe it does good to the Opposition to hear some of the facts of life.

Some Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — So I went over the first promise. We are always proud of always reminding the people, and reminding the other political parties, that we are proud of our program, that even after the election we bring them back again to the attention of the people. I remember the time when the Liberals carried on a campaign. Immediately after the election they had a terrific bonfire throughout the province of Saskatchewan, burning every bit of material that they showed to the people prior to the election. We are proud of our program, and so I am going to go over, repeating or summarizing, the points that I covered yesterday.

In the first pledge that we gave to the people on our program in the June election of 1956, we stated that if elected, we will spend approximately \$100 million on the building of a provincial highway system. In that regard this Speech from the Throne mentions the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway system in Saskatchewan, which as I stated yesterday, is the first province in the Dominion of Canada to have completed that great project. In fact the only Liberal province within the Dominion of Canada has not yet built a mile of black-top, and that is Newfoundland. May I say that we are well on the road towards the completion of this particular promise in this term of office.

The next pledge that we gave the people of Saskatchewan was that we would contribute an average of \$3 million a year for municipal roads or in the form of road grants to the municipalities of the province of Saskatchewan. I told you of how, in the past year, I had met the odd councillor or reeve of the municipalities, and while talking on the amount of road grants contributed by this Government, that I would have been prepared to wager that, in this coming year in any one of those

municipalities, we will contribute more road grants to those areas or to the rural people of that municipality than the previous Liberal administration in Saskatchewan did during the whole history that they were in power in the province. I took the opportunity to check over some of the grants that we gave to the municipalities of the province. I compared it to the last six years of contributions made by the Liberal administration when they were in power here in Saskatchewan from 1938 to 1944. I have the records of the nine municipalities that are wholly or partially within my constituency, and when I make the comparison, our contributions this year run all the way, if you take the contributions we made to the municipalities in the year 1957 and compare them, for example, to the average of what they contributed to those municipalities over the six years, the comparison would be something like this: if they wanted to equal the total amount given to the municipalities by this Government this year, it would take them in one case 233.5 years to be in power; in connection with another municipality, 81 years to be in power; in another municipality, the Liberals would have to be in 230 years to equal the contributions we made in 1957.

Then, I gave them a break. I took the last year (which is an election year) — that's the time when they were usually generous. When I make that comparison, it runs all the way to some 116.5 election Liberal years to equal our year, this year (that is the highest) to the lowest, some 26 years. In another municipality, if I take the total for example, the total of the contributions made to all the municipalities in the last year that the Liberals were in power (which was an election year) and compare it to this 1957, they would have to be in power and bring in 46 Speeches from the Throne to equal what the Speech from the Throne will give these municipalities at the present time. So when they talk of a 'skeleton', what was it under the Liberal administration? When they say that the people of Saskatchewan want more meat and potatoes, I'm going to tell you they're getting it under this Speech from the Throne. Under any Speech from the Throne presented by the previous administrations, all that the municipalities did get was dried bones and potato peelings, if anything.

I went on to the next pledge — that is the third pledge: "increase substantially the Provincial Government's contribution to the cost of education." I pointed out how, last year alone, our increase in the budget to the educational costs of the province of Saskatchewan was greater than the total Liberal contribution to education was in 1943-44. Then this Speech from the Throne says that grants to schools will be considerably increased again. Therefore, I say we are on the road to implementing that promise.

I come now to promise four: "Bring up to 65,000 the farms supplied with electricity, and double the generating capacity of the province." I want to check again: How do we fare on this point

as far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned? I see that the Speech from the Throne reports that there is quite a growth in the rate of consumption of electrical energy; that in 1956-57 we tied in another 6,200 farmers with electricity, and, with this year, there is no doubt that it will go beyond 50,000 tied in with electrical energy. The Speech from the Throne announces that the Government is keeping, and will keep, up with the needed expansion of generating and transmission facilities of electrical power. It also mentions the building of a \$40 million power project at Estevan; another \$40 million power project at Saskatoon. I realize the Leader of the Official Opposition talked about a power building in the city of Regina which would run to \$4 million. I want to assure him that that building will go up. Why didn't he point out, to be fair sometimes and commend the Government for the \$40 million project at Saskatoon and at Estevan, and say that it may provide some employment for the people of Saskatchewan and particularly the farmers of Saskatchewan, who have been liquidated by the cost-price squeeze of the Federal Liberal Government's inflationary policies. But, going on — we were criticized for the cost, the capital cost to the farmers. I want to point out that under the Liberal administration, for example, in 1943-44 they had the largest rural electrification project under the Liberal administration. That was the year they tied in eight farmers in one year, in the whole province of Saskatchewan, during the whole of the year — a terrific program; and all of these farmers paid the total capital cost of providing power. That was their policy in those days.

Mr. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — There was a war on.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The total cost. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can compare the power utility to the telephone utility of those days. What did they do as far as capital cost was concerned in providing rural telephones to the rural people of the province, as compared to providing telephones to the rural areas of Saskatchewan or the cities and towns? To the cities and towns they provided telephones at no cost. To the rural people or the farmers of the area, down through the years, what did they do? They charged the total cost of providing telephone service to the farmer. Then, of course, they levied this on a debenture levy. They shoved the farmer into the clutches of the mortgage companies and, by the time the farmer got through, he didn't pay the total cost; he paid two and three times the total capital cost of providing telephones to the people of the areas.

Yesterday, I mentioned something about irrigation. I remember their irrigation policy. Where today this Government contributes to the irrigation projects in the province of Saskatchewan in aiding agriculture, in those days the total cost was placed on the shoulders of the municipalities under a debenture scheme, whereby, when the farmers finally paid these costs, they paid two or three times the total capital costs.

Another member mentioned the cost of energy or the rates. I'd like to point out that, in 1944, the Liberals' charge under the Power Corporation to the cities and the farms was some eight cents per kilowatt hour; the maximum rate, and the minimum rate was somewhere around four cents. I want to point out, because the Leader of the Official Opposition mentioned it, that we should make some comparison because the dollar isn't worth today what it used to be then. In other words they were charging eight cents and those were good eight cents. We have reduced the charge for electrical energy from eight cents to four cents, and that four cents is only actually worth two of the cents that they used to get, in other words, if we take the inflation into consideration, we are only receiving one-quarter of the rate that they used to receive in 1943-44. Yet they have the gall to talk of excessive rates! We are well on the way to implementing that pledge to the people of Saskatchewan.

Pledge Number five: "Bring natural gas to all cities and intermediate towns and villages." Now, what does the Speech from the Throne say with regard to this particular pledge made to the people? I see that we have already tied in seven of the ten cities of the province of Saskatchewan, and the towns and some of the villages in between. The Speech from the Throne announces the largest program on record; that is, the tying in of the city of Regina with natural gas service. In the Speech from the Throne, it again forecasts one of the largest programs on record, particularly in the building of pipe lines and tying in additional communities. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that pledge will be implemented before our term of office ends.

I notice that the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) compares gas rates here in the city to the rates in Alberta. But he didn't tell this House that Alberta was providing gas installations in Alberta in the 'thirties and the early 'forties, when installations were cheap and only a fraction of the cost that we have to pay today; that the capital cost of equipment has been written off and, therefore, their rates could be cheaper. Why wasn't he honest about it, and say, "I will compare Saskatchewan or Regina with that of Winnipeg, Manitoba — a Liberal province?"

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — They installed gas at practically the same time as we were installing gas in the city of Regina. I noticed that the private company there tried to foist upon the people of Winnipeg a price rate of some 35 cents per thousand cubic feet higher than in the province of Saskatchewan, of course, the mayor of that city protested; the people of Winnipeg almost rose up in arms, and finally, the company reduced this by some ten cents.

February 25, 1958

Even at the present time they are paying from 20 to 25 cents per thousand cubic feet higher than they are in the city of Regina. I'd like to point out to the city of Regina that the Liberals in this city tried to foist the same company on the city of Regina.

Mr. Cameron: — We do have high gas rates.

Mr. Danielson: — That's a good one.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, that particular pledge is being fulfilled, and I believe will be fulfilled before the term of office is over.

Pledge number six: we promised the people, "We will continue the rapid development of oil, minerals and forest resources in the province of Saskatchewan." Now, what is the story in the Speech from the Throne? The Speech from the Throne says that there are now 3,200 oil wells in production or capable of production. My, this is a surprise to me! I remember a member of the previous Opposition in this House making a statement that never while the C.C.F. Government is in power in the province of Saskatchewan will there be an oil well or a drum of oil produced in the province. You know, just about as wise as the present Leader of the Official Opposition, (I see he is not in his seat), making the statement, the other day, that as long as those C.C.F. jokers are in power, there will not be a pulp mill!

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Now the Speech from the Throne further states that in 1957 there were 37 million barrels of oil produced. That was 37 million, valued at \$78 million.

Mr. Lopton: — Peanuts!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That last year a \$3 million steel pipe plant went into production. I remember the time when they were ridiculing this, saying that the pipe plant would never establish in Saskatchewan.

The Speech from the Throne announces the flare gas compressing plant opened in the Smiley Field. The Speech from the Throne says a flare gas processing plant costing \$20 million will be constructed in the Steelman field in 1958; that a start has been made on a \$20 million potash concentrator at the potash mine near Saskatoon; that a similar \$20 million potash project is under way at Esterhazy; that in 1957, there was a record uranium production valued at \$39 million, and the Speech forecasts that there will be even an expansion in this production in the year 1958.

I say that if the Liberals, over the past 10 years that they were in power, could have made one-such announcement, it would have been stupendous news throughout the province. There would have been jubilation. In fact, I'm going to tell you (if I know the Liberals right), they would have declared it a provincial holiday throughout the whole Province of Saskatchewan. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that these are ordinary happenings in the life of a C.C.F. Government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, I wish I could say the same thing, or speak of the same terrific and dynamic, rapid development about forest resources that we have had in connection with oil and minerals. But you will remember, Mr. Speaker, the first time this Government came into power, the first thing we had to do was to stop the unplanned, uncontrolled slaughter of our forest resources that had been carried on by the previous administration. You will remember, too, that when this Government came into power, we immediately had to engage foresters to carry on an inventory of the forest resources of Saskatchewan, because, prior to that, the Liberal administration did not know what they had in the north. They never bothered with it. These inventories have been carried on and are even maintained today.

The Leader of the Official Opposition, the other day, cries and says, "Where is the pulp mill industry?" Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if we carried on the same planless and uncontrolled exploitation of the forest that they carried on, you wouldn't have to talk about a pulp mill industry, today.

Mr. Danielson: — Where is the pulp mill?

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, where is it?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — By 1956, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Get in your own Department.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . I want to point out that most of the inventories were completed and with good conservation policies carried over the past 12 years, we have some of the firms of Canada and America interested in a possible pulp mill industry in Saskatchewan.

Mrs. Batten: — Hurrah!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I want to say that, with the inventories on hand, the Industrial Development Office was asked to work on encouraging pulp firms or other capital to look at the possibilities for a pulp mill for the province of Saskatchewan. One firm, as most of you are aware, had an option. It made some studies and research,

February 25, 1958

and then gave up the option because they were offered a better forest area in Ontario, closer to the market. They gave us the reason that, at that time freight rates were found to be too high from Saskatchewan into the market areas that were considerably closer to the Ontario forest area, which is, of course, true. In May, 1956, an option agreement was signed by the Campbell's pulp interests under the name of Waskesiu Forest Products. We gave this firm an option on a block of forest area north of Prince Albert, and an agreement was signed calling for the building of a 600 ton mill per day on the outskirts of P.A., after they have done their engineering and so on. A further reserve area was set aside if the firm extended its mill to 1,200 tons per day. I want to say that this agreement was signed in May, 1956.

Mr. Danielson: — Before an election.

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — But, Mr. Speaker, if the announcement had not been made to the press at that particular time, there is no doubt that the press would have obtained the news. Then, of course, we would have been charged with withholding important news to the province. In fact, I could just imagine, Mr. Speaker, how the Leader of the Official Opposition, and especially the two 'dead-end boys', would have been up and throughout the province, charging us with 'Russia' — "They're doing things in secret and not informing the people of their negotiations."

Mr. McDonald: — That's why I'm going to do something.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — So I want to say this, Mr. Speaker; you're wrong if you do it; you're wrong if you don't.

Mr. McFarlane: — You're wrong all the time!

Mr. McDonald: — You're just wrong — period!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I want to say that this firm spent some \$300,000 in engineering and research. By 1957 there was created a surplus in the pulp-producing area of North America. For example, even today the pulp industry of Canada can produce from 15 to 20 per cent in excess of demand. Of course, the industry itself forecasts that, by 1960-61, there will again be a shortage of pulp production on the market.

Mr. McDonald: — That's election year.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Campbell had some difficulty in finding the market for the pulp.

Mr. McDonald: — Not according to . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Later he took in a partner, who controlled a market for approximately 250 tons per day. By this time, the Federal Government of Canada as well as the United States came out with a tight money policy. With the tight money policy came the unemployment and economic recession that 'John' and 'Mike' are haggling over today. I want to say that Mr. Campbell was able to iron out his financial problems by the end of the year, 1957. I believe Mr. Campbell was earnest in going ahead. In fact, prior to the end of the year, he had purchased land just outside the city of Prince Albert for the site of the plant. Early in February of this year, however, Mr. Campbell came to Regina. He met a committee of Cabinet and informed us that he would like to wait and think it over for a year. He told us unemployment is increasing in Canada and in America at an alarming rate, and the recession, he said, may snowball into a depression. He further stated pulp prices could drop and his investment could be wiped out. He wants to take off a year to see whether or not the Canadian and American Governments can stem the rising tide of the recession. And, I don't blame him.

Mr. McDonald: — We just wanted to take off, from you.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — From the discussion with Mr. Campbell, I gather that he was not afraid of the C.C.F. Government, but he was very concerned with the economic recession which was brought about by the tight money policy of both the Federal Canadian and American Governments. I want to state here that I believe that both Governments at that time were aware that the tight money policy would create some unemployment; but their plan was that some unemployment would be good for the nations: it would curb inflation. Yet, the Federal Government of Canada did not have the backbone or the courage to freeze prices, to bring back price control. They brought about a tight money policy which brought about unemployment, and a recession which may actually yet snowball into a depression. I say that is the reason why a pulp mill today is not established in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McDonald: — Blame it on the Federal Government!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, we have another group, the Patterson interests of California, who are still interested in the establishment of a pulp mill in Saskatchewan. I want to say that their agreement was extended to April 30, 1958. The Leader of the Official Opposition said, "Why, there were supposed to be four pulp mills!" Well, that's of his own making: nobody ever stated that there will be four pulp mills. I know that the Department of Natural Resources has made the statement that there is room for four pulp mills in the province of Saskatchewan. Then he goes on with another statement,

February 25, 1958

and I'm going to quote this: He stated, "Well now, Mr. Speaker, who knows? We may know quite a bit about Mr. Sommers before long, but I doubt if we will ever know too much about the proposed pulp mill, because in the last Session the agreement was tabled here in the Legislature at my request". This statement, Mr. Speaker, I say is a filthy exposition of him judging others by himself. Then he ended off with an absolute untruth. That statement that he requested the agreement to be tabled, is untrue. I want to say . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Speaking on a point of privilege . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Just a minute! I'll . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Speaking on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — I would ask the hon. Minister to withdraw the statement. If he will go back through the records of this House, and to the records of the newspapers of this province, he will find that, on numerous occasions, I have requested that the agreement be tabled in the House, and finding an agreement, not to build a pulp mill, but an agreement for an option on some timber land in the Candle Lake area which was tabled in the House.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — You take up my time, I will take up yours.

Mr. Danielson: — No profit at all.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, in the last Session of the Legislature, at the request of the Hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) on February 26th — he was the man who requested that these agreements be tabled, and on March 8, 1957, I tabled the agreements. They were on the table over there. They were underneath the nose of the Leader of the Official Opposition, and every member of the opposition. They didn't wake up until two or three weeks later when the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) mumbled in his beard, "What about the pulp agreements?" and the Premier and I replied, "they have been on the table for three weeks now. Wake up."

Mr. Cameron: — There was nothing in them.

Mr. McDonald: — An agreement to build a pulp mill has never been tabled.

Mr. Cameron: — The agreement has never been tabled

Mr. McDonald: — You haven't tabled an agreement yet, because you haven't got any.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this isn't the first time that the members of the Opposition have been ridiculing the Premier for not sitting on his hunches like they did, but has gone out to try and encourage, and to bring in industry to the province.

Mr. McDonald: — We haven't had any.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — This isn't the first time they've been ridiculing us. I remember the Bill for the organization of the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation came in; they ridiculed it; they voted against it. The ex-Premier of this province, the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, stated that the clay around Regina was not fitted for cement production.

Mr. Cameron: — Who owns it now?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yet today, Mr. Speaker, we have an \$8 million cement corporation operating in the city. They made the same statement when we announced the building of a \$3 million steel pipe plant
...

Mr. Cameron: — Who got control of it?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . but it is there. Smoke is gushing out. It is employing some of the farmers who were liquidated by the 'Jimmy' Gardiner cost-price squeeze of the Dominion Government.

Mr. Cameron: — Liquidated through paying your taxes.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I'll never forget the time the Potash Company of America took a lease on an area east of the city of Saskatoon. I remember the hon. member for Saltcoats jeered and laughed and ridiculed — "Why, it wouldn't amount to anything; all it is is C.C.F. propaganda." But the big thing is the mill is coming on.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — And another one in another constituency.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes. And another one — a \$20 million one in the Esterhazy area. There are others; the Continental Paper Products Ltd; \$1 1/4 million sewer pipe plant; two light aggregate

February 25, 1958

plants, the Prairie Fibre Board, and many other industries that have been established in the province of Saskatchewan. They laughed at them all.

I see my time is up, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to make some announcements, particularly on the northern road development. At the present time I want to say that we are spending some \$325,000 on northern access roads that are going to be paid for on a fifty-fifty basis with the Federal Government. We have a letter, too, from the Federal Government committing themselves on the \$15 million northern road development project over a period of five years, where northern roads are going to be built into the north, which will tap other resource areas.

I see my time is up, Mr. Speaker, so I am going to say I'm sure you realize where I stand. The amendment to the Address by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition actually means this to me: that they realize that the Federal Government has failed miserably to cope with the economic agricultural situation, as well as that of unemployment, therefore they urge that we, the Provincial Government, step in and assume the Federal responsibility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against it. I have checked on the promises that we made to the people in 1956, and I see that the Speech from the Throne has in it another step forward in the implementation of every one of those promises. Therefore, I take it that it is my duty to support the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this debate on the Speech from the Throne, I do so with a feeling of keen disappointment in the contents of that document the Speech from the Throne, despite the very eloquent and glowing accounts, and support of it by my neighbour, the Minister of Natural Resources, (Hon. Mr. Kuziak). It provided no remedial solutions to the urgent and serious problems confronting the people of Saskatchewan, particularly the farm people, labour and small business man.

Before I proceed, however, I wish to join with the members who have spoken previously in this debate, in extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion, and also to compliment all the other speakers who have taken part in this debate, for the efforts they have put forth. I want particularly to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) for the very fine contribution he made to this debate. His outline and summary of many of our problems was most courageous and realistic, and his suggestions for the solution of some of these problems were sincere and practical.

On perusing the Speech from the Throne, I find mention made of an increase in mothers' allowances, and I am sure this is most welcome. It is something that was long past due, and I am sure it should be a great help and assistance to many of the mothers, widows and orphan children in this province. But I do think the Opposition sitting on this side of the House can claim some part of the credit for the increase because, in the last Session of the Legislature this Government was severely criticized for the pittance they were paying to these particular people. I think it had something to do with this very worthy increase which has been extended to these people.

Then I noticed there has been an increase, or there will be an increase, given to the old-age assistance recipients, to the blind persons' allowances, and to the disabled persons' allowances; very worthy contributions, I am sure, and something that will be appreciated by those people who are unfortunate, in many cases, to have to have these particular allowances. I am certain it will fill a very definite need they have experienced over the past year or so.

I see also certain assistance is going to be provided to our municipal governments and local school boards, and I am sure it will be very acceptable. But that particular provision, as it is outlined in the Speech from the Throne, is qualified and limited to the increase that the province may receive under the Dominion-Provincial tax-sharing agreement. Now, from certain remarks which have been made in this House already this Session, it would seem probably that would not be too great. I hope it is a very large increase, and that, as a result, the municipalities and our local school boards will receive considerable assistance they so badly need. But I am afraid, possibly, even if it is a very large contribution, it will fall short of meeting the extra costs our school officials and our municipal men find it is necessary to spend in order to provide the educational facilities and municipal services their public demands.

Another item I would like to bring attention to, briefly, is the matter announced in the Speech from the Throne that there will be held, during this coming summer, I assume, a conference of representatives of all the Indian bands within the province of Saskatchewan. I am hoping that coming out of that Conference will be something really worthwhile for those people, our Indian population, and that they possibly may be granted, at their request, full citizenship rights in the province of Saskatchewan. I hope, if that takes place, it will, in no way interfere with the current or present particular privileges and rights they enjoy under the Treaties of years ago.

February 25, 1958

We have heard a great deal in the last few days in connection with the problems being faced by the people of this province, and I am sure everyone will agree there are some very serious problems confronting the people today. As I have already mentioned, those chiefly affected are the small farmer, the small business man and certain portions of our labouring force in the province. I am quite satisfied our local school officials and municipal officials are people who have had to face real problems. I don't know, but that this Government has failed in doing all it might have done to relieve some of those problems, and one of the most acute problems, possibly, is, the ability to deliver grain by the farmers of this province. Some on the other side of the House may say this is something they, as a provincial government, have nothing to do with. Well, in that I disagree, because I believe, if the foresight had been used a few years back — possibly it isn't too late yet — the Provincial Government could possibly have departed on a program of grain storage facilities in this province that, in the long-run and by this time in most cases, would not have cost the taxpayers of this province, insofar as direct assistance from the provincial treasury is concerned, one cent.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That would be Socialism!

Mr. Barrie: — They were private people; they were private concerns that established those particular kinds of facilities in the province. In my own village of Pelly we have a very fine rink built under those conditions, on borrowed money, and I am very pleased to say that, by the middle of this summer that rink, which is now housing over 150,000 bushels of grain, will be an asset to the people of the village of Pelly for years and years to come, and paid for from storage received.

There is another matter which, I claim, the C.C.F. Government have failed in furnishing or supply, possibly a partial solution, to some of the problems our farm people, particularly in the northern part, have to contend with today, particularly people who are engaged in the poultry industry. We have heard a great deal about the poultry producers in the province of Saskatchewan not being able to secure for their products certain prices which have been guaranteed in the past by the Federal Government. I think most people realize and know there is a reason for that. However, in the province of Saskatchewan, and in the districts most seriously affected, there are no storage facilities for these products. If large cold-storage plants had been established in those districts, particularly in the north-eastern or central-eastern portion of this province where there is a great production of eggs and poultry, then I am quite certain the prices the producers of those products would have received, would have been much greater than what they have been because there are no great storage facilities. These products have to be gathered together in all storage facilities, and shipped out to other provinces in other parts of Canada, where they have these large storage facilities. That is

something the Government of this province might have done to help out a situation these people have been faced with.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No points of order here.

Mr. Barrie: — So I claim, Mr. Speaker, this Government has failed to measure up to its responsibilities in many respects.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — They've done very little towards some of the things that might have been done to help the situation which they howl so much about, and 'pass the buck' to the Federal Government at Ottawa. The effects of some of these problems are well known to everybody. I think my particular part of the province is not different from other parts of the province, where I find many vacant farms, people leaving the farms. I find many of the small businesses in the small rural communities having to discontinue. I find there seems to be a great scarcity of young people — they have had to move out over the past few years, and are still moving out to other parts of Canada to secure employment. This is, in my opinion, a very serious matter for this province. If we are going to lose the small rural communities, and we are going to lose the small-unit farmer, then something that has been the backbone of this western country is going to disappear entirely, and anything that could be done to provide, or give, assistance to those people, should be done. I hope this Government will realize the situation, and give it the consideration it deserves. We find we have a loss of population, probably not a great deal; but we have not kept pace with other parts of Canada, and that means a very serious matter for those of us who are left here, because we are going to have a much greater burden to bear.

This is another matter which should be given serious consideration. We have heard a great deal about industrial development and expansion. My friend, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources painted a very glowing picture just a few moments ago in the House, but I want to make this comment. I believe, even if we have made certain strides in Saskatchewan, far greater strides might have been made had we a little different climate or atmosphere in this province.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I think it is only logical to say that when we hear the principles of Socialism expounded from time to time, up and down in this province, and all that it implies — I don't think

February 25, 1958

any reasonable person would say that was the attractive atmosphere to induce free-enterprise capital into this province, which is absolutely necessary to expand natural resources, expand industry, and such like. So I believe the Ministers of this Government, the members of this Government, and the C.C.F. party have to accept a certain responsibility . . .

Mr. McDonald: — That's right.

Mr. Barrie: — . . . for the lag behind in industrial and resource development and expansion in Saskatchewan. Now, in Canada and in Saskatchewan we have two major and three minor (if I am allowed to use those particular terms) political parties seeking support of the people of the province of Saskatchewan and of Canada. You can divide these five parties into two very distinct groups. The first group would include the Conservative party, the Social Credit Party and the Liberal Party, and we are making no apologies for it. While these three parties have differences — they are being expounded every day on the platform, at the present time in the Federal election campaign . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Pretty trivial!

Mr. Barrie: — . . . but the basic principle of these three parties which I have just mentioned in this particular group, is democratic free enterprise. They believe in the freedom of the individual, and believe that is the primary and utmost importance. It is the best system yet devised by man, which can be amply proven by the advantages available wherever it is in practice.

Then we have the other group, the C.C.F. Party, and the Labour-Progressive, or Communist Party.

Mr. McCarthy: — They're both the same!

Mr. Barrie: — They have as their basic policy or principles of their parties, Socialism, and that's their business. I say that's their business; I am finding no fault with it. But Socialism means planned economies and all it implies, with the restrictions, and such like, that are applied to the individual. I want to be fair, I know, and I realize and appreciate that between these two parties there is a decided difference in opinion as to the methods of application and the extent of control, but, basically, their political philosophy is the same.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Who are you trying to kid?

Mr. Barrie: — These differences, Mr. Speaker, in political philosophies and policies explain many things. A week ago this evening, I was very pleased to have the opportunity to attend, and I want to congratulate the Premier of this province on the very able

address he made at the banquet for the University students. I quite agree with the assessment he made in his address of the international situation today, particularly in connection with the great struggle that is taking place to capture and control men's minds. Now, the techniques used by those behind the Iron Curtain, which have been used and are being used today . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They're being used right now.

Mr. Barrie: — . . . are techniques that I don't think many people in this province agree with: infiltration, mass propaganda, and the stirring up and promoting of bitterness and hate between friends. That's what is taking place internationally in our world today, and it was pointed out by our Premier; and I heartily agree with what he said at that particular banquet. I believe I am right in saying that, in the concluding remarks of his speech in this debate, a week ago tomorrow, the same thing was dealt with.

But Mr. Speaker, I want to say this is nothing new in the province of Saskatchewan, because we have suffered from this particular thing for 25 years. They are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the C.C.F. party this year, and this infiltration some years ago (and probably to a certain degree today) was carried on in a very large and wide field. By various means of organized infiltration, they sought to capture control or get power in this province, and to a large extent they were successful, I'll agree. But in this process, they undertook to infiltrate into non-political bodies, school boards, municipal, social and service organization. Oh! They can laugh; but many of these gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, know only too well it is correct and they probably participated in that particular kind of thing. They tried to infiltrate into the co-operatives in this province, and they even did not exempt the church organizations. The emphasis was on you, and still is. It's something that isn't too new, either, because Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin realized and appreciated the potential power there was, if they could capture the minds of youth.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Pretty contemptible, Barrie!

Mr. Barrie: — He had one example in this province I am going to mention. Some years ago there was a very glaring example of the practices that were carried on at that particular time. There was a text-book introduced into the schools of the province of Saskatchewan — they laugh about it; but the textbook was there, and that 'Wonderful World of Today' text-book, was for no other purpose than to try and capture the minds of the Grade IX students of this province and lead them down paths of Socialism.

February 25, 1958

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that statement must be denied as being absolutely ridiculous and untrue.

Mr. Barrie: — It's quite true, and I would like to deal with many clippings to substantiate what I said, with some of . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Go ahead and substantiate it.

Mr. Barrie: — . . . with some of the statements of the Minister of Education and his opinions; but other people have opinions, and they are also expressed in these clipping of years ago. Nevertheless the record is there and it was an attempt to channel the winds and the thinking of the youth of this province along the road of Socialism.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I am sorry to say that it worked in many cases. For example, we have a department which has operated over the years, and is still operating today, and that is our Bureau of Publications. I believe they have changed the name now to the Travel and Information Bureau — where mass production of slanted propaganda, at public expense, is not only spread over the province of Saskatchewan, not only within the confines of our nation, but outside of our nation, all at public expense, eulogizing the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan and promoting the socialistic experiments, and such like. I believe the people of this province are beginning to awake to what is being done.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I believe possible it has something to do with the rather subdued atmosphere we find in this Legislature, this Session. Yes, the philosophy of a party, particularly a political party, means and explains many things. Those of us who oppose Socialism can take some heart for the future, I believe. I think possibly some of you Socialists should take a little warning from statements made, not too long ago, by possibly the most outstanding man of our time, truly a real international figure, Sir Winston Churchill. I believe the people, not only within the British Commonwealth of Nations, but outside of it, with the exception of those people behind the Iron Curtain, have the highest respect for Mr. Churchill. This is what he said on one occasion.

"The theory of Socialism is unsound economically and socially, and contrary to human nature. The more it is enforced upon the people, the worse the results will be. Socialism has been tried many times and always found wanting. It has never, and will never, work."

Mr. Speaker, I notice my time is up. This Closure we have in this Legislature . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, rise on a question of privilege. No remark can be made about a closure in this House. The hon. member can talk as long as he likes — from now until midnight, if he likes.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has just made a statement that there is no closure in this House. I deny that statement. Radio time is divided between the Government and the Opposition, and we have closure every day we are on the air.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there is no member on this side of the House who is due to speak, this afternoon. My hon. friend is not required to sit down. He can continue to speak as long as he likes; but if he has to sit down, it is only to give way to one of his colleagues. The rules of this House are not to be reflected on in an improper manner by any member.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The word 'closure' in effect, is the closure implied in our Standing Orders, agreed to by this House at the last Session.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the point of order. We on many, many occasions have objected to the division of radio time and, naturally, if the hon. member who was now on his feet were to speak for the balance of the radio time today, it would mean that one of our members would not have an opportunity to speak over the radio during this Session. And it is closure, because of the division, the forced division, of radio time by the C.C.F. Government, or the members of that Government who sit on the Committee.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's despicable, 'Hammy'!

Mr. McDonald: — It's isn't despicable; it's a fact.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. First of all, the radio time has nothing to do with closure.

February 25, 1958

The hon. member can speak as long as he wants to. If he wants to give way to one of his colleagues, that's his privilege; but he is not required to do so by any rules of the House, or any closure.

Secondly, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that, worked out on a basis of individual members, the members opposite have more time per member than the members on this side of the House. That is the greatest possible generosity; it is not my fault that they don't know how to make use of the time they have.

Mr. McDonald: — Nine seconds more.

Mr. Cameron: — Nine seconds more. You have imposed closure!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member for Pelly still has the floor.

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in connection with the remarks that I previously made, I think it must be very obvious that I will support the amendment and will not support the motion.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that we have had such noisy conduct of the House the last few minutes, at least I am on my feet. I am going to assure you that I am not going to follow that example, for the few moments that I am going to speak this afternoon. I believe, at this time the greatest concern of the people of the world, and of Canada, and of the province of Saskatchewan, is the situation of our international affairs. It is therefore not surprising that the eyes of the world are focussed on the present Federal campaign, not because they are only interested in our domestic affairs, but because they are the individual who happens to have been absent from the peace table since the 10th of June has been much missed and more mourned by the nations of the world, and he happens to be one of the leaders of the contestant parties.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Which one?

Mr. Loptson: — Hon. Lester B. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — You had us fooled there for a minute, didn't you?

Mr. Loptson: — Canada's representative in the United Nations organization prior to the defeat of the Liberal Government this summer, and during this time has gained for himself

and Canada the respect and confidence of all the nations of the world, as an outstanding diplomat in the art of smiting our discords and differences among the member nations. He is given the credit for averting a world war at the time of the Middle East conflict, and was awarded last fall the Nobel prize in recognition of this and other outstanding accomplishments in the cause of peace. This is the first time this coveted award has been made to a Canadian . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Are you going to vote for the address?

Mr. Lopton: — . . . in view of the present troubled international situation, his return to the Peace Conference is earnestly sought as being the one man in the world today that can do more than any other to avert a world war. With these facts known, it is hard to imagine that any peace-loving man or woman going to the poll on March 31 and, by the mark of his ballot, would deny the world the services of this diplomatic genius. The only way they can assure his services is by voting for his Liberal candidate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of many others, that if we can, during the next few years avert a conflict, that the danger of a world war passed that period would be very small. I believe the tendency in the Communist or Socialist countries are gradually softening towards the exchange of visits and greater trade, and there is nothing that will cultivate friendship among nations like the exchange of tourists and the expansion of trade. If you want to cultivate friendship with your neighbour, there is nothing better to do than to go and visit him, and try to exchange goods with him.

Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks made, I will devote myself to the local issue. The bankruptcy of the Speech from the Throne has well been exemplified by previous speakers, so I'm not going to waste any more time on the contents of that speech. But I do want to confine myself to examining some of the remarks made by members on the Government side. First of all, I would like to take under review remarks made by the seconder of that speech, the hon. member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). He made a very familiar speech, and remarks that belong to the C.C.F. party as a whole. We hear it from every platform; we read it in the press, and we hear it on the air. That is the insinuation that the cost-price of implements are the results of large profits made by the manufacturer. He mentions here that in 1951, he bought a combine for \$4,365 and he says that that combine today is selling for \$7,200. He says that on the basis of \$1,000 which is the value of his quarter-section, it would amount to a lot of mills. Now, in the first place I'm going to say this, that to buy a \$4,300 combine to take a crop off a quarter-section worth \$1,000 doesn't seem practical, or else he must be very much under-assessed.

February 25, 1958

Secondly, I want to say that the price spread between \$4,300 in that period doesn't seem to me quite in line with the actual price, in 1951, the price he says, was \$4,365. I bought a combine in 1952 and it cost me \$5,200. I tried to buy a similar combine in 1956, or 1957 and it was going to cost me \$6,800. But what I want to say is the policy of the insinuation that the company that made this combine was responsible for the spread. Let us be truthful. Of course, a C.C.F.'er must not defend the truth. I'm going to say this, and my hon. friend (and I don't think he really wants to be untrue) — I don't think he just knows what he was talking about, but he was just following the practice of his leaders; because they are professions in the art of prevarication doesn't mean that he has to go out and commit the same sin. What is the result? What are the facts? in 1951 the company that he bought that combine from made an average profit in that year of less than 4 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Brown (Min. i/c Sask. Power Corporation): — On what?

Mr. Loptson: — On the sales; on the overall sales.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Oh, that's different.

Mr. Loptson: — Less than 4 per cent, or in other words, if that had been applied to the manufactured cost of the combine which usually is approximately half the price of the retail price, their profit would have been, on the \$4,300 combine — or approximately \$100. Then, in 1956 when the combine was \$7,200, as my hon. friend said it was, the profit to the company was 5/8ths of one per cent, or 80 cents on every one hundred dollars of turn-over.

If you want to get the truth of those things, it is not hard to obtain. Every corporation in Canada has got to advertise its financial statements, and all annual statements are being compiled by MacLean's Publishing Company, of the 'Financial Post', showing the profits of every company every year. This book costs \$3 and that is very little to anybody who wants to find out how the different corporations stand. In spite of the fact that the company only made 4/5th of a cent on the dollar, my hon. friends go around the country and say that the Government of Canada is allowing the Corporations to take these fabulous profits.

Now let me give you little items taken from the annual survey, showing the standing of the implement companies. Let us take our own Canadian company, for instance Massey-Harris-Ferguson.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Yours, not ours.

Mr. Loptson: — You don't want to hear it, you're afraid of it, eh? In 1953 they made a profit of \$7,365,000 after paying

the Government a tax of \$7,650,000 — or approximately 3.9 per cent on their turn-over. In 1954 they paid the Government a tax of \$8,400,000 and retained a profit of \$7,194,000 or a profit of 2.4 per cent. In 1955 they paid in corporation tax \$5,075,000 retaining \$7,521,000 or a profit of 2.6 per cent. Then in this crucial year where they were supposed to make such a fabulous profit on my friend's combine, they made a profit of 5/8ths of a cent, or 80 cents on the \$100. Take the Cockshutt people — another Canadian company. In 1953 they paid the Government in taxes \$1,623,000 and made a profit of \$1,175,000 or 2.3 per cent, and for 1954 — they had a deficit of \$1,919,000 and paid the Government . . . In 1955 they had a deficit of \$124,000, and yet my hon. friend says these companies are making fabulous profits.

I want my hon. friends to hear about Canada Packers. They say the packers are taking all the profits from the cream and eggs and butter that the farmer has to sell; and they say the packers get all the profit between the price the farmer gets for his products, and the price the consumer has to pay. Well, I took the trouble to check up and see just how much money the packers were making; and I checked on Canada Packers Ltd., who I believe are making as much money as any other packer in Canada. In 1953, they paid the Government, in taxes, \$5,581,000, retained \$4,400,000 themselves, or 1.1 per cent on their sales. This included all the profits of the Company. In 1954, they paid the Government, in corporation taxes, \$4,480,000 and retained \$3,702,000 or a profit of 1 per cent. In 1955, they paid the Government \$4,490,000 and retained \$3,716,000 — or a profit of 1 per cent.

Yes, I may say, Mr. Speaker, some of these C.C.F.'ers know the truth, and they can well hang their heads in shame for the dishonest way they are presenting the fact to their friends and neighbours. That is the way they get votes from the people. Who is behind this conspiracy? Why don't they put the blame where it belongs? During this period, labour lead by C.C.F.'ers has been continuously asking for higher and higher wages, and shorter and shorter hours, right across the democratic countries. Wherever there is a socialistic party, they control labour unions. What is going to be the result of all this? Ninety per cent of the labouring force are good people, prepared to give an honest day's work for a good living wage; but we have 10 per cent who are incompetent and lazy and a percentage of that 10 per cent have only one object in mind, and that is to preserve their salaries of up to \$50,000 a year, and destroy our economic and free enterprise system.

Now, in order to prove this statement, Mr. Speaker, I have a report of a speech made by a C.C.F. member of the Manitoba Legislature. Surely we ought to take his word as authentic. Some of you may know the gentleman, Mr. Donovan Swailes, speaking to a C.C.F. forum, is reported to have said that wages have nothing to do with the

cost of goods. He says:

"Change comes in the profits of the capitalist. We are out to take this profit away from industry, so that they will close their doors. We will then demand the Government to take it over and we will share in the profits."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Are you quoting from something?

Mr. Loptson: — That has been a long-term plan of the C.C.F. and the Communists combined, on the other . . .

Premier Douglas: — And the Wheat Pool!

Mr. Loptson: — On the other hand, they are endeavouring to depress agriculture by undermining the selling market; our Wheat Board has been undermined as a result of the speeches made by our representatives here, from Saskatchewan. A few years ago my hon. friend across the way started a give-away policy, and now, yes, we criticize the United States for doing the very thing that we preached for two years, before the United States took up the suggestion. Bill No. 480 did not pass Congress until in 1954. Our friends were preaching give-away wheat a year before that.

On the other hand, I should say that if the policy is a good one, then who can better afford to give wheat away than the United States? And who is more ready and willing to do it than the most charitable nation that we have in the world today? They have, as a matter of fact, been trying to give away some 500 million bushels of wheat for the last five years, and have not been able to get rid of it. Why shouldn't they be more able to do it than we here in Canada? What would only cost them ten cents per capita would cost us \$1 per capita.

Mr. Speaker, we have a dangerous force not only here in Canada, but we have in all democratic countries across the world. Look what they're doing to labour today, through the agitation which started in about 1950 for higher pay. As a result of this unreasonable demand, they have closed up half the coal mines, thrown thousands of people out of work. They have closed over 50 per cent of our rock mines, and other tons of thousands of people have been thrown out of work. If you go through this survey you will find about 50 per cent of the corporations in Canada today are getting ready to close their doors. Another hundred thousand people are going to be thrown out of work. We had 275 ships sailing under Canadian registry at the close of the last war. What have we got today? Eleven, and eight of them

belong to us, the people of Canada, and they have been strike-bound in their harbours for the last eight or nine months, because they cannot go out at the rate they have to pay for wages, and compete with those other ships who have gone to foreign registry and hire people at more reasonable rates.

I feel concerned that labour is being used by this insidious outfit that is infiltrating our free enterprise system. Yes, we believe in free enterprise, free co-operation and public ownership, say come C.C.F.'ers, and on the other hand we see a statement from the Premier himself, saying there is no difference in the principle of the C.C.F. than there was before the Winnipeg Declaration. You all know what the C.C.F. Manifesto is. It says that we shall not rest until we get rid of all capitalistic . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Oh, but you said they're all gone broke!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, that's the way you're taking them over. That's the way you're doing; you're trying to break them. Just as Mr. Swailes said. Well, so much for their way of getting control. If the rank and file of labour doesn't wake up to what their leaders are doing to them, there is no Government going to prevent a depression. You can no more ask more than the market can pay for labour than it can for the goods that labour makes. There is work for every man in Canada today, at a good living wage, and there is market for the goods they would produce at a competitive price.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Are you speaking for your party?

Mr. Loptson: — But when you get beyond that, then you have lost your market, and you have lost your jobs as well.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Is that Liberal policy?

Mr. Loptson: — Well we hear a lot from the Premier about the eradication of Communism. I don't believe it is possible to eradicate Communism as long as there are any people in the world who are imbued with socialistic ideas. Socialism is naturally based on envy; it is greed, and the ideal of Socialism . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Where did you get that idea?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . is to take from the progressive and bring him down to the level of the unprogressive. In other words, the policy is 'take from he who has, and give to him who hasn't'. You cannot bring the lazy fellow up, so you've got to bring down the willing fellow, so we'll all be equal. Socialism all over the world

February 25, 1958

has now shown to be of any benefit to the people. You know, after all, humanity is borne selfish. If you want proof for that, put two infants in a cradle and give one of them a toy, or even give both of them a toy, and see how quickly one will grab from the other.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's Liberal — that's free enterprise!

Mr. Loptson: — When he grows up . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He'll be a Liberal!

Mr. Loptson: — . . . his nature has been provided for, he doesn't make that nature. The Creator makes that nature. The wealth of a nation is only as great — or the nation's prosperity is only as great, as the productivity of its working force, whether it is mental, or whether it is manual. But there are two great differences between the mental capacity and the physical capacity. You may judge how much a man can do physically, but you cannot judge the capacity of his brain, so in order to draw a capacity out of his brain, you have to give him an incentive, and it is that free enterprise and the freedom and the right of this man with the brain to exercise it, that makes him prosperous, and his country, too.

What harm is there in man making a profit? Henry Ford came to be probably the richest man in the world. He died, but didn't take a dollar with him. He used his millions to expand industries all through the United States and Canada, and even across the sea. Hundreds of thousands of people benefited. If he hadn't any incentive to invent this car of his, or if his partners hadn't had a chance to make a profit on their investments, are we likely to have had all this expansion? No. That's why free enterprise countries are so much more prosperous than those controlled by Communism or Socialism. There's no difference; they are both the same. Ask the Americans. Consult your dictionary. Yes, I see Mr. Coldwell says the definition of Socialism is not right in the English dictionary; he wants it changed, because it doesn't fit his policy. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the quicker the people of Saskatchewan realize what this socialistic theory is doing to them, the better off we will be.

The Premier is always fond of telling us that by giving wheat away to the hungry people, we can stop the spread of Communism. Well, now, to say that the C.C.F. is incoherent to the Communist philosophy would be repudiating the statement of their leader. Let me just quote you some of the statements of C.C.F. leader, the Premier, for instance. I can read you for the next hour his statements.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Oh, come on!

Mr. Loptson: — No, no, no. The statements of Mr. Woodsworth . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They look kind of old, those statements.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . or here is one fairly recently from the Premier of Saskatchewan. Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan, in the Session of this Legislature, was asked to define the difference between the C.C.F. and that of the Communists, and he proceeds to say that there are four points of difference between the C.C.F. Manifesto and that of the Communists of Russia, and they are this. First, he says:

"We believe in free religion".

Secondly, he says:

"We do not want to use force to get elected."

Thirdly, he says:

"We are going to have free speech".

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it is quite correct that when a member quotes, he should give the source of quotation. Now, obviously he is not quoting from the official records. He is only quoting from a member of this House, and that's what the records are for, and he should use them for that purpose.

Mr. Loptson: — I am quoting from a paper that was from the records of this House in 1947.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What paper?

Mr. Loptson: — The records of the House, 1947. You can find it in the records yourself. You're not going to deny it, anyway. Will you deny that you said A? Will you get up now and say that you didn't make that statement?

Premier Douglas: — That is a very poor distortion of what I said.

Mr. McDonald: — It's no distortion; it was a poor speech!

Mr. Loptson: — Then we come to our friend, Mr. Coldwell. Our friend from Hanley (Hon. Mr. Walker) just made a statement that would coincide with what I have here. Here in a statement of Mr. Coldwell, as reported in The Toronto Star, when speaking to the C.C.F. convention in August, 1953, and in essence he says this:

February 25, 1958

Premier Douglas: — In essence?

Mr. Loptson: — In essence he says this:

"I prefer feudalism to our today's capitalism."

And I would say that is pretty close to Communism. Then we have here even a picture of the Premier of Saskatchewan, also quoted in the 'Toronto Saturday Night', July 19, 1954, where he was also speaking to the C.C.F. Youth Movement:

"Just a couple of weeks ago . . . (I am quoting) Premier T.C. Douglas of Saskatchewan was talking to the C.C.F. Youth. Mr. Douglas has learned a great deal of restraint in the 10 years he has headed the Saskatchewan Government. But when he addressed the Youth, he slipped easily back into the Marxist jargon of his younger days. His listeners heard about the class struggle, about the class that was trying to destroy political democracy when the people tried to gain control of social democracy, and they got a fashion note, too.

"The dress-shirt squads", Mr. Douglas informed the starry-eyed youth, "are as much a menace . . ."

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What are you reading from?

Mr. McDonald: — He told you once.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . as blackshirts". In this performance of Mr. Douglas, that gives some sense to the flippant remark of the cynic who described Socialism as 'a Communist without guts'."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He had a ghost writer, did he?

Mr. Loptson: — There's something I would like to draw your attention to. You know, Socialism not only in Canada, but all over the democratic world, is a haven for Communist activity. Now, I'm not going to say that all those who believe in Socialism are Communists.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — But you might as well.

Mr. Loptson: — But they're definitely on the road to being one.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — What about the Wheat Pool?

Mr. Loptson: — Now let me just — yes, and I'll tell you the poor fellows are long dead now, but they certainly were radicals, and if it hadn't been for the Liberals baling them out, they would not have the pool today.

I'll give you an example of how Communism works through Socialist parties in the different countries. Take Great Britain, for instance. In a survey of Communist activities in Great Britain, the British Isles, they found there was no less than 11,000 infiltrated into the Civil Service, and some of them in very important positions. Of course, that wouldn't mean anything to you, because that would be what you want. Then we have a report here of John B. Eden, a cousin of Anthony Eden, who had made this survey, and he says further:

"It is to be estimated that 2,000 party members are entrenched in the great British teaching profession",

also coming in there as Socialists. There were 200 Communist prelates connected with the British churches. Socialism as it stands in any form, in any country, is a forerunner of Communism, "As sure as night follows day", he says, "Communism follows Socialism."

Now, I have another one here I want to give you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Read it, come on.

Mr. Loptson: — This is from an authority, Mr. Speaker, that even you wouldn't deny, is the highest on record. It comes from no other person than the Pope from the Vatican City, reported May 16, 1956:

"The Pope, in a speech published Saturday, criticized excessive state Socialism, and said the Roman Catholic church favours well intensive private enterprise.

"Speaking to a group of Italian businessmen, the Pope said the private enterprise contributes more to increase common riches, lightens men's labour, raises its return, cuts protection costs, and builds up savings.

February 25, 1958

"He said the price of state planned economies is that they interfere with individual liberty, disturbs the senility of work, violates the character of the family, distorts patriotism, and destroys religious heritage."

Well, I would say there is a lot of sense here in those few words, from a man who knows what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Why not quote from Pope Leo's Encyclical, too?

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, sure you would. Still you stand up and say you are a socialist. Probably you know more than your master does, here, or you think you do — maybe you do.

If my hon. friends want to know how they are thought of abroad, they should ask Mrs. Sobell. How did she come to Saskatchewan instead of any other province in Canada? Why did she come to Saskatchewan? That's what they think of the C.C.F. party in the U.S.A. She could have gone to any other province and certainly to any other country, who would have had more money to give her than Saskatchewan, because Saskatchewan was broke that year, in 1955. But she came straight to Saskatchewan. How did she find out about her friends? She lived in the United States. Somebody was there who knew your records.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Oh, come on. Some more.

Mr. Loptson: — For 25 years honest and sincere men and women throughout this province and throughout Canada donated money and worked hard in support of the C.C.F. party, with one great objective in view, and that was that they might some day reach the eminent position of having the balance of power in the Government of Canada. The day came on the 10th of June. Great celebrations were staged. Conventions were held. Plans were laid for how they were going to get just what they wanted, because the Tories had about 112 or 116 members and the C.C.F. had 25, and the two combined carried a clear majority.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's not right, of course, and you know it.

Mr. Loptson: — But anyway, the two of them combined to make a majority. Do you know what happened? They get to Ottawa with all this great ambition and the Tories wouldn't even consent. They found themselves just as important to the people they represent as the teats on the belly of a boar pig, and they came back

here empty-handed. Now, what is going to happen to the C.C.F. party?

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Form the Government at Ottawa.

Mr. Loptson: — There is only one thing for them to do. Mind you, there are some good men in the C.C.F. party. I would say that there are some men in Ottawa that could make a valuable contribution in the caucus of one of the older parties.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — if they had the courage!

Mr. Loptson: — But you know what good they are now. Our friend, the ex-Attorney General in the Commonwealth suggested that they go to Ottawa and play 'political poker'. They should move resolutions that are of no value, and that nobody will support; that is what they have done. Why should we be paying them \$10,000 a year and \$3,000 a year pension for life any longer? Wouldn't it be more sensible to send somebody down there that had some say?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes!

Mr. Loptson: — Never in the history of the C.C.F., as long as they have been in Ottawa, including the time our Hon. Premier was there, did they ever present a resolution or suggestion, of any importance, that was accepted in the House of Commons. Consequently, they have never been of any value there.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Look at those trained seals!

Mr. Loptson: — What they should do is what the Progressives did years ago. Each one of these members must have come from a Liberal or a Tory Party. If they are honest with their convictions, then let them go to the party they came from. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that some of them wouldn't be of much value to any party. There is the odd one, you know, these blather skites who do happen to come into a party — the fellow whose tongue runs well ahead of his brain; has cost the farmers a lot of money by speaking out of turn. We have one of them south of Regina, and it cost the farmers plenty for him not being able to hold his tongue. It's going to cost us about \$4 million a year in car demurrage; it cost us a market in Poland. He could have sat in his seat a little longer and held his tongue, and we probably wouldn't be up against this.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Who told you that, Ross Thatcher?

Mr. Loptson: — The Hansard told me that right from Ottawa. Yet there are people who go and vote for him. I hope they don't this time; I hope they've got better sense than to send him

February 25, 1958

again, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the end of the C.C.F. Surely people know that it is to their benefit to get back to the old party system, and even my hon. friend, the Premier, suggests they should do that. The Premier himself said, "it is about time we came back to the old party system."

Premier Douglas: — I said "two-party system"; not old party system.

Mr. Loptson: — But imagine the audacity of him thinking that the C.C.F. was going to be one of them.

Premier Douglas: — They are.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . with only one vote out of 10 in the Dominion of Canada!

Premier Douglas: — Eight Liberal seats from the Great Lakes to the Pacific Ocean!

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, that is all I'm going to say. I will support the amendment, but not the motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the Throne Speech Debate, I believe that, another year, I am going to make certain that I don't follow the two friends who have preceded me. I had a speech prepared for this afternoon, but I am afraid I am going to have to change quite a bit of it. I will save that for another day, if it is needed. However, before leaving the subject that has been discussed, there are just one or two things I would like to read to hon. members. Before getting to that part of my address, I would like first to take this opportunity of extending to the two members who moved and seconded the Address. My congratulations on their presentations. They had a very poor subject so speak on, but they made a very good job of a very poor case.

Having said that, I would like to say something on behalf of the members of our party who have spoken prior to myself. Our leader (Mr. McDonald) made a presentation following the addresses by the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne that I believe will go home to the people of this province. It will mean a great deal to them, and they will know that the Leader of the Opposition in this Legislature is a man who can present the case of the people of this province, and particularly those in the rural areas of Saskatchewan.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, for the others, when you come near the end of a debate practically everything is used up, so you have to use your own ingenuity instead of most of the books or reports that you might have before you. However, before getting into the main part of my address I would like to continue, to some extent, to enlarge on the question that

has been discussed by the two previous speakers. I am only going to take one or two excerpts from the handbook of the present Government here in this province. I have heard some of them read during the present debate, but I don't think any more striking than the two that I came across in reading this document, last night; and it is not the first occasion on which I have read it. This is in the question-and-answer form that has been presented to members here during the debate previously.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — What page is that on?

Mr. Gardiner: — The question in this case is: "Is the final objective of this group to socialize industry in its entirety?" This is the answer:

"The wording of the objective is social ownership of all the resources and the machinery of wealth production. This, therefore, includes all industries. We recognize the rights of the individual . . ."

Now listen to this:

". . . to own personal property which he can use for his comfort and well-being. Personal property includes the home, clothing, and furniture; otherwise everything should be controlled by the Government."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Are you still quoting?

Mr. Gardiner: — Now we come down to the next question: "How are we going to carry on a distribution system? Would we have co-operative organizations working with the State, or working under the control of the State and selling at State prices?"

This is the answer:

"Our co-operative organizations in Canada are far too insufficient to allow us to have much hope of setting up distribution on a co-operative basis, with the co-operative systems. We might have a State distributing agency, for instances, in which the present storekeeper would become a civil servant and have his salary paid by the State and the prices governed by the State to give people a decent standard of living."

Now I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the statements of the previous speakers have been quite correct. When you read statements of that type it is obvious that the object of the Government of this province and the party that they represent is a system of Socialism and, as previous speakers have said, there is very little difference, a very little line, between Socialism and our friends across in Russia, today. One of the hon. members across the floor of the House, speaking the other day, mentioned the question of supply and demand. He scoffed at it and said he would sooner be under a planned economy, probably such as they have in Russia at the present time. I don't know whether he has read much about what has happened in Russia through their planned economy. I don't know if he has read what has happened to the farmers of Russia in years gone by, due to the policy of planned economy in that great nation. Many of them have been starved to death by the nation trying to put into effect a planned economy, which is to be helpful to the farmers, as they say, in this province and in this country. I say here, and I don't think anyone can deny it, that there is no person in the Russian economy at the present time or since Communism has been in effect in that country, who is in a poorer state, or is considered a lower individual in the economy of that State, than the person who is working on the land and the farmer; and I don't think the people of Saskatchewan want a planned economy . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That was true right here, under 'Jimmy' Gardiner.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . of that type or the type that Socialism would give them in order to place the farmers in a position of that type.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had certain references, made to international affairs and Canadian affairs, and I am not going to take too much time on either, but I think there have been one or two statements made, by members on the other side of the House which are not strictly accurate, and I would like to correct some of them. I am not here defending anyone. I would like to see the income of the rural people of this province rise to much greater heights than it has in the past; but when we start talking about things going up or down, about the economy going up and down, I think we should have the facts before us; and I am going to show you where I got the facts — the same place I got them, last year — and you know, since we began to use this they stopped printing it. I went into the Library today, and they tell me that the Economic and Advisory Planning Board have ceased to print this document, and I think it is because of the fact that it is becoming very embarrassing to the Government of this province in trying to prove their case to the farmers of Saskatchewan. But in any case, the reason given is the fact that they say it takes up too much time.

Now what do we find when we read the statistics put out by the Economic and Advisory Planning Board of this province? I'm not going to say, for a minute, that these figures are as good as they should be; and I hope that, in the future, they will be much better, but I am reading from the farm "net income" after all expenses have been deducted. I am going to take five-year periods starting with the year 1935. In the years 1935 to 1939, the total net income of the farm people of this province was \$132,200,000. From 1940 to 1944, the figure had increased to \$988,000,000. From 1945 to 1949, the figure again increased to \$1,414,000,000; and in the last period, 1950 to 1954, to \$2,700,200,000. That is there was a steady rise from the time the Liberal government came into office in Ottawa, in 1935, up to a record point of \$2,700,200,000. These are figures taken from a book printed by the Government of this province, to prove the case for the Economic and Advisory Planning Board. In the last two years the income in one of those years has been lowered, but in one particular year, 1956, there were only three other years in the history of this province in which the income was higher than it was in the year 1956.

Premier Douglas: — Not cash income.

Mr. Gardiner: — The net cash income.

Premier Douglas: — Not cash . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Yes, the net income of the farmers.

Premier Douglas: — That includes inventory; that's not cash income — not net cash income; it's net income. My friend has to . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — This is farm net income.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, but that includes inventory — not cash.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The wheat in the fields.

Premier Douglas: — All the stored wheat in the granaries.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am reading from these figures, and the same figures pertain to the previous years as well, so I think the figures can be read into the I record. The same thing would obtain in the other years mentioned in this particular report, so I think it gives a fairly good picture of the income of the people of this province. I am reminding you that I am not saying for one minute that this is good enough, but it does disprove the story, which members on the other side of the House have

February 25, 1958

spread, that the Liberal Government had brought us to a position where the farm people were progressively getting less for their crops that were sold, on the whole, than they had in the years gone by. I believe that definitely illustrates that, in those five-year periods, it has progressively continued to increase, and I hope that, after the election on March 31st, under a Liberal government it will continue in the future to increase even higher than it has in the past, and that the income of the farmers in this province will rise to a record point in the history of this province and in the history of our country.

In leaving the field that our friends across the way speak of as 'Federal matters', I would like to join with my neighbour here, the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), in stating that there are many ways in which the Government of this province, in which we as members representing the people of this province, could do something to assist the agricultural people of this province. I would hope, this year, and if not this year possibly in sessions to come, if we are to continue to have a surplus of grains (and after all, the affairs of the farmers of this province should be of some concern to the people of this Legislature), not just to rise and speak about them, but to rise and try to do something about them. Surely we must realize that, if we had the storage that was spoken of by the member for Pelly, if we had millions of bushels of storage built in this province, not only would our farmers dispose of more of the grain they have on the farm, but they would have received a larger payment out of the money that is being paid, today, by the Government of this country for the purpose of storing grain. In other words, not only would they have disposed of more of their grain, but they would have received a higher price because of the payments from the Federal treasury for the purposes of storage at the present time. So in two ways we could have assisted the farm people of this province to increase the income that they have at the present time. But members on the other side of the House would rather sit there, and I don't think they would like to have a C.C.F. Government at Ottawa . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . I don't think my friends across the way would like to see a C.C.F. government in Ottawa at any time, not as long as they are sitting there, because they wouldn't have anyone to blame for the problems that exist here in the province of Saskatchewan.

The other day, one of the members made reference to a statement made by the Premier of the province some time ago. I am going to repeat the statement. I am not going to bother reading the figures of the foreclosures; but the statement wasn't read, the other

day. It was merely stated that he had said it. Here is the statement that was made by the Premier, at the time, in an address to the people of this province:

"Over 12,000 families in the province have been compelled to give up their titles under the present regime", said Mr. Douglas.

And that statement, of course, was proven entirely false by other speakers during that campaign. He made a definite promise that:

"If it could be proved that a single farm family lost title to his home under a C.C.F. administration, headed by himself, that administration would resign."

That, of course, is one of the major promises that he made. The press even took notice of it. They put it right at the beginning of the address, and they took note of the fact that he had promised to the people of this province that he would resign under the conditions mentioned. Of course, after the figures that were given to us by the Government were read the other day, we know that he should have resigned many times over since we came into office in this province if he were going to fulfil the pledge he made to the people. That promise was made to the people of Gull Lake in this province.

There is one item I took up during the last session, or tried to, through a lot of noise and difficulty, that I would like to spend a few moments on during the course of this debate. This, perhaps, goes back to something that might have reference to Socialism. It goes back to the matter of people entering into a business enterprise. Now, in this House, they are against free enterprise and they are against business; but when they get outside the House they like to go into businesses themselves, I suppose with the hope of making a profit — I don't know. Politically, they don't believe in making a profit, but I am sure that, in going into the business, or taking the part of the mortgage of the Theatre Under the Stars outside the city here, I am sure both the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer hoped that, at some future time, they would be able to realize a few dollars from the part they played in the organization of that particular company.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Hear! Hear.!

Mr. Gardiner: — The beginning of this story goes back quite a long piece. It goes back to May 1, 1950 when Mr. Bodnoff, a partner of the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier in the Theatre Under the Stars in this city, made written application to the Government Insurance Office for a loan of \$75,000. Then we go

February 25, 1958

to May 3, 1950, when regulations of the Government Insurance Office were changed to permit such loans as that applied for by Mr. Bodnoff. Then to July, 1950, when the application of Mr. Bodnoff was approved by the Government insurance Office. On August 30, 1950, a formal mortgage was executed covering the \$75,000 loan. On September 3, 1950, the original shareholders of Theatre Under the Stars Limited met in Regina and on September 4, 1950 the loan of \$75,000 was paid to Mr. Bodnoff. On September 16, 1950, Premier T.C. Douglas and the Provincial Treasurer, C.M. Fines, were made shareholders and directors of Theatre Under the Stars, Limited, the company which owns (or at least did own as a company) the Sunset Drive-in Theatre here in Regina.

Now at the time this debate took place in this Legislature, I believe the hon. members who were here at that time will remember the statements made, I believe, by both individuals concerned, that with respect to the theatre in Weyburn, for which the loan had been given, and the theatre here in Regina, there was no connection between the two whatever; and that there was no question of funds being provided by a Government organization to a company in which the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer were co-partners. Well, last year, just towards the end of the session, I received some information with regard to the Theatre Under the Stars, and, in seeking out whether the information was correct or not I found that the mortgage which had been placed there in the name of Mr. Bodnoff, Mr. Shumiatcher, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, was, on December 30, 1955, cancelled. That particular mortgage was cancelled on Theatre Under The Stars. I believe, just shortly before that, that the theatre in Weyburn on which the \$75,000 loan was given had been sold. I don't know what was done between the time that theatre was sold and the time that a new mortgage was placed on Theatre Under the Stars here in the city of Regina; but I do know that, in the meantime, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer had ceased to be partners in the organization, according to statements they had made sometime previously. They were supposed to have ceased many years before, particularly with regard to the Premier and I would take it that since he had made that statement, it was correct. But it was never changed at the Land Titles Office and his name was not removed until December 30, 1955. However, I would accept his word that he was out of the organization at the time he made the statement to the people of this province that he had disposed of any interest he had in the theatre, which was some time previous to that.

In any case, when I looked up the Land Titles on that occasion, I found that a loan had been issued in April to Theatre Under The Stars Limited, but now it is just Mr. Philip Bodnoff; the other three partners have ceased to be partners and Mr. Philip Bodnoff was now, I suppose, the sole owner of Theatre Under the Stars. But the Government made a loan to Mr. Bodnoff of \$33,750 on April 27, 1956 (to be exact).

Taking you back, Mr. Speaker, to statements that have been made in the past by the Provincial Treasurer, probably in the original occurrence and in the original debate in this House, in which he has said, time and again, that never again would a loan of the type which was made in Weyburn, be made by the Government Insurance Office. When I brought this to the attention of the Legislature last year, I was refused the right to speak on it or bring it to the attention of the members on that occasion. It did get into the press that Mr. Fines made a statement on it the week following, and this is what he said. The Provincial Treasurer stated in that statement "that this was the balance of the loan on the theatre in Weyburn." He said it was a very common thing to transfer a loan from a building belonging to an individual in one place to another building someplace else that a person owned, when he disposed of it. That may well be, Mr. Speaker. It may well be that that is ordinary business practice, but my friends across the way ordinarily don't like business practice. They ordinarily don't like businessmen, so I do not know why they carry on their dealings like ordinary businessmen, when they deal themselves, if that is their opinion.

The thing I want to bring back to the Provincial Treasurer is this — it is not written, but I sat here and heard it. We asked the Provincial Treasurer in Committee, I believe on two occasions, last year, if the loan on the theatre at Weyburn had been paid off. Maybe it is just a half truth, Mr. Speaker; but when he definitely told us that that loan had been paid off, he wasn't being quite fair to the members of that Committee, because actually he told us a week after the House had prorogued that it wasn't paid off, that it had been transferred to another one of Mr. Bodnoff's holdings here in the city of Regina. And when, six or seven years ago, they both protested, "Oh, we have nothing to do with that theatre in Weyburn; they are altogether different things; the two theatres." They were an altogether different thing until Mr. Bodnoff had to dispose of his theatre in Weyburn. Then he was able to pay off, I suppose, if he still owed the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier any of the money from that, he was able to pay them off with the money received from the theatre in Weyburn, and then was able to come down and borrow a further \$33,000 from the Government Insurance Office in this city on property that the Provincial Treasurer says is worth a quarter of a million dollars. I don't know. It may be if you built a building on it — I am not certain whether it would be or not; but as a theatre it certainly isn't worth that amount of money. It isn't even worth a plugged nickel as a theatre. The land there may be worth something, but as mortgagable property, with land values today, the people of this province, if conditions happened to go back at all, as our friends across the way are telling us all the time they are going to, if conditions went back in this country, that land could possibly be worth very little in a few short years. In other words, the Government Insurance Office of this province could

February 25, 1958

stand to lose thousands of dollars unless something is done in the very near future in order to realize from the assets that they have at the present time.

I am just going to say, with regard to the statement on this theatre, that I think it ill behoves two individuals, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer of this province, to stand in their places and go around this province accusing business people of the type of practices that they carry on from time to time, accuse our people of going into businesses for the purpose of making profit, when they, themselves, have gone out into this world of 'sharks' and 'shysters', trying to make themselves what they would term, probably, if they had the opportunity, a 'dishonest dollar'. I heard some very fine names with regard to that theatre out there, after it was built. I am sure the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier have heard what some people called it, after it was constructed; but I am certain that as long, probably, as long as the two gentlemen remain in public life they will remember this Theatre Under the Stars, and probably, instead of seeing pictures, they will be seeing stars.

Premier Douglas: — We'll remember some of the vermin that came out of . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, having passed one of the perhaps more unfortunate things that has happened in public life — I might say that most individuals who enter public life usually dispose of their business interests lest they might have associations with governments after they enter politics; but here, in this province, individuals believe in starting into business after they get into politics.

One of the most important items, I believe, that should have been dealt with in a more proper way in the Throne Speech has to do with the question of education of our children in this province. I am not going to say too much on this point, today, because of the fact that there is a resolution on the Order Paper of the Legislature dealing with the question of education. However, I do want to make one or two references with regard to education, and particularly the Government's part, financially, in the cost of education in this province.

The other night, when I was looking through both the statements of receipts and expenses of the Government of the province, I found out, after doing a little figuring, that with regard to education, last year, if you take the amount that was collected under the 2 per cent Education Tax paid to the Government of this province solely for the purposes of education; if you take the amount collected from that tax and take one-third of the total funds received from the Federal

Government under our Dominion-Provincial agreement — and actually, I think, we should take more if we are to believe the statements of the Provincial Treasurer at the present time; he told us that he was going to pay all this money for two purposes — for the municipalities and for the schools. Last year he divided it that way. Well, if I were to divide it that way, actually some of the money that should have gone to the schools hasn't even been paid out. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a third of the amount received from the Federal Government under the Dominion-Provincial agreement, plus the amount collected from Education Tax, more than covered the amount paid by the Government of this province for purposes of education. In other words, there isn't a cent from any of the other revenues received by the Provincial Government used for the purposes of educating our children.

We hear a lot about grants going up. I have here, as you will see, grant forms. They go away back to the time the last government was in office. I can go through each one of them and show you how grants have increased since this Government came into office. Originally, when they came in, the basic flat grant per day was \$1.50, continuation and high school departments, \$2.00. Then we go up, in 1947, and it is the same thing. (These are all from one school district). The grant is still the same — \$1.50 and \$2.00, across the board. When we come to 1948 the grant is still the same — \$1.50 and \$2.00. We go on to 1949, and the grant is still \$1.50 and \$2.00; not a cent of change over 1944. We go on to 1950 — well, this is just a grant for a projector of \$200. Here is another one from 1950 — \$1.50 and \$2.00; it is still the same, no change. Then we go up to 1951 — \$1.50 and \$2.00; still no change after they had been in office for seven years, and here are the men who speak about increasing grants to the schools.

Now, here is 1952: here is the first increase after they came into office, Mr. Speaker. They increased the flat grant by 50 cents, bringing it up to \$2.00, and they decreased the grant for high schools and continuation department by 50 cents, bringing it down to \$1.50. That was the change in 1952. Then, Mr. Speaker, we go to 1953 and the same thing again — it is still \$2.00 and \$1.50. Then we go to 1954 . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, there was no decrease in the high school grant. The hon. member has made this statement before. The decrease was simply in the difference between the extra high school grant and the elementary school grant, but at no time has there been a decrease in the high school grant.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know. Either the Minister doesn't know what they have been doing in his Department, or else there is something wrong with the figures that appear on these grant forms that I happen to have in my hand.

February 25, 1958

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Read them.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I am reading them. I read every one. This one is down to \$1.00 for continuation and high school departments — down from originally \$2.00 to \$1.00; and the flat grant is \$2.50.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker will the hon. member give the total for the high school?

Mr. Gardiner: — The total for high school departments is \$119 on this particular form that I hold in my hand.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The total rate.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am speaking about one school district now, and I am reading the same figures from each form that I quoted here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the first year in which there was perhaps a better-than-average increase in school grants — 1954. That is the first year; and one reason why I can realize that my figures are right (and I quoted them last year) is that the grants for our schools, under exactly the same conditions, was \$100 less in 1952 than it was in the year 1944. So, when the speakers say that there must have been an increase and there couldn't have been a reduction — well, what happened to our grants?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What was that school district?

Mr. Gardiner: — The Lemberg public school. I believe the Minister knows what district I am talking about. I don't think you have to know. I am not speaking about your particular branch. In 1955 we find that we did get an increase; in 1956 we received an increase; but unless there had been careful administration by the School Board of that district over that period of years, if we had been waiting on increases in our grants from the provincial treasury of this province, our school and many other school districts would have been in the same debt position that many schools are in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time.

I have some other figures here. I quoted figures, last year, and I want to extend congratulations to the Minister on the fact that I find that his percentages, this year, have finally got up. Half of them are higher than they were in 1944 — half of the school districts. I have here the figures for 1944 down to the year 1957, and 50 per cent of those ten schools have finally got into the position, percentage wise, where they are receiving more in provincial education

grants than they were receiving in the year 1944; and five of them are either receiving the same, or less, in Provincial Government grants than they did in the year 1944. So, in spite of the fact that the Minister says my figures are wrong, I will settle for the total figures, and I know, sitting there every day looking at my school books, because I am secretary of that school district, that up until 1952 there was not any increase in the grant aid to our schools, and I know there was a great deal of increase in the costs that we had to pay out for school administration in our particular district. So I say here, today, that, in spite of the fact that the Minister throws his hands out and says, "we finally got up to the position where we think (they haven't any figures to go on) — we are paying 33 per cent this year." I don't think they are, Mr. Speaker. I think, when the final figures are . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. Gardiner: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — When did I make the statement which you have just quoted?

Mr. Gardiner: — The Premier made the statement, and if I made a mistake, and the Minister didn't say it, I will withdraw that, and say it was the Premier of the province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — When?

Mr. Gardiner: — The statement was made . . .

Mr. Cameron: — It was made in this debate.

Mr. Gardiner: — The statement was made in this debate, Mr. Speaker. The Government of this province did not say they were, but they thought it would be 33 per cent on the basis of figures that they have at the present time. Well, I suppose I am in just as good a position as they are to make a statement about what I think. I think it will be very lucky, in the last year, if it even reaches 30 per cent, because, in my own school, in spite of the large increase that was made last year, the teachers' salary increases made up not only the total increase of the grant, but \$600 on top of it. If the same thing pertains in other schools in this province, I am sure that the portion of the expenses paid out by school districts, received from the Government, will quite likely be less than it was in the year 1956.

Now, Mr. Speaker, most of the matters I'm bringing up today are local issues. They are things I know something about, because I 'm right there at home to see them happen. I have here one or two instances of actions by Crown Corporations in this province, one in particular that I am afraid the Minister should be ashamed to have to write to anyone and give them the report I received from the Corporation — the report that they would not agree to extend power facilities to an old-age pensioner in a town in this province, because of the fact that somebody had reported to them that the only reason he would turn on his lights would be to light his oil lamp. That was the excuse the Power Corporation gave for refusing power to an old-age pensioner in this province; and I think the Minister and the Government should be ashamed of a Corporation that carries on business in that manner.

Mr. Cameron: — No wonder your face is red!

Mr. Gardiner: — I am ashamed to stand, as a member of the Legislature and have to think of writing that man . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Tell the rest of it.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . and telling him the reason that he can't have power like the other people in the community in which he is living. And I want to press this matter — I see the Premier smiling, and well he might. He might be proud of the exhibition and the reasons the Power Corporation uses for refusing power to people who unfortunately, because of their position, cannot afford to pay the exorbitant charges that they would have to pay to the Power Corporation for lights.

Here is the old-age pensioner to whom they say: "We will give you power if you pay us \$311. Your neighbour, one block away, can receive power free of charge; but you can't, because the only reason you would turn on your lights would be to light your oil lamp."

Mr. Danielson: — Humanity first!

Mr. Gardiner: — I hope that occurrences like this will not take place again. I wrote the Minister many letters about this particular matter. I hope that he will again use his good offices, because I do not blame the Minister. I blame those who are in charge of the Corporation that he is in charge of for the actions that have taken place from one end of this province to the other with regard to installation of power in our urban communities. I want to say again that, if he is looking after his position, looking after the people of this province, he will see to it that he can work out a program whereby not only all the people in the urban centres will

be treated as one (as they should be) but also that the rural people in this province will be treated in the same manner and be given free installation of power in the future.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — I'll tell you all about it.

Mr. Gardiner: — The other question may not be quite so serious; but this one deals, again, with the Provincial Treasurer of this province. I have received permission from the person in question to use the correspondence and, if necessary, I will table this particular correspondence of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. A few years ago there was a wind storm down in the Crooked Lake country . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There's one here, too.

Mr. Gardiner: — Yes, there have been windstorms here, too, particularly since 1944 . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And still blowing!

Mr. Gardiner: — In this particular case I would like to read all the correspondence, but I am not going to. It shows and proves the fact that many of us have been stating in days gone by, that there is no such thing as an insurance policy, as far as the Government Insurance Office is concerned, that they have no policy with regard to matters of claims. Here, Mr. Speaker, I am just going to read part of this correspondence. It is not marked confidential. I don't think the Minister intended it to be confidential or he would have marked that on the letter when he wrote it. It isn't marked confidential, and I imagine that, along with these other letters, it is public information. If they were marked confidential I definitely wouldn't read them, but I believe I am quite right in reading them. This is what he says with regard to this individual. He said:

"In August, 1955, Mr. Schoeffler agreed that we were very generous and that he was lucky . . ."

This was before Mr. Schoeffler knew what his neighbours got, of course.

". . . to obtain any insurance money whatsoever. If at any time Mr. Schoeffler wishes to refund the \$615.75 that has been advanced to him we are prepared to waive the statute of limitations and allow him to enter suit for the full amount of

February 25, 1958

his policy, that is \$1,000 . . . to be ruled upon by the court. I am satisfied that the court will not give any consideration to his claim and that he will lose the case entirely. We are quite prepared to allow the court to settle the matter, if he feels he been unfairly treated."

That is the approach that the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fines) uses to a person in this province who asks redress and fairness, according to what has been given to others who are his neighbours.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Isn't that fair enough?

Mr. Gardiner: — This is what happened, Mr. Speaker. There was a storm down there; four buildings were damaged to some extent. Four of the people had insurance with the Government Insurance Offices. One man, when the payments were made, received, roughly, 95 per cent of the total he was carrying, under his policy. His neighbour (this chap here) received, roughly, 65 per cent. His was paid on the basis of half of the damage and so was the other man's, but he had \$600 insurance; this man was paying for \$1,000 insurance, so they paid the both on exactly the same basis.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What was his name again? May I get it? I want to get my file on it.

Mr. Gardiner: — Just a minute; I will read the letter to you.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Was it Schoeffler?

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Schoeffler, yes. This is the statement that was made from the Department. This is the letter:

"I would like to set out, first of all, that the liability under the fire insurance policy and its endorsements for the particular occurrence is very doubtful.

"It was certainly not the intention of the fire policy to pay for such an occurrence, but after considering all of the factors and referring to solicitors (these are the people Mr. Fines was referring to in his other letter), we decided it was preferable, in view of the possible ambiguous phraseology in the contract, that we would make settlement for either 50 per cent of the claim, or 50

per cent of the insurance carried — whichever was the least."

This was the policy. Now listen:

"This method was adopted as it was felt at meetings of various insurance companies, in which approximately 15 companies were represented, that both the assureds and the companies could accept partial losses to bring the matter to conclusion; and in the future the wording would be definitely spelled out in the policies so that there would be no doubt that the fire insurance policy and its various endorsements did not provide any coverage for flood, high water or wind-driven objects.

"The settlement on your cottage was actually not in agreement with the procedure adopted by the various companies; and, as a matter of fact, you were actually paid \$115.75 more than you should have been. This is solely due to an error in a telephone conversation between the adjuster and this office.

"I have also referred to the files of the other three individuals to which you make mention. It is quite correct, as you state, that they were paid a larger proportion of their insurance than you were; and this, again, is due to the adjuster's error in making a note of his instructions. I regret that I am unable to give you details of settlements arrived at with the other three parties, as we consider such information to be confidential between our assured and the company; but in actual fact they are not much more out of proportion than your own overpayment of \$115.75."

And one of them was paid slightly over 90 per cent of the total amount of insurance carried, and he was supposed to have been paid 50 per cent. So he tells the man, "Oh, you're well off; you got \$115 too much; don't worry about the other fellow getting too much, too; he may have got a little more than you, but don't worry about it; it is just an error that somebody made in the Government Insurance Office." Well, that's

fine, but the only reason I am bringing this to the attention of the House at this time is because there has been no action taken by the Minister to see to it that this man got exactly the same treatment as his neighbours in that particular locality. I could say more with regard to that particular question, Mr. Speaker; I could go further, but I am not at this particular time going to mention anything else.

When we come down to considering these Corporations, we quite often hear the Ministers, both in Committee and around the country, crying to the people about the fact that they haven't got enough money for this; they haven't got enough money for that; "we couldn't give you farmers power; we couldn't install you free of charge, because we haven't got enough money."

I have the figures that were brought down in this House. They are only complete to 1955, but I think pretty well from memory, I can give you the complete figures. There is the cost of advertising and publicity. One of the other hon. members, the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), mentioned something about propaganda, and the other day in Committee, and sometimes in this House, we have been taken to task for getting figures on salaries paid to certain officials of certain branches of the Crown Corporations in this province, solely for the reason that we feel, in certain cases, that over-excessive salaries have been paid in certain quarters, particularly expenses. Only the other day in Committee, we found out that, on top of receiving his salary — I imagine it has probably been increased since the last figure we had. I think most salaries were increased last year by roughly 10 per cent — (that is just roughly from memory) but, from going through estimates, last year, I believe, usually, it was a case of salaries being increased by 10 per cent. Well, if we take it that that happened in the Corporations as well we could consider that probably, in 1957, Mr. Cass-Beggs' salary would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$22,000. Then when we consider he is supplied with his own car for his own use, the expenses of the operation of the car, and then, as well, we come down to Public Accounts and we find that the Government is in the house-renting business, and you know, they said: "We bought that house for Mr. Baker" (that is what they said) "who is on the Royal Commission." I don't know how Mr. Cass-Beggs ended up in it; today, surely he must have had a house in the city, or someplace to live in the years that Mr. Baker was using that house and he was head of the Power Corporation. But for some reason or other (I don't know what it was) when Mr. Baker departed from the house, Mr. Cass-Beggs entered the house owned by the Government of this province, and I believe he is paying a very reasonably light rent for the city of Regina at the present time. I am not saying anything against the man . . .

Premier Douglas: — Oh, no!

Mr. Gardiner: — I know my hon. friend across the way will probably get up and say: "How about Donald Gordon?" Well, I say, divide Donald Gordon's salary by ten, for all the provinces — he operates a business that is Canada-wide. Divide his salary by ten, and then you have the salary that should be paid by a like corporation here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you look at those other expenses . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — How silly can you get!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . half a million dollars paid out; for what purpose? For propaganda for an organization which compels people to buy everything that they buy from them. I would like to repeat what I said here, last year. The bills say: "Use more power and it's cheaper; the more power you use the more the bills go down." Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't agree, even this year. I have kept a good eye on my accounts, and the more power I use the more the bills go up; and they are getting up to the point now where either I am going to have to quit using electricity (like the chap I mentioned a while ago) and perhaps go back to something else, if the bills don't soon start going down.

Premier Douglas: — Get a wind-charger.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . they have got to the place now where I cannot afford to keep up with them, even with the large salary we receive as members of the Legislature.

So we find here half a million dollars paid out for the Power Corporation for publicity; and I am going to say that I have sat in my home on Sunday evenings in days gone by, and I have heard what I would call political addresses made, not only by the various Ministers of the Power Corporation from time to time, but by the Chairman of the Power Corporation himself. On one occasion I remember one of those addresses was attacking the officials of the city of Regina for statements they had made with regard to power, on a Sunday night; a political address, I would take it to be put out at the expense of the people of this province . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is correct — that I ever said anything about the city of Regina on a Sunday evening.

Mr. Gardiner: — I didn't say the Minister. I said Mr. Cass-Beggs.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You said the Chairman.

February 25, 1958

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that also is not true. I heard the broadcast by the general manager of the Power Corporation, and there was no attack on city officials.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I would say . . .

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend endeavours to distort his words like he distorts everybody else's.

Mr. Gardiner: — In my mind — it may not have been in the Premier's mind; but in my mind it was a . . .

Premier Douglas: — Your mind! That's the most distorted cesspool imaginable!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, if he sits down and keeps quiet, perhaps there will be a better chance that I will sit down.

Now we can go on to the Telephones. They haven't got any money to help out the rural telephone system, yet I hear members (just as I stated here in this House, last year, and they are continuing to do it) standing up here and taking credit for the fact that we have a rural telephone system in this province. It was built not by any Government, Liberal or otherwise. It was built by the farmers of this province, and they should be given full credit. I say here and now that there is another place that the Government of this province could be giving assistance at the present time to the farm people of this province, by giving assistance to the rural telephone system as it exists at the present time.

We come now to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, and here we find another half-million dollars paid out for advertising. There is a little more reason, perhaps, there. They are in a competitive business — one of the few Corporations that is in a real competitive business. But in looking over the report — and probably it is not proper to speak on this year's, but I can speak on last year's; and comparing reports from past years, most of the surpluses shown by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office are only shown for one reason, and that is because of what the people of this province, through the Government, through their school boards, through their hospitals, through bonds that have to be purchased from the Government, have paid in premiums in order to keep that Company showing surpluses to the people of this province.

And not only that, but, year after year we have pleaded with the Minister (I know the previous Opposition members have, and we did, last year) to change the figure of expenses that he shows as between The Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance Act fund and between the regular insurance Company to a more realistic figure.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Tell us what is wrong; which way do you want it?

Mr. Gardiner: — About \$150,000 too much to The Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance Act in expenses.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The last time it was claimed the other way.

Mr. Gardiner: — No, the expenses should have gone to the regular insurance company — another \$150,000. I don't think anybody ever said anything different; I don't see why they would.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — May I correct the gentleman. The last time the question was taken up in the Crown Corporations Committee, the criticism was that we did not charge enough to the compulsory plan; that we should have had to raise the rates more had we charged the plan with all that we should have.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that may be someone's premise, but right now I say (and I think I can show figures) that that should go to the Government Insurance Office in the regular insurance company and they would not be showing the surplus that they are at the present time. Of course, I don't see anything wrong with . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — May I ask the hon. gentleman why he didn't ask one single question on it? Last year, we had all the expenses that related . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — We did ask a question. I did ask a question, Mr. Minister; so, if you will sit down and let me make my speech, you can make yours.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You didn't ask one single question; not one.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we asked plenty of questions about it; and if I didn't ask it, it was just because I didn't ask quickly enough; because somebody else asked first. Most of our members asked many questions about those expenses, and also about the relationship between them as well. The Minister's memory must be very poor.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You never asked them.

Mr. Gardiner: — He must have forgotten during the past year.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You didn't ask me.

Mr. Gardiner: — We didn't ask you? Well, that's too bad; I don't know whom we did ask. We must have asked someone.

February 25, 1958

When we have discussed these particular issues, Mr. Speaker, we can come back to municipal problems such as roads, hospitals, hospitalization, and many other problems that face our people today. When the leaders of the Government of this province stand in their places and say, "There is no way that we can reduce the costs to the people of this province, the costs to the farmers in spite of the fact that we are in all of these businesses, in spite of the fact that we could make larger grants to our municipalities to reduce taxation — in spite of the fact that we don't have to hike up the hospitalization tax after every election in this province, after we have been returned to office." In spite of those things, they still tell the people "There is no way we can help you; go and find somebody else in Canada some place that might be interested in you; we aren't. Maybe the other 225 members down in Ottawa, outside the province of Saskatchewan will take an interest in your case; maybe they will see to it that the machine companies are whipped into line and that they have to sell their machinery to you, whether it is at cost or below cost — anything in order to bring down your prices on the farm."

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I am sure the member for Melville won't do anything about it, anyway.

Mr. Gardiner: — This is what the speakers across the way tell us in great crocodile tears: Let's go someplace else and see if the people in Manitoba will help us out. Let's go to Alberta. Let's go out to B.C. They have lots of money; we'll take their money and we'll do it with theirs. Let's go to Ontario, and we'll do it with theirs, or to Quebec. That is what they say every time they stand on their feet, on the other side of the House. They say it is the job of the rest of the people of Canada to look after Saskatchewan, and not our job here in the province.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I was elected, and I think probably I have stuck more to provincial legislation than anyone, including one of their own members, this afternoon . . .

Premier Douglas: — I wouldn't blame you, either.

Mr. Gardiner: — I might say that any time out on the hustings I will be glad to deal with anything, but while I am more as a paid official of the people of my constituency, I will deal with the problems which they sent me here to deal with.

With some of the remarks that I have made, it appears that members on the other side of the House haven't been too pleased.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Just amused!

Mr. Gardiner: — Just amused? I know they haven't been laughing as much as they have in the past; but in spite of that fact . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — We're sorry for you.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . I hope they will continue to operate for another few days in any case; but I am afraid that, unless something is done very soon, there may be others in the government field in this province who may not be able to operate just as well as they would like, in the next few years, unless the two women and the men in this Legislature are prepared to spend the next five weeks trying to do something about the position of the people of this province. It is all very nice for the Premier to call a Conference here, in December. He said to the members of the Opposition, and he sent them a nice invitation: "You can come and sit in", and then when we get here, all of a sudden he stands up and says: "Anyone can say anything they like." He had all the Cabinet grouped around him, and he said: "Now anybody can say anything they like", after he got us all sitting in the House here, and not prepared, of course, to take part in the discussions of the day or anything else. He didn't tell us, in the letters he sent us: "Come along all prepared to take part in the discussion; you are going to be given free access to the floor; you are going to be able to speak along with the rest of the people of this province, as the Official Opposition, and give voice to your feelings in this regard." No. He said: "Come and sit back and be good fellows, and listen to what the people of the province of Saskatchewan want us to do."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They're not interested in you.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I am afraid, if we heard the people of Saskatchewan, we didn't hear too much, because we were too busy listening to others who had already put down volume after volume — I think I have fifteen at home; in fact I need practically a whole bookcase to hold them. After writing all that, they had to come and spend about three-quarters of the time of that meeting telling it all over again, and trying to convince us in certain cases that they were right, and perhaps everybody else was wrong, after all. I am afraid, when it drew to a close and when we got down to the position where we were going to have all the planning boards — I don't know if you heard the reference to planning boards that I heard. We shouldn't have just one Planning Board in the Government; we should have one for every Department; and then we go out and we have a planning board in every municipality; then we have a planning board, I suppose, in every school district — I don't know; and a planning board in every hospital; all these Boards — and here we are. We might as

February 25, 1958

well go home, because it appears that they are going to operate the Government of the province. These Planning Boards are going to operate it, and you and I, as members of this Legislature, might as well just stay at home, because we won't have any more say in the operation of government than the other individuals of Saskatchewan, so we might as well save them the salaries they are paying us. And this great Utopia — the day when we are going to be under the direction of the so-called planning boards, when that day comes, we can say goodbye to our seats here that we like so much. We can stay at home and look after our businesses, and maybe the people will pay us to stay there if these planning boards make such a good job of running this province.

That is the main reaction I got from attending that Conference: that we are going to have the Utopian government before long. I don't know who the planning boards are going to be. That is about the only question I have in my mind . . .

Mr. McDonald: — They'll be imported.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . just who are we going to entrust.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! it is 5:30.

Mr. Gardiner: — I'll adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — No, call it 5:30. There is no adjournment: recess.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that's what I mean.

Mr. Speaker: — It being 5:30, the House will recess until 7:30 o'clock.

Continuing at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, before I continue with my address which I began, this afternoon, I would just like to make reference to the bouquet of flowers on the desk of our lady member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), which is in deep appreciation from the people of Canora to Mrs. Batten for her address in the House. I might say that I would like to express my thanks to her for the fact that I am wearing one.

I understand there are some people confused about the document that I hold in my hand here, that I made some reference to, this afternoon. This bears (I suppose it is) a mimeographed signature of the present Provincial Treasurer: "We hereby certify that this is a true copy of the handbook for speakers issued by the Farmer Labour

group, in 1933." it is signed by "C.M. Fines, President". I always thought he was the 'money man' and was the Treasurer; but it says here he was the President at the time, so I guess I'll take that as being correct. I noticed just going through this since we stopped for supper, there are a few other items I thought would be of interest to the members of the House, particularly the item with regard to the lightening of the burden for the women of our province, which was given as one of the provisions of the platform at that time. The question was:

"What provision does the Farmer-Labour Party make to lighten the burden of the housewives and mothers of the nation?"

The answer:

"The social trend is that the housewife and the mother shall be more and more released from the drudgery of the home. We are going to see that, in future, a greater extension of community laundries and other facilities of that kind are made to lighten the care of housewives and mothers.

"The school today is undertaking more and more of the care of the child."

That's their program for the women of the country.

There are one or two other items I would like to read with regard to the policy of the Government of the province. One has to do with their land policy. This is their land policy:

"Social legislations are secured to the worker and the farmer."

I don't know, I suppose that's the farm worker. I don't imagine they would be referring to any other worker with regard to land.

"A. An adequate income and leisure with an effective voice in the management of the industry.

B. Freedom of speech and the right of assembly."

Now, I'm not certain whether they didn't think they had freedom of speech at the time this document was written, or not.

February 25, 1958

Premier Douglas: — The Gardiner 'machinery' was in.

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't think they have done much to encourage freedom of speech in the legislature at least. Now what would be the unit of the whole freedom; "on what basis would the farmer get protection? Quarter-section, half-section or three-quarter-section?" The answer:

"The details will be left to a committee to work out".

Now wasn't that a fine solution to the problems of the farmers of the province!

And where does farm machinery stand? Is it privately owned, or is it socially? Now here is the answer:

"In the various occupations, there would be certain utensils" (now listen to this) "like knives and forks, for the development of that occupation and the machinery necessary for such occupations would not be socially owned, but would be individually owned."

"Now, will collectivized farming . . . (this is about the only good thing I can find in the whole book; but I don't know that they actually agreed with it at that time, all of them) "Will collectivized farming be forced on the people of Saskatchewan?"

"No. The development of agriculture in Saskatchewan is a matter of the Saskatchewan farmers' own choice,"

Then they go on with smaller questions:

"How much land will a man be allowed to hold?"

. . . under the system as proposed by the people across the way.

"We cannot definitely state how much land a man will be allowed to hold, but it will give him a good standard of living."

That is their answer to that one. Of course, they've got the planning boards I was speaking of, this afternoon, and unless my friends across the way would like to hear a little more of the document I will leave the Regina Manifesto for the time beings at least.

Before we recessed, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Unfortunately, during the last few months there have been a number of nuisance difficulties with regard to power in my constituency, particularly in the town of Melville. I am sure the Minister knows well the difficulties people of the town of Melville have put up with due to power failures in that district. I would just like to read from an editorial, written Wednesday, November 20, 1957, by the assistant editor, I understand, under his by-line that day.

"There is only one thing more dismal than a power failure, but we haven't yet been able to figure out what it is. People today are so dependent on electricity, they're almost helpless without it. Take a home with a baby, for example. We know of one mother who, during the power break last week, had to stand for half an hour heating the baby's bottle over a candle flame, the baby screaming in her ear for his supper. By the time she was finished, she felt like heating both the baby and David Cass-Beggs in the same manner.

"We've had so many power failures in Melville during the past year, this will undoubtedly go down in history as the dark ages — in the dark so long, the only thing we remember being lit is grandfather.

"One little fellow looked up at a light bulb, one night during one of those rare occasions when the power comes on and said excitedly to his mother, "Look Ma! The sun's shining!". But Ma explained to her little boy. "That's not the sun, Junior, that's the moon."

"And Pa who had been in the dark so long, he was using a white cane, shouted hysterically, 'I can see! I can see!'"

February 25, 1958

"We know of another little guy who got glasses a year ago, but his father won't let him wear them. He figures that there's no point in wasting them on the dark.

"It is odd, too, how light bills can be so high when the only time the Power Corporation turns on the electricity is once a month so you can read how much you owe them.

"Those with the biggest complaint however, are the motorists. We know of one poor fellow who hasn't hit a pedestrian for months. He chases up and down the streets every night peering into the dark, for signs of life. But what chance has he got? In the inky blackness a pedestrian can see a car's headlights blocks away. Such a head start is too much of a handicap for any car.

"We used to consider candlelight suppers romantic, but not any more. Every time we eat supper by candlelight, it's like playing Twenty Questions. Your wife sets your supper in front of you and you try to guess what you're eating. For instance, you'll tell your wife that the pancakes you ate were delicious but a bit stringy. And your wife will reply that she didn't make pancakes for supper. That was one of her coasters you ate. Well, what did you make for supper, you may ask. 'Soup a la Cass-Beggs' is the reply. 'Soup a la Cass-Beggs?' you ask again, 'What kind of soup is that?' 'Cold' is the answer.

"It is not only electric stoves that won't work during a power failure. Nose gas and oil furnaces depend on electricity, too. It gets pretty cold in the house after the furnace has been out for a few hours. At times such as this, most persons feel like sleeping with their clothes on. We know a guy who sleeps with his clothes on, whether he has power or not. He says it is to keep him from getting dirty off his blankets. One fellow was so cold one night, during a power break that his wife woke him up . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . she complained about his teeth chattering."

Mr. Speaker: — Order! How much of the paper is it necessary to read?

Mr. Gardiner: — There are just a few more lines, Mr. Speaker, and I will be finished:

"... It wasn't the chattering that she minded; she just asked him to change the tune so she could harmonize."

I think that will be sufficient to give you an idea, Mr. Speaker. I also have one that is in a little more serious vein in the editorial page. I'm not going to read; but it does ask for some action. In fact it is entitled "What now, Mr. Cass-Beggs?"

Some Opposition Members: — It's been a title often.

Mr. Gardiner: — But I thought it would probably be better for the members' spirits at this time of the night, if I read the one that had a little bit of humour to it.

Mr. McDonald: — They didn't like it.

Mr. Gardiner: — I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister last year in the Crown Corporations Committee and asked that something be done about the condition that was existing in the Melville area so far as power breaks were concerned. I understand from the announcements of the head of the Corporation that perhaps in the future, they are not going to happen. Well, I hope for the sake of the people in the town of Melville that they aren't going to, and I do feel that with these power breaks that are taking place all over our province and in Melville, there were people there who lost many dollars through the fact the power was out one day, at least once, for about nine hours. There were cars that were left up on hoists. Everybody who was hired, people they wanted to have working in their shops, had to be paid whether or not the power was going or not. There was the loss of much money, and I hope that possibly the Power Corporation has by now made good the losses of all the residents of the town of Melville due to the power failure.

Now having mentioned that and before getting into the major part of my address, there are one or two references I would like to make, some of them I am not particularly happy about, others may give members in the House, laughs.

February 25, 1958

The first one has to do with some things that have taken place not only during this session, but during the last session. I might say here, that I am not objecting to any people here to hear the sessions of the House or to attend functions, but have here an article that appears in the last issue of the of 'Saskatchewan Commonwealth' entitled "North Battleford Hears Premier", and I might say they were good enough to have copies passed out as people were going into the galleries of the House this afternoon. I don't know, but I suppose that if the other political parties want to have their papers circulated in the House, they can do likewise, and leave them so that people can pick them up when they are on their way into the Chamber.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Here are just a few of the copies that were picked up.

Premier Douglas: — . . . who passed these out?

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't know who they were, but they were passing them out to people going into the galleries.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this is a reflection on the staff of the House. The hon. gentleman says "they". This is the usual type of cheap insinuation that comes from the hon. member.

Mr. Gardiner: — It is not only insinuation . . .

Premier Douglas: — I want him to tell me who 'they' is.

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't know who 'they' is, but people got them coming into the House. I wasn't there. I was being driven . . .

Premier Douglas: — Then the hon. member has no knowledge himself that these were passed out by anybody, either connected with the Government or anybody connected with the staff of the House.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, as far as I'm concerned, they weren't. I didn't say they were passed out. I said they were left where they could be gotten . . .

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member said they were passed out and left the impression that some members of the staff passed them.

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh, no, no, no! I didn't leave any impression that some members of the staff did.

Premier Douglas: — This is the type of Gardiner manouvering we have come to expect from other places.

Opposition Members: — Aw! Sit down.

Premier Douglas: — I don't have to sit down. I have just caught this gentleman in a deliberate attempt to lie.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor. If the Premier can't sit and listen he had better go home.

Premier Douglas: — You can have it, after that.

Mr. McDonald: — You're not big enough . . . leave this stuff lying around like this.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Filthy!

Mr. Gardiner: — I am sorry that the Premier has become a little heated. Maybe before the night's over, he'll be a little more heated, yet.

Premier Douglas: — I object to people trying to lie.

Mr. Gardiner: — This article is headed, "North Battleford Hears Premier", and I'm just making this as a request that possibly all the members of the House should have the same privilege as the member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) with regard to having friends in to certain occasions in the House. And I'm not objecting to the fact that these young people were here at any time during the Session. I brought 40 young people from my own school in last year, and looked after them on an occasion of my own, and took them downstairs to the dining room. I expect that the hon. member paid for the meal for all those who were here from North Battleford High School group. The article says: "Thirty-two young C.C.F. members (not high school students; C.C.F. members) from North Battleford journeyed to Regina, last week, to hear Premier Douglas deliver a smashing rebuttal to the provincial Liberal leader's attack on the Throne Speech." It must have fallen pretty flat. The reporter was a pretty good reporter. The trip to the Legislature is sponsored by the North Battleford Ladies Club and the Young C.C.F. Club is grateful for this generous assistance. Most of the club members are students

February 25, 1958

at the North Battleford Collegiate Institute and came in six cars driven by C.C.F. supporters — which we are not objecting to at all."The young C.C.F.'ers joined a group of students from the University of Saskatchewan at a banquet in the cafeteria in the Legislative Buildings, following the address by Mr. Douglas.

"The young people heard the Leader of the Official Opposition, Mr. A.H. McDonald, speak on "World Understanding and Canada's contribution to World Affairs". There is nothing smashing about that, as far as the reporter was concerned."The Leaders of the campus Liberal and Conservative parties also spoke briefly, and also heard was a student from Trinidad", and so on down to the end.

"This was the second excursion to the Legislature by the young C.C.F. Club from North Battleford, which hopes to make a visit an mutual event. The trip was arranged by Mr. E. Kramer, member of the Legislature for The Battlefords." I am saying here, Mr. Speaker, that neither myself nor any member here objects to that particular fact, provided that each one of us has exactly the same rights to have our students in at the time when the university students are here. As I said, I'm quite certain that the member himself looked after all expenses in connection with the visit of those children here, and for the meal that they received down in the cafeteria. I'm quite certain that that was done; so I'm not questioning that for one minute. But I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that all the children who come here should probably have the same opportunity of hearing the Premier of this province speak as those who came in from North Battleford. For instance, I would like to have my group come to the Premier, too, make the same speech. He could probably make it every night; and we could each bring our children in from our own schools to hear him make the same speech he made the other night, and I think they could go home feeling they had really achieved something. But I don't think it is something that should be done just for one group of children in the province; it should be done for them all. As far as I understand (I wasn't here previously to last year) this has always been considered an event for the university students, a special day for those people to come down here to the House. I feel that the rest of us, as private members, if we desire to bring our students down, should bring them down on another day separate and apart from the occasion which is supposed to be put on for the university students.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having mentioned those two items, I'm going to go back, for a moment, to the previous question that I was speaking to when we adjourned for supper, and that is the question of Planning Boards, and how we are going to operate the province. I am surprised that they only have one in 14 years. To read all their manuscripts, you would think they would have had all these planning boards

in each department already, because that was their policy. And here is what the policy says in the 'Bible' of the C.C.F. party, "Make this Your Canada":

"To make possible the overall planning that is so lacking today, the C.C.F. will immediately establish a planning commission, consisting of small group of economists, engineers and statisticians, assisted by an appropriate technical staff."

That's the group that is going to run the country. That's what it sounds like:

"This body will keep in close touch" (and it doesn't say that they're going to have any members in these groups, but they're going to keep in close touch) "with farmer, labour and consumer organizations, and with provincial and municipal planning bodies."

The duties of the Commission were well defined by the Regina Manifesto. Here we come again — the little document that I have here:

The task of the Commission will be to plan for the production, distribution and exchange of all goods and services necessary to the efficient functioning of the economy — to co-ordinate the activities of the socialized industries." (How can they co-ordinate something that hardly exists?) . . ."to provide for a satisfactory balance between the producing and consuming power; and to carry on continuous research into all branches of the national economy." (And so we go).

And so we find there the answer. It is almost the same thing if we were to listen to the last address that was made by the head of the Royal Commission. He could have taken it from a page in "Make This Your Canada", when he was speaking about planning boards to the group that met here, on that particular occasion.

Some of you may have been worrying about all these books that are on the table. Well, I don't intend to read them all. You remember we had a conference a year ago — not this last one; this is just a little bit of a problem. After the Commission had written

February 25, 1958

a report, the Government sat down and they wrote a report, too, to each Cabinet Minister and this is just some of it. Then, after they had written them, they didn't even let us read them. Most of them got up and gave us the report verbally. So, if we didn't want to read them, we had to hear them anyway, if we were going to sit here. And so we came, we looked, we saw, we heard.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And you didn't understand.

Mr. Gardiner: — We expected to hear a bang and we didn't hear one. In fact the noise that came following that particular meeting was so minor that we hardly knew we ever had a meeting, outside of the appointment of a few more committees. And you know, I always think, after having a commission sit for six or seven years, that it would be hardly necessary to appoint two or three more committees for the Government to decide what it is going to do. I am wondering if the Government is afraid that some of the things that they would like to do, that have been presented by the Commission to the Government, the people would not stand for them, and they are not prepared to go out and put their policy into effect and see if the people will accept it. I am throwing out that challenge tonight — that some of the policies mentioned in that report that this Government has refused to undertake since it was brought down, that if they did undertake them and went to the people, they would be defeated at the polls so badly that they would never recover in the history of this province again.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get back for a moment, to some of our local problems. I would like to say, first, before continuing my remarks, that in my first year in the Legislature or as a member representing the constituency, having sat here through one full term, and coming back here for the second Session. I must say that I find proceedings much different here than they are in the ordinary place, such as this within the British Commonwealth, particularly in Canada. I have had an opportunity of sitting on many occasions in the House of Commons in Ottawa. Unfortunately, I have never been outside of Canada to see any of the Legislatures meeting in other countries.

This afternoon, the Premier took the Leader of the Official Opposition to task for using the term 'closure'. I don't know exactly what closure is, Mr. Speaker, but I would say here that the control that is placed here, on this legislature, in radio broadcasting has done more to do away with the democratic rights of the members of this Legislature than anything the Government of this province or the Government of any part of Canada, or Canada itself, has done to break down the institutions, as we know them, of parliamentary government.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Are you opposed to broadcasting?

Mr. Gardiner: — No. I am going to suggest how you could broadcast in a sensible way, if you'll just wait a minute. It is quite a long story; it might take a little while.

Premier Douglas: — I know. That scares me.

Mr. Gardiner: — But, if you just listen carefully, you might learn something. I am going to review some of the happenings of the Session, last year. Some of the things have proved very embarrassing to myself, and were brought about due to the fact that in this province the Government insists on having unto itself powers which no other legislative group, no other legislative government would insist on in the British Commonwealth of Nations. And this is what is happening . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — How thick can you be?

Mr. Gardiner: — The Government in this province feels that it has to speak first on everything, and whether it is in the books or not, they have to speak last on everything and, if not, they are going to force the Opposition to come to agreement with them.

Last year, we had an agreement for radio times on hours, as the hon. members opposite will remember. They gave them to us. They told us what days we were going to have, when the Session opened. During the course of the Session, shortly before the end of the Throne Speech (and I was the last speaker on that occasion), I was told that the Government would not allow me to be the last speaker. Accidentally, they had given us the last day on the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. McDonald: — The radio time.

Mr. Gardiner: — The radio time, Mr. Speaker; the radio time on the Throne Speech Debate. They said that we would have to change our time, either that or they were going to bring about means in order to try to force us to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. I had arranged, I'd advertised, I know, and I know the other members of our party had advertised in their local papers, days before, with regard to the fact that they were broadcasting on a certain date. And then, they'd have to turn around . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And heard a good speech.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . and change the whole thing. Well, I think most of them switched it off that day as soon as they

February 25, 1958

heard who was on. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask if you think that is a proper performance for a democratic government in this country to decide that they are going to make all the speeches, and when they are going to be made, decide that they are going to be the last 'on the air', as we call it here in this province. They have got to be the first on the air. They have got to be the last on the air, or they won't agree to operate this House in the proper fashion.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I say it is about time the people of this province know this was not a democratic session, and it is what the Leader of the Official opposition said here, this afternoon: it has affected the life of this Legislature. It has affected the whole performance. In fact, I understand there were some members who came here, who didn't know they could speak, after radio time. I knew I could; so that's why I am here tonight, because I don't particularly want to speak on radio time, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I can understand that.

Mr. Gardiner: — Rather than speak for ten minutes on radio, I would just as soon stay here and let these boys have it all in one dose. So that's what they' re getting tonight.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — It's a real emetic.

Mr. Gardiner: — Just to go a little further, Mr. Speaker, on the budget address, the same thing occurred again. They made a mistake. They gave us the wrong day again, and they came back and forced us to give up our time on the budget debate, as well as on the Throne Speech, because we couldn't finish on the air; they had to have the time on the air.

Mr. McDonald: — Babies!

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you — it is time we had a democratic process of operating this legislature. It is time that we went back to the rules of this House, and I am going to tell my friend — he asked if I am in favour of radio: I say broadcast it all, broadcast every bit of it, and I am sure if they did, by the time 1960 comes along there wouldn't be one of them left on the other side of the House.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Like 1956!

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, with regard to my idea — and I'll give it to the hon. Attorney General. I'm glad he gives me these suggestions, because every suggestion helps, you know, that comes from the other side of the House; it gives you another new idea . . .

Premier Douglas: — You need them.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . because you can't remember all these problems at once. You can't expect to write them all down or memorize them and then come here and give them. So if the hon. members just continue to give me ideas, it will help me along immeasurably.

Premier Douglas: — Who needs them more?

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, with regard to this ratio, I'm going to give this suggestion. The Premier can laugh if he likes.

Premier Douglas: — Thank you.

Mr. Gardiner: — What we should have in the House — we have our recording system as it is operated at the present time on all these debates. I should say, before saying that, that this year the people in the country are not hearing the debates of the Legislative Assembly. I think it is time, with the money we are paying out, that as far as the people knew that the times on the air were changed in the Regina district. But my constituents and all the people in that part of the province have to wait up till 11 o'clock at night if they want to hear the debates, unless they listen to the home station of the Premier of the province, Weyburn. They can also listen to Swift Current and North Battleford, but the rest of our people have to listen to it some time well on into the night, with the exception of Moose Jaw. Yorkton and Regina are put on at a time that the average person, particularly country people, are not sitting up listening to the radio. Out my way now, during the evening, most of the people are watching television; they are not listening to the radio at all. So I say, if that is the way it is being operated, it is a waste of the people's money in this province, and it should either be corrected, or the money should be expended in some better way.

Now what is my idea on it? There is nothing to prevent everything that is said in this House, whether it is on estimates or anything else, being broadcast, and each party appointing a representative. Have your time if you like. Have your time two-to-one, if you like, and each party would go on record. The recording would be much easier. You could put it on, the next day — it might as well be the next day, now; late at night they can't hear it anyway. Perhaps put it

on in the morning when the women can hear it (if nobody else will), or early in the afternoon, and have each party pick out in the day's proceedings what they want to go on the air on that particular night. That way we can proceed under the regular rules of this House, day in and day out. We can proceed as a democratic legislature, and I say that is a much more sensible and a much better system than is being adopted in the House at the present time. And I think the people of this province would prefer it, too, because we could get some of our estimates on the radio. We could get the resolutions, if we wanted them on. It would be up to each party to decide from the proceedings of the House what they wished to have on the air for that particular day.

I give that suggestion now. The hon. Attorney General asked for it, so he has had it. But, I am still going to say that, unless there is a proper change in the performance of this House, the Premier or no one else shall prevent any member on this side of the House from drawing his own conclusions as to the way this House is handled. The Leader of the Official Opposition has expressed the term 'closure'; and I say it's a crime on democratic government in this country, the way in which the House proceedings have been mishandled by the Government of this House during the past few years.

Mr. Loptson: — You're telling the truth.

Mr. Gardiner: — Having said that, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Legislative proceedings themselves, I would like to pass on a compliment or two, maybe a flower or two. I do want to express my appreciation to many of the Ministers whom I have had dealings with during the past year, for any assistance they have been able to give either to myself or to my constituents. In most cases, relations both with the Ministers and with departments of Government, I have found to be very fair and reasonable, and I am quite prepared to make that statement, particularly with regard to the staff.

There is one occurrence though, that I would like to mention at this time. It was rather unfortunate. I feel very sorry about it. The individual concerned, up to that time, I had always considered as a very close friend. He would come into my office quite often on his routine duties. But when he was sent out by his department or by the Minister — I don't know whom — to question me with regard to statements I make in this House. I say, Mr. Premier and to that Minister, the next time any official of any department of Government comes into my office to try to question any statements I have made in the House, I will personally throw him out and let the Minister know about it. It was the Fire Commissioner's office, I might state, the office overseen by the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams), that was concerned in this particular case. I rather regret the thing

happened at all, because, as I said, previous to that time my relations with that particular employee of the Government had been, I feel, a very happy one. But I feel quite offended, Mr. Speaker, when a member of the Civil Service . . .

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The member from Melville has indicated that someone from the Department was sent out to question him. Nothing could be further from the truth. This man went out to make enquiries as to a complaint made by the member. If he went to the member's office asking some questions, he did that on his own. Certainly, it had nothing to do with anything that was said in this House, last winter.

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't know that it had to do with what was said in this House; but the question he asked me had nothing to do with anything that the Civil Service should be going around this province asking anyone. He asked me for the names of people who had been making complaints to me, hotel keepers in this province, with regard to the regulations. He might have known, and the Minister should have known, that there is no member on this side of the House who would give any such names, because we feel we know, although I won't say it positively, about how the Minister handles his branch with regard to hotel keepers. We feel we know that troubles may develop, if names were mentioned in a case of that type. And so I assured him that any statement I make in the House, if he wants to make any inquiries of me, or if his Department does, there is one way they can make them and that is through the Minister to myself. I think that is the proper way they should be made, that is between the members in this Legislative Assembly, and not by officials of the Government coming out and questioning members of the Legislature with regard to statements that have been made in this House. I think it is only fair . . .

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege, I have already denied that anyone was sent out to question the member from Melville and, certainly if he came in and asked you certain questions you didn't want to answer, you didn't have to answer them. He was only trying to do his job, and if you know of hotels that were being improperly inspected, certainly, I would think, in the interest of public safety, you would have told him.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I did tell him. I said, "almost all of them". The ones I have been in were not satisfied. Of course, they wouldn't say that to the Minister.

Premier Douglas: — Why do you object to him asking you?

February 25, 1958

Mr. Gardiner: — I object to him coming in and asking me anything about statements made in this House. I don't know how the hon. gentleman even know the statements were made in the House, unless someone told him.

Premier Douglas: — The reporters.

Mr. Gardiner: — None of the other members here have been questioned personally by Government inspectors, that I know of, with regard to statements that were made in the House. So why is there a slightly different treatment made in my particular constituency?

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): —: Oh yes they have. Ask your Leader!

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Perhaps we should fire the fire inspector.

Mr. Gardiner: — I still feel that the Minister knows the proper channels to go through in order to carry on relationships with Members of this House, and I think that is the way they should be carried on. If a Minister has dealings with a member of this House, he should not send him, or if he says he didn't send him, I'll take his word for it; but, there must have been something have gone into his department about it, or the man probably would not have come out to question this particular statement that I made in the House . . .

Hon. Mr. Williams: — I'll bring the file over tomorrow.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . because I know that he would not have come out, as a matter of fact, on his own. He must have had some kind of a briefing before he came out to inquire.

That is the only time that I have had any unpleasantness with any of the government departments; as I said in most cases the cooperation has been very good. I have received assistance in many instances, and I want to give credit where credit is due, in that regard, for the assistance that has been given to my constituency since I have been the member there, either to myself, or to other residents of my particular constituency.

There is one problem that has bothered me during this last year, a local problem that exists right in my own town, and I think it exists in hundreds of small centres in this province. It has to do with the distribution of pasteurized milk within this province. Most members probably know that all towns under 500 are supposed to come under the pasteurization Act, if there is a location nearby within a reasonable distance where pasteurized milk can be procured. In the town of Lemberg we have about 35 miles to go to the nearest dairy;

but it is not the difficulty of getting pasteurized milk. We can get pasteurized milk, but today, in order to make this change, it would cost families of the same size as my own — I know there aren't too many; but there are families the same size as my own that are living in rather poor circumstances in that small community and others, and that are today able to buy milk, and I think it is pretty good milk. I have brought all my children up and they have never had anything but plain cow's milk in their lives; they have never had pasteurized milk yet, and they are a pretty healthy bunch of kids. Today it costs me 17 cents a quart for my milk, but for pasteurized milk it would cost me 24 cents a quarter. In the town where the milk is pasteurized, it costs them 20 cents a quart. But because of legislation that has been placed on the statute books of this province, I can be forced to pay more than the people in the centre where the milk is produced. I can be forced to buy that milk and pay the price I have to pay, in order to bring it to my locality, because we can't finance a dairy there.

I say that one of the most humanitarian things this Government could do today, if it feels that this matter of pasteurization is one of importance to the people of this province and to the citizens generally, and to those living in small towns in particular, would be to pay a subsidy to allow the pasteurized milk to be sold in all centres at more or less the same price. After all, if the Government is going to say, "You have to buy this milk whether you want to or not", I think they should have some responsibility to see to it that no great burden is put on certain people in this province, because of the fact that they have not dairy facilities to handle the people in their own district.

I make this suggestion to the Minister if his Department honestly feels that every child in these small centres should drink pasteurized milk. I know they can't force the farmers to drink it, and they won't; and I often wonder how they are so healthy without it. I don't think the majority of them will drink it out in these districts where they are milking their own cows; they're going to make use of their own products right there on the farm. So I say that, if the other people in the small centres are going to be forced to do this, then the Government of this province should, for that reason, pay to the dairies the subsidy to see to it that people in these smaller communities receive their milk at the same price as the distributing point receives it, at the point where the milk is actually pasteurized.

I believe this is an important problem. It is particularly important to the people along the route I live on, because I am certain that legislation will be put into effect. Right now we have asked for it to be set aside for a while until we see what arrangements could be made, but we are quite prepared (and probably will have to, whether this new provision will be put into effect or not) buy that

February 25, 1958

milk, but I figured out (and I want the hon. gentlemen to know this), that, for a family using the amount of milk that we use in our home, it would mean over \$100 increase in the cost of living to the people in my community and many other rural communities in this province, to be forced to buy pasteurized milk in place of the milk they are drinking, in the home at the present time. So I say this is a serious problem, and should be taken under consideration, and that consideration be given to see to it that all children receive the benefits of pasteurized milk if that is felt necessary, in the smaller communities at an equal price.

This afternoon I did not have too much opportunity, or I possibly did not take too much opportunity to say anything in regard to roads, or the grid road system. I think I should deal for a few moments with some of the problems related to the municipalities which I serve as their member. In a Return handed down a day or two ago, it was stated that last year, only two out of the six municipalities in my constituency received any grant under the grid-road grant system. In other words, there were only two municipalities in my area in that year that felt they could go into the grid system without hurting their municipalities in a financial manner. According to the Public Accounts, two or three other municipalities had been given a grant for a small piece of road in the previous year, usually to fill up a slough some place or a piece that had to be done. They built up that half-mile or mile, and they did get a little grant on that. But on touring around, and I attended each of the council meetings of each municipality before coming to this House in the month of February, I found the same complaint arising at every meeting I attended, particularly from the poorer municipalities, that they feel it would be unfair to their taxpayers to enter the grid system under its present set-up, because of the fact that the moneys they would have to spend to contribute their 40 per cent or 45 per cent would be more than the budget of the individual municipality could afford. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that at least a half of my constituency will not be able to take part in this wonderful grid system that the Government has set up, because it has not dealt sufficiently in a financial way with the problems of the people of those various municipalities.

Another problem I heard about while attending these meetings is the problem that is probably peculiar only to certain municipalities, and probably only a small portion of the municipalities in this province. For that reason I feel that it should be taken over as the responsibility of the Provincial Government. I refer to the question of the medical and hospital services for the Metis people of our province. One municipality (and it is not a very wealthy one; it has an assessment of \$1 1/2 million) paid out, last year, \$2,800 for hospital cards and medical services to the Metis people. I think this is very fine on the part of

that municipality, but because of the fact that the Metis People are gathered in only a few areas of the province, I feel it is unfair that two or three, or only a handful of municipalities, should have to bear the responsibility of that extra cost, whereas I think the Provincial Government could accept that responsibility very easily and without any great charge on the taxpayers of this province.

I should say, in speaking about the \$2,800 that the municipality of Abernethy paid out \$1,000; the municipality of Cana has a bill for \$1,500, and they don't want to pay it; but they have a bill for \$1,500. It is a fine thing if these municipalities are doing it, but it is becoming a drain on the individual municipalities, and I feel that the Government should accept this as their responsibility.

Having mentioned those two particular problems that were brought up by the municipal people of my constituency, I would like to turn for a few moments again to some of the excess expenditure where some of this money could be realized to do a few of the things I have been speaking of here tonight. I have in my hands the list that was handed to us with regard to the number of cars and trucks purchased by the Purchasing Agency for the Provincial Government in 1955-56. I am just going to take a glance at this for a minute; I just want to make certain — no. It doesn't include Crown Corporations as far as I can see. It only includes the actual departments of Government. This list contains \$750,000 of expenditure, or three-quarters of a million dollars, last year, on the purchase of cars, trucks, jeeps and other vehicles of that type by the Government of this province.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — You'd rather they walk, I suppose, eh?

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't know if they should walk, but there should be just about enough to carry all the civil servants that we have in the province of Saskatchewan for that amount. That expenditure goes on almost year after year; it is not just a one-year thing. That is almost continuous, and even some years it will be a little higher. Then when you add to that — I wouldn't want even to try to think of what the expense of operating these vehicles is; but I have a feeling that there are many cars being purchased by the Government of this province that are being purchased unnecessarily. For instance, it would be quite easy to do away with cars that are purchased for the Ministers. Let them purchase their own cars. That would save the people about \$50,000. Let them buy cars for their own personal use.

I am just going to mention a little bit of political history here, Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that was raised in the campaign of 1934 was exactly the thing I am talking about here at the

present time. The Anderson Government of that day had purchased cars for each of the Ministers, and one of the promises that was made during that campaign was that, the day after the election was over and the new Government took office, everyone of those cars would be disposed of, and a separate car would not be purchased for each Minister in the future. I don't know if it was the day after, but shortly after — and there are still pictures in this province today to prove the point — there's a picture taken out in front of this building with the Hon. T.C. Davis standing with a string of cars as they were auctioning them off, following the election of 1934. From that time down to 1944, the Ministers of the Government were not provided with a car for their own personal use by the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's wrong.

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh no, it isn't wrong. There were two cars purchased by the Government during the years that followed. If the Minister wanted to go some place on government business, he used the car. I think they had a chap that drove; one man was hired to look after that particular job. He took the car out and usually drove them when they were using a government car. I can tell the hon. Minister that I should know something about the matter.

Premier Douglas: — Why should you?

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You can't kid us.

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, as well as Cabinet ministers, we find that practically every one of importance in the civil service, whether he has much need to be out of Regina or not, has a car purchased by the Provincial Government. As far as I can find out, every single Deputy Minister has one. I don't know. Some Deputy Ministers may have to travel a lot, but I certainly feel that there are quite a number of them who probably don't go out of the city very much, driving, and it is absolutely unnecessary that personal cars be purchased for the Deputy Minister of every department in this province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's just not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I don't know. I asked a question the other day, and, as far as I could get the reply in Committee it was true. There may be the odd one . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It's not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — Even the Deputy Minister of the Attorney General's Department told me he had one, and that would be one particular case.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That is not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that's what you told me in Committee, which is true.

Premier Douglas: — If you can't tell the truth, then keep quiet.

Mr. Gardiner: — I won't even ask the Premier to withdraw that, because it doesn't make any difference to me what he says.

Premier Douglas: — We gave him an answer.

Mr. Gardiner: — I heard the answer. I might say to the hon. members opposite there is one reference I should probably make that might please the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), since he wasn't here, the other day, when Mrs. Batten was speaking in such glowing terms of him. I feel that I should, in her place, give him the bouquets in place of the ones he missed the other day when he wasn't here, unfortunately, and was in hospital for a short time.

Before I came into the House, Mr. Speaker, I thought Mr. Fines . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Please refer to the constituency, and not the name of the hon. members.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . the member for Regina, or the Provincial Treasurer, I didn't know him too well, but I didn't think he was just too fine a chap; but I am going to say that in the short time I have served in this House, my respect for the Provincial Treasurer of this province has grown by leaps and bounds, and I want to extend that as a bouquet to him, because it is a fact. Unfortunately, it doesn't pertain to all members on the other side of the House, but I can say my respect for the Provincial Treasurer has grown to a great amount since the time I have served in this House, and I might say that, if he wasn't on the other side of the House, most of the others wouldn't be there, either.

Now, having said all the nice things I can say, I'll get down here to some of the information that I wanted to . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Down? You've been going down all evening.

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh yes! I've got some of the Crown Corporations here, and that's just about as low as we can get. I think for a few moments I should deal with the matter of Crown Corporations in the province. It is a favourite subject for a lot of people in Saskatchewan. Some members of the Government like to talk about Crown Corporations, and others at times are not too happy to have to refer to these organizations.

During the debate on the Address we have heard many remarks from the other side of the House with regard to surpluses. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to try and bring along a blanket and a pair of shoes here tonight, and go into competition with the Government Finance Office, which is trying to dispose of blankets and shoes left over from the defunct factories of this province in the past year. It seems quite odd, when members on the other side stand up and say, "Give our wheat away; take it to people in China. Give all our wheat away to the people of China. Give all our other farm produce you can't get rid of to China." How many blankets have they sent to China, Mr. Speaker? How many pairs of shoes that they had left over did they send to China? Every one of those organizations which has gone broke, gone 'down the river', has left surpluses on the hands of this Government, and in Committee only the other day we sold \$4,000 worth of blankets, as I remember. It is an approximate figure — about \$4,000 worth of blankets sold to the people of this province. We didn't send them to anybody; we sold them to institutions in this province probably paying for them themselves. It is difficult sometimes in this organization to find out what basis they do sell these blankets and shoes and disposal assets to other organizations of the Government. But here they are, the Government of this province telling the Federal Government, "Just let us in there and we'll show you how to get rid of the surplus wheat we have in this country", and here in Saskatchewan they've got a few blankets and shoes and they can't even get rid of those, unless they buy them themselves. I say that the people of China, the people of India, the people of these countries that they talk about with tears in their eyes when they get up on platforms in this province, that they'd give the wheat away to, would be just as happy to get blankets and shoes, too, from these Corporations, in place of having to wait around until the people of this province have to purchase them through the tax money of the people of this province.

So I say to any of them staying in business, as well as going broke, that the Government will not accept its own advice in how to handle the surplus problems that it has in this province itself, so I am certain that, if they got the chance to do it in Ottawa, they would do a much worse job than any government before them had ever done. I know the people will never give them the chance, for that reason.

In speaking of one or two of these organizations — I don't know how we go about it if the hon. members on this side of the House want to buy shoes or blankets, whether we would go to the Government Finance Office and purchase any of these items or not, or whether they are all just saved so that when the institutions need them they can buy them at a good price, or whether perhaps they have decided to hold them until all the blanket plants go out of business, and there won't be any competition, and the people will have to buy the blankets that are left in the warehouses of this province — they won't have any alternative. So there we find we have another surplus in Saskatchewan, and one I don't think the people knew about — blankets and shoes. I am not sure about boxes. I haven't put in a question about that yet, but I will. Maybe there are some extra boxes left up at Prince Albert. Maybe we could send those some place. I don't know who would particularly want them.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You could use one.

Mr. Gardiner: — The place went broke trying to sell them, so I don't know how we're going to get rid of them unless we just store them up in another building. You know, it's odd they can find storage space for shoes; they can find storage spaces for blankets; they can find storage places for boxes; and you are also in international trade (or could be), just like the wheat of this province. Yet there is one big problem, wheat, so they say the Federal Government should look after that one, and we'll store up all our own produce here in Saskatchewan — these boxes, shoes and blankets, and we'll keep them here, and we'll accept that responsibility. Well, that's a great thing, and the example that is provided to the people of this province through the operations of those plants will give the people of this province a lesson in Socialism that need never be forgotten, and they will learn that, federally, the same thing would happen if the C.C.F. Government ever came into office in this country. I would say a broken effort of Socialism; the broken record of Socialism as it exists here in the province of Saskatchewan today.

In mentioning the Crown Corporations there are two I would like to refer to once more that are pretty well accepted, and always have been in government organizations — namely the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. These have usually been accepted by all political parties as organizations which probably can be classed as companies that should be handled by a government. But as for the other organizations that the Government still maintains in this province today, I don't believe there is anyone, in Saskatchewan particularly, who feels the Government can do it any better than anyone else, and in fact, they have proven they can't do it as well as anyone else, because even in their best corporations they have

found it impossible to keep politics out of the operation of those corporations, and every government will, it doesn't matter what government tries. Every government that tries to monkey in business in this country will find that, sometime or other, either that business is going, to be affected by the political antipathies, or else their political policies, their political platform and their political success will eventually be ruined by the failures of the businesses that they go into. I am certain from what has been happening during the last few months, particularly in one or two branches of the Crown Corporations, that today they are saying much of what many of our followers used to say about the income tax department — that that particular branch is going to defeat the Government of this province at the next election. I am quite certain that there are one or two of the Crown Corporations today that, when the election is over in 1960, the C.C.F. Party of this province will have to point to them and say, "Those were the organizations that meant the defeat of Socialism and of the C.C.F. Party in this province."

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Amen!

Mr. Gardiner: — No. We're not through yet, Mr. Speaker. Somebody says, "Amen".

In dealing with this question of agriculture that has been mentioned during this debate on numerous occasions, one of the previous members who spoke, the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), made reference to a matter which I was going to bring before the House myself, with regard to the storage particularly of grain. The other day, some of the hon. members on the other side of the House talked about the laws of supply and demand. Hon. members on the other side of the House, and the people in this country today, know that there is one agricultural product, or type of product, in this country today that is in surplus supply, and they know well what it is. Every other product is selling on the market, and the Canadian people eat it, and buy it themselves. There is no difficulty in disposing of it. There's no difficulty in most cases about obtaining a fairly reasonable price, as most of the farm price legislation has been brought down, most of the prices are above them at the present time, or have been most of the time during this last year.

So I say with respect to all those products today that we can dispose of, and about which we have no surplus problem, that there is a fair price for those products and we are able to dispose of them. So I say that pretty well knocks into a cocked hat any ideas of the law of supply and demand; that it does not work. We have a Surplus of grain in Canada at the present time, and if the Government of this province had done 10 years ago what the hon. member for Pelly stated,

you might today be able to say if you called it a Crown Corporation, that you were really successful, because for the past 10 years, as he stated, you should have paid for the storage space you constructed and you should have been putting back thousands of dollars into the treasury of this province, and at the same time putting money into the pockets of the farmers as well. I'm going to make the same suggestion as the hon. member from Pelly did, and maybe it isn't too late yet.

You could go into the policy of loaning money to any small town that desires to put up a building for storage which could be used, after the surplus problem is over, for some community purpose. Loan them the funds to build the building, and you collect the money from the Canadian Wheat Board for the storage of grain from time to time. Even today I think a solution of that type, or an effort of that type, would not only help with regard to the surplus problem in our country, but would also help the progress and opportunities of our people in our smaller communities in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Did you say that the farmers were getting fair prices on various products?

Mr. Gardiner: — I said they were getting prices, as far as the prices quoted in the various farm legislation both from the present Government and the previous Government, that most of them were about the prices quoted under that legislation, or the legislation would have gone into effect if they had not been.

Hon. members on the other side may not think that is a fair answer, but I can tell them about some of the prices they have been receiving for cattle in the last few months, if the hon. member wants to know about it. I don't think he or any other member on the other side would say that they weren't reasonable prices for cattle.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — What was the price of cattle in 1957?

Mr. Gardiner: — The price of cattle is never the same, as the hon. member knows, so how is he going to say what the price was in 1957?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have, as well as the three Crown Corporations I just mentioned a minute ago, quite a number of others, as these books will show. Some of them show profits; some of them don't. The odd thing about it is that those corporations that show a profit in almost every instance do business with themselves. Isn't that a good idea? I think I'm going to do that. I'm going to go home

February 25, 1958

and I'm going to start and dig a hole in the ground some place and find some money, and I'm going to spend all that money — I'm going to buy something from myself, and then I'm going to say to everybody else, "I must be a successful man. Look at all the business I'm doing; look at all the money I've made". So we find the Government Printing Bureau — oh yes, it makes a profit — it does practically all the Government's printing. They pretty well set their own rates; they don't have any competition to speak of, unless they can't handle it all. When they can't handle it all, then they put it out for tender; but otherwise all the business they do is business for themselves. They can quote their own prices on what they get printed, and then they come out and say to the people of this province, "Look at the proud record we have! We've got a successful Government Printing Bureau."

So we can go to the Government Finance Office, where there is another instance of the same thing — practically all Government business. Saskatchewan Marketing Services has been, for the most part, a compulsory service — compulsory services which people in this province have had to deal with, day in and day out without any choice, at all. Oh, yes, those types of organizations have been fairly successful, as they should be, because, as I said, when you can do all the business with yourself, you can sure make a lot of money; but when you have to go out into the cold dreary world of all the quick-buck artists and the shysters, it's not quite so easy to make all the money that they dreamt of when they went into this enterprise of socializing business in Saskatchewan.

There is one statement I would like to make. It has always been a surprise to me that there are three industries the Government of this province could have made the greatest profit on, if they really wanted to go into them. But they on the other side say, "We can't go into them because our friends on the other side would continually be saying, day in and day out, "Look at the big profits those fellows are making". What were these industries, Mr. Speaker. One is the liquor industry. There is no other industry in Saskatchewan that makes the profit the liquor industry does, as far as I know. But there hasn't been any attempt to touch these big follows. I can remember when the Premier of the province went before even church meetings and church conventions, wailing about the terrible liquor companies, wailing about the fact that they have got a stranglehold on certain of the things that were necessary for health in our country. Well, he had the chance to socialize the liquor industry and why can you make so much money at that? I think my friends know as well as I do that one secret about liquor is, it takes a lot of water; and so, if they want to make a little more money, they take out the cork, pour out a big of the liquor and pour in a little more water, and most people wouldn't know the difference. It

it is very simple to make a profit in the liquor industry; but there haven't been any efforts on the part of the Government sitting across the way, in spite of their preaching to the people of this province, to do anything about the liquor industry, to take over that industry and make for the people of this province the money they could make, if their stories to the people at election time were true.

What are the other industries? Possibly we'll pass over machinery, because some people say, "Oh, you couldn't produce machinery". If, however, they believe in the policies they preach to the people of this province, there is nothing to prevent this Government from going into the business of distribution. They say they are going to do it in the Regina Manifesto, but when they got into office what do they do? Well, they sit down and go out to some poor little guy in Moose Jaw who had a bus. They say, "We're going to take away your buses from you. We think you are one of these big fellows we've been telling everybody about in the election. We're going to take over your bus company, and we're going to start a Government bus."

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — That statement is completely false.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, sit down! Sit down!

Mr. Cameron: — Maybe he's discovered he's going to lose his licence.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — I don't like you to get away with that. That statement is completely false.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that is the Minister's opinion. There's the matter of the buses and of the box factory up at Prince Albert. There was a great financier. He had millions in his pocket. They were just drooling with it — a real catch for the C.C.F. party. So they went up there and started into the box business in Prince Albert. Of course that's gone floppo now. The boys found it didn't make very much money and that probably they had made a mistake by every bothering with it. But did they touch the liquor people? Did they touch the business of distribution of farm machinery in this province? Where is all their brave talk in the last few days about helping the farmers of this province? If they feel that their Socialism could be successful, what has prevented them from going into fields where they could have been of assistance to the farm people of this province.

Then the other one — this is the big booby of them all; it is the one that we hear particularly from Ottawa. There is a little

February 25, 1958

fellow by the name of 'Scotty' Bryce down in Manitoba, and he is talking about it all the time. There were references made to them this afternoon — the packers. There is nothing preventing the Government of this province starting a packing house in Regina or Saskatoon and taking all the products of the farmer and giving him a square deal. The only reason they didn't is that it would be the biggest flop, and they'd never get another farmer's vote as long as they were here in Saskatchewan as the C.C.F. party. That's why they didn't do it. They knew they couldn't. These are the three biggest industries they could have gone into.

Another is the grain storage business that we have been referring to here today, and, of course, we know there are different reasons why they haven't gone into each of these businesses. There's probably a reason why they haven't gone into the liquor industry business. There's probably a reason why they haven't touched the packers, and we all know the reason why they haven't gone into the grain business.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That is not our responsibility.

Mr. Gardiner: — It is not a matter of responsibility. You are the fellows who say in your book you're going to socialize everything.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The means of production?

Mr. Gardiner: — The means of production? You can socialize the means of production in Saskatchewan if you believe in it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You're re hopeless!

Mr. Gardiner: — You can socialize the means of distribution in Saskatchewan. There is nothing preventing you at all under any Act or law in this country from carrying out the distribution of anything in this province. That's your business, and as Attorney General you know that that's your business. Also the distribution of liquor is the responsibility of the Government of this province, although a lot of people say they wish it wasn't, because they feel a lot of it is watered down too much as it is at the present time.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You're quite an authority on the subject.

Mr. Gardiner: — There are three or four things that could have been socialized in this province, and the Government over there sits down and says, "Oh yes, we have Socialism. Look

at all the businesses we have. Look at all the profits we make" — when they could have made enough in probably any one of the other industries to have overmatched this, providing they had got someone who could run them so that they could have had good sense in the operation of them, and who could make them operate. Under those conditions they should have been able to make a good profit on any of these organizations.

But in not one have they had the courage to put into effect the Socialism that they speak of. Not one. You know, I have a great deal of respect for people in politics, even the Conservatives at Ottawa. If they say they believe in something, then they don't go hiding around the back door every time somebody comes up and says 'Boo' to them, wondering whether or not they still believe in it. But I say to the members sitting on the other side of the House that not one of them has done anything to bring in the true beliefs that he is supposed to believe in, if he believes in "Make This Your Canada" and if he believes in the Regina Manifesto.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — They haven't got the courage of their convictions.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Even longer than you, Hermie!

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, just a little bit.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — And ten times stupider!

Mr. Gardiner: — We haven't got just too long to go, you know. One of the final subjects that I would like to deal with has been dealt with here today by another speaker, and has been dealt with on various occasions by members of the Government, and has been dealt with on some of our social occasions. I refer, of course, to the question of the international situation as it exists at the present time. The Premier at the banquet the other evening, and before the House, made some very fine comments with regard to the world situation as it exists at the present time. Today, when one of our speakers got up, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), somebody told him he should be back here at home. Well, I am not speaking now of any international governments or any international problems, but most of those affect the problems that the people on the other side have been talking about most of the time. I don't believe there is anyone over there tonight can say that I haven't stuck pretty close to the province of Saskatchewan. But I am going to say, this evening,

February 25, 1958

that I don't believe there is any government in Saskatchewan, any government in Canada, that can solve the big problems that those over there are usually talking about, and worrying about, the problems that they want the Government of Canada to solve; they don't want to have anything to do with them. Those problems, eventually, I feel are going to be solved in the international sphere, and there will be no one happier than myself, and I'll say this. I had the opportunity of sitting on the committee of the National Convention of our party in Ottawa, a month or so ago, which dealt with the question of external affairs. We had with us on that panel one of the most outstanding men in the field of international affairs in our country. He is not a politician; he's not a member of the House of Commons. He is a man who is in one of our universities, and is on a lot of our radio programs from time to time. Sitting there with him and with other people, both young, and old, from the length and breadth of this country, discussing the problems of international affairs, it made me think back to one of the solutions we have found in this country. This has been said by others before, and may have been said during the course of this debate: we have here in our country at the present time probably the greatest example for peace that the peoples of the world have to look at of any country in the world today.

We have working together here in this Canada of ours people from practically every nation of the world. We have learned to meet together, to work in peace, and have learned to live with the great nation to the south of us. Yet, in spite of the high statements that are made by some on the other side of the House; in spite of the high statements that are made by many in this country, they will insist on speaking as if we have in the nation to the south of us, the great enemy of the Canadian people in place of the danger that lies to us from further to the north — from the great country of Russia.

Most of us have learned to live with our neighbours to the south of us, and we have provided an example. Many in this country tend to hold it up to Russia as if it isn't an example. There are many statements that are made in this country, and sometimes to the south of us, that are made use of by our friends in the Kremlin and Russia to discredit the type of life that we live here in this country of ours, and the kind of life the people live in the nation to the south of us. I say that every Canadian, you or I, everyone of us, no matter what our nationalistic background may have been in the past, none of us should be discrediting particularly the type of life or the way of life that we enjoy in this nation of ours. I don't think that there are many of us who would want to pack our grips tonight and move over into the great country of Russia to the north of us. I don't

think there are any on the other side of the House, and I know there are none on this side of the House who would, for one minute, even consider such a proposal. Therefore I say that we have in Canada an example that is worthy of upholding for all the nations in our world at the present time, but I say that is where the main solution lies to the problems we have at the present time in our nation, and it is a peaceful solution to the problems of the world at the present time. Now, I'm not going to say that one person or another person in this nation is going to play the biggest part in the move, or whether Canada itself today has the biggest part to play in the movement of bringing about a world peace, but I will say this. There has been controversy in the last few days in the press between two of our public men, with regard to when the idea of an international police force (I imagine it was particularly in the Suez crisis) was mentioned. Well, I can refer you to suggestions of the international police force back before the beginning of the Second World War; many of them. I don't know if there is any one particular person you could possibly put your finger on and say he was the first man to originate the idea of an international police force. When Mr. Pearson spoke the other day, he made mention of that fact, that it wasn't any particular person to whom the credit should go for the suggestion of an international police force, but to the feelings and ideas of the people of this great country of ours.

I think that the solution does lie in a form of world police force under which we would be able to live in peace; under which we would be able to have world freedom of trade. There was only one time in the history of the world that the people were really able to move in freedom, and that was during the period when there was a Roman army looking after the affairs of all the known world at that time, and the people of all those nations were able to trade with one another, were able to carry on their business and relationships, because they knew they were free from the fear of war, and from the fear of possible destruction.

So I say here tonight that, while the peoples of the world are able to go to their work, whether it be farming, whether it be labouring, whether it be as a business man; while the peoples of the world are able to go to their jobs and their work in the safe knowledge that they have no further fear from wars in the future, when that day comes we will be able to trade freely one with another, and will be able to dispose of all the surpluses we have in this nation or any other place in the world. And until that day of understanding comes, I am certain that no party, including our friends across the way, are going to find a solution for the immediate problems that face us at the present moment.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You could have said that in half an hour!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You're not getting much applause over there. You'd better wake those boys up; they're not applauding worth a darn!

February 25, 1958

Mr. Gardiner: — I think, Mr. Speaker, in relationship to some of the problems I dealt with tonight and this afternoon with regard to the affairs of the province, and in regard to affairs on the national sphere, and in regard to affairs on the world scene, perhaps I should, probably, before closing — I'm not going to close right away, I might say to my friends — I should before closing my remarks — I see the hon. member for Canora (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) across the way enjoying himself, and I am pleased he is. I thought when he heard I was still speaking he would probably be out in, Canora. He could perhaps pick up a few more roses and bring them back, and give your members some tomorrow, because then it will be their turn.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Put it on the records.

Mr. Gardiner: — I'll do that. Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks . . .

Govt. Members: — Oh, no . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that doesn't mean much when you're concluding — one fellow this afternoon said that four times and still didn't sit down. Speaking of our work in the House, here is one question I think in all seriousness, members of the House should deal with, and, of course, that is the question that has been mentioned, and the amendment that has been moved, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald). It is one that I would like to spend a few moments on, because of the fact that it has an important relationship not only to the financial welfare of our people on the land here in this province, but of the people of Canada, and, of course, that is the question that is facing not only the people of Saskatchewan but the people of Canada as a whole — the relationship to the problem of unemployment as it exists in Canada at the present time.

There has been a great deal said on this particular point, but I would like to mention this to the Government of the day. Here again the Government says, "We're not responsible. Somebody else is responsible for unemployment; somebody also could take the responsibility for that particular thing". I don't believe it is the responsibility of anyone else to have the primary responsibility for the people of our province. In other words, I think there are things we could do, as members of this Legislature, to bring home to the people as a whole in this province, the serious situation in regard to labour matters that are facing us at the present time. I say this largely in relationship to this problem, that our smaller communities in particular are at the present time beset with many regulations that I feel should not exist in our smaller communities; that many of our people during this past winter, who have been registered with the Unemployment Insurance Office,

probably would have been working in our communities at the present time, and would not have been registered as unemployed, as they are at the present time, and showing up the large list of people that are today out of work, and looking for work, not only in our province but in the rest of the Dominion of Canada.

I hope, as one other member stated here tonight, that our small communities in the future will continue to play a large part in the history of our province. I live in one myself, and, for that reason alone, I hope that our smaller communities are not going to die out; but any of the legislation that has been placed on the statute books of this province has not encouraged the existence of our smaller communities in the province of Saskatchewan, particularly those with a population of under 5,000. In those communities in particular, many of the government orders put on those communities by the Government of this province, have made it almost impossible for many of those communities to continue as they have been in past years.

In relationship to the question of unemployment, in my own constituency I can state it is a serious one, because we have within my constituency the large centre of Melville, in which the majority of the population are working men employed on the C.N.R. in that particular community. There are many of those people today who are out of work and living on unemployment insurance, and I feel there are things we can be doing as a provincial government and as members of this Legislature; there are things we can and should be doing to try to assist those people in communities of that type. In a place the size of Melville, when you have 150 or 200 people thrown out of work, it is extremely difficult to find within a community of that size, the possibility of work for those people under those circumstances. But there are possibilities with regard to the Department of Public Works in this province — possibilities of construction work that could be done in the winter. You know, I quite enjoy looking at the picture of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams) on these paper advertisements with regard to providing work for our people during the winter months; but I think we, as a Government and a Legislature, could do more ourselves to see that the Government of this province takes upon it more of the responsibility, and sees to it that the Department of Public Works, and other branches of government, insofar as the work can be done in the winter-time, carries out such work, particularly in our rural areas. It could be of great benefit to . . .

Mr. Loptson: — (brings folder in)

Mr. Gardiner: — Thank you, "Minty", thank you. The only difficulty with these things is it is somebody else's speech, and I've never been known to read anybody's else's speech yet. I even have a

few of Mr. Douglas' here; maybe you'd like to read them. There are one or two of the Premier's that were made in Winnipeg at the time of the change in the Manifesto. The only difficulty is we still have the Manifesto, whether the C.C.F. party has it, or not. So we can read it back and make that the party across the way doesn't forget what its original promises and platform were, and that the people of this province as well do not forget what the province of Saskatchewan has been promised by the C.C.F. party in the way of both political platform and political ideals.

Mr. McDonald: — There's nothing in it.

Mr. Gardiner: — The Leader of the Opposition says there isn't even anything in that big pile. I think he's about right. It's mostly addresses by members of the Government on the other side of the House. That's mainly what it consists of, and that's usually what we get when we come down here to the Legislature. So I put it all in one big envelope, so I don't make a mistake and read it; and then I put it in a nook and corner some place in my filing cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — When are you going to make a good speech, for a change.

Mr. Gardiner: — Not in closing my remarks this time, but speaking on the question of the so-called cost-price squeeze as it affects the farmer, we find there are many other ways that we, as members of this Legislature, could, if we so desired, assist the farmers of this province, and others, in relationship to their cost on the farm. (I think somebody mentioned farm truck licences the other night) the increases in car and truck licences that have been made since this Government took office. Then there is the gasoline tax. Well, you know, the gasoline tax was put on by the Federal Government at Ottawa, and they took it off. So, instead of leaving it off and helping everybody in Saskatchewan, the Government here put it back on. Last year, they added another cent. Remember what they did last year? They took a little bit off the farm fuels and education tax, and put another cent on the gasoline tax. It's a funny thing, you know. When you get figures you find out that they're going to collect more through that one cent on gasoline than they were collecting on the farmers' fuel tax. Most of that, unfortunately, is going to be paid by the farmers. So, instead of assisting with their cost-price squeeze, the problems are going to be increased, and the farmer is going to have to pay more for the cost of operation on his farm due to the changes in the legislation last year.

Of course, there's the education and hospitalization tax. I made a reference to that particular tax a few moments ago, or it may have been this afternoon when I was speaking . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — A few hours ago!

Mr. Gardiner: — In relationship to education, when I stated that the two per cent education tax plus a third of what is received from the Federal Government under our Dominion-Provincial agreement, covers the total amount paid for education in this province, meaning that not one cent of the general provincial revenue is actually finding its way into the educational institutions of our province.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — There's a crack in your record. You're going around the second time.

Mr. Gardiner: — We can even take the Department of Health. We can take the one per cent collected through the education and hospital tax, the amount collected through the hospital cards, and add to it one-third from the Dominion-Provincial agreement, and there we have the total amount that is spent in the Department of Health as well. So, actually, there is no assistance through our Dominion-Provincial agreement, and the balance of the tax can all go to the municipalities and the highways. After those three branches of government are looked after, after our gasoline taxes, all taxes that are put on the people of this province in relationship to our cards, licences, gasoline tax, and all other revenues received in the form, it should go necessarily to highway and construction and improvement — if we put those monies, plus the one-third received from the Dominion Government under our agreement, we find that there again we better than meet the total cost, the total amount of money that is put up for the cost of the highway system in this province plus the Department of Municipal Affairs.

The money coming from the Crown Corporations, we've been told in the past, is supposed to go largely to providing these so-called social services in particular to the people of this province. But we find these are being provided in one form, or another. There are other taxes that are being placed on the people, so we must assume that the balance of the money that is raised through taxing the people of this province is going to other departments of government and also I think going, to a certain extent, to bolster the Crown Corporations, because after all, that's where we are spending a lot of the Government's money, right in the Crown Corporations themselves from year to year.

It is quite an odd thing, as the evening is drawing along, to think upon March 31st. The other evening there was some difficulty, I think, about closure in the House, and I made a remark about somebody being in a little bit of a hurry, or seemed to be in a little bit of a hurry, and I couldn't see any reason for rushing.

February 25, 1958

I think, after all, there are people in the province who are capable of looking after the Federal affairs, and capable of doing their own speaking, as far as I know. I don't think they need your help; I don't think they need mine. As far as I am concerned, I was sent here to do a job and I intend to do it.

Premier Douglas: — I can understand that!

Mr. Gardiner: — The other day when the problem came up, the Premier was in sort of a hurry and said, "Oh, we've got to get on with this tonight". I don't know what was going to happen, whether the sky was going to fall in on us or what, but anyway he wanted to get on with these Bills. You know, last year (my first year here), I didn't see any rush. In fact I don't remember us having any night sittings last year for almost two weeks. I don't remember bringing down any Bills in the House for quite a period of time.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Let us try to keep the hon. member on some tracks. There were 41 Bills introduced the Friday after the House opened. The House opened on Thursday, and Friday there were 31 bills given notice of. My hon. friend ought to keep himself straight.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I was going to say that, if the hon. Premier would just be patient. Oh yes, we had the Bills on our table like we had this year, and we had the Bills presented, as the Premier says, and we didn't actually get into the 'meat and potatoes' until a little later in the Session, and there wasn't quite the rush there seems to be in this particular session.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We sure got into the corn, though!

Mr. Gardiner: — I know that hon. members will want, or may want, to get out by March 31, whether the business of the House is completed or not. I don't know what the feeling of the members are. Personally I think I want to stay here until our business is done in the Legislative Assembly, and until the full legislative program is brought down by the Government of this province, and that each one of us has a full opportunity to have a full discussion on it, and to make sure that the problems that you and I are sent here to deal with are not forgotten, just because there are perhaps some political opportunities out on the hustings for those that are sitting across the floor, and perhaps possibly even for those of us sitting on this side of the House.

I think we can quite truthfully say that in what has taken place in the House of Commons in Ottawa, in spite of the fact

that the Leader of the C.C.F. party in Canada is making great protests about the time that the election was called, I don't know why he appears to be very worried about the fact the election was called for March 31 and that there were no reasons for having an election.

You know, Mr. Speaker, he tried day in and day out, from the time he went down there, to defeat the Government. He wanted an election the first day the House met. Last spring, when the election was over, I can remember quite well reading in the papers of this country the statement, by the C.C.F. saying they were prepared to support this new Conservative Government when they got down to Ottawa. And there weren't too many strings attached at that, time. The Social Credit party in Canada came out with the statement that, as long as there was reasonable cause for it, they would support either party, if they decided to form a Government, or assist them in getting the House into operation when a new Session was called, and got the business that was carried over from a previous election taken care of. Well, what happened when the members get down to Ottawa? Someone spoke about this balance of power. They never tried to use any balance of power, because they couldn't. They don't know very well how to balance it, except to try to find out just which way the balance is, Conservative or Liberal, in the election on March 31. I think if they have any sense at all, they'll try to balance the Liberal way, because I think that's the way she's all going.

What was their action when they got down to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker? Their action was that on every single vote that was held since the last election in Ottawa, not one was for the Government — I should say except once, and that was on the Liberal motion at the end of the Session. Not on one other occasion did the C.C.F. party in Ottawa support the present Government. Yet they were the ones who were going to keep the Conservative party in Ottawa! They are the ones who today are telling the people of Canada that there is no need for the election that our Prime Minister has called. Yet they are going to sit in the House and vote against the Government on every motion. I would be thinking they should say to the people, "It's a good thing there was an election; we didn't think the Government was doing anything right. Of course, there should be an election. We voted against everything they did down there, so it's high time they were put out. They're bringing the country down to ruination, as we told you in the past they would". But no, Mr. Speaker. Their leader gets up at meetings across this country today and he cries tears because of the fact that he had to come back to the people of this province within a year, and fight another election campaign.

I don't know. We speak about sincerity — sincerity in political beliefs or political ideas. Perhaps it wasn't a promise, or maybe it wasn't even an understanding, but I think Mr. Diefenbaker had

good reason, when he took office, to feel that he had the support of the C.C.F. party and also of the Social Credit Party, in order to get through the original legislation last fall, and get around to the point where he could bring down a budget. As I already indicated, there was only one party — or two parties I should say. The Social Credit party and the Liberal party carried out the promise, or the understanding, (if you might can it that) that was given to the Conservative party following the election on June 10.

Premier Douglas: — A lot of good it did.

Mr. Gardiner: — So I say today that my friends across the way shouldn't go around the province stating, "Oh, there shouldn't have been an election called for March 31; this is terrible". I don't know. I think the way things are turning out that some people might say the weather might be bad. I have often seen it in the month of June, when we've had elections, that you couldn't move because you were wallowing mud on the country roads . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That's when we had a Liberal government!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . and I can tell my hon. friend I got stuck on them in the last year, too, many times, and I have been stuck on them much more since this Government has been in than ever before.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You're stuck, period!

Mr. Gardiner: — In spite of the great so-called advances of the present Government, we still have many country roads in this province that in wet conditions could become a problem on election day, and it could be a problem on June 20 just as much as it is on March 31. I think when my friends in the C.C.F. say they are thinking of someone else, perhaps the inconvenience to someone getting out to vote, the only thing they are afraid of is their own possibilities. I think the only thing they are afraid of is that the election just isn't going to turn out any too well. I know it is a very bad thing to have to fight two elections within one year, and know that you're going down to defeat, after having received just one sessional indemnity in Ottawa. It is a thing for any member. I don't know which party most of your adherents are flocking to at the present moment, but I have no doubt there are today in this province hundreds of supporters, moot of whom were previously Conservatives, I think, at one time, and have gone on to support the C.C.F. party and are today going back to the Conservative party. I think when the election is over on March 31 that the people across the way are going to be a great deal surprised when they

read the total votes that their candidates receive in most of the constituencies of this province.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — We heard that last Session, too.

Premier Douglas: — Don't worry about us. Worry about yourself.

Mr. Gardiner: — There is one other matter of interest that appeared in the press — something I didn't have too much to do with, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Worry about your Dad, because he's going under.

Mr. Gardiner: — It appeared in the press a abort while ago. I've heard speakers of this province state that the Government had intentions of trying to establish one or two regions in this province — now, it may just have been hearsay. I'm not saying it happened; but I understand that the attempt was made in this province to persuade certain peoples around our province to accept a unit — we could call it an experimental unit — under the county system. As a matter of fact, a number of meetings were held in a northern constituency in this province, and when those meetings were over, the reeves or the officials of most of those municipalities reported that the people who attended those meetings wore almost 100 per cent opposed to any change in their present system of municipal set-up. I could probably read the remarks of the three reeves who attended the meetings in that particular area. I am quite surprised that the Government decided to use that as an experimental base . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Brave, aren't you?

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . because the people in that area had never even been in a larger school unit (most of them), let alone going into a county system of administration. So I think probably they started at the wrong point in order to try and encourage people in the province to possibly enter into the county system of administration. I am sure this is probably something that was done by the municipal men at their own behest.

I don't know what the inner workings of it were, but it did appear in the press, last fall, that these meetings had been held, and we've been told by one or two individuals there was a possibility that the Government was holding meetings in certain areas of the province to see to it if they could interest the people in the possibility of establishment of some new municipal set-up in the province of Saskatchewan. As I stated, it was only a rumour that came to me, but when it came out in the paper that they had held those meetings in that area of the province, I could only accept it as probable the thing had taken

February 25, 1958

place, and that encouragement had been given to try to persuade people in certain areas of this province to undertake a county system of government.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Well, most certainly it was the P.F.A.A. who inspected . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You should have interfered with it at the time.

Mr. Gardiner: — At least I don't have to read most of it. I don't have to have somebody else write it, and then not even make a good job of reading it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You're not insinuating that 'Hammy' can read, are you?

Mr. Gardiner: — I haven't even heard many good readers since I've been in here.

Premier Douglas: — We're sure not hearing one now!

Mr. Gardiner: — I admit that, Mr. Speaker, I admit that. I know the Premier himself is a very clever speaker and a very clever orator, and I wouldn't for one minute try to claim precedence over him or anyone else as a speaker. I only hope and trust that his words don't have any more value, as far as anyone else is concerned, as they have on me. I can assure him they don't have much effect.

Premier Douglas: — I've never killed time for three hours!

Mr. Gardiner: — One of the problems that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition is the question of industries in this province, and one of the main points raised in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is the fact this Government has failed in carrying out its duty or its promise to the people of this province, in providing industries which would see to it that the population of this province, instead of going down or staying steady, would be going up.

We've heard much about population since the beginning of this debate. Someone on this side rises up and gives some figures, and someone on the other side gets up and says, "Oh, those figures aren't any good" for some reason or other. Well, I think there is one way we can tell, in some manner, who is giving the true point of view with regard to population figures in this province, and one of the criteria is this. The province of Manitoba for the years 1941-46, didn't lose

quite as many people as we did — they probably haven't as many to lose; but they lost population. In those years my friends across the way claim that our population was lost during the time that the Liberal Government was in office in 1940-44, Manitoba also was losing population; Alberta, in spite of the large populations that moved in during the war years, up until 1946 had only had a very small increase in the period 1941 to 1946. There was only a very small increase in population in the Province of Alberta. But what has happened since 1946? The province of Manitoba has been going ahead by leaps and bounds in relationship to population. The province of Alberta has gone ahead even faster, and so we could go to the province of British Columbia as well.

It was not too long ago that we were the third province in Canada in relationship to population. Today we are fifth, and in the next census I don't doubt for one minute that we'll be the sixth province so far as the population figures are concerned. So we'll be from third to sixth since that time, because of the fact that we've had a C.C.F. Government in office in this province since 1944. It is pretty difficult, when you take figures like that, for anyone on the other side of the House to prove otherwise, because most of these prairie provinces went through the same experience during the war years. We all realize that, at the time the war started, many of our people from this province went down to eastern Canada to take part in war factory work, those who didn't go into the armed forces. Many of those people never came back to this province, and either they must have come back to the provinces of Manitoba or Alberta, or else now people moved in that were encouraged by the former government that they had in those particular provinces. Enough new people moved in to place them in the position where every one of them bypassed us with the exception of Manitoba, and they only have a few thousand to go in order to come to the point where they will be in a better position in relation to population than we are here in the province of Saskatchewan.

So I say, without any doubt at all, no matter what figures you take, there is no way, shape or form that anyone can prove that the Government of this province has carried out its actions in such a way that it has been able to bring people to this province, that it has been able to keep our people here at home, or even been able to keep the statue quo. So today we are fifth province in Canada, whereas when the present Government came into office, we were in a much better position.

I'm not going to say that it was probably the fact that a lot of industries didn't come in. I think it was more the Regina Manifesto and "Make This Your Canada" — I think some people had received information about this before. I think a lot of people who came from other countries around the world to Canada came maybe with the intention of coming

here to Saskatchewan; but when they heard they had the kind of government they had just left in the old country, they refused to come here and settle in the province of Saskatchewan. Of course the hon. members across the way have admitted, in no uncertain fashion that their aim is the same aim as many of the governments controlling affairs in European countries that these people have been leaving to come here and live in a democratic country. So, when there is a government here of the same complexion, I can well realize, when they come here to Canada, and hear they have a Socialist government, here in Saskatchewan, that if possible they will try to make arrangements to go elsewhere. I think we can also accept that as one of the reasons why the population of our province has failed to grow to the same extent as the population of our neighbouring provinces, and other provinces in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — You're putting us to sleep!

Mr. Gardiner: — In fact, if this present Government stays in office too long, I would be afraid that one of these days even Nova Scotia is going to be catching up on them. If they get this new assistance from the Federal Government that they're talking about, maybe the Nova Scotians here in Saskatchewan will move back there, because of the opportunities that are provided by the Government of that province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I want to express my appreciation for all the happy faces that have faced me across the way. I have appreciated it just no end. Quite often when these long speeches are made, I usually have to sit and listen to them; so I thought tonight at least, I had the opportunity of being on the other end of the stick, so have made good use of it, since most of the people who had to sit there were you fellows across the way. After all, you are the ones that most of it was meant for, and probably you'll get more out of it than the average person would. So I felt I should actually let you know not only what your own policies were, but let you know the failures that you had brought about from the time you had come into office in this province of ours, and to show some of the ways, individual little ways, in my constituency and other parts of the province, you have failed to carry on the administration of the affairs of this province in a manner which gives credit to the province of Saskatchewan.

So I say here this evening that I intend to support the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, first, because of the fact that I cannot support Socialism; secondly, because of the fact that certain Socialist policies in this province have brought us into the position we are in at the present time, and thirdly, because of the failure of this Government to provide any assistance to the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan to help us over the difficult

periods that we have been going through. So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the amendment and will definitely vote against the Speech from the Throne.

Premier Douglas: — Hurrah! Hurrah! Thank Heavens!

The question being put on the amendment, it was negated by 30 votes against 17.

The debate continuing on the motion:

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the understanding at the beginning of the debate and the amendment that we would be free to discuss both, and so I intend to deal with some of the things that have been said on the amendment.

I would like, first, to refer to the very delightful speech given by the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), this afternoon, and particularly to congratulate him upon the pronouncement he made which was accepted by all members of his party — that there was no basic difference between the Liberals, the Conservatives and the Social Credit. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is something that some of us have been trying to tell the people of Canada for the last thirty years; and, this afternoon, we have it officially declared in this House by a member of the Liberal party.

May I suggest, too, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada, a great many of them, have no confidence in the Conservative party, and there is only one alternative, then, and that must be the C.C.F.

Mr. McDonald: — That's not an alternative.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I was also delighted — you know, when our friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) started to quote the Pope, I think that we have reached a new high in this Chamber.

Premier Douglas: — The devil quoting scriptures!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I never thought that I could ever remain in this Chamber long enough to realize that the hon. member for Saltcoats is reading the words of such great men. I would like to quote something back to him right now. This is by the now Archbishop of the metropolitan city of Sherbrooke, Quebec, Monsignor Philippe Desranleau:

February 25, 1958

"Capitalism is equal to Communism as a danger to moral and religious life. Capitalism means the excessive accumulation of private goods in the hands of a few. It can only uphold itself under a series of abuses. Capitalism tries, under cover of civil laws, to reduce production, diminish agricultural production, centralize money and destroy the production of necessities and this serves to increase prices and profits.

"As long as these products — flour, milk and potatoes — are cornered, made scarce and debased by monopolies under the eye of indifferent government we must admit the corrupting influence of capitalism and reign of corruption in North America.

"It is this Capitalism, well entrenched and well protected by anti-social legislation which holds national and international political . . . The church never will accept an economic regime that puts capital into the hands of a few, who put profit ahead of the workers and creates famine and scarcity of necessities of life to raise the prices."

There we are. We have the church from both sides.

Mr. Loptson: — He must be a partner of the Red Dean.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I would like, now, to refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). I am not going to thank him for the compliment he paid me this evening; if I thought he was sincere in making it I probably would; but I do not like the statements — which he made earlier today — the criticisms he has made and then to make a statement of that kind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to point out that this is the gentleman who started his talk by referring to closure in this House and that we were denying the right of speech, and yet for three hours and ten minutes we listened to more drivel than has ever been listened to . . .

Mr. Loptson: — A better speech than you can make.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . at any time since I have been here. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal, first, with the

question which the hon. member raised — that is, the question of the Bodnoff loan. May I say that this was dealt with in 1952. He had an election shortly after and the people of Saskatchewan gave their answer in no uncertain terms. It was brought up again in 1953, when certain charges were made concerning myself, in this Chamber, where we sat as a Court of Inquiry for nearly two months; and again, within a few months, the people of Saskatchewan had an opportunity . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You're mixed up; that was the Rawluck charges.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . to express their views. Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1956, this question again was used in the election campaign and once more the Liberal party had its answer.

Now, what are the facts? Well, Mr. Speaker, in April of 1950, Mr. Bodnoff applied for a loan of \$75,000. It went through the Insurance Office in the usual way. I had no knowledge of it, nor had the Premier, nor had any member of the Government or the Board of Directors, until such time as the matter was brought to the Board in the usual way by the management. The security for the loan was ample — the Act requires that a loan must not exceed 60 per cent; in this case the loan was actually less than 40 per cent. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that no member of this Government or of the Legislature used any influence whatsoever to obtain this loan. It was made through the usual channels and recommended in the usual way by the management. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have complete confidence in the management of the Insurance Office. Mr. H.L. Hammond and his assistant, Mr. Blackburn, are two of the finest men that have given a lifetime between them — approximately 55 years — in the insurance business.

Mr. McDonald: — He wasn't manager, then.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Hammond was in charge of the loans and made the recommendation to the Board of Directors. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was conclusively proven, during the discussion that took place in the Committee, that there was no connection whatsoever between the Bodnoff Weyburn loan and the local drive-in theatre, in which the Premier and myself did have an interest. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that for having had an interest in a drive-in theatre, I have no apologies to offer. I have always believed it is the right of the individual to take part in any kind of a business. I don't deny the hon. member for Melville the right to operate his business in the town of Lemberg. I don't deny the right of any member, nor shall I ever criticize them because they have a business and sit in this Legislature at the same time. Here was a business that could not possibly, in any way, be connected with the Government, where we saw a new developing industry in which we saw hope of making a profit,

if you like. We got into it and I want to publicly, tonight, thank Mr. Walter Tucker and those others who raised this question, which caused the Premier and I to sell our interests in that theatre, because we sold our interests at a very good profit and I don't think we could today; because of what has happened to the drive-in theatre business. So you see, sometimes these criticisms . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Talk about greedy!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . do help. Now, Mr. Speaker, we proved conclusively to the Committee that the loan had no connection with the drive-in theatre.

Mr. McDonald: — To yourself.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — This was accepted; cheques were brought forward and there was no question about it whatsoever. The \$75,000 was distributed as follows: \$52,000 was given to Mr. Mitchell, the solicitor, to pay off the previous owners; \$6,500 to McElroy Lumber Company; then the balance of \$16,500 to a number of small creditors; \$4,650, Canadian Theatre Chair; Waterman and Waterbury Company, \$5,762; Robert Simpson Company, \$2,993; Ken Black Architect, \$600; and other miscellaneous ones — we have the complete list which has already been put on the records of this House, or at least the records of the Committee.

Wow, Mr. Speaker, that was away back in 1950 that this loan was made. Now it is true the Premier and I had an interest in the Drive-In Theatre, but I want to deny again, tonight, that over a five-cent piece of that money that was borrowed by Mr. Bodnoff from the Insurance Company was used in any way, shape or form for the Drive-In Theatre. There was no relationship whatsoever between the two things. In 1953, the 9th of April, the owners of the Theatre had a meeting and we decided — three of us decided that we would sell our interests to Mr. Bodnoff. This was done in July of 1953; as a matter of fact the first meeting took place on the 14th day of April; I have here a letter under date of July 28th which gives me a copy of the Minutes of the Directors and Shareholders meetings, with notice of change of Directors, and notice of resignation of the above noted Company, for my information and files, together with Agreement dated April 14, 1953.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, in 1955 Mr. Bodnoff had an opportunity to see his theatre in Weyburn. The original loan — if I remember correctly, was \$75,000; by this time he had got it down, my hon. friends can figure it to, I believe it was \$37,500; it had been half paid off and Mr. Bodnoff had two courses open to him. One was to pay the loan off and the other was to get it to apply against

his Drive-In Theatre property, insofar as the officials, the officers of the Insurance Company were concerned there was no question in their mind at all, that it was a good loan. As a matter of fact, there was a feeling that we had some responsibility towards Mr. Bodnoff, that we had allowed his name to be dragged into the mud here in this Chamber and in the Committee Room.

Mr. Gardiner: — What's that got to do with the Government Insurance Office?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The Insurance Office had loaned him this money. He had always paid on time, in fact, always a little ahead of time, so there was no hesitation, when he asked if he could transfer the loan to the Drive-In Theatre, the manager had no hesitation whatever. He did it. Now remember, the Premier and I were out of the Drive-In Theatre two years before this, Mr. Speaker. This is just another of these despicable things that we see so often.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I want to say it is not the first time it has happened. I have here a copy of the Vancouver 'Sun'. I happened to be down in Winnipeg last spring; it was a very unpleasant occasion — the funeral of my brother's wife; and my sister, whom I hadn't see for two or three years, was there from Vancouver. She made reference to an article she had seen about me in the Vancouver 'Sun'. I said, "What was it?" She said, "Well, it was 'Jimmy' Gardiner going after you. I think I may have it at home." Well, last summer, in the month of May, I received through the mail this page from the Vancouver 'Sun', dated Friday, August 1956. Here we are:

"C.C.F. finished", says Liberal Gardiner."

Premier Douglas: — How finished!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That was after the election. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did he say? He recalled the Socialists used to talk about the fifty 'big-shots' and he said the Socialists used to say that people drawing \$10,000 a year controlled 90 per cent of the income of Canada.

"Today, most of the people who used to say that, are making \$10,000 a year, he said. I haven't heard them talking about the big shots for a long time. The Agriculture Minister wouldn't mention names, but he was thinking of men like Clarence Fines, the Saskatchewan Provincial Treasurer."

February 25, 1958

He wouldn't mention names, but he was thinking about me! What did he say?

"When he joined the C.C.F. party in the 'thirties, Mr. Fines was a school principal who drove an ancient car, lived in a modest home and wore a threadbare suit. Now Mr. Fines is reputed to be the wealthiest man in Saskatchewan . . ."

I should have been treated with a little more respect, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, from the son of this man.

"He owns a lavish home, two Cadillacs and more than a hundred suits of clothes."

This is the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner, in the Vancouver 'Sun'.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Shame!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the truth?

Mr. Loptson: — How far wrong is he?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — When I joined the C.C.F. party in the 'thirties, I was a school principal and drove an ancient car, he claimed. That is not true. I was not driving a car of any kind! I had no ancient car. Secondly, I lived in a modest home — that is true; I still do. And I wore threadbare suits — well, Mr. Speaker, that could be true, because I was teaching school under a Liberal government, and it is quite possible that my suit was threadbare. I have no apologies to offer, because I think practically every other teacher in Saskatchewan was in a similar condition at that time.

Now, let's come to the other things. "He owns a lavish home." Mr. Speaker, the home that I own, today, is the same home that I owned when I was teaching school in the city of Regina. I have not changed my home at all.

Secondly — "he owns two Cadillacs" — well, you know, Mr. Speaker, this has gone all over Saskatchewan, this story; I hear it everywhere I go — that is one reason I got fairly good crowds out to my meetings; people come to see my Cadillacs and they are so disappointed when they see me riding up with a Dodge car.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the truth? I have never owned a Cadillac in life, nor have I ever owned any other kind of a car, except for a very short time in the middle part of the 'twenties,

for a couple of years when I was teaching in a country school. I don't own a car today and I haven't owned a car since 1926 — for over 30 years; and yet this man has the nerve to give the people of Canada the story that I have made a great deal of money out of this Government and own two Cadillac cars.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Contemptible!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I was very anxious to see just how many suits of clothes I did have, after I got this, so I went up and counted everything I could — my extra pairs of slacks I put with sport jackets, and made one suit out of them and I was able to get seven suits of clothes . . .

Mr. Loftson: — Three times as many as I've got.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . and some of them were just as threadbare as the one I was wearing back in the late 'twenties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we have men in public life who have to resort to this kind of tactics — here we find the father trying to destroy me, personally. He didn't succeed, evidently, and now his son, this afternoon, comes out with these statements that there is not one shred of truth to, to try to create suspicion and distrust among the people of this country. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only very bad for my own family, for my own self, but it is not good for the province. I must have the respect and the confidence of the people of Canada if I am going to be able to do a decent job for the people of this province. But how am I going to get it, if we have these contemptible statements such as were made here in this House, this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Purveyor of garbage!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of thing that is driving people out of public life. This is the sort of thing that has made me determined that this is to be my last term in office.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, oh, my!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — This is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that is preventing young people from getting into public life, because they realize that, at any time, their children and their family are going to have to suffer because of these dirty contemptible statements that are made by irresponsible people sitting opposite.

Premier Douglas: — . . . sewer rats.

February 25, 1958

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member again went on this afternoon, to talk about a certain case in Melville. This man, as he knows, is a very good C.C.F. supporter that he was referring to. The first time he came to my office, he was accompanied by the local member and a committee member of the C.C.F. May I say that at no time, in all the years that I have been in charge of the Insurance Office, has the politics of a person had anything to do with the settlement they would get. If there is anybody that can disprove that, I challenge them to do it. But in this particular case, I am not satisfied with the way it's handled at all; I think it was handled very badly. I told the hon. member that. I told my officials that, and in a letter I wrote them on the 16th of April, I told them I thought they had handled it very badly, but that we couldn't do anything more about it. But the hon. member himself says this afternoon that the Insurance Office met with the representative of about 15 other companies, and they worked out a common policy to accept 50 per cent of the claim, or of the loss, whichever was the least.

Unfortunately, before this was worked out, some of our enthusiastic young adjusters had given as much as 50 per cent of the loss when that amount made up 90 per cent actually of the amount of the policy. I am not stating for one minute that this was handled perfectly by our officials. As a matter of fact, in this letter I said this, and I'm going to read this paragraph from a letter to Mr. Blackburn, the secretary:

"I am enclosing herewith a file on the above case which Mr. J.W. Gardiner, M.L.A., left with me last week.

"I cannot say that I disagree with the decision made to pay approximately 50 per cent of the damages. However, I do feel that our adjusters made some very serious errors in the carrying out of that policy. For example, Mr. Fox, on July 19, stated we would make settlement for either 50 per cent of the claim, or 50 per cent of the insurance carried, whichever was the least. Unfortunately that statement compared with Mr. Koffman's statement made in a letter November 2nd, in which Mr. Koffman admitted that we paid \$600, whereas the insurance carried was only \$800 or 75 per cent of the insurance carried.

"He also admits, in the case of Kristoff we paid \$550 where the insurance carried was \$600,

or over 90 percent. I can see where Mr. Schoeffler would think that we're not all treated alike, as stated by Mr. Koffman. However, I expressed my feelings in a final letter on October, 1956 and do not feel there is anything more can be done, but I do think a little more care in these adjustments would have eliminated a lot of trouble which this has created for us in Melville."

Now, what more can I, as a Minister of the Crown, do? I cannot tell my officials how they are to settle these claims. Whom am I to tell people that have had 30 or 40 years' experience — whom am I, as a politician, to interfere with the operations? The hon. member, a short while later, made the statement, when dealing with Crown Corporations . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would just like to ask the Minister on what basis those three or four claims were adjusted. There doesn't seem to be any rhyme or reason to them . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well yes, there was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gardiner: — No order to them at all.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the point is that those cases were adjusted on the basis of 50 per cent of the actual loss. They did not take into account that they had only \$600 or \$900 insurance, so it actually worked out at 90 per cent of the total amount of the policy, which was contrary to what they should have been doing. In other words, when they paid \$900 and there was \$1,000 insurance, they should only have paid \$500, under the agreement that was made. However I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have settled tens of millions of dollars worth of claims in the Insurance Office. I got complaints from time to time from people who feel that we have not done sufficient. I get complaints from people who feel that they should get a great deal more. I suppose no one is ever exactly satisfied, but nevertheless, I think it is a great tribute to the operations of the Insurance Office, and to the officials there that we have had very, very few of these cases brought before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see the time is almost up. I was very interested, this afternoon, to listen to the member's remarks on the power and he was telling us that the power costs were getting so that he may have to discontinue the use of power. I am sorry if that will happen; if he should have to go back to a wind-charger. It reminds me and takes me back to a little speech here: "Liberalism — solution to want and war." This picture you see is a picture of the

February 25, 1958

Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner, the Minister of Agriculture. This pamphlet was issued by the Liberal Federation, and it is a speech to the Reform Club, on March 4, 1944. At that time Mr. Gardiner made the statement:

"This brings me to the suggestion contained in all political platforms to the effect that electricity should be placed on every farm. It should; but I am afraid that here again our opponents are inclined to think in terms of great centrally-located power plants operated by the State or by a Corporation, whereas, in many parts of Canada the essential results can be obtained at much less expense, under individual control.

"A power line runs within two miles of my farm in Saskatchewan. My farm has light and has a water pressure system in the buildings and equipment for every convenience, except electric heating and equipment, such as a grain grinder, which requires high power; but I do not draw electricity from the power line. The reason is that in our section we can harness the air and obtain electric power from a windmill at much less initial cost and only a fraction of the monthly cost that would be involved if we were attached to the power line."

Mr. Speaker, after what we listened to, this afternoon, I am sure there will be an ample supply of wind to look after the charger, if it will be necessary for the hon. member to discontinue his present hook-up to the power line.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, there is one question I would like to ask, in relation to the other question that I asked. I find, on checking the figures, that 50 per cent wasn't paid in either of the other two cases. They say in the letter "approximately"; but the exact 50 per cent wasn't paid in either of the other two cases mentioned.

Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

DISTRIBUTION OF 'COMMONWEALTH'

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, there is one matter I would like to clarify here, tonight. With regard to the statement that was made regarding the distribution of the 'Commonwealth' — I wasn't aware of it until the statement was made; but I was aware of the Premier's remarks, when he said, in effect, that the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) was spreading a deliberate lie, in a definite Gardiner fashion. I thought, this is a junior member, his second year in the Legislature; and I heard from the others where they had these copies, so I checked with the member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), an inexperienced member in his second year. He told me of two people who brought these back with them from the gallery, saying it was passed out to them when they went into the Speaker's gallery.

Premier Douglas: — By whom?

Mr. Cameron: — They didn't know by whom. They don't know the people around here.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Maybe the Secretary of the Liberal Party was doing it!

Mr. McDonald: — Don't be so small.

Mr. Danielson: — It was more likely to be Bodnoff.

Mr. Cameron: — He didn't even know the man that came to him. I phoned some friends of mine that I knew were in the gallery; they said the pamphlets were being passed out. Now that was all that the speaker alluded to — whether it's right or wrong doesn't bother me, if they are passing out pamphlets — but I think the Premier brought the debate to a new low in this House . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Without any rhyme or reason to accuse the member of a deliberate lie.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It should have been raised at the time.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get into this debate just to raise this, and I was on my feet, I think, prior to that gentleman over there.

February 25, 1958

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I saw the gentleman over here first.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on this question that has been raised, all I want to say is that the hon. member says these copies were being passed out and the implication certainly was that someone on the staff or someone in the Government was passing them out. I asked him — because if any such person has been passing them out — I want to know about it. Now, it is quite possible that individuals . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Why didn't you inquire and find out?

Mr. Gardiner: — You said it was a deliberate lie, and I don't care what you say, now.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member was trying to leave the impression that the guards or the Commissionaire was giving them out, then I say it was a deliberate falsehood.

Mr. Gardiner: — I think the Premier must have a guilty conscience, Mr. Speaker, because just because I say something he takes it for granted that I am referring to the people that are working in this building.

Premier Douglas: — I have listened to insinuations so long that I am used to it.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.