

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
10th Day

Wednesday, February 26, 1958

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate On Address-in-Reply

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 25, 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.

Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I first wish to compliment those speakers who have preceded me, who have contributed valuable information, their opinions, to the debate on this very important subject. I regret, that I cannot get into a sufficiently charitable mood to think of any compliment to pay the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner), who made us endure a very lengthy harangue yesterday.

Regarding the problems that do confront this province, and I think problems do exist, as we would expect in any society in which we have a condition of flux, such as exists in the province of Saskatchewan today.

I would like to deal with the matter of farm population with regard to our farming industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Firstly, I wish to start on the initial premise that farmers wish, and are entitled to a standard of living, a standard of services and security that is on a par with that of the urban dwellers. I would like to state a second premise: that agriculture as an industry should aspire to economic efficiency. Furthermore, I would like to lay a third premise: that it is desirable to have the greatest number of people possible living on farms with at least an acceptable standard of living.

I would like to elaborate on these last two premises. Regarding that of economic efficiency, I feel that if Canada is to continue and compete on the markets of the world with her exports, we must have economic efficiency within agriculture as an industry. By this I refer broadly to the matter of the output

February 26, 1958

per worker involved — a comparison that may be similarly applied to the industrial industries. I feel that within this province now there are farmers who themselves can compete price-wise with any of the other countries in the world. I think we also must admit that there are farmers in this province who are having extreme difficulty with the situation that now exists. Of late, there has been much interest and controversy regarding the matter of firemen on freight diesels. It is a matter of personnel redundancy. I think that we, in this legislature, and as members of the great industry of agriculture, should put this question to ourselves. At what level of diminishing size do farms, as individual entities, also become redundant in our agricultural industry. There may be some compromise required between the premises two and three, that is, between agricultural efficiency as an industry and the number of people living on farms.

I'd like to comment further, regarding the matter of efficiency in agriculture. Too often we find the small unit being referred to as the inefficient unit. I do not mean the term in that way. I will mean that efficiency is a matter of productivity per worker.

In the second premise, I think the important phrase is, that farms and farmers must provide and be provided with an acceptable standard of living. I think it is useful here to refer to report No. 14, by the Rural Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, wherein they define 'the family farm' which is commonly regarded as a desirable unit. I can go along with their definitions which is, that a family-size farm meets the following conditions:

- A. The farm operator makes all or most of the managerial decisions.
- B. The farmer and members of his family supply most of the labour needed.
- C. Available farm resources are sufficient to provide the family with an adequate, minimum standard of living.
- D. Tenure is reasonably secure for the operator and his family.

If we examine the farm situation in Saskatchewan, we find that a good number of our farms will qualify under the matter of the farmer being administrator. Most of our farms supply all the labour that is needed. Some protest about the number of large farms, and the Royal Commission observes that only three per cent of our farms could be considered overly large.

Regarding "C" — the matter of farm resources; we find here is a qualification that immediately eliminates a very large proportion of our farmers from classifying as being a true desirable family farm. By taking the year 1950, we find that over one-half

of Saskatchewan farms received a gross income from the sale of farm products of less than \$2,500. Eighty per cent had a net farm income below this amount. 1950 was a year in which there were many poorer grades, but it was a year that could not be considered typical. Certainly the return that these farms obtained cannot, by any means, be considered a grandiose amount.

Referring to farm income, we must observe that it is a function of the price and quantity of the product sold. It would be ridiculous to ignore the effect of price on the farmers' income. However, I do not propose to deal with that matter in the time I have today.

However, if we look at the matter of production, we must find that quantity is primarily a function of area, accepting, of course, that there are other factors beyond human control which will affect fluctuations in yield. In pursuing this further, it is interesting to note that Saskatchewan has an area of improved land of approximately 40 1/2 million acres, with approximately 104,000 farms, as in the 1956 census. By exercising a little elementary arithmetic, we find that the average farm contains 380 acres of improved land. Furthermore, we must find that there is little new land available for farming in the province of Saskatchewan. That is, there is already land under cultivation that is submarginal and possibly should be removed from agriculture. We must come to this sad conclusion, that a good many of our farms simply do not have the resources with which to supply a farm family with a satisfactory standard of living.

We find that in 1956, we had around 46 per cent of our farms with less than three-quarters of a section. I admit that, of these, many farm intensively, that is, they produce livestock and other products. But this is a solution that cannot be applied across the board. Many of the terms and many of the farmers simply are not suited to such enterprises.

Furthermore, it may be interesting to calculate the income that a farmer can derive in one year from, for example, a half-section. With a six-bushel quota, we find that a half-section may produce a gross income of around \$2,200. That is the amount from which the farmer would have to pay his expenses, live, and pay his taxes if that is the area of his farm and he is producing wheat alone.

Let us visualize a natural process of evolution that does take place in our farming industry. We must recognize, and do recognize that farms are steadily increasing in size. Possibly that is not an undesirable trend, except from the standpoint of the people who are thus displaced. Let us take the case of a half-section farmer who goes bankrupt. He is forced to leave the farm and seek a livelihood in some urban centre. In doing so he is very often ill-prepared to assume a living in the city. If he is lucky, he may find a job as night watchman, janitor,

February 26, 1958

labourer, and frequently, he contributes to the slums that tend to accumulate around the edges of our cities. This process of natural evolution is undesirable from the standpoint of the farmers who are displaced. It may also be undesirable, from the standpoint of our third premise, that we wish to have the maximum number of farms, the maximum number of farmers on farms, living at an acceptable standard of living.

I feel that our function in the legislature is to ameliorate the harshness of this natural trend. We should accept that our population will, for some time at least, continue to decrease and we must endeavour to initiate the harshness that is often caused. We must endeavour to see to it that the more capable of the small farmers are allowed, in fact encouraged and aided, to acquire the land of a displaced neighbour.

The normal process of evolution, as you well know, is that the small farmer is displaced and the larger farmer is able to acquire his land. The person who needs more resources is rarely in a position to acquire more.

The present Government has done much to enable this transition — this new transition toward a more industrialized economy. I feel that there are directions in which we should accelerate our progress. I feel that we should stress more the importance of farm management training in school, both from the standpoint of making better farmers and from the standpoint of allowing a young person to decide, at an early age, whether the resources within reach of his family will provide him with a standard of living to which he aspires.

Our Department of Agriculture has made some valuable contributions. It has established a Farm Management Representative who is doing commendable work. The Department of Agriculture has also established a land-leasing program. This allows a farmer to acquire the use of the land without capital outlay, with security, with consideration of land productivity and year-to year yield, and with consideration given to improvement provided by the farmer. This program is helping many farmers, who have the use of more land, with security, without the necessity of providing a large capital outlay.

The assistance and direction that this Government has given and is giving in building toward a more industrialized economy is commendable. Such progress is essential if we are to profitably employ rural people who will be free to leave.

I'd like to comment briefly on another matter that sometimes is a subject for specious argument — the matter of young people leaving farms. The young people are the only ones who are flexible enough, in their lives, to leave the farms. We must

equip them so that they can take their places in an urban society and we may also be required to assist those who, essentially, because of age, must remain on the farms.

Because the Speech from the Throne contains very much of a program that is beneficial to this province, and it outlines a course of action that we must follow, if we are to continue in our progress, I shall support the motion.

Mr. Fred Neibrandt (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, in rising in this debate in support of the motion, I do want to associate myself with all the fine things the previous speakers have said with regard to the wonderful job that our colleagues have made — the movers and the seconders in the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I want also to extend congratulations to their respective constituencies, the constituency of Touchwood and the constituency of Moose Jaw, on their discerning choice, and on their loyalty to the C.C.F. cause.

When I was honoured last year, in seconding the Address-in-Reply to the Speech, I tried to outline to this Assembly the needs and the hopes and the aspirations of the people of the Yorkton constituency, which I have the privilege of representing. I outlined their many fine qualities and their attributes which I figure highlight their distinction. I pointed out the many fine natural advantages and attractions that we have in that area of the province and indicated some of the reasons why we like to live there. I also want to acknowledge with appreciation the help and the co-operation that has been extended to me, as a member, from the various Government personnel and ministries, and also, from the people of the Yorkton area, who have co-operated with me in trying to arrive at some of the solutions of problems with which we are confronted. I feel certain that this good relationship will continue in the future, — that we will continue our quest for solutions to our various problems.

I was pleased, indeed, when I listened to the reading of the Speech from the Throne, that consideration will be given at this session of the legislature, to increase grants toward hospital construction. Some of the members already have alluded to this and commented on it favourably. As members well know, our hospital problem has bedevilled the people in the Yorkton area and has divided them for longer than I care to remember. It should now be possible to resolve this most embarrassing and long-standing hospital problem. The city and the districts surrounding have organized into a Union Hospital District and with the announced increase in Federal grants and the anticipated increase in Provincial grants, I look forward to the day when our hospital facilities in Yorkton will meet our requirements and will be in keeping with the importance that we feel Yorkton has obtained as a centre of importance in the medical field.

February 26, 1958

Equally, we appreciate the fine service that our medical staff and our 17 doctors are giving us, sometimes under very trying and difficult conditions. The record shows that, in spite of being handicapped both in facilities and plant, they are rendering service of a very high calibre. We feel that this fine service greatly relieves the pressure in that area, at least for admittance to our fine University Hospital, — the hospital that has, in just a few years, attained international recognition. I am sure that all the members here are filled with pride when they contemplate the achievement. I am sure that this is no mere accident but is the result of a policy of this Government of non-interference, and of encouraging the finest technicians and physicians available, to the end that now, the people of Saskatchewan no longer need to be dependent on outside facilities when confronted with expensive operations or diagnostic services or treatments or hospitalization. This is but another example of continued progress that is assured while the C.C.F. Government is in office.

I also want to refer to the fact that the Yorkton constituency is now incorporated into a newly organized health region — The Yorkton-Melville Health Region. It naturally gives us hope that since much greater health services are now available in this area, the general level of health and well-being will be raised.

I have had the pleasure of meeting some of the personnel in charge. I have been greatly impressed by the director in charge, Dr. Prestage, who has been good enough to outline to me the scope of health services available. I look with confidence to important improvements and progress in the various aspects of our preventive health program.

I also want to inform this House that we have completed the first phase of our program for senior citizens. Last year I had the pleasure of announcing before this House that we had made a start on this program. I outlined that Mr. Anderson, through his generous bequest, had left \$185,000 that was made available for a home for senior citizens. This government's encouragement and assistance for housing accommodation has helped, not only to fulfil Mr. Anderson's wishes, but to augment his vision beyond his fondest dreams. Accordingly, I can now announce, the second phase is well under way, that of providing for self-contained units, which will double the accommodation and be accessory to and complement what Mr. Anderson had originally visualized.

The Throne Speech today revealed that we have 20 housing projects for senior citizens completed and 26 are in the process of construction. As I previously intimated and hon. members know, the Government provides technical assistance and a yearly maintenance grant and 20 per cent of the total construction cost. I heartily support such a program for our citizens who, in their twilight years, now have the opportunity of passing their days with

a maximum of security and among congenial surroundings. My hope is that this fine program will be extended and that we may be able to accelerate it.

When it is realized that Yorkton is, this year, celebrating its 75th anniversary, we become keenly aware that time and its march is relentlessly catching up with even the most hardy. Few remain of those who were children at the time when these original settlers settled in our area. These pioneers laid a solid base for agriculture when they organized, 75 years ago, one of the first agricultural societies, and laid the foundation for agriculture in promoting exhibitions and demonstrations so that today, Yorkton and the Yorkton area is noted in many fields of agriculture. This year, as a gesture of confidence in the future and as tribute to those pioneers, the Yorkton Exhibition Association plans to dedicate a new grandstand as a tribute to the pioneers when they celebrate their 75th anniversary. I am sure that the hon. members here will wish to extend, with me, best wishes to our fair city and to the Exhibition Association on reaching such an important milestone. On behalf of the people in my area, may I extend a cordial invitation to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the members, to come and visit us when we celebrate these important events. I know that you will be welcome.

We continue to hear a great deal, both in and out of this legislature, and as the hon. member, Eldon Johnson, just mentioned a moment ago, the exodus or the claimed exodus of our young people from this province. Were this so, it would indeed be a great and a grave indictment. I have heard the Premier and members on this side, on many occasions, effectively answer these fantastic allegations. I do not attempt, at this time, to try to defend or pretend that young people are not leaving the province, or to say that we are absorbing all the graduates. We are, however, narrowing the gap and, as the Premier indicated, reaching the point whereby, with the tremendous expansion that is going on, most students at the present time are being absorbed in various fields and in the professions.

If the argument is valid that our young people are leaving this province, then it only points up our contention that Ottawa should make more funds available for educational purposes in this province.

I want to remind the hon. gentlemen in the legislature and especially the hon. gentlemen opposite, that since the turn of the century, over 5 million people from Canada have emigrated to the United States. Three and one half million of those who originally left, returned, together with numbers of American immigrants, but it left a net deficit of 1 1/2 million in favour of the United States, a deficit that we can hardly afford. A lot of these people were highly trained and I presume that a lot of them, I should say, instead of "emigrating" to the United States, they "escaped" from Canada and from the lack of opportunity that we feel is lacking here sometimes. I want to remind this Legislature that I, too,

February 26, 1958

found it necessary at one time, for lack of opportunity, to leave Saskatchewan and make my living elsewhere. From the handful of students that graduated from the Yorkton Collegiate many years ago, I don't recall any that stayed here in Saskatchewan, except maybe the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) who is a former classmate of mine. I don't know if he has ever left Saskatchewan.

Today, in this same collegiate, we are graduating more students, — more students than the total enrolment when I went to school there. I am very glad to say that a big percentage of those students are rural students. This is due largely to the fact that under the larger school unit, we have educational opportunities for our young people, previously denied them. We have not been able to solve all our educational problems, even through the larger units, but I believe that no member here will deny that progress has been made in the right direction. In spite of this and due to factors which are entirely beyond the control of the larger school units and this Government, costs have continued to spiral. We find that in the Yorkton district, some of the ratepayers are getting restive and anxious and there is a petition being circulated at the present time for a vote of dissolution.

When the last revised schedule of grants was submitted here last year, the Yorkton Unit had an increase in grants of \$79,000, which is a little over \$2,500 per classroom in that area. I think the hon. members will readily admit that this is a very substantial increase over anything provided by previous administrations. There are dozens of schools in that area, and my hon. friend alluded to that fact a little while ago, that, outside the Unit alone, they could not operate. That is true in the Yorkton district. The average ratepayer there on highly assessed land, often fails to realize that outside the Unit, the grant may be as high as \$1,000 less per classroom. It is only right and proper that opportunity should be given for people to express, by means of the ballot, their endorsement or rejection of any proposition. This is essential in any democratic society. They should also be informed in order to express an intelligent opinion. I earnestly hope that when the time comes to do so, the ratepayers will know exactly what they are voting for.

This Government has made tremendous strides in the various aspects of Government that affect our daily lives, and education certainly is no exception. I see that I've been talking very slowly and that my time is practically up. I had wanted to touch on the agricultural situation, especially as it affects the people in my area. I will have to forego this and will conclude by saying that, as a member on the government side, I feel that I have a right to hold my head high in view of the fact that this Government has met, in the past, the needs, the hopes and the aspirations of the

people of Saskatchewan. The Speech from the Throne has given me the assurance that we will continue in this progress and face up to our responsibilities and to the pledges that were given to the people several years ago.

For that reason, I will vote against the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and in support of the Motion.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — They say it takes all kinds of people to make a world, and it would seem that we have a pretty fair cross-section of them in this Legislature. I notice the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald), the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner), the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), the member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) — they certainly make up quite a variety.

Yesterday in this House a number of the members opposite made statements reflecting on the procedures in this House, which statements were in fact a reflection on your office.

Mr. Gardiner: — No. no.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They used the term 'closure'; they cast reflections on the report of your committee, and I would suggest to the hon. members who might make charges about such things as 'closure', that two things are important. One is that the charges are justified, and the other is that you come with clean hands.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — . . . give you a month to talk on it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Liberal Party is the most infamous party in Canada, insofar as the abuse of free speech is concerned. Their performance in the House of Commons over the pipeline debate is something of which we are all ashamed in Canada, using closure to, in fact, if not absolutely prevent debate on the question.

Mr. Speaker, I saw a Liberal majority sit in this House . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You will again!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and bring in a Lieutenant Governor when a C.C.F. member in the Opposition was standing on his feet debating a motion that was on the Order Paper. These people come to talk about closure; come to talk fair practices in the Legislature. The Liberal Party doesn't know anything, about it. They always, when they were in power, acted like bullies. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to get some of the facts, let him go and talk to some of his past friends, whose party he belongs to . . .

Mr. McDonald: — I'd have to. I couldn't get any from you. I'd have to go elsewhere.

February 26, 1958

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . to find out how the Conservatives were treated by the Liberals in this province. A personal incident that happened to me — a Liberal Cabinet Minister of this Province called me a 'fascist' at a public meeting.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Did he call you a 'dirty liar'?

Mr. McDonald: — He called him a 'rat' yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And he refused to allow me any defence.

Mr. McDonald: — There probably wasn't any.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Certainly the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) wasn't refused the privilege of making any defence. A Liberal Cabinet Minister, (I was in the Opposition — there had been a meeting in a country hall), called me a 'Fascist' and refused to allow me to make any defence. Free speech!

Mr. McDonald: — In the House?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Free speech. You people on that side of the House don't know anything about it.

Mr. McDonald: — The Premier called the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), a 'dirty rat'.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The radio broadcasts from this House, of course, were opposed by the Liberals, and they are, in fact, still against them. They were opposed originally because the Liberal party has never wanted the people of the province to see into or hear directly from the Legislature. They wanted to keep that quiet and under control through a servile Liberal press and their Liberal speakers out in the country.

Mr. Gardiner: — How about 'The Commonwealth'?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friends may laugh at these things, but there are too many people in the province of Saskatchewan who know that they are true. The radio time in the Legislature is divided evenly, giving a minute advantage to the members in the Opposition — a minute more than the members on this side of the House.

Mr. McDonald: — That's not true. You can't add.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, I would like to know who they think they are.

Mr. McDonald: — Who do you think you are?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Each one of them is a member representing a constituency entitled to be treated as a

member of this Legislature, and that is the treatment that he gets.

Mr. McDonald: — From the dictators over there!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In the Votes and Proceedings of February 17, you find a report of your committee on radio broadcasting and selected proceedings. The committee had under consideration the division of the 1,500 minutes of radio time for the current session, and the committee reported and recommended for the Opposition members 500 minutes — that's over 29 minutes for each member, 1,000 minutes to the Government members, which is less than 28 minutes for each member. The next thing we find on the minutes of the House is this: "By leave of the Assembly, on motion of Mr. Howe, seconded by Mr. Dewhurst, ordered that the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting of Selective Proceedings be now concurred in". Parliamentary procedure provides a place for everything, and if there was any objection by the members in the Opposition to the report of that Committee, that was the place to take it up. If one had had the courage to raise his voice at that time, they could have had a full dress debate on this question over the radio, and aired their views.

Mr. McDonald: — We have had it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They did not want to debate this question, therefore, they did not take the opportunity to debate it.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. Minister who is now on his feet has no authority to state what the Opposition wants, and if he wants the facts, we have debated this on radio time in days gone by, but we have been continually dictated to by the Government.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The very fact that the report of this Committee was adopted without debate signifies the agreement of the members sitting opposite. Either that, or they weren't doing their duty. If they did not agree with it, it was their duty at that time to raise objection, and they didn't do it. Once upon a time a Liberal Government in Canada prevented this Government from operating a radio broadcasting station.

Mr. McDonald: — I should think so!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — If we had had that radio broadcasting station, think how we could have pleased the hon. member from Melville.

Mr. McDonald: — God forbid that you should have a radio station!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We could have had him on the air yesterday or three hours and 10 minutes. It would have been wonderful.

February 26, 1958

Mr. Gardiner: — I might have taken more time!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But the Liberal Government, at Ottawa said, "Oh no, it's all right for the Federal Government to own radio stations all across Canada, but a provincial government shall not be allowed to own and operate a radio station."

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friends signify by their applause that they agree with that, that they don't think provincial governments should have the same right of free speech that the Federal Government at Ottawa has.

Mr. Gardiner: — It gives you more.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) yesterday, during that three-hour harangue said, among other things, that the population of Manitoba was going up by leaps and bounds. While he was speaking, I imagine the newsboys were on the street with yesterday's 'Leader-Post', and on page 14 there is a heading, 'Manitoba Farmers on Decrease', Manitoba's farm population is decreasing at a rate of almost 1,000 a year during the period 1941-1956. I need make no more comment.

Mr. McDonald: — That about the total population?

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Minister misquoted the statement that I made yesterday. I was speaking about total population, not farm population. The total population has risen.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I did not misquote him. I said the member's statement that Manitoba's population was going up by leaps and bounds.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, it is too.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The point I want to make is that he was very careful not to mention the farm population in Manitoba, because he wouldn't like anybody to think that the farmers in Manitoba weren't the most happy people in the world. As I said a little while ago, it takes all kinds of people to make a world, and we have quite a lot of them here.

Mr. McDonald: — Thank goodness there's only one of your kind!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Listening to the debate as the members of the Opposition took part in it, I noticed there were a great many contradictions. Sometimes in one member's speech, certainly between different members of the Opposition,

there were many contradictions. Some of them maintain that the management of our Crown Corporations is inefficient. I've heard them say that.

Mr. McDonald: — You just fired one of them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Then we have some of the members attacking the salary paid the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, saying what a terribly high salary it is. Of course, they would like us to have the poorest people possible for managers.

Mr. McDonald: — You have.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . because they're happy when those things get into trouble.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — You've made a pretty good job of it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But my friends sitting over there are also the last people who should start talking about salary, who should object to paying good salaries. Since I had a little spare time, I looked up a few things, and I find a salary paid to the Rt. Hon. J.C. Gardiner, together with some other allowances (we go back to the year ended March 31, 1957 — that's just past.) His salary was \$15,000; he had a motor car allowance of \$2,000 which was not taxable . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — That applies to all members.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . he had an indemnity of \$10,000 and he received travelling expenses of \$3,945, making a total of almost \$31,000, of which over \$7,000 was not taxable.

In the year ended March 31, 1956, all these totals added up to \$34,000 for the year.

Mr. Gardiner: — That's a good example.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — For the year ended March 31, 1955, it was \$32,649, and, of course, each year you could add \$40 or \$46 or \$55 a month old-age pension to this, too. But without taking that into consideration, in the three years the Dominion of Canada paid to him \$97,705. It is interesting to note that in the year 1955-56 for salary, travel, indemnity on the basis of no-pay for Sundays and holidays, he cost the country \$111.83 per day, not counting old-age pension. A lot of time that year he spent out here in Melville constituency, and I think we have to say that his mission was accomplished. We should compliment the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner, because he achieved almost the impossible. He got his loquacious, (and I can say that after yesterday), and I think not-too-responsible son elected to this Legislature, but at \$111 a day -what a price to pay for him. What a price to pay!

February 26, 1958

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — We're still paying.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, my hon. friends would probably like to raise some more questions about salaries on some other lines, but we'll leave that for the moment.

Mr. McDonald: — Tell us about yours, Brock.

Mr. Cameron: — Are you going to vote against it in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Other contradictions — that if the Government does something that it's wrong, and if it doesn't do it, then, it's wrong, too. We hear that over and over. One member says we shouldn't discuss international affairs; we should stay with provincial affairs.

Mr. McDonald: — It's true.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think it was the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), and where did the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) go, and the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie). Why they were all over the world. But if we go, it's wrong.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — You've been all over the world. What more do you want?

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — You can't even get going!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Liberals have often referred to the C.C.F. with derision as being the planners. They talk about the back-room boys and all that sort of thing, and the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), in that long speech of his, was pointing out how we were going to have plans for everything, and trying to make fun of it. Now Liberalism, of course, if my hon. friends know anything about it, really means no planning, but each in the pursuit of his own good will makes the greatest contribution to the good of all. Of course, that philosophy in this modern interdependent world is completely archaic. Now, the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) says the C.C.F. has no plan.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — I didn't say . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now she's trying to get out of it. But she says . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I did not say that the C.C.F. party had no plan. They have a plan for world domination . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that's no privilege. The hon. member wasn't taking advantage of privilege that time; she was taking advantage of her position.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — She said, "But my leader has a plan", and I was very interested, because I wondered where does he keep it. We've never seen it. Actually he has no plan because I have listened carefully to a lot of speeches made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and they all boil down to this, that the Government should do more of the good things than it is doing. That's all. He doesn't talk about a plan of his own — they're not doing enough.

Mr. McDonald: — You can't blame me for your inability to comprehend.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He went down to the Liberal convention in Ottawa a month or two ago and helped to raid the C.C.F. platform to get some planks for the broken down Liberal party.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Regina Manifesto, wasn't it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Actually, no government was ever more sincerely complimented than by the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition when he followed this line, that we should do more of these things; they're good — do more. That's what they say all the time.

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): — When did we say that? You're imagining things.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They say, "Aid the local governments". Well, I don't think much needs to be said about that, because a great many people have a pretty good memory. But I do want to mention road grants. As I listened to the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) speak on this subject; I thought I would like to see what was happening to the municipalities around her home town, so I said I would just pick the four municipalities that are closest to the town of Humboldt — just four, and it's a good area. The municipalities (you can tell by the assessment) are good municipalities. In 1933, which was not only an election year (but, of course the member for Humboldt wouldn't remember that), but also a by-election year, so there was a double issue. These four municipalities probably got more grants than any other four municipalities in the province, because they got \$3,400 or \$850 apiece. But how much did these same four municipalities get in 1957? A total of \$64,000 — over \$16,000 apiece. Almost 20 times as much as they got in 1938. I don't blame my hon. friends for squawking and shouting when they hear these things. They don't like to hear them, but they are the facts and they must listen to them. Now, I'll tell the Leader of the Opposition he doesn't need to worry — we are doing good things for local government and we're going do more in the future.

Now we come to the question of school grants. School grants are over five times what they were when we took over, and I thought I'd better find out what the truth was in regard to the Lemberg school,

February 26, 1958

after listening to the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) yesterday. This school district has a relatively high assessment. It is an area of good land. In 1945-46 the rate per classroom, including elementary and high school rooms averaged \$586 — that is, grants for the year per classroom were \$586. Being a highly assessed area they did not participate, to any great extent, in the equalization grant, but in the 1956-57 year, just closed, they got \$1188 per classroom, or more than twice what it was back in 1945-46.

Now we go to the town of Melville itself . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — The costs were higher, too.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and there they have a relative low assessment. In that first year, 1945-46, for the public school district, the grants averaged out at \$362 per room, and in 1957 at \$1750 per room. In addition, that school district in 1957-58 got a building grant of \$55,000.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Their costs have also risen.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Hospital grants — Let's turn to health for a minute. Communities either did without their hospitals, or built them themselves, or a private organization or the Red Cross built a little outpost. That was how they got hospitals and we started paying hospital grants . . .

Mr. Cameron: — They're still paying them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and the Liberal Government at Ottawa was so ashamed of itself they came through with hospital grants then, three years after we started, after we had got a big part of our building program done.

Mr. Gardiner: — Just in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — With regard to hospitalization, nothing need be said about that in this province of Saskatchewan. But I would like to tell you something about the health services which the Liberal Government had in this province before most of you members were here. They don't know anything about it probably. This is a letter dated April 23, 1940, signed by R.O. Davidson, Deputy Minister, Department of Public Health. May I read just a couple of short paragraphs?

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Read it all.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — "As you are aware" . . . the hon. member says, 'read it all'. The only reason I won't read it all is that I think my speech is a lot better than most of the letter of the former Deputy Minister of Public Health.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's a nice thing to say about a former member of the House.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: —

"As you are aware, the Department has been paying for the care of these persons (that is persons who couldn't get medical attention) on a basis of 50 per cent of the schedule of fees of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. However, we now find that the cost of providing this service has mounted to such a high figure, it is impossible to continue.

"It has been decided, therefore, to adopt a different policy, and we trust that the medical profession will see the difficulties that have arisen in connection with this service, and be willing to co-operate with the Department in providing an adequate service to those who need medical care and are unable to pay for same, realizing that it should be in the interests of the medical profession itself and the people, rather than continue on the present basis.

"It has been decided to pay you (this is written to a medical doctor) a subsidy of \$25 per month, and you will be expected to render medical services when called upon, providing the service is required." (Then they say) "This subsidy which you will receive monthly has no reference whatever to the obligations the people themselves may have to pay your account. You are entitled and quite free to make the usual charges for the services you render and expect the people to pay you in whole or in part for them."

Mr. McCarthy: — Could the Minister give us the date of that letter?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is dated April 23, 1940. A lovely way for the Liberal Government to withdraw from a very partial and small responsibility for providing medical services — pay a little bit of cash to the doctors to get the doctors on their sides, too. If ever I saw anything cheaper than that, I haven't heard about it yet.

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Somebody over there talked about loans to local governments to help finance public improvement projects. Well, we've made lots of them. We have, in many cases, purchased 50 per cent of the debentures of a town or village or municipality. We have made direct loans to school units to help them with their capital program, and we took over 75 per cent of social aid. When we come to the farm program, we spent many millions

February 26, 1958

on drainage. When the Liberal Government was in office here, no drainage was done but it was charged up to the community. We spent money on irrigation, in land clearing and water conservation grants for veterinary districts, all these new things. We have increased the agricultural representative service, and the general technical and advisory services for the farmer. We have introduced farm management study . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Planning!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . You see, you could never expect a Liberal or a Conservative Government to do that, because they didn't want the farmer to know where he was at. They didn't want him to be able to keep books . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — They took it for granted he knew.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . because whenever he did, he couldn't help but find out that he was in the poorest position of anybody in the country.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's a fine thing to say to your farm friends.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Leader of the Opposition also listed some things which he thought were the cause of the agricultural depression. He mentioned the increased gas tax. The average gasoline tax for the provinces of Canada with Liberal governments is two cents higher than ours. The average for provinces with Conservative government is three cents higher than our tax. There are only three provinces lower than Saskatchewan, and six higher. He spoke about farm truck licenses. Farm trucks get the lowest vehicle license of any class of vehicle in existence. He also mentioned the compulsory insurance. He would probably like the farmers either to go without any insurance at all or be compelled to go to the insurance company and pay through the nose for that protection.

Mr. Gardiner: — He would at least have them . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He talked about the rural electrification charges, but I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that a proper price for wheat would pay for a lot of electricity. It has already been pointed out in this House that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is now investing about twice as much capital for each rural connection as for each urban connection. The farmers are getting the advantage of that plan now. Then, above all things, he mentioned the mineral tax as one of the causes of an agricultural depression. We made a study and found that in actual fact, only about 10 per cent of the acreage tax was paid by bona fide farmers. Take into consideration the minerals that are owned by other companies, and the fact that when minerals are leased, the oil companies refund 7/8ths of the tax and it comes out to about 10 per cent, or an average of about 40 cents per quarter-section.

Mr. McDonald: — Would the Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, thank you. If the hon. member asked a question and I gave him an answer, he probably wouldn't be able to understand it anyway.

Mr. McDonald: — You're afraid of it, Brock.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The only reason the Opposition acts in this way is to cover up the deficiency of their friends in the Liberal and Conservative parties at Ottawa, and we must include Social Credit, too. You know, I have always maintained that there is no difference between the Liberals, the Conservatives and the Social Credit party except one is in, and the others are out. The member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), states that they are the same. One is in and the others are out; when the one is out, he gets more and more progressive, and the one who's in, gets more and more conservative, and then they get thrown out again. But they're fundamentally the same.

Mr. Gardiner: — The C.C.F. . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We've got some evidence in that respect. I have here a poster about a nominating convention in the Legion Hall at Weyburn. This is a little bit soiled (like the Liberal Party). 'On Tuesday June 1,' (it doesn't say what year), 'this convention is called by the Liberal Association and the Progressive Conservative Association of Weyburn Provincial Constituency. Everybody opposed to the present C.C.F. Government is urged to attend.' I have an extra copy of this, so I'm going to present one of these to the Premier — that's his constituency — and I suggest that he gets the words of the hon. member from Pelly engraved on the poster.

Mr. McDonald: — What about this one, Brock?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member for Pelly states that his provincial government has the responsibility for the economic conditions on the farms. The member for Melville states that unemployment is the responsibility of the province. Let's see what some of their friends think. I have in my hand here a copy of the 'Prince Albert Daily Herald', and on it is a picture of the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent, former Prime Minister of Canada.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The only trouble is, my hon. friends disagree with him.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member seems to be very good at saying things I didn't say. What I did say was that that there were things the Provincial Government could do to assist in the province.

February 26, 1958

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: —

"The aims of the Liberal Party to ensure to all Canadians in every province, of every race and creed and class and of all political parties, the closest possible approach to equality of opportunity and to a fair share of the bounties with which Providence has endowed our favoured land."

Nothing wrong with it.

Mr. McCarthy: — There's nothing wrong with that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, there's nothing wrong with it. What's wrong is what the gentlemen say on your left, Mr. Speaker, and what the Liberals and the Conservatives do in Ottawa. That's what's wrong. There's nothing wrong with this . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Tell 'John' about it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . if they would carry out what they say is right.

Mr. Gardiner: — Brock, you're making more votes for us all the time!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They're talking, not only here about the farm economics, but the unemployment, and again I have here the former Prime Minister, quoted in 'The Montreal Star', September 20, 1954, and he says:

"I am convinced that if my colleagues and I cannot set up the controls of our economy in such a way that there be no long unemployment periods for those who want to work, then the people should throw us out and put in our places, persons who could do a better job."

Then in typical Liberal arrogance, he says:

"But I don't know where they could be found."

We'll not leave too many people out of this. Here is an advertisement . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Hurry up, Brock, get on with social inequity!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . published by the Diefenbaker Club in the 'Prince Albert Herald', April 26, 1957:

"My pledge to farmers in all parts of Canada is to assure that the farmer shall receive his fair share of the national in-

come; my objectives will be equality for farmers in Canada's economy; my desire to correct the social inequity, and the inferior economic position into which agriculture has been allowed to fall."

The hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) says there's no difference. I'm sure he couldn't help but agree with the present Prime Minister of Canada. They have a responsibility, but my friends over there want to push the responsibility on to the Government of Saskatchewan for these things, instead of keeping them in the right place. Of course, everyone knows that even in the best times we've ever had in Canada, when agriculture was at its best, and we had price controls, farmers — the farm population received \$60 per capita when the non-farm population got \$100 per capita. That was the best relationship we ever had. Now the farm population is getting about \$25 per capita when the rest of the population is getting \$100 per capita.

Mr. McCarthy: — Blue ruin!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member from Melville said the farmer in Russia is at the bottom of the economic scale. With a Conservative and a Liberal Government here in Canada, there is no difference — the farmer is at the bottom of the economic scale here, as he says it is in Russia! Now how is the rest of the Canadian economy? Well, it's not so bad, because here from the 'New York Times' I have an item which says 'stockholders of Canadian companies received a record \$722 million in dividend payments in 1957 or eight per cent above the previous peak of 1956'. Here I want to show to hon. members of the House, (they should have seen it already — it's published in 'The Western Producer'), a chart which shows that the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat now is lower than it ever has been, except for four years during the depression, 1930-33. The purchasing power of a bushel of wheat is lower, and yet my hon. friends over there would stand up on their heels and yak, yak, yak about taxes, about licenses and about this, that and the other, without recognizing or referring to the important and fundamental principle. When we talk about the rest of the world, and how it is getting along, I have here from the 'Calgary Albertan' — my hon. friends over there in the northwest corner might be interested, and this is for January 8, 1957, (if you want to look it up):

"Tennessee Gas Transmission, a giant American firm with no particular concern for Canada's welfare, is setting up machinery to deprive Canadians of \$5 million to \$10 million a year for the next 25 years.

"Tennessee Gas Transmission, in its own right, by having Trans-Canada Pipelines in the palm of its hands, is arranging to deprive Canada of at least \$125 million, perhaps \$250 million, or even much more, over the next 25 years. Money which ought to be and easily could be Canada's . . .

February 26, 1958

Mr. Danielson: — Tell us what paper you are reading from.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — 'Calgary Albertan', January 8, 1957, but if my hon. friend from Arm River saw that, he would walk around it and leave it alone. He wants to forget those things, and my hon. friend who sits beside him says, "What's the harm in making a profit?"

Mr. McCarthy: — The Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) said that yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), made one other statement which I would like to deal with for a minute. He said there is no difference between socialism and communism. He actually knows better than that.

Mr. Gardiner: — No.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He knows any person of average intelligence (and my hon. friend, I am afraid is much above average intelligence) . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Your Manifesto says so — that's the same. I read it to you yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . everyone knows that the democratic socialists are most hated of all by the communists, and the social democrats are the first people to face the firing squad when the communists get into power. That's been proven over and over again.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, that's not democratic socialism; that's capitalism.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You know the communist party isn't a bit particular. I have in my hand an advertisement that was published June 9, 1944, and I just want to read a little bit of it. It says this:

"You cannot find the answer to Canada's problem, either in the policies of the Progressive Conservatives or in the present anti-national unity policy of the C.C.F."

Do my hon. friends believe that, or don't they think that?

Mr. McDonald: — Do you believe that?

Mr. Gardiner: — That was during the War when Russia was fighting with us.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Then they say, "Only a Liberal-Labour coalition government can reinforce and broaden national unity for the winning of the wars and bring peace." And later:

"We shall fight unreservedly for the unity of all sections of labour; for the unity of Labour with all the Liberal and patriotic forces, to elect a Liberal-Labour Government which will lead the way forward to a new Canada of expanding production . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Tim Buck!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Wouldn't I be a fool if I were to say, because of that advertisement signed by Tim Buck that that makes my hon. friends Communists? No.

Mr. Loptson: — Your Manifesto says that the C.C.F. . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Communists aren't too particular. They're willing to go along towards even the Liberals, but that doesn't make communists out of the Liberals.

Mr. Danielson: — He's your bosom friend.

Mr. Gardiner: — In Manitoba, they should know.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), of course, uses that statement, not because he doesn't know better, but because it is easy to say, and he can say it very piously, as if he really believed it.

Mr. Loptson: — You've got to believe it, because it's your own.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Having listened to the members of the opposition during this debate, I can't help but think if they really believe Saskatchewan is as bad a place as they say, with this curtailed freedom, with the bad roads, the high taxes, they must be heroes to live here — real heroes.

Mr. McDonald: — Chase you out.

Mr. McCarthy: — We were here before a lot of the Johnny-come-latelies were!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Let's take a look at the Speech from the Throne. I know, Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate this poor old Speech from the Throne is getting kind of beaten around.

Mr. McDonald: — It was beaten before you started.

February 26, 1958

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — There have been a lot of not very nice things said about it.

Mr. Gardiner: — It's like the whites of the egg, and no yolk.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Speech says:

"My Government is gravely concerned with the continued decline of our farm income."

Mr. McDonald: — What are you going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I don't think my hon. friends said anything about that. They omitted that altogether. They repeatedly tried to blame the C.C.F. Government for this condition.

Mr. Gardiner: — You told us you couldn't do anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But they are not concerned, greatly concerned, and I don't think they care very much.

Mr. McDonald: — Don't be ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think they probably hope to make some capital out of those troubles.

Mr. McDonald: — That's a ridiculous statement.

Mr. Danielson: — That's what the C.C.F. has been hoping since 1944.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Speech contains this statement as well:

"It (that is, the Government of Saskatchewan) has contended, however, that in accordance with the principle of equal treatment to all provinces of Canada, Saskatchewan should not be required to assume a larger share of the direct financial responsibility for this project — the Dam — than has been required of other provinces."

Was there any one of these heroes sitting over on the other side of the House who got up on his feet and said, "That is my opinion", and who backed this Speech up and said that Saskatchewan, his province, should get the same treatment as any other province in Canada? Not one of these brave men came out and fought for Saskatchewan on that issue.

Mr. McCarthy: — Tell 'John' about it.

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, tell 'John' about it. He tells us they can't do anything about it, and then he wants us to . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Last December the Commission's recommendation to call a conference of interested organizations was intimated, and, we hardly heard that referred to. My hon. friends don't want conferences.

Mr. McDonald: — We went action.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They don't want people to discuss their problems; they don't want people to find cures for them.

Mr. Gardiner: — We want a conference where they talk, not you.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — A committee was appointed to give further study to reorganization and reallocation of finances and responsibilities, and this committee was appointed. Not one of the heroes sitting on your left, Mr. Speaker, said, "That's a good thing for them to get together". Are they opposed to it? I don't know.

Mr. McDonald: — You've got two now.

Mr. Gardiner: — Why don't they do something.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They've all stated that they're going to vote against the Speech from the Throne. Again, the provincial Premiers were unanimous in pressing the Government of Canada to take immediate steps to provide the province and the municipalities with a more equitable share of revenue from income taxes and succession duties. Was there one member on the opposite side of the House who got up and said during this debate, "go after the Federal Government to get a fair share", or do they believe we're getting a fair share now? The Premier of Manitoba . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — After March 31st, we'll tell them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . doesn't think we're getting a fair share. The Premiers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Ontario don't think we're getting a fair share. Where do the heroes stand?

Mr. McCarthy: — You'd keep it all, anyway. The municipalities wouldn't get it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They're like a wisp of smoke, here today, there tomorrow, and gone the next day.

Mr. Gardiner: — At least it comes from some place.

February 26, 1958

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — As unstable as a wisp of smoke . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You're like a wisp without the smoke!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . willing to take any stand; willing to dodge any real issue for the sake of political gains. The paragraph here that talks about the hospital insurance in Canada, starts out by saying:

"Saskatchewan has pioneered a hospital insurance in Canada."

Are these people proud or are they ashamed of the fact that Saskatchewan did pioneer the hospitalization?

Mr. Gardiner: — We put it there.

Mr. McCarthy: — We're proud of it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Miracles will never cease. We will yet, in the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), have a convert.

Mr. McCarthy: — I was helping to build hospitals long before you.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He's proud of the hospitalization. That's good. I wish more of them had the courage to stand up and say so. Why didn't they support the idea of pressing for having patients suffering from mental illness and tuberculosis included in this scheme. There was a subject one of them could have talked on to the benefit of Saskatchewan people for a few minutes in this debate. No, not one word about that very important subject from these brave heroes sitting opposite.

Mr. Gardiner: — We're saving that for the budget speech.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I could go over the Speech from the Throne and pick a lot more points, but I think I have enough to illustrate the point, My hon. friends don't show — I didn't say they aren't interested, but I say they don't show any evidence of being really interested in the welfare and good of their province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's your opinion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Speech from the Throne is a pretty substantial, well-rounded-out skeleton, and I am going to support it. But before I sit down . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, don't stop.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . I still have nearly 15 minutes, so before I sit down I want to say a few words

about the subject that has been discussed very often — taxation of mineral rights. This tax was instituted, as it has been instituted in some other provinces of Canada, as a tax on valuable property for revenue — the mineral tax.

Mr. McDonald: — Which other provinces?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Alberta.

Mr. McDonald: — They have no land tax.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Alberta has, or had, unless they have done away with it very recently, a mineral right tax.

Mr. Danielson: — When?

Mr. McDonald: — When? Not on farm land.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Leader of the Opposition is losing his head. I know, because I can hear it rattling from here.

Mr. Danielson: — You're dreaming.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They had the Mineral Tax before we had it in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Danielson: — Give us the year.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I can't give you the year for that, but I know when we were discussing our tax they had a rate of one and one half cents an acre, and the industry — some people made representation to us to make it the same as Alberta's, one and one half cents an acre.

Mr. McCarthy: — That was on producing areas.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, over all privately-owned mineral rights. All privately-owned mineral rights.

Mr. McCarthy: — I never heard tell of it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, there are a lot of things you haven't heard, old as you may be.

Mr. McCarthy: — I admit that, and a lot of things I don't want to hear.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I agree to that. There are a lot of things he would sooner not hear. The tax was taken to the courts and challenged by the C.P.R. During that time we took

no notion to collect. Some people did send in money to pay their tax, but we took no action to collect. Certain rights, which prior to the action of the C.P.R. had been forfeited, were restored to put everything back until we could find out whether this tax was good law, and give everybody a fair start. The court decided that it was good law. Bills were then sent out and now most owners have received at least three annual notices, and I may say that most of them have paid some or all of their taxes. Plenty of time was allowed, and time and again through circular letters and public statements I pointed out that this tax — (we wanted to give everybody a chance to pay it) was a tax for revenue purposes.

Last year, and this was about three years after the tax was declared good law, those who were in arrears for many years were notified that final notices would be sent out. They were notified by this little pamphlet which the member for one of the constituencies had so much fun with.

Mr. McCarthy: — Where did you get the mule on the front of it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It's not quite so dry as a formal and stiff letter. We didn't want anybody to overlook it. If somebody gets a solid and typewritten letter they might pay less attention to it than they would to something like this. That's why it was sent out in this form, and I say it worked, because taxes came in very well, very well indeed.

Mr. McCarthy: — Better than good English?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I take full responsibility for this. I have already pointed out that the bona fide farmers actually paid very little of this tax, and I want to assure you, that many people who have no mineral rights would be very happy to have the mineral rights and to pay the mineral tax.

Mr. Nicholson (Nipawin): — I'll go for that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, everybody up in our part of the country believes that, because we have no mineral rights, at all. It is our intention to do our best to collect the tax, but to give owners every reasonable chance to pay. When the land is a producing area, producing oil, coal or in the future probably some other mineral, the tax applies in another way by assessment and the levy of a mill rate. There will be much more tax paid where there is substantial revenue. The three cents an acre or \$4.80 per quarter-section is purely a minimum assessment.

I'd like to say a few words about the great mineral development which we've had in the province of Saskatchewan in the last two years. We came in oil from nothing to 120,000 barrels per day. In 1957, we got more new oil wells than the

province of Alberta. We are still far short of Alberta in the total number of wells capable of producing, but last year we actually got more new oil wells than did the province of Alberta.

In potash, I mentioned that before, we have three shafts on the way down, and one company is doing a test of mining by the hydraulic or brine method. It is not known yet, if that will be successful. If it is, it will be certainly quite revolutionary to save putting down a shaft. There is no doubt about it, that the potash mining industry is going to be one of our large industries for many years to come. Next year I think we will see the first potash production.

In metal, we have two new mines which have just started producing during the last year or so up near Flin Flon. We have a great deal of active exploration — as the Speech from the Throne indicated — over 11,000 mineral claims, and I might point out here that up until about 1947, the greatest number of mineral claims staked in any one year was under 2,000 claims. That is really a great deal of activity.

Uranium mining is still expanding up in the north-west corner of the province. Fifteen years ago our revenue from mineral resources was less than one-half million dollars a year. It is now right around the \$25 million mark. Actually equal to the whole provincial budget of 15 years ago.

In this age of mineral development and atomic energy, nuclear energy, there is a great need for scientific research. The Federal Government at Ottawa established the Canada Council and endowed it with \$100 million, partly to get rid of an embarrassing surplus. They came out with it at the end of the year.

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, get out!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I have no quarrel with the establishment of the Canada Council with that \$100 million to help universities in Canada, But I would point out this, that they are directed to support in their grants for building only the arts and letters. Science buildings are needed too. We need here in our own University more science buildings. With our mining, our oil and all this sort of thing going on, we certainly need expansion in the University in that line, and there should be another \$100 million established to help with the sciences and research in Canada. If we don't do that, we're going to fall farther behind than we are. I am afraid I have to admit that in some ways we, in the western world, are certainly a little behind. Saskatchewan was pretty well up, and Canada was pretty well up . . .

Pardon the interruption at this point, Mr. Speaker, The Mineral Taxation Act, introduced in 1941, was still in effect in 1955, according to the Statutes of Alberta, 1955 — the mineral tax rate not exceeding five cents per acre. They started it out, I

think I already mentioned, at one and one half cents, but it has raised to three cents. I was not aware of that.

Premier Douglas: — It was raised to three when we raised ours.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I was saying, speaking of the need for science, assistance to education in the sciences, and to scientific research, that Saskatchewan and Canada were fairly well up in the early days of nuclear reaction, and our university was famous, to some extent, for some of the early things they accomplished, but we are, I am afraid, falling behind, and Dr. Spinks who is one of the leading scientists at the University, a short while ago addressed a group of technical agriculturists, and he ended this way:

"Speaking as a fundamentally religious person, I would conclude by saying that atoms and atomic energy are aspects of this wonderful world in which we live — aspects if you wish, of the works of God. In themselves they are neither good nor evil. The good and evil aspects are introduced by man himself in the uses to which he puts these powerful forces.

"It is up to man to see that the evil aspects are eliminated and only the good aspects are developed."

If we are to make progress, and the competition is strong (there is, of course, lots of competition), we must have, I believe, more assistance for scientific education and more for pure scientific research.

I would like also to speak for a minute or two regarding a problem with which Saskatchewan is concerned, and that is in the jurisdiction over pipelines. The Parliament of Canada passed a Pipelines Act some years ago. That Act defined an "extra-provincial pipeline" as a pipeline for the transportation of oil or connecting a province with any other, or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of a province and includes all branches, extensions, tanks, reservoirs, pumps, racks, loading facilities, and equipment of all kinds — all branches and extensions. The problem is that this Pipelines Act of Canada is so broad and sweeping that when you carry it to its logical conclusion, any pipeline that is connected to one of these interprovincial pipelines right back and down into the core of the well, is under the control of the Federal Government.

We recognize, and I think everybody recognizes that the Federal Government must take responsibility and have the necessary authority to control interprovincial trade and regulate the traffic. There is no question about that. But it is not necessary to carry that control right down into the cores of the rock where the oil

first starts to move. I have been discussing this by mail with the Minister of Transport at Ottawa, and so far have encountered no particular difficulties. I know the Minister of Transport at Ottawa is very busy at the moment, but this is a pretty important question of provincial rights, and I intend to give it my attention, and I'm sure the Government will give its attention to it. I know it can be solved easily if everybody is willing to take the necessary steps to get that solution. I thought I should mention it here today.

In closing my remarks, I would like to point out that Saskatchewan is really not the horrible place that it has been described by the members opposite. It is not nearly that bad.

Mr. McCarthy: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Our economy now is very much diversified with oil, mining, new industries and secondary industries started. There's a long way to go yet, but let me say that if, during the last three years, we were dependent upon a Saskatchewan economy that was as purely agricultural as our economy was 15 years ago, we would certainly be in a tough position in this province. We have achieved a diversification, which is very important to us, and is at least a good start along that road. With continuous work we can expect Saskatchewan to develop an even better and sounder economy, and can look forward to the future of this province with a good deal of confidence. I shall support the motion.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne Speech debate at this late date, I can assure you that I will keep my remarks very brief. I will not attempt to do as my hon. friend from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) did yesterday, who started at approximately this same time and by half past nine had not yet completed convincing himself that he could add nothing which was new and very little which was true.

I want to associate myself with all the congratulatory remarks that have been given to the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), and the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). After having said that, I am afraid I might not have time to get back to the Speech from the Throne if I am going to attempt in any small degree, to follow the wanderings of the members of the Opposition, particularly those who engaged in this debate, yesterday.

You will note that on the Order Paper, there is a resolution under the name of the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), dealing in general terms and in specific terms with the farm problem as he sees it, and which will be debated in this House. The majority of the remarks which I would like to make with respect to the agricultural situation, in general and in particular, I will

reserve for that occasion. However, I do feel after some of the remarks made here yesterday, regarding the agricultural situation and the agricultural economy, compelled to say a few words in that respect.

We heard yesterday, in this House, an echo of something which we heard during the summer of 1957, previous to the general election of that year. The then Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. James G. Gardiner, was going up and down the length and breadth of this province saying that agriculture was never in a better position and that the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan were prosperous. We heard that echo here yesterday by an equally irresponsible individual, as the Minister of Agriculture proved himself to be, for he is no longer the Minister of Agriculture in the Federal Government.

Anyone who suggests that the agricultural industry in Canada is in a prosperous condition and is in a safe economic position is simply ignorant of the facts or deliberately attempting to mislead this House, as was the former Minister of Agriculture deliberately attempting to mislead the people of the province of Saskatchewan. You have only to take the figures which my hon. friend quoted. That is the farm net income which does take inventory into consideration. Take the seven-year average from 1951 to 1957 in the agricultural industry — the net farm income per person engaged in the industry, during that seven-year average, was \$2,894. In 1957 the net farm income, taking into consideration the increase in inventory, was \$1,824, a decline over the average of the seven years of \$1,000. Apply that to the non-agricultural economy in the province of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — There was a Tory government in office.

Mr. Brown: — . . . taking the same seven-year average from 1951 to 1957 in the non-agricultural economy, the income per person was \$4,393; in 1957 it was \$4,758, or an approximate increase in 1957, over the seven-year average, of some \$400. In the one case, a decline of \$1,000 as compared with the average, and in the other case an increase of \$400. So anyone who suggests, on the basis of that, that the agricultural industry is not in a precarious position, is ignorant of the facts or deliberately attempting to mislead the people.

You can look at it in another manner. Every one of our major agricultural economies, taking the period from 1948 up to 1957 has had a price decline. We can take wheat as an example from a high of \$1.83 to a low of \$1.50 — a decline of 33 cents a bushel within that 10 year period. The same thing is true in respect to oats — from a high of 85 cents a bushel to a low of 66 cents a bushel in 1957.

Mr. Gardiner: — A Tory government.

Mr. Brown: — The same is true with respect to flax — from a high of \$4.95 a bushel in 1948, a continual decline to a low of \$2.81 in 1957.

Mr. Gardiner: — A Tory government.

Mr. Brown: — The same thing is applicable to steers from a high of \$31.96 to a low of \$17.82 in 1957.

Mr. Gardiner: — A Tory government.

Mr. Brown: — The same thing is true with respect to hogs — from a high of \$32.33 to a low, at the present time, although that is not the low, 1956 was lower, but in 1957, the price was \$28.42. The average returns received in 1957 in every one of our major agricultural commodities has been consistently lower and we have seen a gradual decline in the prices of these commodities ever since 1948. In addition to that, western Canada's index of cost increased — that is composite farm costs increased from 190.20 to 249.40. I suggest, that anyone who would try to suggest that agriculture in this province has not reached the point where it is, indeed, at a crisis, is attempting to mislead this House.

Agriculture has reached the point where we are faced with certain utter chaos and possible complete bankruptcy, unless some concrete action is immediately taken. My friends opposite must assume their rightful share of the responsibility for the fact that we are in this position today. It was under a Liberal government that these conditions were created. I also suggest that under a Tory government there hasn't been any concrete effort to improve it. I doubt if there is anything that can better describe the agricultural situation in Canada and in Saskatchewan today than the words used by the member for Springfield in the House of Commons on Friday, January 17, 1958. When speaking on the Stabilization Bill, he was referring to the former Minister of Agriculture, the hon. James G. Gardiner. He suggested that the former Liberal Government had placed on the statute books the Agricultural Prices Support Act, and he was speaking as member of the organized farmers. He said this, as reported in Hansard of Friday, January 17:

"We trusted the former Minister of Agriculture, and what happened? He juggled us around and he juggled us down until we landed in hell. And then he stood beside it, throwing snowballs to lower the temperature . . ."

I think that is a pretty fair analysis of the attitude that the former Liberal government took with respect to agriculture here in Western Canada.

Mr. McCarthy: — Is that the best you can do, Allan?

February 26, 1958

Mr. Brown: — The only change that has been made since that time is that the present Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Douglas Harkness, has failed to continue to throw the snowballs. The conditions have continued to get worse and he, himself, has suggested that this is what will happen. He said as reported in the 'Free Press' of December 30, 1957:

"Regardless of circumstances that may develop the farmers will be assured of prices almost as good as those secured in the past."

There is the future for the agricultural industry and I suggest that my hon. friends on the opposite side should join with us who have, throughout the years, attempted to improve the agricultural stability and the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan and Canada, and we have been doing it alone. I ask at this time if we cannot get some assistance from our hon. friends opposite.

I notice my friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) has entered the Chamber. I was rather interested in his remarks with respect to the term implement industry and his attempt to ridicule the statement which was made by my hon. friend, the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). He attempted to indicate to the House that major farm implement companies were not making enormous profits; that they were only getting a slight return, and I think he quoted some figures of four per cent on their sales.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, less than that; some of them are losing money.

Mr. Brown: — Okay, okay, don't make it any worse than it is. But anyway he was trying to create the impression that farm implement companies were not making enormous profits, and, as such, were not having the impact which my hon. friend suggested they were having on the agricultural economy here in Western Canada.

My hon. friend, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), sat with me in a Committee back in 1952 which investigated farm implements, as distributed in this province, and we attempted to find out certain facts with respect to the manufacturers of those farm implements. He will recall that the major farm implement companies operating in the Dominion of Canada showed utter and complete contempt for this Legislature and utter and complete contempt for the farmers of Saskatchewan, whom we represent. Those are the companies that he is attempting to defend. If he doubts my word he has only to refer back to that report in which the Massey-Harris Company — and that is one of the companies he mentioned — wrote to our Committee and stated, and these are their exact words:

"Therefore, we do not propose to submit factory costs to the Legislative Committee."

When they did that, how were we to find out what their true profits were, and how are we to find out, even today what their true profits are?

Mr. Loptson: — From their financial statements.

Mr. Brown: — Well, all right, I will use the financial statement, to the extent that we were able to use it, and I will take one of the companies to which he has referred — the Massey-Harris Company. It shows the percentage of return or of profit based on the investment and it was not four per cent. It varied from a low of 15 per cent to a high of 56.9 per cent. Yet he is not prepared to admit that that is an enormous return on the investment and, as such, will have an impact upon our economy here in western Canada. I cannot conceive his type of thinking.

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): — Buy some shares.

Mr. Brown: — That's right, sure; that is what he would like to do. I would suggest . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Why don't you buy some shares, and you would get no dividend.

Mr. Brown: — We can take the Cockshutt Company and we find exactly the same story; and it is a Canadian company. From a low of 8.1 per cent return on the stockholders' investment to a high of 43.8 per cent.

Mr. Loptson: — That's the way you treat the people out in the country.

Mr. Brown: — Those are the companies which he is attempting to defend here in this Legislature, and then he went on and he was going to give us the . . .

Mr. Loptson: — One and two per cent and how much do you save?

Mr. Brown: — The true reason why there was an enormous increase in the cost of implements to the farmers, the true reason that he suggested, was the enormous increase in labour costs with respect to these implements.

Mr. Loptson: — Sure, that is where the trouble is; that is what is causing it, whether it is justifiable or not.

Mr. Brown: — He will recall that in this Committee we attempted to break down the manufacturing costs within the limitations of the information at our disposal in an attempt to find out the amount of the wages involved. We found out that at the time we made that inquiry and the statement is even more true today, that there is less of the consumer dollar in the purchasing of farm machinery going into labour than over before. He will recall, at that time, it was indicated in the 7 year period, from 1945 to 1952, that there was a drop in the amount of the farmers' dollar purchasing farm implements, going to labour. It dropped from 42.4 cents down to 28.9 cents. We are in the position today, that there is less of the consumer — and when I say the

February 26, 1958

consumer, I mean the farmer purchasing farm implements — there is less of his dollar going into labour than ever before in the history of farm implements. For anyone to suggest that the increase in cost of farm implements is due to the increased cost of labour in the factory, is a continuation of the same thing that the hon. member for Melville was attempting to do yesterday. That is deliberately mislead the House, or through ignorance of the facts.

Mr. Loptson: — Eighty-six per cent goes into labour.

Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, there has been some suggestion in this House . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the member has charged members on this side of the House, including myself, of misleading the House. I would say the only one we mislead . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . was the hon. member because he can't understand . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member said either misleading the House or ignorance of the facts. He is entitled to say that.

Mr. Brown: — I am expressing my opinion, but it is an opinion that I think is held by a goodly number of people throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — He took his choice.

Mr. Brown: — And he indicated to the House which was his choice. There has been some indication in this House, — it was remarked by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) and also by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) — that there was something more could be done for agriculture than was being suggested in the Speech from the Throne. They suggested that we could, here in the province of Saskatchewan, undertake to inaugurate, by ourselves, a crop insurance program. It is true that the member from Turtleford qualified his remarks by saying: "I don't know much about crop insurance." There never was a more gross overstatement made in this House than that. If he had attempted to read any of the reports that have been submitted with respect to crop insurance, I am satisfied he would have come to the conclusion that it would place the province of Saskatchewan in a position where it would face virtual bankruptcy, not only as far as the farmers are concerned, but as far

as the rest of the economy of the province is concerned, if we undertook it on our own.

The Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, in its report on crop insurance, makes it very definite and very clear in its recommendations. It recommends that, even on an experimental basis, it would require the backing and the underwriting of the national treasury. They can suggest that this crop insurance was reproduced as a result of a Royal Commission appointed by this Government, and as such they might argue that it might be biased. I am suggesting that the information contained in the Royal Commission's report on crop insurance is well worth reading and studying by the members of the Opposition, but if they don't want that, they can take the report of the Manitoba crop insurance committee, which was appointed in December, 1954, and I think at that time Manitoba was under a Liberal regime. I don't think they can accuse that Committee of being wild socialists, where we have Mr. Maher, Director of Research Department, Searle Grain Company; we have Mr. Crawford, Winnipeg, retired; and Ralph Hedland, Associated Editor of the Country Guide. They make the same recommendation — that it would be foolhardy on the part of any provincial government to undertake crop insurance without the assurance of the co-operation of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government undertaking to underwrite such a project.

My hon. friend from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has left the House, but he was making reference to the fact that there have been no increases in school grants in his particular area. Yet the official figures in the records show that year after year in the province of Saskatchewan, there have been increased grants provided. What he suggested are the facts in his particular area. I would like to ask him this question, and I would ask the members on the opposite side of the House to ask him this question, since he is not in his seat. Does he not believe in the theory of equalization? Does he not believe that the resources of this province with respect to education should be diverted into those areas and into those places where the people, through no fault of their own, are unable to supply the standard of education that is required, in order to set a minimum standard throughout the province?

Does he believe in the theory — and apparently he does and I would like him to stand up on his feet sometime and tell us. Does he believe in the theory that to those who have, shall be given, and to those who have not, shall be taken, even that which they have. That was exactly the policy which he was suggesting should be applied to his particular area. He was trying to prove that in that area of the province there hasn't been the increase that we, on this side of the House, have been maintaining has been in grants for education and the increase in assistance for education taking place over a number of years. If it had gone into his area it would have to have gone at the expense of areas more in need.

February 26, 1958

This Government has dedicated itself, that there shall be a greater equalization of opportunity for education, not only for those people who have, but for those people who have not, if this Government deviates from that policy you can rest assured that they will lose my support and they will lose the support of all decent thinking people in the province of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) also undertook, in his remarks, to make criticism of the democratic procedures which this Government has attempted to inaugurate. He criticized the Conference which was held here in the fall of 1956; he criticized the Conference which was held here in the fall of 1957. The calling of those conferences was an endeavour, on the part of the government, to bring the people of the province and their respective organizations together to give them an opportunity to take an active part in forming the policies of the province of Saskatchewan. He suggests that that is something should be done away with, and something which he does not favour. It is interesting to note that of all the Royal Commissions established in Saskatchewan, and throughout the history of Saskatchewan, and of all the Royal Commissions set up in the Dominion of Canada, this is the first one that was asked by the Government which appointed it, to come back and report to the people who, in the final analysis, would have to judge whether their recommendations were good or bad. I would suggest that in this field of democratic procedure this Government has, in that respect, plowed new furrows and has struck out a road and a path which makes it possible for the people of this province to take a more active part in their own affairs. It is no longer a question of whether we shall have planning or not; that decision has been made and now it is a question of who does the planning — whether a few people on the top do the planning, or whether the people who are actively engaged in communities in the province and in the Dominion of Canada will do that planning. I note that the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), has many times referred to the fact that the Conservatives and the Liberals and Social Credit have banded themselves together, or at least committed themselves to a common objective — the eradication of socialism. I would suggest to you, (you can pound your desks), but I suggest to you, they have banded themselves together because they have this common philosophy — that there is a class born to rule and a class born to be ruled.

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Mr. Brown: — I suggest that we in the C.C.F. believe that there should be no class distinction and that techniques must be worked out by which it is possible for all of us to rule ourselves. I suggest that it is through us getting together in conferences such as we had here in 1956 and again in 1957, that we can better hammer out our differences and arrive at a common understanding, based upon a more complete and thorough understanding of the problems, and as such, arrive at a solution which will be of benefit to ourselves and of benefit to the generations which will follow us.

They always have a favourite theme in all of their speeches and they always suggest that our Crown Corporations in the province of Saskatchewan are failures and that they are going bankrupt and are costing the people of the province of Saskatchewan a great deal of money.

Mr. Loptson: — They're sure on the way.

Mr. Brown: — When many of these speeches were being made, there was on their desks the report of the Government Finance Office which, if they had taken the trouble to read, they wouldn't have made the irresponsible and ridiculous statements in this House which they did make. They had only to turn to page two and they would have found listed there a table which shows the advances that have been made to the Crown Corporations from 1947 up to the present time. It gives the percentage of return on those advances. There is a similar table with respect to the advance in the same year — the cash-paid over to the Provincial Treasurer and the net cash returns that the Provincial Treasurer received on this endeavour. It is true it goes to a low of 3.05, but to a high of 14.18 with a total of 8.25 of earnings on advances. That is a fairly good record, I suggest; a fairly good financial record. It is true that it is not as good a financial record as the Corporations to which my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) referred, but nevertheless, I suggest it is a commendable return. If we take the percentage of cash returns to the Provincial Treasurer based upon the advances we find it is 6.95, or just under seven per cent.

So the financial record of the Crown Corporations in Saskatchewan has been good, but I have never based my analysis of the Crown Corporations and their worth to the people of the province of Saskatchewan strictly on the basis of the financial statement, as submitted to the Crown Corporations Committee. Rather, I have based my analysis on that, on the one hand, but in addition to that, I have based it on the fact that they have made a contribution to the economy of Saskatchewan. In addition to that, they have proven beyond the question of a doubt that the people, through government, through social ownership, can operate their own business in the interests of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

I realize that the vote on this main motion must be taken at 5.00 o'clock and I will rapidly bring my remarks to a close.

Mr. Gardiner: — Good.

Mr. Brown: — Thanks. Turning now for a moment to the Speech from the Throne — (at least I get back to it, which is something my hon. friends never did) — I think that we, on this side of the House must, and I think every member of the House should, give an analysis of the Speech from the Throne as to where it is leading us and if it fulfils those commitments which the Government made to the people. My hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak), yesterday, I believe it was, went through

February 26, 1958

our platform point by point, I am satisfied he must have convinced everyone in this House that in this Speech from the Throne we are, once again, continuing to implement those commitments which we have made to the people.

However, there is another criterion upon which we must base our decision as to whether we will or will not support the Speech from the Throne and that is whether or not it continues to fulfil the ideology and the philosophy that lies behind the C.C.F. On those bases, I suggest that the members of the Opposition cannot support this motion because it does not fulfil the ideology and the philosophy of those people who sit on the opposite side of the House. As long as this Government undertakes to fulfil its commitment to the C.C.F. organization and its commitment to the people of the province of Saskatchewan within its limited jurisdiction; that it indicates it will undertake to bring greater economic security, social security and economic stability to all classes of people in the province of Saskatchewan, it will receive my unqualified endorsement. As long as it attempts once again within the limitations of its jurisdiction to narrow the gap between those at the top and those at the bottom, it will have my unqualified endorsement. I can assure the government of this — that if it deviates from that, I will pledge myself and my limited ability to see that it does not have the support of the House or the support of the people of the province. In my opinion, this document indicates beyond a doubt that it is still continuing to travel along the road which it undertook in 1944 and in the Speech from the Throne. It is still undertaking to plow new furrows in an effort to bring complete and total economic and social security to all. On the basis of that, I give it my unqualified support.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? You mentioned a low of 15 per cent and a high of 50 per cent profit of the Massey-Harris Company — I would like to know where you got that information.

Mr. Brown: — From the report of the Select Special Committee.

Mr. Danielson: — When?

Mr. Brown: — It is in the report of the Select Special Committee on farm implements conducted in 1952.

The question being put, it was agreed to by 30 to 16.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — The Bill is to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. As hon. members know, this Act was passed originally in 1946. Since that time it has been amended quite frequently to provide increased benefits to the motorists of Saskatchewan. The proposals made today are not outstandingly important, but they at least do continue to give to the people of Saskatchewan improvement in the various sections. It is particularly true insofar as the benefits under Part 2 of the Act are concerned.

The principal one has to do with the change in the payment for the weekly indemnity for bodily injuries. We have had a great many problems in connection with the administration of the Act as it has been. In the past it has provided that no indemnity is payable unless the income of a person is reduced below \$25 a week during the period of this disability. The new section will improve the manageability from an administrative point of view. It will, of course, also provide greater equity in the payment of the weekly indemnity between various claimants and between various classes. It will also, of course, provide indemnity in cases where it wasn't possible to provide it before.

May I just give you an illustration of the type of administrative difficulties. Here we have, for example, a person who has been unemployed for several months. He becomes disabled; we are not able to pay him anything at all at the present time. Or take the case of a farmer who moves into town and is injured during the winter. Clearly he hasn't lost any income and so we are unable to make any payment to him. Now the new section provides that, irrespective of whether or not a person loses income as the result of a disability, as long as he is totally disabled, he will be entitled to receive the sum of \$25 per week for a period of two years.

We have also made provision in this to cover a person who is partially disabled and there the provision is for \$12.50 per week. So there will only be two figures, \$25.00 or \$12.50, depending upon whether it is complete or partial disability.

There are two other changes. One of them has to do with women. In the past, women have been able to receive only \$20.00 a week for a period of six consecutive weeks. We are raising this up to \$25.00 a week and also extending the period of time to 12 consecutive weeks.

We are also making provision here to cover a new type of disability that has never been covered before. That is for those

February 26, 1958

persons who have been confined to hospital, to bed or a wheel chair under doctors orders. The person will receive \$12.50 per week unless, of course, he is entitled to receive the full \$25.00 per week. In the case of a person who, normally, would be unable to work and is unable to return to work because he was unable to work to start with, he would still be able to get \$12.50 per week under this provision.

The other important change in the Act is in the limits for the supplementary allowance. This has been changed once or twice before. There is now a limit of \$600 on the amount a person can get. This, of course, is the amount which is payable for ambulance services, special wards, hospital fees, nursing care, doctor bills and so on. We have run across quite a number of cases where \$600 will not pay all these extra charges. It is proposed, this year, to raise the maximum from \$600 to \$1,000.

Then there is one other increase and that has to do with funeral expenses. There is not only the increased cost of living that we have heard so much about in this Chamber the last few days, but there is also the increased cost of dying, which we have taken notice of here. We are raising this from \$175 to \$200.

These are the principal changes. There are other changes to broaden the scope of the Act, but I think we can probably better discuss the others in Committee of the Whole, tomorrow, announce the rates which are going to be proposed for 1958. I hope to be able to do that tomorrow.

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

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

Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act

Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Health): — This is a revision to permit the Dominion Government to participate financially in the Saskatchewan Hospital Insurance Plan, under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Act of the Dominion Government. To this end, certain changes will be made in the residential requirements and certain other changes will be made in this Act and the Hospital Standards Act to authorize provision for diagnostic services and to permit the financial sharing of costs under the Dominion legislation. They are very minor amendments actually, and with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

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

Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend the Hospital Standards Act

Hon. Mr. Erb: — This is an amendment to the Hospital Standards Act. There are two amendments proposed to this Act, and these are to permit complete participation with the Dominion Government under The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Act of the Government of Canada.

These amendments, together with the amendments to be made under The Saskatchewan Hospital Act will permit payment for the services to be provided by the institutions not ordinarily considered as hospitals. With that explanation, I would move second reading.

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

Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend the Union Hospital Act

Hon. Mr. Erb: — The proposed amendments to The Union Hospital Act are actually of a minor nature. Two amendments here are being proposed. One is to clarify the provisions concerning the publications of the notice of a roll that is to be taken under the Act; and another amendment will propose the payment by which Board members of a hospital may be paid for the meetings which they attend. This payment is to be increased for the Board members. With that explanation I would move second reading.

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

Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend the Cancer Control Act

Hon. Mr. Erb: — There are two minor amendments here. The first is to provide for flexibility to the resident requirements which are now contained in the Act. The second is to amend, or clarify, the authority for cancer clinics and provide certain procedure for persons who are not now affected with cancer. I would move second reading of this Bill.

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

Bill No. 47 — An Act to amend The Research Council Act, 1954

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the activities of the Research Council are expanding and are expected to expand even more. As was indicated in the Speech from the Throne, our new building is going to be ready some time this fall, and it is our wish that we make provision to increase the size of the Council. We are now limited to a total of eleven, and it is proposed that the limitation be increased to fifteen. I would move second reading of this Bill.

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

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The School Assessment Act

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — The suggested amendment to The School Assessment Act is largely for the purpose of facilitating the administration of the Act, simply changing the month of March to April in order to give the school units more time to get their requisitions in to the municipalities. With that explanation I move second reading of Bill No. 48.

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

Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The City Act

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I think there are just two main principles involved in the proposed amendment to The City Act. One is in connection with the licensing of the operators of trailer parks, or trailer camps. Provisions are also made in the same by-law for the operator of such camps to collect the license fee on behalf of the city and turn the license fee over to the city under regulations suggested by the city councils. This particular amendment has been asked for by the urban municipal associations because of the large number of trailers and also what they call 'shack portable' buildings, that have been springing up in the province as a result, largely, of oil development. In an effort to control the trailers and get them in the proper

location, the Urban municipal association asked for this amendment.

The other amendment has to do with the business assessment on grain elevators. The present Act reads that the business assessment on grain elevators is based on 1,000 square feet of elevator space. In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the capacity of some of the later and more modern elevators, and there also has been a substantial number of permanent annexes built by elevator companies. Both the rural and the urban municipal associations have asked the Assessment Branch to see if we could work out a formula that would recognize the capacity of the elevators for business purposes and for business licensing. After some two years consideration and discussions with the elevator companies, about two months ago the elevator companies, (and I have reference to the Pool and the line elevators), sat in with us and agreed on the general principles.

Those are the two main principles in this Bill to amend The City Act. Therefore, I move second reading of this Bill.

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

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Town Act

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I think the principles in this proposed Bill are the same as those in The City Bill, and anything further that might be said in connection with some of the minor proposed amendments I think can be dealt with more fully in Committee. Therefore I would move second reading of Bill No. 50.

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

Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Village Act

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — The same principles that are mentioned in The City Act also are included in the proposed amendments to The Village Act. I might just mention one other principle here, which has to do with the levy of a service charge for sewer and water installations that might be servicing a public building or a utility building, in a village. In other words, many of these buildings are now located in

February 26, 1958

villages are supplied with water and a sewer system. The urban municipal association asked that there be provisions made in The Village Act for the villages to levy a service charge where the services are made available to public buildings or to buildings that might be serviced in the vicinity of the location of the public buildings. Therefore, I move second reading of Bill No. 51.

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

UNIFORM TIME

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed notion of the Hon. Mr. Walker:

That **Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Statute Law** — be now read the second time.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — I adjourned the debate on second reading of Bill No. 27 in order that I could give it some study. I was, to say the least, amazed at the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) and the attitude he adopted when he brought this Bill into the House. I copied down, I think, his sentences. I think it would be correct to state that he said: "it is with some hesitancy" that he brought this Bill into the House. He said if the people refused to obey it, if the Bill passed, they would not be penalized. He said:

"Perhaps we can put this Bill on a trial period for a year or so and see how it works out. If we find it isn't working out then the Government is prepared to give further consideration to it and bring in some other arrangement."

I thought that was a great approach from the Attorney General in introducing a Bill that had been his special interest ever since he came into this House. I can recall him, when he was a private member, lobbying every member in the corridor, getting a Committee established to go into the Time business. He made the statement: "if there is one thing above all else that I am going to do; I am going to straighten out the time situation in the province."

That was the fervor and the vision of the Attorney General at that time. Then he came in, the other day, with the Bill. In ten years in the Legislature, I have never seen a Bill introduced

by a Minister in such a weak-kneed, apologetic fashion as the Minister used in the introduction of this Bill. I think the only reason he did it is because of this, — I don't believe his heart is in the Bill that he is introducing. I don't believe his heart is in it.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of Official Opposition): — His feet are in it.

Mr. Cameron: — I can appreciate something of the quandary he is in . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I want to say that I don't believe that the hon. member can attribute insincerity to me. I think that is against parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Cameron: — Might I say that the comments he made on the introduction of the Bill . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, is my point of privilege well taken or is it not?

Mr. Speaker: — I did not hear the hon. member attribute insincerity to you.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He used the very words, Mr. Speaker. He used the words 'my heart wasn't in it' — that is, in what I said in the House. 'Insincerity' is the only word that can describe that.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think the point of privilege is well taken.

Mr. Cameron: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate the quandary that the Minister is in. I think all of us in the House who have heard his statements in the past appreciate it. Here he is standing up in this House bringing in a Bill when he knows, or feels, that there is going to be a certain amount of opposition to in the country. He is afraid to stand and face that opposition, and he can't turn and run, because he has a force behind him pushing him on.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You said it was my own idea.

Mr. Cameron: — What has been his performance to date in this affair? As I said, he lobbied everyone until he got a Committee set up. The Committee brought in its findings; then they assessed the situation and they asked for correspondence; they asked for every bit of information they could get. In assessing the situation, the Committee bogged down in utter confusion; they know what the answer was. By that time he had become a Minister of the Crown and he handed it over to the Minister of

Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh), and said: "You carry the Bill from here on in!"

I can appreciate the position of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He didn't know what to do with it, so he called in his panel of experts and he asked them to draft a ballot in order that he could put it to the people, saying "perhaps they will tell us what to do." So they drafted the ballot, and that is ancient history. And what a ballot it was! When the results came back in, as a result of that ballot there was so much confusion that even the experts throw up their hands and abandoned it. They asked then that another Committee of the Legislature be set up — "Let us look at it again". So another Committee was set up to study the findings of the ballot and to try to get some order out of this chaos and confusion. Then they brought their findings into the Legislature last year. This particular Committee commended that we set this province on this system of time: mountain standard time in the winter, central standard time in the summer.

Where was the Attorney General when this recommendation came in? Was he leading the group?

Mr. McDonald: — Winding his watch!

Mr. Cameron: — No. He gathered around him a band of dissenters who were going to have nothing to do with such a resolution as that.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I did no such thing.

Mr. Cameron: — I want to read you the names of those dissenters. There are some prominent people among them, led by the Attorney General last year in this session against the very recommendation that he is bringing in in this Bill; and here were his colleagues in this rebellion: . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You people voted like sheep over there.

Mr. Cameron: — The Attorney General, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Social Welfare and the Provincial Secretary and the member from Lumsden and the member from Kinistino, and the member from Touchwood, who had made this remarkable statement, who said he would be shot as soon as he set foot in his constituency if he should ever agree to such a dastardly thing, as that.

I wonder where these people stand on the Bill. I wonder what attitude the member is going to take now. I think he feels like this: he's damned if he does and he's damned if he doesn't, because, surely, if he goes home he will be shot on setting foot

in his constituency and if he doesn't vote for it, he will be scuttled here from within.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would like to draw to the hon. member, attention that it is now 5.30.

Mr. Cameron: — I have just about two minutes to go in my remarks, if I may carry on for that; if not, I will ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Danielson: — Continue, continue!

Mr. Cameron: — I move the adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question before you adjourn the House. I would just like to ask what the order of business will be for tomorrow's sitting.

Premier Douglas: — Tomorrow is private members' day and under the procedure for that day, motions will come first, if I remember correctly; then Public Bills and Orders, Motions for Return, Public Bills and Orders, then Government business after that.

Mr. McDonald: — The motions will be on the air, tomorrow, then?

Premier Douglas: — The motions will be on the air.

Mr. McDonald: — Thank you, sir.

The Assembly then adjourned without question put at 5.30 o'clock p.m.