

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
16th Day

Thursday, March 6, 1958

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

STUDENT VISITORS

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to say I am sure all hon. members will be very glad to welcome here this afternoon a group of students from Scott Collegiate, and their teacher, Mr. Anderson.

MANUFACTURING PLANT

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to inform the House of the establishment of a new manufacturing plant to be located in the city of Regina for the purpose of manufacturing corrugated containers. The plant will be constructed by the Martin Paper Products Limited, which is a jointly owned subsidiary of the Powell River Company, and MacMillan & Bloedel Limited, both with head offices in Vancouver, B.C. It is estimated the cost of this plant will be approximately 40,000 square feet, located on a seven-acre site in the north-eastern industrial section of Regina. This company will manufacture corrugated containers for the brewing and beverage industries, meat packers, creameries, dairies, poultry operations, milling, packing and fruit, etc.

Mr. George B. Hill, Jr., vice-president and general manager of Martin Paper Products Limited, is today making a public announcement regarding his company's intention. He said that his company had some difficulty in determining the location in Saskatchewan for this plant, but after studying a number of communities had decided to locate in Regina. It is estimated that the productive capacity of this plant will be adequate to meet the needs of the Saskatchewan market for an indefinite period.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

March 6, 1958

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Wednesday March 5, 1958, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate this afternoon, I would first like to associate myself with all those who have congratulated previous speakers in this debate, and also the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I feel a keen sense of responsibility every time I stand up in this House to make some remarks, because I feel that we are here for a very definite purpose. We are here to formulate policy; policy that will affect the lives of people. We are not here to play politics. I don't think we are here to build party strength. I don't think we are here to build personal popularity, but the real reason for us being in this House is to help to work together to formulate policy that will be to the betterment of the lives of the people of Saskatchewan, and it is for that reason that I am active in this type of work; it is for that reason that I take pleasure in taking part in this debate. I feel that both Government and Opposition sides of the House play a definite role in a democratic government. Both sides of the House, I think, have to learn to criticize and to receive criticism in the right spirit.

A new member of the last Federal house was asked for his first impression of the proceedings of the House at Ottawa. Before I give his impressions, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you my impression that I have so far, of the proceedings of this House. Many of them are jovial, many of them are in very good spirit, but I have sensed kind of a listless, indifferent attitude, often displayed by both sides of the House, and I hope — I hope this spirit does not stem from a spirit of arrogance, because that could be saddening, could it not?

Now, this member of the Federal House who was asked to give his impression of the proceedings of the house at Ottawa, (I am reading from "The Leader-Post"):

"One of his first impressions, he said, was the lack of attention paid to the speeches of the Members of Parliament. Some members sat in their desks reading newspapers, and others wrote letters."

I wish we could honestly say that that is not true of this House. This, by the way, was a certain Mr. Lewry of Moose Jaw.

Before I go to my main part of my speech this afternoon, there are a few matters I would like to deal with in particular. The first is, yesterday the hon. member from the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), injected in his speech a most uncalled for criticism of the dividends paid in Alberta and British Columbia, — uncalled for because they had absolutely no bearing on the thought he was trying to put across. Now, I would like to describe these dividends as a realistic, personal experience, as a result of efficient government stewardship on behalf of the people, compared to the conspicuous illusion of our socialized industry in Saskatchewan.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. member from Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) stress the need for the bridge at Petrofka. I would like the hon. member to know that I concur with him in everything that he said regarding that bridge. I would like, however, to stress one fact, seeing indications are that the Prince Albert bridge will have priority over the Petrofka bridge. The roads leading to the Petrofka and Laird ferries are under a terrific traffic load, and I do firmly believe that any requests for financial assistance by the municipality of Laird to help them in the maintenance of these roads should receive very, very careful consideration. I would like to spend a few minutes speaking about my constituency, because I did not take part in the Throne Speech debate.

It is always best, Mr. Speaker, to get the right information about anything before we express our opinion on any matter. Lord Durham was sent to Canada after the rebellions of 1837 and 1838, to study the conditions which underlaid a discontent in Canada. Lord Durham who had not been in Canada very long, had but a poor opinion of the people, because he did not really know them. In his report to the Mother country he wrote: 'they are the people without a history'. It was the 'waiting maid' who read these words, and it was she, a humble servant, who so heroically defended her people by correcting Lord Durham. The many historical sites erected during Jubilee Year in my area at such places as Carleton Trail, Duck Lake, Battlefield, Batoche Crossing, Fish Creek Battlefield and others, all testified of exciting and vigorous historic events. We must not forget the site erected in memory of Dr. Wheeler. He happened to be our neighbour who developed Red Bob wheat and the famous Marquis wheat. He made this statement one time:

"The soil is ours to make or mar, and we should aim to leave it when the time comes for us to pass it on, in as good or better condition than it was when it first came into our hands."

Now, the people in my area have caught that vision, Mr. Speaker, and are practicing that philosophy of life. Sites are being erected even

March 6, 1958

now which will stand as monuments to testify to my people's willingness to contribute to the welfare of society. During this year the new Rosthern Junior College was officially opened; the Old Folks' home in Rosthern was enlarged by the addition of a new wing; at Dalmeny a very fine Old Folks' home is being built. In addition to the social and welfare contribution, I am happy and proud to be able to say that the people of the Saskatchewan Valley contribute greatly to the economic growth of our province.

I was rather pleasantly surprised when I heard from the receivers of eggs and poultry in Saskatoon that they receive more eggs and poultry from that area than any other surrounding area. From the creameries in Saskatoon I again learned that the Saskatchewan Valley area was rated as the best for the production of milk and cream. A start was made last year to grow potatoes on a commercial scale. All this wealth is produced on small family farms; according to the Dominion Department of Municipal Affairs, we have one of the densest concentration of rural population in the province. In view of all of this, Mr. Speaker, I can easily understand why my people feel that they are unjustly neglected and forgotten by the Department of Highways.

I have in my hand a reply of the Minister of Highways to an inquiry made regarding No. 11 Highway which runs through this area, and I would like to read part of it. This was dated February 25, 1958:

"In connection with your recent inquiry from the construction branch, concerning No. 11 Highway between a point three miles west of Rosthern, and No. 2 Highway, I am pleased (note that word) to give you the following information.

"From three miles west of Rosthern to Rosthern, the original grading was done in 1921 (I mention history for no mean reason); in 1921 the original grading was done, and in 1922, and gravel was first placed in the year 1930. From Rosthern to Duck Lake original grading was done in 1923. It was re-graded in 1930, and gravel was applied that year."

Now, do you blame my people, Mr. Speaker, for getting impatient, when the only highway we have was originally built 36 years ago, and the most recent re-grading was done some 28 years ago. I don't blame the Minister for blushing, because he well remembers that last year when he spoke in the House, outlining the program for 1957, he

said preliminary survey work would be done on No. 11, but not even that was done. Yet, on page 13 of the Report on Highways I noted that the vote for surveys was under spent by \$14,000.

Mr. Danielson: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Elias: — So I cannot see the justification of it at all. Ask the travelling salesman. Ask the man who drives a transport truck; ask your own bus drivers about this stretch of highway, and they all describe it in words that are not fitting to be used in this House.

It was the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) who started a game in this House about party grouping, and since then several members from both sides in the House, have attempted to group political parties. Not because we can't happily associate with the fine people of all these parties, but because we divorce ourselves completely from all of them when it comes to certain policies. We believe in free enterprise as opposed to Socialism. We believe in democracies, both politically and economically, so that Canada's financial policy would be formulated by the Parliament of Canada only. That has always been opposed, especially by the old-line parties, and therefore we cannot be grouped with them.

I am proud of our policy, knowing that they are the only alternative to which Canadians will turn unless they are willing to be subjected to regimentation, and finally become mere puppets of the state. Because of this grouping that has been going on, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a few minutes to clearly identify ourselves. A great deal has been said about the problems facing our people, the ever-increasing taxes, the unemployment situation, inflationary trend, the crisis of the farm situation, have all had priority, and rightly so. The remedies suggested, such as grants by senior governments to local governments, price controls, deficiency payments, freer allotment of box cars, and so on, all have their merits, but all are but temporary and unsatisfactory solutions. All of the problems facing Canadians have a common basic causes and that, Mr. Speaker, is the lack of purchasing power in the hands of the consumer.

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) when he spoke on Monday, quoted from the 'Western Producer' - no, I'm sorry, it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). He quoted from 'The Western Producer' of February 20, and I would like to repeat the quotation, because to me the thought was very, very fitting. It says:

"But the economic war is on. The battle lines are drawn, and are we to refuse to fight? Are we to throw our hands up without even a struggle. That is the basic problem."

March 6, 1958

That is the economic problem — the basic problem that is facing the people of Saskatchewan, and the people of Canada today. The depression of the 'thirties' was not caused by the lack of farm production, but simply by the lack of money. A similar lack of money for farm products is in evidence today; although other sections of the economy are doing well, the grain growers are not. The farmer is providing us with consumable goods, primarily food, in plenty, and is penalized for doing so. We, in Social Credit, say that the money system must be made to serve both those who produce, and those who consume, to pay the farmer a fair price for all he produces, because the world needs the food. Surely if the need is there, we should be able to devise a policy that would encourage production at an optimum level, and at the same time allow for the movement of our goods to those who need them, because we in Social Credit believe that all that which is physically possible can and should be made financially possible.

We, in Social Credit say that the welfare of our people is more important than the welfare of an outmoded, defunct financial system. We say that the welfare of the people is more important than the welfare of a political party. We say that the welfare of a state depends upon the welfare of the people.

The unemployment situation, too, is mainly due because people generally have insufficient purchasing power to make effective demands on the goods that industry has produced. Therefore, when consumption cannot keep pace with production, production is automatically geared down, with the inevitable results of unemployment. Again, the basic reason for unemployment is a faulty financial system. Under this orthodox financial policy, governments are forced to fall into a deficit, and jump into our national debt, and up the interest goes, and the vicious circle of reduced services, higher taxes, increased costs of living, labour unrest, bigger wages, higher prices, more taxes, results in a real witches' brew.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that these are not purely provincial matters, but some of these matters have received considerable attention during this Session. Many problems have been bandied about with hoarse-voiced sincerity, yet we never come to grips with fundamental and basic issues at the root of our problems. I feel also, that my colleagues and I have not identified ourselves sufficiently, and that is why I took the time to explain our stand.

The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy,) last year, expressed disappointment that we had not told him enough about Social Credit. Now, we feel that Parliament should enact a modern, scientific financial policy to govern most carefully the money supply, and shall regulate that money supply in the interests of all people. Maybe these few words have aroused the interest, not only of the member from Cannington, but maybe to all of us, to give it some real, unbiased consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things about the budget. We have heard and seen many words describing this 1958 budget. It's the largest, the most generous, the most optimistic, the most inspiring. No doubt it merits all of these, to some degree. There are other things to be said about it, and I am sure that will all be said. I have given considerable study to it, and there are the general characteristics that certainly came to my attention. One is the attempt to put the blame for any shortcomings of the past and of the future, at the feet of the Federal Government. This tone was well accented in the opening paragraphs. I won't read them all, just two. It says:

" . . . the unsettled erratic state of affairs at Ottawa had injected a considerable measure of uncertainty into our public finances."

And also:

" . . . that the normal course of budget planning and control may be seriously violated by the unpredictable gyrations of federal policy during the period ahead."

I could read you many others. Now, the other characteristic is the lengthy glorification of the Government achievements, especially those of its socialized industries. I would like to read a few of those, on page 22 it says here:

"Our own corporations continue to prosper, Mr. Speaker, and at the same time, are making substantial contributions not only to employment but also to resource utilization and the general economy of the province."

Also on page 9 it says:

" . . . Last year 5,144 men and women served in the various companies, and the total payroll for the year amounted to more than \$18 million."

Well, if these same services, Mr. Speaker, had been rendered by private enterprise, the same number of men and women would have been employed, and I am sure that the payrolls would have been just as great.

Mr. Danielson: — Probably more!

Mr. Elias: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are good aspects

March 6, 1958

of this budget, but there are those which I certainly do take exception to, and I would like to deal with some of them. First of all, I would like to say something about the source of revenue. The Provincial Treasurer dealt so energetically on the economic buoyancy of our province that I almost became suspicious. What have been the contributing factors to this new and extraordinary salvation from the doldrums of depression? From the breakdowns of revenue shown in the budget, I find that the taxes like education and hospitalization tax, gasoline tax and the revenue from the Vehicles Act together represent 37.5 per cent of the total revenue. The two items, mineral resources and natural resources, contribute 20.64 per cent of the total revenue, and I am happy that that shows improvement.

Mr. Speaker, on the same basis what share do these Crown Corporations that are the pride of this Government, what share do they contribute to the revenue of the Government. Excluding the Saskatchewan Government Telephones and the Saskatchewan Power Corporations they contribute .72 per cent of the total revenue. So we see that the contribution to our economy of the non-agricultural industries, of which private enterprise is responsible, is 29 times as great as those from the Crown Corporations. But that is only half the story. What per cent of the government expenditures is being applied to the promotion and the furtherance of these sources of revenue? Natural resources and mineral resources will receive 4.89 per cent of the total expenditures, while Crown Corporations will receive 9.5 per cent of the total expenditures in the form of loans and cash advances. That is, Mr. Speaker, a source of revenue that nets the province almost 21 per cent of the total revenue, gets 5 per cent of the expenditure, while the source that nets the province, at a great risk of loss, as past experience has shown, a little over one-half of one per cent gets almost 10 per cent of the expenditures. I think there is a terrific out-of-balance there, and that to my mind, Mr. Speaker proves several things. Firstly, that this Government has not a healthy appraisal of values, and that in spite of the re-wording of the 'Regina Manifesto', in spite of the care exercised by the government members to refrain from calling themselves Socialists, or describing their program as Socialism, it becomes very evident that there is still a deep and dangerous undertone of Socialism in Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask my hon. friend why he included the power and telephones when he was talking about expenditures, and excluded them when talking about revenue?

Mr. Elias: — Because in all your reports, they are always classified separately. I think this is very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

Much has been said about municipal grants; Liberal

members claiming that they are inadequate while the Government feels they are giving greater financial aid to municipalities than ever before. Even yesterday, the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) said that the Liberals in 1944, I think it was, gave grants of \$450,000 and last year it was \$5 million, or 12 times as much. But that is a very, very poor way of expressing it. I think that the yardstick to use in measuring government assistance to municipalities is, (and I want you all to pay close attention) — mind you, I was a school teacher for 16 years — I feel that this yardstick to express percentage-wise the relationship between government assistance to the total of municipal expenditure — I have worked this out; the percentage for 1946 and also for 1956. In doing this, I find that in 1946 the government grant to all rural municipalities was 13.36 per cent of the total expenditure of the municipality, leaving 86.64 per cent to be borne by the taxpayer. Now, 10 years later, in 1956 the Government's share of the total municipal expenditure for rural municipalities was 14.52 per cent, leaving 85.48 per cent to be borne by the taxpayer. So you see, Mr. Speaker, in 10 years the government's share of the total load has increased by one per cent; or in other words, in spite of increased grants dollar-wise, the taxpayer has received practically no relief in his share of the municipal expenditures. Now, that to me, I think, is the healthiest way of appraising the government assistance to municipalities.

Comparisons to other provinces are so common in this House, so let us apply the same yardstick to Alberta. I have the figures here for Alberta, and in 1956 the government's share in Alberta was 59 per cent of the total expenditure, leaving the ratepayer to bear 41 per cent. At this time I would like to read a paragraph from the 'Edmonton Journal' of March 4. It was the Minister of Municipal Affairs speaking. In his speech that lasted an hour, he quoted several government figures showing:

"In 1955 Alberta grants to municipalities amounted to 34 per cent of the municipal tax levied."

This is using a little different comparison than I did, but they contributed 34 per cent of the municipal tax levied. Now, let us get the comparison of all the provinces. This, compared with 32 per cent in Newfoundland; 21 per cent in British Columbia; 19 per cent in Ontario; 17 per cent in New Brunswick; 6.4 per cent in Prince Edward Island; 5 per cent in Manitoba; 4.5 per cent in Saskatchewan, and 4.3 per cent in Nova Scotia. It is the second lowest of all the provinces in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — That's not right.

Mr. Danielson: — How would you know?

March 6, 1958

Mr. Elias: — In the same period, 1946 to 1956, general and school taxes had increased 144 per cent. The alarming thing about the whole matter is that in spite of increased grants and increased taxes all school districts and school units are facing financial embarrassment. In the last seven years, 1949 to 1956 debentures increased 653 per cent, while other capital liability had increased 559 per cent. Debentures overdue have increased 73 per cent, but loans have increased 269 per cent. In the ten-year period 1946 to 1956, general loans to municipalities have increased 193 per cent, while unmatured debenture debts have increased 102 per cent in the last five years.

I am very much concerned about the increasing taxes and ever-mounting liabilities to municipalities, school districts, and for that matter, private individuals. Mr. Speaker, it is bringing our country to ruin. These are some of the prime contributing factors that force small farmers to get off, that force small business to fold up, and that play into the hands of centralization of industry and power. It is excessive taxation that provides the club to beat people into submission, which can only terminate in a totalitarian state. What is the solution? Well, you may laugh, but the Social Credit dividend to the consumer would certainly be a great help. Their policies provide greater assistance to small business, and encourage them to invest in free enterprise and develop our natural resources, so that the people of our province would receive a fair share of the revenues received because of their development; that would certainly help. Records of industrial development prove that this is being done with great success where free enterprise is in operation.

Are we really enjoying this greatest possible industrial development in Saskatchewan? In answer, let me quote from the 'Western Business and industry' of December, 1957:

"If Saskatchewan would develop its timber resources, it would be unnecessary to import wood products", a private company operator at Prince Albert told a conference in Saskatoon on northern resources development.

"He urged a healthier industrial climate in the province, with the Government recognizing that new industry in their initial stages require special treatment. He called for a clear statement of government policy."

This is not a Liberal speaking; this is not a Social Crediter. This is an industrialist who was interested in the development of industry in Saskatchewan. He is calling for a more clear-cut statement of policy from this Government.

Now, I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that industry is beginning to have more confidence in Saskatchewan. One of the most striking things in the budget is on page 21, under the heading 'Resources and Industrial Development'. I would like to read that. I think we should all memorize it. Page 21:

"Of all the problems of government in a dynamic and forward-looking society, none is more exciting or challenging, or, as the past few years have so ably demonstrated, more rewarding, than that of strengthening the economic structure of the province through the intelligent use of our resources. This budget contains many measures designed to stimulate economic growth and resource development."

Now what is the striking part about it? Finally, this budget. After 13 years they come out with a budget that has the answers. After 13 years of experimentation and hopeful anticipation, the light begins to dawn. It is only of late that this Government has at last awakened to realize that the reluctance of industry to come to Saskatchewan is due to the lack of a policy that was conducive to a healthy and a big industrial program.

Premier Douglas: — That's Liberalism!

Mr. Elias: — Also, on the next page:

"Reflected in the 1958-59 budget is a continuation and expansion of those methods of assistance which have proven so successful in recent years."

So there has been come kind of an awakening in these last few years that has helped some!

I see I won't get through, so I will go on to provincial debt, because I hate to disappoint the Provincial Treasurer by not saying something about the provincial debt. I welcome the change in the form of the accounts to be used from now on. It is simply the equation of what the province owes plus what the provinces owns, equals the net debt. It is also very effective and simple. Its

March 6, 1958

effectiveness is apparent in that it automatically manages to reduce the net debt from \$51 million to \$31 million.

Mr. Danielson: — By the stroke of a pen!

Mr. Elias: — Talk about the magic of the stroke of a pen — here it is in its full essence. I wish I could apply that to my own business.

I would like to revert back to the old system of accounting for a few minutes. In arriving at the net debt figure, I am reminded of the boy who came to his father to borrow to buy a truck to go into business for himself. After giving the boy a loan of \$500, the father reminded the boy that he, the boy, owed him \$500. When the boy returned with the truck, he said to his father, "It sure feels good, because now not I, but the truck owes you the \$500."

Now, for 1952-57, the gross debt in our province had jumped by \$118 million. In the same period the loans and advances to Crown Corporations had jumped \$177 million, and the net debt during the same period decreased \$49 million. Actually then, Mr. Speaker, the net debt has decreased simply by loaning more money to the Crown Corporations, or in other words, the truck is being held responsible for the debt!

My contention is still that in referring to the financial standing of a province, both the net debt and the gross debt should be considered. The gross debt of the province increased by some \$57 billion last year, and the loans to the Crown Corporations some \$68 million. So the Government borrows money, turns around and advances a greater sum to the Crown Corporations, and then claims they have decreased the debt of the province. It might work out if the truck won't break down.

I had something to say about mental health, but I am sorry I will not be able to do that, lest I get into trouble on this side of the House. In summary, though, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that because there is no direct tax cut provided in this budget; because the depressed agricultural industry is not assured a reduced percentage of the proposed expenditure; because too liberal advances are earmarked for the advancement of socialized industry; because proposed grants for schools and municipalities will not reduce taxpayers' share of the total expenditure at both levels, I cannot support the budget.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the hon. gentleman who just sat down, in congratulating all the hon. members who have taken part in both debates.

I was pleased to hear, yesterday, the announcement by the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) that Highway No. 26 from Meota to Edam will be constructed this year; and also that Highway No. 40 from Blaine Lake to Krydor will be built during the coming season. However, in case there will be the necessity to by-pass some of the small villages, I ask the Minister that there will be access branches from the highway built into them. I have in mind Krydor and Vawn and some of the places, because when the highway passes farther away from these places, they are usually doomed to extinction.

I was rather disappointed not to hear the Minister announce that he was going to extend highway No. 24 from Spiritwood to Hafford and down to No. 5 Highway. For many years now, the people of Spiritwood, Rabbit Lake, Mayfair, Mullingar, Alticane, Keatley, Speers and Hafford have been asking the Government for this highway, which would run from Spiritwood to No. 5. In the 1952 campaign our charming Premier, while speaking in Rabbit Lake and later on in Mayfair, promised to have that highway built. This promise has not been kept, like most of their promises on the pre-election hustings. At a meeting in Glaslyn, on 26th January 1958, attended by representatives of some 21 Boards of Trade, reeves and councillors, with some 110 delegates present, in the presence of the Minister of Travel and Information and the Minister of Natural Resources, who were there with their staffs, a brief was presented on behalf of some 30 communities of northwestern Saskatchewan, enumerating the various needs of northwestern Saskatchewan.

Among other things, all those who were present endorsed the need of extending No. 24 Highway from Spiritwood, through the places I have mentioned, to No. 5 Highway. In reply, the Minister of Highways now states that the thinness of population in this area does not warrant a highway there. He presumes to know better than those 110 delegates representing over 30 communities. He claims

that, because of the P.F.R.A. pasture some 12 miles east of the proposed route, it would be unwise to have a provincial highway located there. I examined his argument and the statistics in this case, and I am sorry to say that the population statistics do not support the argument. Here is what I found in the municipal report of last year in connection with the population of the area. This proposed highway would serve the following rural municipalities and would cut through them: Spiritwood, population 2,965, with 995 farming units; Round Hill, population 1,420, with 488 farming units; Meeting Lake, population 1,505, with 370 farming units; Douglas, population 1,445, with 400 farming units; Redberry, population 2,686 and 569 farming units; and Great Bend with 1,874 population and 415 farming units. That makes a total of 12,895 in population, with 3,237 farming units.

I examined comparative areas in Saskatchewan, in other parts of this province where highways have been built recently, and I find many areas with smaller and thinner population served by provincial highways, in some cases, hardtop highways. This just goes to prove that this Government has completely neglected the people of the north; in fact they do not even know the facts about the north. They seem to follow the policy that the farther away you are from Regina the less service you should get, unless you are in some Minister's constituency.

As for the community pasture which is some twelve miles east of the proposed highway — I leave this to you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members to judge, as a point why there should be no highway there. If this was used as a reason for no highway going by, then half of our highways should be closed, because there are many community pastures that are right beside the highway. I believe it is a good idea to have the highway running near the pastures. May I ask the Minister how he proposes to get the stock into the pasture if there are no roads into this pasture? Does he propose to fly the cows in?

Premier Douglas: — You're the only one silly enough to ask that question.

Mr. Korchinski: — The usefulness of the P.F.R.A. pasture is much reduced because there are no suitable access roads to it. I believe it would be much more sensible to build this highway near that pasture than to try to organize another community pasture within a short distance to the west of this P.F.R.A. pasture. In passing, Mr. Speaker, I may mention that the proposed provincial pasture, between Sandwith and Hatherleigh, is being organized in the face of strong opposition of local people. The people in

that area are pushed around and intimidated. I know that the rural municipality of Round Hill, in whose territory this pasture is to be located, passed a very strong resolution against the organization of this pasture, and this is the feeling of most of the farmers in this locality. Most of them are against having a pasture organized there. They think - and most of them are people of responsibility — that the reason a pasture is being organized there is because it would be of great convenience to one of the hon. members of this House who is sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, who is a stock raiser, and who would benefit by this pasture, it being handily next door to his inadequate private pasture.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Opposition Members: — Oh, sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. gentleman is rising on a point of privilege.

Mr. Kramer: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Loptson: — He didn't mention any names.

Mr. Kramer: — I am the only stock raiser from northwestern Saskatchewan, and the hon. member has been making this reference in the country. I will never pasture one head of cattle in that pasture, and I state that clearly and unequivocally here, right now.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, it is very peculiar to see the hon. member from The Battlefords jump up and start questioning this statement.

Mr. Loptson: — He must have felt guilty.

Mr. Kramer: — There is nothing queer about it. You have been circulating that slander throughout this constituency for the last two years.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — I would suggest that if the hon. member from North Battleford wishes to organize a pasture, he should do it in his own constituency.

Mr. Kramer: — Again, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

March 6, 1958

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, sit down.

Mr. Kramer: — He has made a direct reference, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Kramer: — I want to state again that I had nothing whatever to do with organizing the pasture in the area that is mentioned by the hon. member for Redberry.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Demand he withdraw the statement.

Mr. Kramer: — And I demand that he withdraw that statement.

Mr. McDonald: — He never said that you did.

Mr. Kramer: — He certainly did,

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Kramer: — I demand a withdrawal, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member made the statement that the member for The Battlefords had a part in the organization of that pasture . . .

Mr. McDonald: — He didn't say that.

Mr. Kramer: — He did say that.

Mr. Danielson: — He didn't say that at all

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, he did say that, and I demand a withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! My understanding of what was said was "if the hon. member for The Battlefords wishes to organize a pasture he should do it in his own constituency."

Mr. Cameron: — That's right. Sit down!

Mr. Kramer: — I say the impression he was trying to leave was that I was personally responsible for the organization of that pasture . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Sit down!

Mr. Kramer: — It isn't what he said in this House, it is what he has said outside this House, as well.

Mr. McDonald: — Sit down!

Mr. Cameron: — You're just taking up radio time.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Kramer: — I'll sit down when I'm ready. If my name is being taken here, I have a right to stand up and . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! What has been said outside of the House cannot be given consideration here. The words that were used — I didn't gather that any accusation was made against the organization, although it might be inferred; and I say to the member for Redberry, if he inferred that the hon. Member for The Battlefords had a part in the organization of that pasture he must withdraw that statement. If he does not withdraw it then I am assuming that he made no such statement.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I was following very closely my notes, and I see no place where I have mentioned the hon. member from North Battleford, and I deplore the fact that he has taken so much of my valuable radio time. It seems to be, though, the general policy of the Government to do things to help their C.C.F. friends.

Now to get back to the highway for the people in this area, it should not be overlooked that this area is the best mixed-farming area in the province. You will find large herds of cattle, sheep and swine, and large flocks of poultry there . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — What are you reading from, anyway?

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . and who needs roads more than the farmers who are engaged in mixed-farming operations? These are the people who have to make frequent trips to market with their farm produce, such as cream, milk, butter, poultry and stock, These people live on the farm the year around; not like the grain farmers who, in many cases, farm from the urban centres and make only infrequent visits to their land for seeding and harvesting purposes. These farmers are on the land all the time, and they are forced to travel on well-nigh impossible roads. I remember, a couple of years ago, because of a lack of highway a farmer in this area had to transfer

turkey poult by aeroplane. Now imagine the overhead cost to him!

This Highway No. 24 from Spiritwood down to No. 5 would make this mixed-farming area a much more effective and prosperous area. Besides helping the mixed farming in this area the highway would open up a wonderful country for tourists, fishermen and hunters. There is the Redberry Lake, the Mistawisis Lake in the P.F.R.A. pasture, the Meeting Lake, the Witchekan Lake and numerous lakes north of Spiritwood, and they are a real fishermen's paradise. The Redberry Lake area and all the other lakes are unexcelled for duck hunting and big game hunting in the fall; and all of these lakes have beautiful beaches for swimming and are awaiting this highway to bring the people from Saskatoon and other urban centres to their attractive places. And so, Mr. Speaker, because of the thickly settled, mixed-farming area, because of the tourist trade, because of the recreation of fishing, swimming and hunting, and because of the neglect in the past, I plead with the Government to extend No. 24 Highway as soon as possible, because it is very, very badly needed there.

Now, Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with the grid road system. It seems to me that the time has come to take a very good look at this system of building roads and the financing of them. The main market roads are, in reality, what were previously known as highways.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — And the secondary highways are the true provincial responsibility of this Government and no one can deny it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Whose speech are you reading?

Mr. Korchinski: — It is true that the Government through the Grid Authority, now offers substantial aid to rural municipalities for the construction of these roads, but the construction of the roads, in the long run, is really a very small initial cost. Where the real cost will come in and pile up will be the maintenance and upkeep of these roads — the ones that have been completed. In questioning the Minister of Highways, last year, about the cost of maintenance of provincial highways, we found that it costs around \$500 a year on gravelled surface, and around \$750 a year on the hardtop, per mile. Although the regular highway, in many cases, bears heavier traffic than these secondary highways, it is quite safe to say that the cost of maintenance will not be much lower than on the regular highways. If you take into consideration a municipality, for instance Redberry, with 70 miles of grid road, it would cost

them \$35,000 a year for maintenance.

Premier Douglas: — How ridiculous can you be?

Mr. Korchinski: — It is impossible for a municipality to raise that much for maintenance alone. This amount is completely beyond the means of a municipality. The result will be that the road will be constructed and then it will not be maintained properly and, therefore, it will deteriorate; in fact, even now, there is evidence of quick deterioration of the grid road system.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Do you suggest we shouldn't have one?

Mr. Korchinski: — Because of lack of proper maintenance, lack of proper maintenance equipment, the grades under constant heavy use are spreading back into ditches. The gravel, gradually, is being lost and the weeds are taking over the shoulder of the road and the ditches. This makes one think of a building without a properly constructed and maintained roof. No matter how well constructed and costly the walls and how expensive the floor, if the roof is poorly built and not properly cared for, soon the whole building would be in ruins from snow, rain, frost and other factors.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Your trouble is in your roof, too!

Mr. Korchinski: — That is what happens to a grid road which is not properly built and properly kept up. It is an expensive building without a roof, where the initial cost will soon be completely lost. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) talks about the roof. There is a lot of natural gas under your roof, I think.

Another reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Provincial Government should take over the main market roads and incorporate them into the provincial highway system is that the provincial Department of Highways possesses already the necessary equipment and personnel for maintenance for these roads, both in summer and winter. It is sheer waste of public money to ask the municipalities to acquire duplicate maintenance equipment while the provincial equipment and men are idle for more than half of the working time. It must be remembered that both sets of equipment are paid for by the same people. What would be wrong with having the highway patrol go on the main market roads, in spare time, and do a good job of upkeep? It is bordering on a public crime to have to struggle with inadequate road maintenance equipment on the market roads while the provincial highway equipment, financed by the same taxpayers, is sitting idle.

Mr. Cameron: — That's right.

March 6, 1958

Mr. Korchinski: — I was happy to notice that the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) supports the idea that I advanced several years ago, in connection with the snow-removal program on country roads. He may not be a greater speaker than the Premier, but he certainly shows more down-to-earth common sense.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Who wrote that down for you?

Mr. Korchinski: — One could never understand why the farmer should struggle against the drifts with homemade plow, inadequate small snow plows, while the large provincial snow plows are sitting idle, and the operators are sitting idle in the beer parlours, or playing pool.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Again, those are provincial snow plows . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — That, of course, is a statement which the hon. gentleman should be asked to take back. That is the most despicable statement to make against someone who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw because in the heat of the argument . . .

Premier Douglas: — You'd better withdraw!

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . quite often things like that are said. I withdraw; but it is a fact that the crews of provincial snow plows are paid by the taxpayers of this province and are not occupied continually. The crews that were working No. 40 Highway have not been on that highway this year; not once. And so what have they been doing, while the farmers have been struggling with the snow clogged roads?

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I just . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — I don't want the Minister of Highways to be making my speech, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — I want to correct another false statement. These men are not being paid when they are not working, and, as I stated yesterday, their services are available to any municipality that requires them, for the simple cost of operation.

Mr. Korchinski: — If the municipality pays for them . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, do I understand the hon. member has withdrawn the statement?

Opposition Members: — He's withdrawn. He's withdrawn.

Premier Douglas: — I am asking a question. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman has withdrawn the statement that he saw employees of the Provincial Government wasting their time in beer parlours and pool rooms.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, that was withdrawn.

Mr. McDonald: — You heard him, too. Sit down!

Premier Douglas: — Nobody but a contemptible cur would say a thing like that.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, if the Premier of this province was not asleep half the time when the speeches are going on, he would have heard.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — I want to repeat that the provincial snow plows and the myriads of little private snow plows are paid for by the same people. At least the main market roads should be kept open by the provincial snow plows. Send them out on the farm roads and let them earn their keep.

Nothing demonstrates so well the truth of the statement of the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that the Government has failed to adjust itself to the changing conditions of time, with the way they are organized in the Government. There are 15 Ministers, scores of Deputies, hundreds of Branch Heads, hundreds of experts and myriads of other satellites and sputniks. This administration has become sputniks, of course; it has become top-heavy in expenditures and idleness. The general staff is large enough to run not only Saskatchewan, but the whole country of Canada, let alone this province which is only six per cent of Canada.

I say there are "too many animals in Jones' house." This Government has grown too large. This Government is like the ancient dinosaur. The dinosaur, because of balmy climate, grew larger and larger, but unfortunately, for some unknown reason, his

March 6, 1958

brain failed to keep up with his large, growing body, so the poor dinosaur died from sheer weight and lack of brain, and now it is completely extinct.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Like the Liberal party.

Mr. Korchinski: — In a few years, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. party will be completely extinct. All the historians and the archaeologists of the future will be able to find will be a few fragments of tibias and fibulas of the C.C.F. monstrosity, lying in the glass cases of the Natural History Museum.

I notice the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen), just a while ago . . .

Premier Douglas: — . . . can pronounce the words better than you can.

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . and the hon. member for Rosthern, (Mr. Elias) were speaking about the ferry at Petrofka. I was glad to notice that this bridge, where the ferry is, was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and I do hope that the Government proceeds quickly with the work. I hope that they do not leave this for the 1960 or 1961 election.

I would urge upon the Government the necessity of reducing power rates, especially on the farms. The Power Corporation, in view of their reported profits, is not justified in over-charging, its customers. We note that the power costs here, both in small urban centres and on the farm, are much higher than in the neighbouring province of Manitoba. It is claimed that they are 70 per cent higher. In reply to this, the Government has given the same answer, that Manitoba had a head start in construction, and has shorter distances to cover, therefore, it can afford low power rates. Both these arguments do not stand or pass scrutiny, but even if they did, I still think that the power rates for electricity in Saskatchewan are too high. The people in the country think they are too high. They find their bills too high and too difficult to pay at this time.

I think, also, that the financing of extending the power to the rural areas should have been on a different basis, and that even now it should be changed. I do not think the farmer should be asked to pay \$500 for construction before he is connected to the line. I think the farmer should be treated the same way as the urban dweller, who did not have to pay the \$500 before he got the power. I think it is not too late to correct this injustice to the farmers of this province. I believe that the farmers should be reimbursed at least the major part of this \$500, and the cost should be spread

over the whole power system, with long-term repayment.

Talk about price-cost squeeze! This is where the C.C.F. Government really squeezes the until he is bled white. I just wish the C.C.F. were not so hypocritical when they appear on the hustings. They preach "equality for all", they deplore and condemn the practices of a free-enterprise system. The favourite statement of the Premier of this province is he is against the free-enterprise system of the capitalists, and he always says, "competition brings the power to the strong and the hale, and may the devil take the hindmost." It sounds good on the hustings, for vote-catching purposes; but the C.C.F. planned economy, in practice, has become "may the devil take the independent farmer".

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that my time is nearly up, so much of it has been taken by the hon. members to your right, and this closure makes it almost impossible for me to continue . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must ask the hon. member to withdraw his reference to closure, because there is no closure operated in this House, except the Standing Orders which were agreed upon by the Assembly, last Session.

Mr. Kramer: — While you are keeping order, the hon. member is reading his speech.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this was out of order, I will withdraw that word 'closure'.

I was going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, about the extravagance in Social Welfare. I have the facts here, from last year's Public Accounts. I brought this to the attention of the Minister, last year, but no correction has been made. I can say this very briefly. The Department of Social Welfare is so overpopulated with civil servants that a very large portion of the money which is supposed to be appropriated for social welfare aid, for recipients out in the country, goes to paying the civil servants. Upon a question which I asked: "How many civil servants are in this Branch?" I got the answer — 836. Now this is just about half of all the civil servants that were employed before the C.C.F. party took over the Government of Saskatchewan. In one Department, 836 servants! I doubt the necessity of that great number. I find that the administration costs \$1.00 out of every \$5.00 of the money they disburse among the needy. In other words, Mr. Speaker, to be more exact, I calculated it very closely, and I found that it costs \$18.41 to write cheques for \$100 and I still think that is too much.

March 6, 1958

Hon. Mr. Fines: — How stupid can you get?

Mr. Korchinski: — That is nothing to laugh about . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Give us your advice . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — I will. I will give you the details . . .

Premier Douglas: — Go ahead.

Mr. Kramer: — Don't wish that on anybody . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — The cost of administration is \$265,000, and program services administration is \$1,154,000, making a total of \$1,500,000 for administration; and they dish out \$7,500,000.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They do more than write cheques.

Mr. Korchinski: — Of course, the Attorney General doesn't know very much arithmetic, the way he talks. He had better go back to school.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up. It is impossible for me to continue this discussion. I heard the Premier, not very long ago, complain that soft spots were appearing in our economy, both provincially and federally. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that soft heads in government, both provincially and federally, produce the soft spots in our economy. The people of Canada will have the opportunity, on March 31st, to remove those soft heads and prevent further softening of our economy. May they wisely use that opportunity.

I am going to oppose the Budget, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, while the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) was speaking, I believe that across the floor you saw a fine show, a shining example of the type of people that are governing the province today, not giving a fair chance to an individual to express himself the way he should, because whenever there is any criticism that seems to hurt that soft spot that the member for Redberry mentioned, they get up in arms.

There may have been an occasion at this moment when one Minister of the Crown had reason to get up and probably try and defend his Department; but there was no reason for the Premier to get up and try to raise a little hubbub, because he happened to be on the microphone that went on the air.

And then the member for Battleford (Mr. Kramer) gets up half a dozen times. You know the Jack-in-the-Box type.

Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to say very much on the budget because the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) has dealt with it — what there was of it.

Premier Douglas: — He didn't have much to say, either.

Mr. Coderre: — So I believe there isn't much use in saying very much about it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I don't think I should go into mentioning my constituency. We had some underground roads, last year, and now they are tunnels, but it doesn't matter; we are going to go ahead — and I feel sure that the people of my constituency are more concerned that I bring out the very weak spots in the Government and I believe that there are many things coming out, today — some of the Bills that have been passed in this Legislature — I would like to mention some that may not have been passed, and I believe they are infringing on the rights of the individual . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. gentleman may not reflect on something which has been done by this Legislature at this Session, or the decisions of the House.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, some of those Bills are discussed in the Budget and I feel that at any time they are mentioned in the Budget, they have a right to be — at least I think they have a right . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member will refer to something that is in the Budget Speech, he is in order.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, I shall do that, Mr. Speaker. However, ever since I have been in this Session, all I have listened to is a lot of loose talk from the Government side. You know, there is a little program on Sunday afternoon "The Great Storyteller" and one Sunday he was mentioning something about 'gobbledy-gook'; well, I think we get a lot of that from the Government side. I haven't been able to find anything constructive coming from any members of the Government, and particularly the Cabinet; and I believe the Government is trying to tell us that it is unable to cope with the situations that are presenting themselves and confronting the people of the Province.

Now, the other day — to show you exactly where I feel that the Cabinet, or many members of the Cabinet, are not fit to act

March 6, 1958

in the Government; in Committee, the other day, we were discussing the question of noxious weeds — but we shall deal with it in a true fashion. Bill No. 22 was being discussed; and one of the members from the Opposition, the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. McFarlane) was asking the question that if a tax was imposed upon an individual what recourse would he have to try and have this tax abolished. The question was asked of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) and he sat there sort of scratching his head and wondering what it was all about; so he looked around and he looked at the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in turn, got up and was wondering just exactly how we could cope with that situation; and apparently he couldn't do it; and then the bright boy of the Government got up, Mr. Speaker — the learned man; he got up and he is the person whose duty it is to guide the Government in its legal angles, insofar as the Government is concerned. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when we have Ministers who, in my personal opinion, if I may express it, answer the members of the Opposition that when we are asking questions in order to clarify situations, regardless of what they may be; when we are told to go and get legal advice and hire solicitors, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these people are not doing the job that they were elected for.

Mr. Speaker, where we see failings in the Government insofar as the way they have brought down budgets, the way they handle the affairs, generally, in the Government, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that they are not suitable to govern the people of Saskatchewan. I spent five years in the services, Mr. Speaker, and the five years that I spent in the services made me realize that I should do everything possible to preserve democracy and good government.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You should have stayed there.

Mr. Coderre: — And when I get up here, Mr. Speaker, I wish you had been there.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I was.

Mr. McCarthy: — You got two months leave, probably.

Mr. McDonald: — In the Boy Scouts.

Mr. Coderre: — However, Mr. Speaker — the gentleman served in the Boy Scouts! I don't know — that is just the remarks we get. However, my job is to see that we try and have good government. Now, we find that the actions of the Government are not conducive to good government in the province and we are seeing the reaction of that in the hustings, where we find, today, that the leader of the so-called socialists is travelling all over the province, or spending time, according to the press, in practically

only two provinces where they have some semblance of a foothold in government — Saskatchewan and British Columbia. And it seems when we find that the leader is devoting his full time in these two spots that there must be some reason. There must be a soft spot in the economy of the Socialists, because they seem to be failing; and if they have to devote their full time to defend it, then I believe that it is a definite indication that they are holding on to the last string.

We find the Government has been mentioning considerable amounts about planned economy, particularly from the hon. Premier, who has got up on several occasions and said that a planned economy is essential to the welfare of the people of Canada.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — You know I was just hoping that they would applaud a little bit. This wonderful planned economy that the Premier is talking about so much, Mr. Speaker — said the Hon. T.C. Douglas in a radio broadcast January 19, 1943 — it is quite a way back; but he said:

"We feel that the war is being used as an excuse to fasten upon the Canadian people semi-totalitarian state in which the control is from the top and in which the workers, the farmers and small businessmen are denied any voice in the functioning of our economy."

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — And now the Premier lauds that same kind of thing.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, no.

Mr. Coderre: — Exactly. I wonder just what they are driving at. They want controls in one minute and in the next minute they don't want it. Is it that they are on a see-saw, or what is it? I don't think they know what they want. The Minister is so concerned with the question of price controls — controls, rather, of planned economy; when they had a chance to go ahead and put that into effect, even though in a very small way, did they do it? What about the rent control? Did they do anything about that? The one little chance they had to assist the economy in preventing this cost-price squeeze, they didn't do anything about it. I believe that the only thing they are doing is to try and get out there and make political capital in any way, shape or form. If it is right for the occasion — price control; if it isn't right, we don't want it. It is a dictatorship. What are we going to do with them?

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am practically convinced of what is going on. The Government is looking for formulas. Now I believe they have some ninety formulas. I believe they have sort of run short of formulas and they are looking into Marx's little book for formulas, or maybe Lenin might give them some advice. It could be that Khrushchev is sending his little red book around; we don't know. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all these formulas have only one objective in mind — that some day they hope to have complete control of our economy; that is what they want — complete control of our economy where they can freeze us out and throttle us. Well I can say, Mr. Speaker, that thank God that throughout this world in some democratic countries they have done away with this Socialism. You know it is just like a little sore that grows somewhere; it gets bigger and bigger; and these sores — they call them growing sores — cancer; I compare Socialism with cancer. It is a growth and when it gets too far, well there is another word for that and I think our friends Bulganin or Khrushchev might give the answer as to what it actually means.

And now, Mr. Speaker, some years ago, the Government of the province used to publish a little booklet they called 'The Saskatchewan Economic Review'. It has its use in the affairs of the Government; it had its use until such time as the reports were not favouring the Government and members of the Government, and then they stopped publishing it. It seems to me that the Government uses the press and every means that they have at their disposal to produce some sort of propaganda as long as it is to the advantage of the Government; and immediately it becomes detrimental to their operations they withdraw the publication.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the statement made by the hon. member is not correct. The 'Economic Review' is still published. It is being published and may I say that it is not being published for general consumption; we do put the members of the Legislative Assembly on the mailing list, I believe; but this is largely for investors and institutions and people of that kind. Certainly, we intend to continue to publish this document about three times a year. It has not been withdrawn.

Mr. Coderre: — The hon. Minister of Finance hit the nail on the head. We produce it, but we don't publish it. Exactly what I was saying a while ago, Mr. Speaker. As long as it is to the advantage of the Government, they go ahead and put a circulation out; but when it becomes detrimental to the Government, then they withhold it. I was asking for information; the other day, and I was unable to get it because they said "that is not available."

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member — he has made a charge that this has been withheld. May I ask him on what occasion this has been withheld?

Mr. Coderre: — Well, it should be in the library and it isn't there.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Would the hon. member send me over a note asking for any particular copy, and I will check into it.

Mr. Coderre: — But why . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Why should he do that?

Mr. McDonald: — He asked for it and it isn't in the library.

Mr. Coderre: — However, Mr. Speaker, it was being published and circulated to members of the Legislative Assembly. But there is no reason why it should be withdrawn from circulation. I haven't had it for quite a while. All right, let's have it, why was it withdrawn? That's what I am after.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It was not withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Minister has explained that it was not withdrawn, but it hasn't been in circulation . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I don't know; I have been trying to have a little debate on that, but I'll take his word for it.

Well we will now go to this much-debated question of Crown Corporations. A lot has been said about those Crown Corporations on the radio, TV — some good and some bad. The other day, the member for Maple Creek mentioned a few things about some of the losses that are now defunct Crown Corporations and I have a little point to bring out here — that we have a tannery with \$200,000; a shoe factory with \$82,000; a woollen mill with \$830,000; a box factory with \$325,000 — and do you know how much money that is, Mr. Speaker? That would buy shoes for a lot of people. It could put refrigerators into practically every farm home in the province.

Premier Douglas: — At a dollar apiece!

Mr. Coderre: — If you take everything into consideration — all the fabulous losses — and in connection with the box factory at \$325,000, I had a question asked, the other day, on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, "What was the total loss to date of the box

March 6, 1958

factory?" And it is not \$325,000 — I believe the hon. member for Maple Creek was very modest in his figures — it is actually \$496,000, or one-half a million dollars. Mr. Speaker, I have just wondered sometimes why they ever went into the box factory business. The Government sometimes reminds me of a bunch of little children. They want little boxes to sort of stuck up for fun and see how it would look.

Now, this is what has happened to date — not taking into consideration the amount on this report; but the defunct Corporation have cost a very modest amount — I mean it is a lot more than that, if you take into consideration the depreciations and the interest charges; it is well in excess of \$2,000,000, and that would have put electricity into the farmers' homes — into 4,000 extra farmers' homes, at no cost at all. They say they can't do it. Well it is just a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Government fiddling while the rest of the country burns out.

We have some Corporations that have been successful, and the only reason they have been successful is because, due to the monopolistic control that the Government has had — and I have heard the Premier of this province, in several places across the country, speaking against these great fabulous monopolies. He says they are like a big octopus; he says they are trying to strangle you in every nook and corner. That is true. I believe that monopolies do try and do that, but it is more so when you have a Government who has monopolies. It is just like a large octopus that is strangling the economy of the country. But there is one little thing about it, when a Government has that monopoly, you have a head on the octopus and the head of the octopus is the part that squirts the ink, you know, and clouds up the issues; and the head of this octopus is the sort of travelling information bureau; it throws out the ink and clouds the issue insofar as the Corporations are concerned.

Premier Douglas: — You have sure helped today.

Mr. Coderre: — I will show you one of the reasons why I maintain that the Corporations that are successful what they call successful — I believe the only reason, as I have mentioned, is because they are monopolistic corporations, they have complete control.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to a question that I asked on the Order Paper — Question No. 155 on page 271 of the Journals of 1957, when I asked the Government: "What is the cost of one kilowatt of electricity produced and transmitted to the farmer's yard?" The answer was: "2.48 cents per kilowatt."

Then I also asked the Government, in the same question:

"What was the cost of one kilowatt of electricity produced at the plant?" Basing the average consumption on 300 kilowatts, which I think is a modest figure — some use less and some use more but we will say 300 kilowatts. We find that a person who buys 300 kilowatts of electricity at the rate which the Saskatchewan Power Corporation schedules, will pay \$9.45 for the 300 kilowatts of power. That is not taking into consideration education tax. For a period of one year, that amounts to \$113.40. Now we understand that these are amortized over a period of 20 years so that if you take the amount of power that a person will be using for a period of 20 years the farmer would be paying, \$2,268 for power for that particular amount of time.

It was mentioned a while ago the cost of producing power into the farmer's yard, and the answer was put in this way: "The cost to bring power to the consumer is 2.48 cents, which includes depreciation of the initial cost of the Corporation. So, on that basis I figured out what 300 kilowatts of power would cost — by that I mean the cost of production. And it boiled down to the fact that the cost, including the depreciation which I mentioned, the cost for everything was \$1,785, which it actually cost the Government to bring it to the farmer's yard. Taking the amount that the farmer pays, there is a difference of \$482 of excess profit. I say excess profit because the Government has been going into the hustings and saying that the Government has entered into business to provide service at cost. If that is service at cost, then what is this \$482, that the farmer has paid over and above all expenses? But then I am not forgetting the cost the farmer has to pay. I understand from the Minister of Finance that when the Government borrows money, or when money is deposited at the Finance Office, they pay 4 per cent interest. So, I have taken 4 per cent interest — simple interest (I didn't compound it) — and that amounted to an additional \$480; so it means that in a period of 20 years, the farmer who is connected to power pays in excess of the total cost required for power production, the main transmission lines, \$1,490. You cannot refute that — there are your figures; the figures that you gave us.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You'd better square that.

Mr. Coderre: — In a period of 20 years it amounts to \$56 million. In other words, it could be possible for the people of Saskatchewan to operate it without paying one penny tax for a year.

My gosh, I was forgetting about this little newspaper clipping, Mr. Speaker: "Douglas is a Tory".

Premier Douglas: — The member for Redberry said I was a fellow traveller and Martin says I'm a Tory.

March 6, 1958

Mr. Coderre: — Well, of course, I can see, Mr. Speaker, that it depends in what particular part of the hustings the hon. Premier happens to get into. If he happens to get into the Tory quarters, then he is a Tory; if he happens to get into the left wing side, then he is a . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Social Credit.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I compare the Tories and the socialists — both are supported by big monopolies. You have the monopolies of the big business of the Tories and then you have the monopolies of the socialist government. But basically, Mr. Speaker, they are the same. They are all for big business.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Why don't you see a psychiatrist?

Mr. Coderre: — We have many situations, Mr. Speaker; I have a bunch of clippings here in regard to Crown Corporations: "Premier Douglas in regard to pulp and paper mill", October 31, 1957; we have an interview by the 'Financial Post' and there are many of them; and the funny part of it is that, as I have been saying, it is sort of a Jekyll and Hyde situation. You know when he is in one place, he is Mr. Hyde and in the other place, he is Dr. Jekyll. It just depends on what happens to be best suited for the occasion. Then we turn around and we find here that: "The Hon. Minister of Finance" — I will put it this way, Mr. Speaker — on the one hand you have the hon. Premier saying "we will not rest until capitalism has been eradicated from Saskatchewan." On the other hand we have the hon. Minister of Finance and he says: "We have had enough headaches; now let's get out of this." We have had a situation like that that happened 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker. We had a great movement, a different type of movement to the one we have today; but in that movement there was a traitor to his leader — we called him Judas. It looks like we have a few Judas' in the Socialist party, today; and it is quite noticeable, particularly in an interview on the radio the other night when the Hon. Minister of Finance was introduced by a member of the press or radio in Prince Albert, and he said: "Now we have had enough headaches in regard to the pulp mill." What is the situation? Does the Government wish to get into . . . in the province? The hon. Minister of Finance raised his hands and said: "Oh, no; we can't do it; we have enough headaches already." So it is a definite admission on the part of the Government, Mr. Speaker, that they are having headaches even with the supposedly successful Corporations that they have, because I believe that the hon. Minister of Finance is shrewd enough to realize that the money he has borrowed from all over the world, from the monopolistic capitalists in the States, as they call them, to use for the expansion of the Power

Corporation, is probably getting to the point where it is hurting them and they are having great difficulties, probably through . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I don't like to interrupt the hon. member but may I point out exactly what was said. I am sure he would like to have it correct. That is, when I was asked the direct question, "Has the Government made any plans to start a pulp mill, itself?" I said: "Definitely not. If private industry feels that they can't do it, then why in the world should we take these headaches onto ourselves." Never at any time, Mr. Speaker, did I refer to any headaches we have. Now, while I am on my feet may I point out . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I thought I had the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Is the hon. Minister speaking on a point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have been to the library and find that there are two copies of every issue of the 'Economic Review' that have ever been published. They have not been withdrawn. The records are all on file — two copies of them. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that No. 10 was printed in March of 1955; then after a lapse of 18 months, in October of 1956. No. 11 was printed; and No. 12 — the proofs are back, today, from the printers; so that actually we are printing them at the rate of about every 18 months.

Mr. Coderre: — The hon. Minister of Finance is just confirming what I have said. I have the last one for the year 1956 and there hasn't been any since.

Another thing I was saying is that the Minister said he has had enough headaches. I believe it is an indictment on the part of the Minister of Finance — saying that Socialism will not work. That is demonstrated by their statements every time that they speak on it.

Now there is another point, Mr. Speaker, while I am just drifting around from place to place and I shall not take much of your time. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that some of the Crown Corporations of the Government are successful; and again I will refer back to the power, the Saskatchewan Power, is that they take no responsibility for the damage that they do. The Government, Mr. Speaker, today, with its Saskatchewan Power Corporation is able to go into every home in this province, or almost every home, and damage the individual's property and the individual has no recourse. They have been into the homes and I accuse the Government of that, Mr. Speaker — I will put it this way: of going into the homes of the farmers of this province and destroying their property and the

March 6, 1958

farmer has no way of getting any of it back.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — That's an utterly ridiculous statement and you know it.

Mr. Coderre: — I was just hoping that you would say that because that is why I repeated it. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter dated February 19, 1958, from a gentleman in my constituency regarding claims for damages to a fridge — and I will read the letter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the hon. member prepared to table the letter?

Mr. Coderre: — I am prepared to table the letter, Mr. Speaker, or I will take full responsibility for it; I would rather keep it because this letter may be used in some other place. I will take full responsibility for it, and it may be seen by any members of the Government if they wish.

"Re damage claims, your account of \$173.80 covering the cost of repairing your fridge, which was damaged by high voltage on November 21st has been referred to this office by District Superintendent for attention.

"Shortly after the trouble occurred on the line a full report was received from our District Superintendent; a copy of this report was referred to our Insurance Company, with whom we carry liability insurance policy, together with a number of accounts . . ."

That is not the only one, you see.

" . . . sent in by customers who had appliances damaged. They advised us that we are not liable for damages done to our customers' appliances as the trouble was caused by something we had no control over. The high voltage was caused by severe icing conditions in the power line . . ."

I shall deal with that in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

" . . . and the vibration of conductors that continued from November 20 until the

evening of November 21 when the weather got milder and the wind went down, thus causing the ice to fall off the lines."

Now apparently that is the reason. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is responsible for this damage in that if the power line in question had been properly engineered there would have been no such thing as high voltages on that line; because I am sure if it had been properly engineered they will take into consideration that on these prairies here . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — On a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Coderre: — There is no privilege there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brown: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Coderre: — If you will wait till I finish giving my points of view on it, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that he will have an answer and then he can try and figure out what they can do about it.

Everyone in this area knows that we have conditions of severe icing on our power lines at times; that we have extensive winds and any such things that nature can bring on to us. I can appreciate that you are likely to have power failures, which I believe, is an act of God and I don't believe that a person would have any recourse in that case; but when a line is so engineered — and I believe that I am correct in putting the blame on to the engineering in this particular case — that if you cannot take into consideration the conditions, the weather conditions that may develop, from time to time, then I feel that there is something radically wrong with the engineering and the Government should be liable for any damages. That means to say, Mr. Speaker — I don't know the figure exactly, but in excess of 44,000 farmers overnight could have every one of their fridges or any of their electrical appliances burn out. They consider themselves to be the Government for the people; they are going to help the people. They are the almighty; they can go into the homes and destroy the people's property, in an indirect sort of a way; but they still should be liable for that.

I believe that such a glaring example, Mr. Speaker, should be brought up on the floor of this House.

Premier Douglas: — Would the hon. member tell us how you would go about building a line so that it doesn't ice?

March 6, 1958

Hon. Mr. Brown: — He might suggest what could be done for Joey Smallwood in Newfoundland where they have all their lines . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I am very glad that the gentleman across the way, Mr. Speaker, brought that up. I just finished saying that we can not overcome the conditions of icing where the power line will break and we will be without power; but where the conditions of the icing on the power line, on the lines, cause shorts then I think they should extend their booms or something. But there is something radically wrong with the building of the line when it causes excessive voltages. It is not that I am only concerned over a fridge, but the life of an individual is at stake here, because if you can get high voltage to destroy property you can destroy life and about that, I am very concerned. And then the Minister gets up and says, "Well, look what they do in Newfoundland." It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — It sure is.

Mr. Coderre: — Well I could go on and on, but time is going on, and my throat is sort of drying up a bit. There have been a few remarks passed by the Government every time I ease up a bit; but seeing what I have of the budget, I feel that it provides no assistance to help us in this cost-price squeeze that we hear so much about. I could probably go on for another two hours on the cost-price squeeze but I feel when you bring in the question of the cost-price squeeze it reminds me of a little situation, but I will deal with it as it comes. We hear the Socialists all over the province talking about the cost-price squeeze on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, and they are the ones who have done absolutely nothing to alleviate this squeeze. Now we find that we have a three-cent an acre mineral tax. If the Government had any concern whatever for the cost-price squeeze, it seems to me logically, Mr. Speaker, that the Government would take that off; and it would at least help a small portion of the farm people.

Then we have another situation; we have the question of our advertising. In 1957, the Government spent \$2,444 in advertising on television. In 1956, \$10,644 was spent. If I recall correctly that was an election year; and that is part of the head of that octopus, taking advantage of public funds for advertisements which sometimes have a tendency to favour the political affiliation of the Government.

We have the question of education and we know, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing being done insofar as education is

concerned to alleviate the financial burden that is being borne by the farmers of the province.

We will deal with the Department of Municipal Affairs. I am just going over them briefly, because you could spend hours on each of them. We will deal with the Department of Municipal Affairs; they have loaded the rural municipalities with a grid road system, which is becoming a burden. Why do they not build the grid road system? The additional revenue would be more than ample to handle it. The whole purpose of their squeeze — I think it is quite evident is that they are trying to create a situation where the agriculture will be no more; it will put them in a situation where they can have their controlled economy, at least on agriculture. Every one in this House knows, Mr. Speaker, that if agriculture is completely throttled and controlled, the rest of the economy in this province is also controlled. If the Government is so concerned, Mr. Speaker, with cost-price squeeze, that is mentioned so often, I say 'do something'. It just seems to beg Mr. Speaker, a question of a bunch of little boys — that is the way I feel about it — a bunch of little boys in some back yard, some back alley, who run across a tube of toothpaste. I compare each little boy with a member of the Cabinet; they run at it and take a little squeeze of the tube of toothpaste until everything is out of it and then they discard it. That seems to be their attitude.

I have another little point, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to bring out and then I assure you that I will not hold you up any more. The Government considers itself a government who went into business to provide services at cost. Well, I am going to deal with the liquor, beer and wine sales; the small little stores that they have all over the province — or I should say that they had, because the intentions of the Government is to centralize to a great degree, and these little stores that they had were not conducive to their ultimate plan — their goal is toward centralizing so they are closing up these little stores. The reason I mention this point is because it is part of the cost-price squeeze; whether it be for some refreshments — some people call it medicinal purposes; it doesn't matter; when the cost-price squeeze is taken into consideration it means all the commodities a person has to buy. In these particular localities where they have these small beer and wine sales they are closing up the establishments, and it is putting an additional financial burden on the people who wish to have some of those commodities. The point in mind, Mr. Speaker, is that there is one particular place in the province; and I had a question asked on the Order Paper, where they made a profit of \$7,000, in excess of \$7,000 in one of those little stores in a small town. The question that was asked was why did they close it; and the reason given was that it was not economical to keep it open. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government was sincere

March 6, 1958

about providing services at cost that it could have maintained and kept that little store open, with that \$7,000; they could have paid a man good substantial wages, rent and everything else; and they would still have had some money left. But they are not concerned at all. If the Government feels that it must close those places, why does it not make it possible that the outlet for those particular commodities be made available through regular retail channels. They could license some retail places and make the commodities concerned readily available to the people. Such a suggestion has been mentioned in several places and I just thought that in view of the fact that they are closing out these retail channels, I believe they could make it possible to give a service to the people, a service that would make it convenient for the people to purchase the commodities they wish.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Budget, as it is laid down, is not suitable to assist the present conditions that have developed and are continuing to develop in the province; and for that reason I cannot support the motion.

Mr. John J. Harrop (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few matters which I would like to bring to the attention of the Government which are of particular interest to the constituency of Athabaska. First of all; I would like to compliment the Minister of Finance and members of the Government for bringing this budget before the Assembly. There are many things in this budget which will be of material assistance to our constituency, and to the province as a whole. One item which is mentioned in the budget and is of particular interest to our area is that of northern mining roads and I will have something to say on that later on.

Before going into these matters that concern my constituency, I just want to say a few words in regard to the role of the Official Opposition. Being a new member in the Assembly, I have apparently been misinformed as to what the duties of the Official Opposition are. I had assumed that where they could not agree with the policies of the government, that they would offer constructive criticism. We have heard plenty of criticism but certainly nothing that is constructive, nor is any alternative offered. It would appear to me that they are attempting to secure their lack of any platform or program under a barrage of abuse and character assassination and innuendoes. These tactics to seek to destroy us here in this manner ill-becomes members of the party and betray the philosophy of Liberalism.

The Social Credit member who spoke this afternoon has an alternative, but from what I could gather from his speech he suggested that all that was required was more money. It was suggested

also by members opposite that we should be concerned only with affairs our own constituencies, and those of the province, and that to discuss world and national affairs is wasting the time of this House. Mr. Speaker, I believe that members in this Legislature should show some leadership, and anything they can do to convince the people that they have a vital interest in world affairs and national affairs, is not wasting time, but it is their duty to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I want once again to take a few minutes of this House to deal with the problem of Metis and Indian settlements in the province. As I mentioned in this House last Session, we have settlements where the fishing and trapping resources are not sufficient to provide an adequate standard of living for these people. The population of these is increasing each year, and this problem is becoming more and more acute. I suggested at that time that a committee or a commission be established in the search for a way or means to correct the situation, and at the same time inquire into the mining developments in the area.

I would like to make one suggestion now, and that is where land is suitable for grazing and garden plots, that action be taken to assist the people in that production. Efforts are being made in this direction, by visits from ag-reps and conservation officers, and others who are doing an excellent job insofar as they are able to do so. I believe that any assistance will require a full-time resident; one who will attempt to convince the people living in these settlements that, by working together co-operatively in various ways, on the land and in raising livestock, they can substantially raise their standard of living. The person selected for this task must have an understanding of the people; be sympathetic, and have infinite patience. An example of what I have in mind is something along the line of the Metis settlement at Willowbunch, where I understand the work and help given by Father Blanchard has materially assisted in improving the lot of this settlement. This would be a long-term program, and require constant supervision. The reason I suggest this constant supervision and help is that I have seen instances where projects were started, and the people were left to their own devices and they have resulted in failures. Such a program would certainly cost money, but I believe in the long-run it will not be nearly so costly as social welfare programs, which will be required in ever-increasing amounts, and not as detrimental to the character of the people.

A program would, of course, require the co-operation of the Department of Indian Affairs, particularly where Metis and Treaty Indians are mixed in the one settlement.

Another matter which is urgent and particularly affects

March 6, 1958

the Beaverlodge area in my constituency is the location of northern development roads. It is to be expected that pressure will be brought to bear to have most northern development roads emanate from Prince Albert, especially if the present federal government is returned to office. You will, of course, understand the reason for this.

I certainly have no objection to the construction of any roads which will assist in the development of the resources of northern Saskatchewan. However, from press reports of speeches made by the present Minister of Northern Affairs, there is an indication that he is proposing a road running northeast of Prince Albert, probably touching on Wollaston and on up to Black Lake, and Stony Rapids and on to the north side of Lake Athabaska to Uranium City. Anyone looking at a map of northern Saskatchewan must realize the vast distance which this route would cover. In my estimation, the route would be in excess of 1,000 miles from Prince Albert to Uranium City. Over the type of roads which \$15 million would construct in this type of terrain, it is estimated conservatively that truckers would require to charge over one cent per pound per 100 miles, or in excess of 10 cents per pound from Prince Albert to Uranium City via this route. The air cargo rate at present is 12 cents per pound, and considering the delay in delivering, any small saving would encourage very little truck delivery. It would seem to me, therefore, that this route would be of little or no value, insofar as reducing the costs of transportation of equipment and material to the Beaverlodge district.

We believe, in this area, that there is a great future in store for uranium. Great strides are now being made in some countries in developing uses for uranium other than bombs, particularly in the production of power. It is believed that in the not too distant future, uranium will be able to compete with other conventional fuels, such as oil. One way to assist in this competition is to reduce the cost of producing uranium oxide. In our area a substantial cost of production is transportation and storage costs. In order to operate a full year, mines and other businesses must stockpile supplies sufficient for nine months' operation. This requires a substantial outlay of capital; large storage facilities and an annual survey of estimated requirements for the following year. It is very difficult to estimate needs for this length of time, with the result that a good deal of material and supplies are shipped in by air.

In addition to this, perishable goods must be flown in, as they cannot be stock-piled. This, of course, adds to transportation costs. I would therefore ask the government to give serious consideration to continuing on the road north from Buffalo Narrows; the cost of construction on the west side would be considerably cheaper and would affect a direct route from railheads of less than one-half the distance from Prince Albert than that suggested by the Minister of Northern Affairs.

I would go so far as to suggest that this road not be completed in one year, but if plans were laid immediately, it could be finished probably within three or four years without too heavy a burden on the finances of the province. There are many, many potential mines in this area which could be operated provided markets are available firstly, and secondly that they could be operated economically enough. At the same time, roads could be gradually pushed out from Lac la Ronge to the east side of the province, in an endeavour to open mining activity in this area, the Precambrian Shield.

Finally, there is a matter which I believe is urgent at this time, and that is the depletion of the barren land caribou herds in northern Canada. At present the government has a policy of limiting the take by the native people, and preventing the white populations from taking any caribou whatsoever. I believe that this program does not go far enough in this regard. I think it will be found necessary that in future, to prevent any caribou being taken whatsoever, I think that now, while the herds are not too seriously depleted, is the time to take action which I believe will be found necessary. It may be found that other sources of fresh meat will have to be made available to the native population. If this is necessary, it should be done now, while the period of restoration of herds would not take so long. Any restrictions to native population, of course, must have the co-operation of the Department of Northern Affairs of Canada, as a good part of the distance of their migration is through the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, because there is much in the Budget which will assist our constituency, and Saskatchewan generally in regard to education, social welfare, public health, and other matters, I will support the Budget.

Hon. Mr. Walter Erb (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I should like, first of all, to join with other members who have spoken, to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer upon the excellent manner in which he brought down the budget for 1958-59. This, as we all know, is the 14th consecutive budget that the Provincial Treasurer has brought into the House, and looking over the years in which he has guided the financial destinies of the province, one is greatly impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the magnificent job he has done. It is conceded by those people who know and recognize financial genius, that there are not many men in our land who equal or even surpass the abilities of our Provincial Treasurer, and when one adds to that his supreme integrity and his unquestionable loyalty, you have a Minister of whom you can be proud, Mr. Speaker.

Government. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — What I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, has already been said by other members on this side of the House, and it is this: That all people of this province who love integrity and have a high regard for order, loyalty and ability, are certainly hopeful that the Provincial Treasurer will reconsider the remarks that he made in this House some time ago. Certainly we, on this side of the House, shall do all we can to persuade him to remain with us for many years to come.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes a tragedy of our society, when people are elected to the honourable position of a member of the Legislature, and/or a member of the Parliament of Canada indulge in tactics which we have seen in this House on several occasions and in the hustings, designed to besmirch the character and integrity of a man — of a deserving public servant, is a tragedy indeed. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they degrade only themselves, and society can have but one name for these people, they are the Iagos, the Cassios, the assassins on the political stage, and to them the poet's words can be aptly applied;

"But they will go down to the vile dust from whence they sprung: Unwept, unhonoured and unsung."

I should also like to congratulate the financial critic of the Opposition, the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) for his strenuous effort. His is not an easy task, Mr. Speaker, for the kind of budget that he has to criticize makes his role a most unenviable one indeed. Now, it is most encouraging to note that notwithstanding the contraction of the agricultural economy, the budget reflects the continuing expansion of the economy as a whole. It is gratifying to note as well, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when deficit financing is being suggested by the two old parties on the hustings with reckless abandon, this budget and preceding budgets indicate careful planning and judicious allocation of funds for the various departments of government.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will give their endorsement to the budget, not only because it assures continuation of those programs that have provided, in so many ways for their social and economic well-being, but also in that it clearly demonstrates the diversification of Saskatchewan's economy. I suggest that were it not for the revenues resulting from this diversification, particularly at a time when our agricultural industry is suffering a depression, a contraction of expenditures in some areas would be indicated, in order to provide the level of service the people of Saskatchewan now enjoy, and to which they have an inalienable right.

Our friends of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, would make light of this diversification resulting from the industrial expansion in Saskatchewan. While it is agreed that the power of suggestion can be very effective, our friends to your left, Mr. Speaker, have succeeded in convincing no one but themselves, and sometimes I doubt if they have done that. Unless, like the proverbial ostrich, they have buried their head in the sand, it ought not to be too difficult for them to see or at least read about, the expansion in industry that has been going on in this province.

Mr. Danielson: — Just peanuts!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Such as the 3,200 oil wells that are in production and the 165 gas wells in Saskatchewan. Perhaps, to enable my hon. friends to better comprehend the magnitude of this industrialism, I might point out that oil wells now exceed in number the grain elevators in Saskatchewan. I wonder, too, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. members to your left have ever pondered the rapid development of a uranium industry in Saskatchewan. These two aspects of our industrialization alone represent, or account for more than 120 million of the 1957 mineral production.

Members of the Liberal Party in this House and outside, have been crying for years to the effect that private enterprise will not come into this province as long as there is a C.C.F. Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, joining their chorus not so long ago, a politician who wandered from light into dark — a refugee in search of political rehabilitation — has added to their wailing and weeping and crocodile tears. I suppose only a psychiatrist could explain why Nero fiddled while Rome burned, or why the Liberal Party cries while Saskatchewan is building. Well, in spite of all their wailing and blue ruin prognostications of the members to you left . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You're a better performer than your Premier.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — . . . industry will continue to come into this province in ever-increasing numbers, as was indicated in the budget, by the Provincial Treasurer.

I was very gratified to learn this afternoon, and I am sure my hon. friends across the way will join me in that gratification, of the announcement the Premier made this afternoon about another \$800,000 industry in this province.

It has been asked before, and I will ask again: Where was private enterprise during the 34 years the Liberal Government sat in office here?

Mr. Cameron: — Here we go!

March 6, 1958

Hon. Mr. Erb: — For that matter, where was co-operative enterprise, or any other enterprise, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Danielson: — Where were you up until about four years ago!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — There was very little evidence of either of these being in the province at that time.

Mr. Danielson: — Did you bring them in in ten years, or what did you do?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Could it be that the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) — (I see that he is not in his seat) but could it be that he had also the provincial Liberal Government record in mind when speaking to the Women's Liberal Club of Regina, when he said that 'people vote for a program and not for a record'.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that as far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, that is not good enough. Saskatchewan is the last province in which such a statement should be made, because I would remind my hon. friends that the people in this province are in the habit of voting for a record rather than a program for promises. The C.C.F. record of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is crystal clear. Through the efforts of this government, private enterprise, co-operative enterprise and public enterprise are flourishing side by side, each in its respective field, contributing to the economy, and to the advantage of the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to leave what I have to say for tomorrow, and with that for my friends opposite to sleep on. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

HOSPITALIZATION PLAN

Moved by Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Thiessen,

"That this Assembly, while welcoming Federal participation in health programs such as hospitalization insurance, regrets the failure of the Government of Canada to include tuberculosis and mental institutions in the national hospitalization plan, and urges that, instead of continuing its piecemeal approach, the said Government should proceed forthwith to the development of a comprehensive national health insurance program by:

- (a) convening a Dominion-Provincial Conference for the purpose of establishing the foundations of such a national program;
- (b) introducing at the earliest possible date enabling legislation to give effect to the program emerging from such Conference, with provision for provincial administration thereof, and
- (c) entering into bilateral agreements with each province willing to establish a comprehensive health insurance program, failing general agreement by all provinces of Canada to participate."

Mr. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I have found it highly entertaining, but at times somewhat revolting, the bare-faced bids which are currently being made for votes of the Canadian people. It seems the most promising men the two older political parties in this country have been able to elevate to leadership are really living up to their promise. They are out promising each other, in a way that is likely to cause the ordinary man in the street to exclaim, whose money are they planning to spend, anyway. Nor are the rank and file leaving anything undone to sell their newly found leaders to a skeptical public. 'Honest John' Diefenbaker is being pictured as almost ready to put on the front coat of an Abraham Lincoln, while Lester Pearson is being promoted as a sort of Messiah whose election to office at the head of a Government is the only way in which the world can be spared a devastating war.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, might I point out this has no bearing on this motion here.

Mr. Speaker: — I will draw to the attention of the member that what he has said up to this time has no reference to the motion.

Mr. Gibson: — I think it has, but, Mr. Speaker, I will accept your ruling. It has been noted by other members of this House, I am sure, that among all the clamour for public votes; very little is being said about some of the issues that are of great importance to the Canadian people. Perhaps Mr. Pearson considers that national health insurance has been promised often enough and long enough, not to need promising again on this occasion.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Here's another promise, now.

Mr. Gibson: — Perhaps he has concluded that the people of

March 6, 1958

Canada, having waited nearly 40 years since the Liberal Party first promised health insurance, that they won't mind waiting a little longer. One wonders how long we might have had to wait if a government of the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent had not been swept from office by a fed-up electorate in last year's general election.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I might point out this has no reference . . .

Mr. Gibson: — I am perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member relate his remarks . . .

Mr. Gibson: — Well, I am relating it. I am relating the fact, Mr. Speaker, of how long we might have had to wait if the Liberal government hadn't been swept from office last year. Mr. Diefenbaker made a noble start, but it took him a long time to get around to any action with respect to hospital insurance. I wonder how much longer he might have delayed any statement of policy, had it not been for a C.C.F. want of confidence motion in the House of Commons last November 18th.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, might I point out again there is no reference to this motion that I can see, in anything that the member has said.

Mr. Howe (Kelvington): — Oh, sit down! You're probably not listening.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Does the hon. member intend to lead it toward the discussion of activities of this Province?

Mr. Gibson: — Mr. Speaker, I think I'm doing that very thing. I'm talking about the lack of action being taken, and I'm trying to get some action.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, in all deference, this motion says:

"That this Assembly, while welcoming Federal participation in health programs such as hospitalization insurance, regrets the failure of the Government of Canada to include tuberculosis and mental institutions in the national hospitalization plan, and urges that, instead of continuing its piecemeal approach, the said Government should proceed forthwith to the development of a comprehensive national health insurance program."

It seems to me the hon. member is discussing that very point — the need for a comprehensive program rather than the piece-meal and spasmodic and somewhat belated efforts that have been carried on over a period of years.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is self-evident that the hon. member was not relating it; otherwise the Premier would not have had to get up and read the motion in order to relate it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I have to assume that certain members of the House don't catch a point quickly, and it has to be explained, and I was doing that.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order, I think it is up to the Speaker who has the floor and is speaking on the motion to explain to the very 'stupid' members exactly what the relationship is. Surely he doesn't have to be prompted by the Premier in everything he says.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think I owe the hon. gentleman an apology. I was under a misapprehension myself.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, he's got his propaganda over there; somebody wrote it up for him.

Mr. Gibson: — I'm trying to point out the need for action with respect to the implementation of this resolution that is before the House. Mr. Diefenbaker had made a noble start, but it had taken him long enough to get around to any action with respect to hospital insurance, and I wonder how much longer he might have delayed any statement of policy, had it not been for a C.C.F. want of confidence motion in the House of Commons last November 30.

Mr. Danielson: — Here it comes again!

Mr. Cameron: — Longest way around . . .

Mr. Gibson: — On that occasion, the C.C.F. called for immediate Federal payments to those provinces which already had hospital insurance plans in operation. The motion was defeated by the Liberals in opposition, providing further proof, Mr. Speaker, of just where the two old political parties of Canada stand when given the opportunity to vote for a national health program.

Mr. Diefenbaker intimated at that time that the national insurance plan was to be discussed at the Federal-Provincial fiscal conference later in November. Mr. Diefenbaker would not go beyond expressing his willingness to hasten the implementation of the scheme, and he

March 6, 1958

continued to support the idea that six provinces, with at least half the population of Canada would have to have plans in operation, before they could expect Federal assistance. The Prime Minister mentioned no date, but one has the feeling that the start of the plan hinges on the preparations of the Tory government of Ontario, and that that province cannot possibly be ready before the first of January, 1959. Certainly, it did not take the pioneering Saskatchewan Government that long to initiate its hospital services plan in 1947. Now, we have a statement from the Minister of National Health and Welfare, that he will be prepared to introduce an amendment to the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Service Act at the next session of parliament, which will advance the date of participation. In the meantime, the three western provinces are prepared to go ahead just as soon as the Federal Government can make up its mind and stop its delaying tactics. The date of July 1 has been mentioned as being considered, but one wonders whether this will be likely.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that national hospital insurance is a fact when I see it in operation, and after 40 years of waiting, we are entitled to be somewhat skeptical. Let's not fool ourselves that the interests opposed to national health insurance, for instance, the insurance companies and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, have thrown in their hands. Forty years is a long time to wait for something the Canadian people want and need as desperately as they do protection against the ruinous cost of sickness.

I wish some genie could tell us today, how many Canadian have had to forgo prompt hospital care for reasons of cost, and how many people struggling to pay honestly the costs of debts incurred because of sickness, have had to forgo other necessities of life. I have noticed that the Health league of Canada has placed great emphasis lately on the fact that sickness can be a cause of poverty. One can assert with equal force, that poverty causes sickness. A noted Canadian Physician has said that if he were to be asked to institute a program of tuberculosis control in some undeveloped country, he would first try to raise the standards of living in that country. For this reason, nobody is going to say that the national health insurance scheme if and when it comes into operation, is the end of the road with respect to health insurance in Canada. As the 'Toronto Daily Star' stated editorially last November 30, and I quote:

"National hospital insurance is only the beginning. We must push ahead toward the establishment of an all inclusive plan. We must not abate our efforts until there is a nation-wide health insurance system that makes every form of health care available to every

Canadian. We must speed the tempo; let's not take as long to complete the plan as we have taken to get this far . . ."

Mr. Speaker, this is in tune with the desires of the Canadian people, but will we have to wait another 40 years for a comprehensive insurance plan? Already most of the cost of the provinces of Canada agree that our national hospital plan should be widened by the inclusion of care in mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanatoria. At the Federal-Provincial fiscal conference, Mr. Diefenbaker announced willingness to include such treatment, but hedged it with the suggestion that this inclusion would jeopardize the fiscal arrangements. The previous Liberal administration was adamant about exclusion of mental and tubercular care. But strangely enough, this past January, when already out of office six months, the Liberal leadership convention adopted a seven-point social security program, and recommended health insurance provision against major medical, dental and surgical expenses, which, combined with hospital insurance, would insure that no Canadian would be financially crippled by illness.

A dispatch from Ottawa outlining this recommendation, said that the Liberals would continue to fight for national health insurance. They would continue to fight for it, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Cameron: — Why not?

Mr. Gibson: — I wonder who they thought they had fought in the past. And I wonder why they waited until they were out of office before making their valiant determination.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Better fighters then.

Mr. Gibson: — I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Liberal Government at any time in the past quarter-century had brought in National Health Insurance legislation, they would not have been swept from office. They more likely would have enjoyed nation-wide approval.

Mr. Cameron: — Who brought it in?

Mr. Foley: — Where is it?

Mr. Cameron: — Why are you grouching about negotiating, then?

Mr. Gibson: — As social reformers, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have not been very energetic or determined, and the Conservatives have yet to prove that they have departed from their traditional role of opposition to social reform. There are those who assert that Canada will endanger its national economy if we embark

March 6, 1958

on a comprehensive plan of health insurance. In other words, they are saying we probably cannot afford it. It is interesting to observe that this is the view of the Canadian Insurance Officers' Association and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce — the same organizations that have opposed national hospital insurance.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Free enterprises!

Mr. Gibson: — Is it their contention that under a national health plan, more people would receive needed hospital and medical care, and that this would not be good? Is it a case of good health service being too good for the poor, or even for the people of average income, who find the financial burdens of sickness too difficult? One wonders. Or is it perhaps some of the captains of industry in eastern provinces feel an unjustified demand for health services. We all know there is a tendency on the part of some folks to take quick advantage of a new commodity when the money doesn't come directly out of one's own pocket, but the good sense of the public ultimately prevails, and there is such a thing as public education. Neither the government of Canada nor industry appears to have experienced much difficulty in informing and educating the public along certain desirable lines. This was most noticeable during the last war.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one to think that people can and should be patriotic only in time of national danger from without. I firmly believe that the people of Canada will accept national health insurance responsibly when the time comes, provided that the federal and provincial authorities will take the people into their confidence and act towards them in a democratic manner.

Finally, just one word about cost. The leading Canadian authority on health insurance. Dr. Taylor of the University of Toronto and formerly in charge of research and statistics for our own Saskatchewan Health Department, has estimated that a total hospital and medical program would cost Canada \$940 million yearly. Can we afford, it? He says we can, and we in the C.C.F. say that we can. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the money Canada invests in better health for its people will be repaid one hundred fold, nay a thousand fold, in future dividends of health and happiness, in national vigour and prosperity.

I take pleasure in moving this resolution.

Mr. John Thiessen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take very many minutes on this thing. I think that (a), (b) and (c) pretty well say what is asked in this thing.

(a) convening a Dominion-Provincial Conference for the purpose of establishing the foundations of such a national program;

This could very nicely be dealt with in the same way as this government has dealt with the grid road system. Municipalities were called in and everything was discussed, and I think that the Federal Government could do this very nicely with all the provinces if they wanted to. There is only one thing wrong, and that is I don't see why we should have come down to the provinces, and given us a scheme such as this to take part in. We are trying to work from the bottom up when it should really have come from the top down.

(b) introducing at the earliest possible date enabling legislation to give effect to the program emerging from such Conference, with provision for provincial administration thereof,"

This, in my estimation means that the health program would be assisted by the Federal Government but would still be administered by provincial governments which is as I think it should be.

(c) entering into bilateral agreements with each province willing to establish a comprehensive health insurance program, failing general agreement by all provinces of Canada to participate."

That again is the same as our hospitalization that has been spoken about, where all the provinces would not be willing to participate but those provinces who want to, can share in any national program.

We know that in our own province we can do with the national health program. We have a lot of areas where people only have a doctor once a week. We have areas where hospitals are quite a distance away, and we as a province can never hope to cover all the health fields which are necessary to be covered. When war was declared the last time, the Federal Government found that only about one-third of the boys and girls who joined the armies were fit to do the services they were required to do, and many of them were hospitalized, many of them were treated for their eyes, or their teeth, and they found that a lot of our children and a lot of our boys and girls growing up need this sort of service. I feel that with a national health program such as this would set up, it would bring health to our people and wealth to our nation.

I take pleasure in seconding this motion.

March 6, 1958

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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

SECOND READING

Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Interpretation Act

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Bill No. 64 is a Bill to amend The Interpretation Act and it becomes necessary only because of a change in the Police Magistrates Act. The Police Magistrates Act changes the name of Police Magistrates to Provincial Magistrates and therefore references in all other acts must be brought in line and so The Interpretation Act makes the necessary correction.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

(Referred to the Committee of the Whole at the next Sitting)

Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Local Government Board Act

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Board is invested with authority to approve or to refuse to approve of applications by local Governments and public corporations to borrow money. At the present time, the present section refers to the prior approval of the Minister of Public Health, as required under the Public Health Act. Now, it happens that there are some other Acts, which also require the approval of the Local Government Board and it is therefore proposed at this time to add a general section or clause that the local Government may only approve in any other case, where any public official or any Board or any Commission or Agency of the Government is required to approve of the borrowing or the debenture, only after such approval has been given in the present section which we are seeking to rectify at this time.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

(Referred to Committee of the Whole at the next Sitting)

Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The District Courts Act - be now read a second time

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to

go into great detail at this point, on these various proposed changes in the judicial system of Saskatchewan. I merely want to voice very briefly my opposition to this Bill in principle.

There are two things that I feel are not good in this proposed amendment. The first is to reduce the number of District Court judges in Saskatchewan. And the second, is to give the Attorney General the power to make further reductions later on, should he so desire through the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

And, I want just to say a few words about the set-up, which may not be entirely clear to all the members, of the District Court Judges in Saskatchewan. As most of the hon. members know, Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of trouble finding enough persons who would be willing to take on the work and to act as a Police Magistrate in this province. And, I think the Attorney General will certainly agree with me in this, it is very difficult to find qualified people who assume positions of responsibility as Police Magistrates.

Now, to a lesser degree there has been the some difficulty in finding qualified and young members of the Bar to accept appointments as District Court Judges. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members will agree with me that we have been very, very fortunate in Saskatchewan and in Canada in the type of person that we have had appointed to our judiciary. There have been very few scandals of any kind. There has been no respect lost by the people of our province, and our country. And they have upheld the traditions of British justice and the laws of our Province, very, very well on the whole. And I think we can all be very justly proud of our judiciary.

In Saskatchewan, I think we can be additionally proud because our judges have done something, — our District Court judges have done something that not very many people have been willing to do in Saskatchewan or any place else. They have, voluntarily, taken a decrease in salary, for very many years — since 1932 I believe, in order to assist the finances of this province. And I think that is something that they have never been given credit for, publicly, that I know of, and certainly this is something that the people of this province should appreciate. I would think that over the period of years from 1932, they have saved this province somewhere in the neighbourhood of around \$300,000 in salary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me, that in this House, a Bill of this type should be brought forth, to reduce the number of judges whose salaries in the main are not paid by this Legislature or the tax payers of Saskatchewan. They also make the appointments. The only thing that the Province of Saskatchewan pays is, according to Statutes, the sum of \$1,500 per year to each District

March 6, 1958

Court Judge for acting in the capacity of Surrogate Court judge, (which means dealing with estates and testamentary matters.)

Now, In 1932, I believe that is the correct date, the judges, due to the depressed state of the economy in Saskatchewan, made a 'gentlemen's agreement' so I understand, with the Government which was then in power and agreed to voluntarily take a cut of \$500 each, in order that the Province's finances would not suffer. And since 1932, those judges that were appointed then, and subsequently other judges who have accepted appointments, have as far as I know, never made any demand on the Government of Saskatchewan to raise their salaries to the point at which they were entitled to collect namely, \$1,500. But they have continued to take merely \$1,000 a year with the exception of, I believe, three judges who in the last two years have received \$1,500.

Now, I can see absolutely no reason, Mr. Speaker, to decrease the number of District Court judges in Saskatchewan. If we have any hope that this economy of ours is going prosper, that our population is going to grow, that there is any future in this province at all, one of the last things that we should do, is to decrease the access to justice which our people in this province have. Certainly this doing exactly that, I don't know anything that can lower the spirits of people, especially people who are not in the main centres like Regina and Saskatoon, more than to lose their District Court judge, or to lose the right to have a District Court judge once the one that they have retires or dies.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if you are aware, imagine you are of the unhappy spirit that surrounds so many small towns today, because shops are being closed, and although I am called unpatriotic when I draw it to the attention of this House but there is not a happy spirit of optimism in our country points. And this is just one more thing to further depress things.

A District Court judge in a small town is not a far-off figure. He is not something that just drops into town once or twice a year and dispenses justice or merely has the company of a few lawyers and is unknown to the general public. He is the personification of justice to most people in our country points. He is someone that they are close to. He is someone that they realize is a person and usually a very, very respected person who will see that their business and their estates are properly looked after.

Now, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there has been, perhaps unjustified — perhaps justified talk, about the unreliability of lawyers. So many of us have jokes made about us. We are called 'shysters', and so forth. I am not trying to justify us. I think

those epitaphs are, in the main, ill-deserved, but the fact remains that lawyers are largely looked upon with suspicion. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the case of judges. They are universally respected and looked up to and relied on, and, they give people a feeling of security. I do not know anything that is more important in order to have freedom and have security and a degree of happiness in our civilization today, than to feel that your liberties are going to be safeguarded and that you are close to justice. It is alright to say there is justice somewhere far away and somebody would look after your interests, but people have to feel that that justice is close.

And, I remember, Mr. Speaker, feeling that a Queen's Bench judge was rather cynical when he opened court when he had been newly appointed, welcoming the Bar to this particular sittings of the Court, expressed his belief with an old English legal writer by the name of Jeremy Bentham and said that not only is justice important, it is important to have the appearance of justice. The thing that makes them happy and secure and actually free is the appearance of justice. If anywhere the appearance of justice is personified in a person, it is in the persons of our District Court judges who are residents at country points; who are there, not only as judges, but they are there as people in whom other people have trust and respect. And they are not only important in the work that they do in their court rooms or the work they do in their Chambers which is not even largely understood by people, but they are important as symbols. And, they are important in the community work that they do. That importance cannot be minimized, because if you look at the list of directors of hospitals, advisory boards and various other very important organizations in any community, wherever there is a judge, you will see that he is assuming, in almost every case, a very important role and raising very much the standard in those communities. And I think that is very important. And all this, Mr. Speaker, the Legislature in the province of Saskatchewan gets for \$1,000 a year.

It is always shameful to have to put a price on a thing like this. What justification can there be for reducing the number? And past the number of 16, what justification can there be for allowing the Lieutenant Governor in Council, without consultation, without the advice such as it is, of this body, to be able to reduce it to two judges, if it so pleases, or no judges if he so pleases? I cannot understand the reasoning that would lead up to the introduction of this type of Act.

Now, there are going to be many other proposed judicial reforms and I wont go into those, but certainly I hope this Legislature, I speak most sincerely, aside from party lines, I hope will reconsider this. If so many of feel the District Court judges, or some District Court judges are not doing enough work, first of all ask yourselves, Mr. Speaker, whether you really realize how much work

March 6, 1958

a judge does. It is not measured in the number of court cases a year. It is not even measured in the number of applications that are formally presented to him in chamber. He is in constant contact with the Bar. He is in constant contact with people, for instance, who come in merely to get their citizenship papers. Those things are very, very important. There is no way in which District Court judges' work can be measured, even in hours, and certainly not in the amount of fees that a court house collects. To even think of that is ridiculous and repugnant to anybody's sense of justice, because justice cannot be measured in dollars and cents. I think these people are very important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from my political hue, you can be well assured that I am not very anxious that the present expiring Government should be allowed to make appointments. If there are any Conservatives who are going to get appointments, I do not think I am any more delighted than anyone else in the province, but at the same time, to spite somebody or to forestall somebody, I do not want to lose something that is good and desirable to my province.

Therefore, I will very strongly oppose the amendment to the District Court Act.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I listened and I am sure the whole House did with rapt attention to the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). I think that she laid before this House a concise and clear understanding and a sympathetic approach to the need for judges in our judicial District Courts. It is rather disturbing to me that I should see in this Bill, not only that judges will be reduced from 18 to 16, a reduction of two, which in itself may not be too great a thing, but " . . . or such lesser numbers as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time, by proclamation prescribe." Here we have an illustration, this evening, of a member of the Legislature bringing to the attention of this House as representatives of the people, some of the important work of judges. We as members of the Legislature, then, are in a position to hear the viewpoint of all of the Assembly, the members that are representing their people, and the most disturbing thing is that this Bill would take this right and privilege out of the hands of the Legislature and the sole judge as to how many judges we should have — the number of districts we should have, should be left to the Attorney General.

Now, the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, is only one man in all of Saskatchewan. While I do not question his judgment, we can err and he could possibly err too. I know of many occasions in the House which we have all experienced, a motion has been brought before the House and when we have had expressions of opinions from

various members, amendments have been brought in, to correct a situation which was brought to the attention of the House, which even the learned gentleman who drafted the Bill, for instance, had overlooked.

So there is no one person who is all-wise. There is no one person who is not subject to error. And I think that we are taking a very dangerous step when we leave it to the Attorney General to decide how many District Court judges we are going to have in this province. I think that the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) raised a very important point. We hear much about the development in Saskatchewan and we are proud of that development — let no one say otherwise. There is not a member here who is not interested in seeing the province go forward. We criticize the lack of progress but most of it is done from an interest in the province itself. Because I am sure that no one would rise and say that it was not the intention of the members of this House on any side, that we should not have a prosperous and flourishing Saskatchewan, an increase in population, opportunities for youth and all the rest that goes with a flourishing economy. We all want this. But surely, when we are reducing the District Court to the number suggested here and then leaving it to the Attorney General in the view of conditions of the time what he thinks he should reduce it to, I think we are admitting in this very fact, that we do not anticipate that Saskatchewan is going to grow and prosper and increase in population. Surely it is a defeatist attitude. It looks to me like a mopping-up operation rather than looking to the future with foresight and to the expectation of our population increasing and thus the need of these judges.

I think we are on very dangerous ground when we, the members of this Legislature, pass on the right that should be ours to the Attorney General, whether he wishes it or not. I think that is our responsibility as the Legislature, as representatives of the people to decide in our judgment how many District Court judges we should have. I think it is a very dangerous principle to put that judgment and that authority into the hands of one man.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — How many do you think we should have now?

Mr. Cameron: — For that reason, I am going to oppose that Bill on second reading.

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass a few remarks on what is contained in this Bill. I would like to concur with the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and also with the Acting Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Cameron). It appears to me that while there may be some districts in the province of Saskatchewan where we find a surplus of District Court judges, there are some

March 6, 1958

districts in the province who are now lacking this service. And I would like particularly, at this time, to draw the attention of the Attorney General to the fact that in the North part of Saskatchewan, there are no judges. We, at Meadow Lake, are only half way up the province of Saskatchewan and we have to go a hundred and some miles to find the services of a judge.

I would recommend that we consider that since we have a surplus of judges in the southern part of the province, one of these judges be appointed to the town of Meadow Lake.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Closing debate.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking tonight about Bill No. 54 and I think that it is premature to discuss the provisions of the other Bill, which may have some effect on the District Court later on. Bill No. 54 stands on its own merits and has nothing whatever to do with my other proposals which may be made in the form of legislation at a later date.

Bill No, 54 is justified on the basis of the facts as they stand today and it is not a part of any overall or general scheme. I want to say that, with most of the remarks of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), I am in hearty concurrence. I agree with her that it is hard to recruit judges, District Court judges or any other kind of judges, and magistrates as well. The reason, of course, is obvious; the salaries presently paid to District Court judges are no more than the average income of practicing lawyers in this country and the excitement of private practice is denied to the judge. The judge must settle himself into a rather staid and settled way of life, lacking a good deal in excitement. He cannot, for example, run for a seat in the Legislature; cannot serve in a political capacity; most of the really rewarding opportunities in life are denied to those who go on the Bench. And the salary of \$12,000 or \$13,000 a year is a poor compensation for the loss of private income and the loss of these opportunities. When I say that I think the salaries are low, I make no apology for proposing, as I will, to this Legislature, some change in the stipend of the Surrogate Court judges. The salaries are low for two reasons. They are low, primarily, for one reason and that is that the Federal authorities have not been able to persuade themselves that the salaries should be increased.

Undoubtedly they should be increased. Undoubtedly they should be increased substantially. One of the reasons why they have not been increased probably is, that it is common knowledge among those who have the deciding of Federal policies in this regard,

that to a very large extent and in a great many areas of this country a judgeship is not attended by any reasonable, or adequate amount of work to justify a salary. I make no apologies for saying that in this House. I've said it to the judges — that when almost a majority of the District Court judges are living in a state of semi-retirement, that it is very hard to convince the Federal Government that an increase in salary is justified under those circumstances.

I want to say a word here, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the judges. The judges have complained and made very strong representations, not only to me, but to my predecessor, I believe, that they be given more work to do. The present District Court judges are not happy about the situation where they are confronted by a legal problem, perhaps once only in a fortnight, or even less. They are not happy about that situation, and the number of District Court judges who have pleaded and implored to be given more work to do, would I think astonish this Legislature. Most of them have expressed an ardent desire and willingness to relieve and to serve in the cities where there is a larger amount of work to do, in order to keep their hand in the legal game. One of the ways of remedying this situation, of course, is to reduce the number of judgeships so that there will be enough work to go around and keep them reasonably happy. I want to say that I have confidence that the judges themselves will applaud any proposal which will give them more opportunity to do the work for which they were appointed.

Mrs. Batten: — They are not in a position to speak for themselves, though.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, I've been told this by many of them and I'm telling the House that in my opinion, that is how they feel. I should say that the criticism that a reduction of two in the number of District Court judges bespeaks a lack of confidence in the development in this province is, of course, just so much eye-wash.

Mr. Cameron: — Not two — it's down to five.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We're talking about Bill No. 54 for the benefit of my hon. friend who apparently doesn't understand how the rules of the House require a discussion of one subject at a time — one subject at a time before this House, and Bill No. 54 is the bill which is before us.

Bill No. 54 proposes a reduction in the number by two upon the retirement of the next two judges. I should say that we ought to have some sense of balance about these things, and some sense

March 6, 1958

of reasonable order about them. The Federal Government has to pay judges; I'm sure they would far rather pay 15 judges at a salary of \$15,000 a year than 18 judges at a salary of \$12,000 a year. The judges would be happier; everybody would be happier. I suggest that the idea this represents selling Saskatchewan short is just so much eye-wash. The province of Alberta, with more people than Saskatchewan has I believe 12 District Court judges, and the province of Manitoba if I'm not mistaken, has even less. The number of 18 — I don't know how it was arrived at, but at some time we had 18 judicial districts in this province, and then in a burst of optimism some government raised the number to 21, and sat apparently waiting to get appointments. The Federal Government was adamant, however, and said, "You've gone this far and this is far enough", and refused to go to the extra three, so it was left at 18. The number of 18 may have been justified at one stage in the history of our province, when transportation difficulties were much greater than they are today, when the sparseness of the population required that judges be local residents of the community. But we have now in Saskatchewan a Court of Queen's Bench centred principally in the city of Regina. Can anyone say that the sense of justice or dignity which the Court — which the judges of the Queen's Bench lends to their court is any less because they reside at Regina than the District Court judge in Humboldt lends to his Court? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in this day of modern communication and transportation, the conditions which were warranted in 1927 necessarily do not have any application today.

It is suggested that the small centres will lose their resident District Court judge as a result of this reduction in the number by two. I would point out that the Law Society, the Culliton Committee and many other representations have been received, suggesting that there should be three District Court judges in Saskatoon and three in Regina. It is proposed that the number shall be only two at each of these places and by virtue of later Legislation which may be submitted to provide for a province-wide jurisdiction so that it will not be necessary to have three in Regina and three in Saskatoon, but only two in each. And this reduction of two in the total number will not effect any further reduction in the smaller judicial centres, but will merely enable Regina and Saskatoon to get by with only two apiece instead of three apiece. Surely that is not going to affront or inconvenience the people of the smaller judicial centres who would otherwise have a resident District Court judge.

The member for Maple Creek suggests that it is dangerous for the Attorney General to be able to determine it. Well, I suggest that that is not before the House at this time, but since my hon. friend raised it, it is not proposed that the Attorney General

will determine the number of District Court judges. It is proposed that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may by proclamation reduce or increase the number of judges . . .

Mr. Cameron: — It doesn't say increase.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . or reduce the number of . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I say further reduce.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . reduce the number of District Court . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I said . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I suggest that there is nothing inherently dangerous about that; that this House would very probably and very likely accept the recommendation of the Government if it was ever necessary to make such a reduction.

Mrs. Batten: — What choice have we?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — But that is not the issue. The fact is that when it becomes desirable to make a reduction, it is important that a reduction be made at a particular time; when a vacancy occurs. I submit that it is not fair to the incumbent judge to allow him to be appointed in August and then in April reduce the numbers. If it is suggested that to reduce the number to take effect only on retirement, then what you are in effect doing is denying the Legislature the right to reduce the number.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, this legislation doesn't suggest that somebody can be disqualified after an appointment. There is no such suggestion in the proposed legislation.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend did not follow what I was saying. What I said was that if this Legislature is to reduce the number of judges and to have the final say in when the number is to be reduced, it can only do so by making one judge judgeless from a particular date on. If this Legislature is going to have the absolute control over the number of judges and if at some session in March or in April it passes legislation reducing the number of the Court, either one of two things is going to happen. Either the legislation cannot go into effect until there is a retirement or the legislation goes into effect at once and judge is without a position. It cannot be any other way. The only way which this

Legislature can give effect to a desire to reduce the number of judges is to provide that the number be reduced at the instant of a retirement. It is no use talking about reducing the number of judges at any other time. I suggest, therefore, that the only way that any reduction can be affected is to permit the reduction to be made at the time a vacancy occurs — not at any other time. Otherwise it would be unfair to the incumbent judge or, in the alternative, it would be completely ineffective. It would not secure the desired result of reducing the size of the Court. So that, if any reduction is to be made, it must be made at the time of a vacancy occurring, and that is when a session of the Legislature is not being held, in most cases.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that, the hon. members opposite had no reason to believe that I, or the Government, are interested in, in any way, sabotaging or, in any way, interfering with the efficient functioning of our judicial system. I think that the people who make up the Executive Council are perhaps in a better position to know, at any particular time, whether or not a reduction is possible. Certainly, if the hon. members find that we have erred, they can chastise us; they can make it clear that they disapprove of the action which has been taken. I want to say that as the nominal head of the administration of justice in this province that I take a great deal of pride and satisfaction in feeling that I have some sense of propriety in these matters; that there will be no drastic or sudden reductions which will cause public inconvenience or cause the consternation of my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. Cameron: — So you say

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My hon. friend from Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) said something about the lack of a judge at Meadow Lake. Well, again I do not want to transgress the rules by anticipating legislation which may be submitted at a later date, but the whole purpose of that Legislation is to provide the degree of flexibility necessary, so that we can have judicial services at the smaller centres of the province that are not now serviced by Court Houses. And, Meadow Lake, probably, would be one of the places that would be given early consideration in providing such services.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is one other consideration that we should have in mind. I have given figures to this House. I have supplied every member of this House with a copy of the Culliton Committee Report and any member who took the trouble to peruse that report, will know that at the present time, perhaps twelve of the District Court judges could conveniently do the work of the District Court in this province — the same number they have in Alberta. And since it is the responsibility of the province to prescribe the

constitution of our Courts, we have a duty to perform here in Saskatchewan. It is true that the Federal authorities pay the salaries and my hon. friend from Humboldt professes not to be able to understand why we should be concerned about reducing the size of the judges.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I mean the size of the Court.

Mrs. Batten: — I am not interested, in the size of the judges!

Some Opposition Members: — You are running away with your own oratory there.

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member meant to say, but if he meant to say that I was not interested in how much money the Federal Government had to pay, that is not true. All I said is that it was not costing the people of Saskatchewan and this particular body anymore than \$1,000 a year for each District Court judge. That is not the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I understood my hon. friend to ask me why it was that we were concerned about this matter. And, I propose to deal with that point in any case. We have the responsibility for prescribing the constitution of the Courts. The Federal Government must pay their salaries. Theoretically, I suppose, we could go to them and squeeze them for more judges and more judges and more judges on the grounds that it does not cost us any money. Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have a joint responsibility with the Federal Government to provide an adequate judicial system in this province, an efficient judicial system in this province, and it is up to us to use the best judgment and discretion which they have, in appointing fit and qualified people to those positions.

I could not justify in my own conscience or to the people of Saskatchewan maintaining a constitution of District Courts when it is clear and obvious to everyone that they are 50 per cent over-staffed in the number of judges. Just because the Federal Government pays that \$100,000 or \$120,000 does not let me off the hook. We are all tax payers in Canada and we have a responsibility in these matters. Our responsibility is to see to it that the judicial system of this province functions as effectively and as efficiently as it can do and to provide judicial services as equally as possible to

March 6, 1958

all the people of this province on a fair and equal basis. It is our responsibility to discharge that onus and if we can do it at less cost, we owe it to the people of Canada, the tax-payers of Canada to do it, and I propose to discharge my duties. Mr. Speaker, in that regard, I have no hesitation in supporting this motion.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Attorney General one question? What did you mean by, when you referred to 'we' and 'us' and 'our' responsibilities? Do you mean the Legislature or do you mean the Cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I speak of the Government of Saskatchewan which comprises the Legislature and the Executive Council.

Mr. Cameron: — No. It does not.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The Government of Saskatchewan comprises the Legislature and the Executive Council and the Lieutenant Governor.

The question being put, it was agreed to by 31 to 14; and the Bill referred to Committee of the Whole at the next Sitting.

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