

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Thirteenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 20, 1959

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): - Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. members to the group of 4-H Club students from Clair, who are sitting in the gallery today. I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming them to this Chamber. It is the first time most of them have had an opportunity to see the Legislative Building, and I hope they enjoy their stay here, this afternoon.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): - Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of this Assembly the students who have come to visit for a very short time from Pleasantdale, Naicam and Spalding. They are the good looking ones that you can recognize up in your balcony, Mr. Speaker.

They are going to visit the Museum and I hope they will find that we are not 'dead life', natural or otherwise, here; so I hope we will have lots of action, this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Willis (Minister of Public Works): - Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity, too, of expressing my welcome, along with the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), to those good looking pupils who are up in the gallery, as part of them come from the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. This is the first time that there has been a group of students from Melfort-Tisdale constituency here while the Session has been assembled. I want to congratulate those people who have been responsible for them visiting here, and I hope that this will become an annual occurrence.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): - Mr. Speaker, my good looking group hasn't arrived yet, but I want to assure the House they will probably be the best looking of all. At least they will be refreshing young farm boys; they are second year students of the Vocational School of Agriculture. They will be with us, later this afternoon; they are going through the building at the moment. I want, on behalf of the House, to extend to them a most hearty welcome. I have assured them that I thought they would enjoy the proceedings here, and that they would have a welcome from the Legislature.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, February 19, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Bengough) for the Address-in-Reply, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McDonald.

Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): - Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate and resume, today, from where I left off yesterday, I wish again to compliment the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, to compliment the speakers who have spoken previously and to especially compliment the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) for the very forceful manner in which he drew to the attention of the people of this province the problems confronting them at this time, after 14 years of a socialist C.C.F. government.

When I adjourned the debate, yesterday afternoon, I said I would like to deal, today, with some of the matters pertaining particularly to the agricultural segment of our province. I said, yesterday, that the Speech from the Throne, as far as agriculture is concerned, was one of the barest documents ever presented to the Legislature in this House. When I point out some of the problems and some of the conditions which the agricultural economy is faced with in this province today, after 14 years, I think my hon. friends will agree with me.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Premier in replying to the Leader of the Opposition, this year as compared to last year. Last year, in an attempt to defend his policies, he said the Leader of the Official Opposition had made more mis-statements per minute than any man he had ever heard. But what happened to the Premier this year when he was trying to defend the policies and the actions of his government? He begged leave, when he was faced with some of his own statements of the past, to say that he had been misquoted.

One of the most important things that is taking place in this province, today – yes, and in all western Canada – is the delegation that is going to Ottawa to interview the Federal Government on behalf of the farmers and businessmen of this province and the other two western provinces. There has been some accusation that this was not a 'grass-roots' movement. There has been some doubt as to why this movement was started; and I would suggest to members in the House that the reason why this delegation is going to Ottawa is that farmers and businessmen are joining in a large delegation to the Federal Government in Ottawa to seek fulfilment of promises made by the Prime Minister and his colleagues that would help alleviate the economic plight foisted on the people of this province, to a large degree, as a result of the brutal policies of state ownership and control imposed on them by the socialist doctrines of the present C.C.F. Government.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: - It is interesting to note, and we have heard in the country, that promises of deficiency payments have never been given by the Prime Minister at Ottawa or any of his colleagues.

That is their story today; but I would like to draw to the attention of the members of this House a statement made in the press on May 9, 1957, and this is credited to the Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker, now Prime Minister. It reads like this:

“For prairie farmers in particular it is proposed that the Federal treasury help farmers carry the loss when wheat is exported at below domestic prices to good customers in the Commonwealth and elsewhere.”

Now in legal terms – I am not a legal man, I am a farmer; and in legal terms that may be the way he saw fit to issue the statement, but to the farmers and the plain grass-roots people of this province it simply means deficiency payments.

The Premier has stated in the course of his remarks that the big ‘bogey man’ in an unplanned economy is agricultural surpluses. I want to deal with some of the matters in our own provinces which could be alleviated by this Provincial Government and the Minister of Agriculture, if they saw fit to help the farmers of Saskatchewan.

It was quite interesting to me to follow very closely the Dairy Convention which took place in this city just a week or ten days ago, and to know that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) was guest speaker at that convention. As I have said before in this House, I am a dairy man and a farmer myself, and so it was of very great interest to me to follow the proceedings of that convention. I am going to point out once again to the members of this House that, a few years ago, we had a surplus of butter in Canada, and you all know the agreements that were set up for the different provinces of Canada for the institutions within the provinces at that time. The Federal Government of the day offered butter, in order to reduce its stockpile, at three pounds for the price of two. Today, the dairy industry is facing the same problem. Today, they have a surplus of butter looming in sight – and what have the dairy producers proposed to do about it? They have said rather than have a decrease in the price for butter they would rather reduce production.

I was amazed when I read from a clipping of a newspaper what the Minister of Agriculture of this province said to the dairymen at their convention, and how he treated the agricultural problem in this province. This is what he had to say, Mr. Speaker, in brief. He said the gross agricultural produce of Canada was worth \$2,800,000 to farmers, yet it was sold to consumers for \$6 million. Then he said:

“No solution has been found; the problem is so simple and logical that the solution must also be simple and logical.”

Now I was surprised that the Minister of Agriculture would attend a dairy convention, in view of the fact that surpluses are looming up in the butter industry; but what he did not tell that dairy convention is that, in a period of six years in this province, from 1950 to 1956, when this Government had the opportunity to help farmers of the province and buy the butter produced in this province and give it to the people in institutions, within that period of time

not one pound of butter was bought for the Saskatchewan hospital at Weyburn; not one pound of butter was bought for the inmates of the Saskatchewan hospital at North Battleford; only 31 pounds were bought for the Saskatchewan Training School, and only 528 pounds were bought for the Physical Restoration Centre at Saskatoon. Since 1950, the Saskatchewan Government has bought, for the four institutions, a total of only 559 pounds of butter valued at only \$341. What any dairyman at that convention could have told the Minister was that all the butter that his own Government had bought from the farmers of this province for those six years was less than the production of any one of their dairy cows. So you have less than a 'one cow' government!

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this helping the farmer provide for his family? Is this helping to strengthen the agricultural economy of this province? Is this helping to protect the family farm? Yet, in the same period they could spend over \$200,000 on radio, TV and newspaper advertising. In fact, up until 1957, the total expenditures on that one item alone amounted to over \$581,381 - \$300 for the farmer and \$581,000 for propaganda! So, instead of protecting your family farms in this province, your attitude has been 'propaganda before butter'.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: - Another place where there has been discrimination against the people of this province - the ones who live on the farms in this province - is in your electrification program. I don't intend to go into all that, this afternoon, because it would take practically a whole session; but I want to point out that consumption rates for electricity are being extended to the farmers in Manitoba 70 per cent cheaper than they are costing the farmers in this province. We face a grave situation and I want to take a few minutes, this afternoon, to draw attention to some of the policies of this Government at the present time in regard to electrification.

I have before me a letter which I don't intend to read, but I do want to read the reply to it. It is a letter addressed to myself, explaining a situation which is arising in parts of this province. I am just going to give you the details behind it, and they are these. A group of farmers in my own seat had sought rural electrification. They were promised that if they got 40 farmers in the group and paid \$550 each, \$50 would be refunded if it was paid in cash, after the power had been installed. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, that promise was made in 1956, and 1956 may have been a significant year. The 40 farms were electrified; the deal had been made. They wrote to the Power Corporation for the \$50 refund, and no refund was forthcoming. I want to read the answer from the Power Corporation. If any of the hon. gentlemen want a copy they can get it from the Power Corporation. In part, here is the answer:

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 5, 1959, inquiring as to why the Power Corporation are allowing a \$50 reduction on the area coverage price which took effect on the 1958 program."

And further on it says this:

“The power Corporation to date has been able to electrify some 50,000 farms. This, of course, could only have been done with the help of citizens such as yourself who have contributed so much in bringing the benefits of electrical living to their farms in this province. As you mentioned, it does appear to be quite unfair and perhaps a bit discriminating.”

They were told they could have the refund of \$50, then they write in, and are told: “Well, you have had the advantages of electrical living which you should appreciate, and so now you can extend it to other farmers in the province.”

I was quite amazed, as I said yesterday, to see a little item here in the Speech from the Throne, that running water and flush toilets would be brought about for rural homes. I just want to say this. The day before, in Public Accounts Committee, we asked how much it cost to build the outside toilet on the Legislative grounds and what do you think the answer was, Mr. Speaker? It was astounding. The cost was \$14,800! So I am going to say that if you are going to install flush toilets for the farmer, and have him pay three times as much as we had to do as compared to the urban dwellers for electrical installation, then \$14,800 times three is fantastic. I don't think there will be many farmers who would bite on your flush-toilet program.

A few months ago there was quite a controversy between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and a private corporation in Moose Jaw. The Premier mentioned in his remarks that there was room in this province for public and private enterprise. I would suggest that the one thing that is embarrassing the Power Corporation and this Government the most is the private corporation at Moose Jaw. They tried to point out that the private corporation had picked all the ‘gravy’; but what they did not point out was that any farmer who applied to the National Light and Power in Moose Jaw for electrification, was told that if he wanted electrification, they had to put it in at the same rate charged by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. So what hope has private enterprise got in this province against a state monopoly? That is another case where you have rank discrimination against the farming people of this province.

Mention was made also by the Premier of the grid supplying Brandon from Estevan. That is something which is not new. A few years back, the Manitoba Power Commission offered to hook up with Saskatchewan farms, and give them electrification at the same rate as applied to the Manitoba farmers. At that time the Government of this province would not give that permission. So I think when they try to take credit because they are going to extend the line to Brandon, we ought to put the true picture and the true facts before the people of this province.

I want to deal for a few minutes with another source of rank discrimination against the people of this province, in my opinion the cruellest tax ever imposed on any segment of the people of Saskatchewan. I refer to the

Mineral Tax imposed by the C.C.F. Government on the farmers. It is a tax for something that, in many cases, does not even exist. This tax of three cents per acre could yield 12 cents per acre. Arrears of this tax have built up to the point where, a year ago, they were almost \$1 million. At that same time, 412 separate parcels of land comprising 47,564 acres had reverted to the Crown, and unless the arrears of taxes are paid, the mineral rights on many more parcels will do the same. This has been the result this Government hoped to achieve. Some farmers have been given notice of the tax arrears on their property as late as 10 years after this tax had come into force, and you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the terrific amount of arrears that have been built up in that period of time. During that period, they did not help the farmer understand the tax; instead, a year ago, they saw fit to send out this insignificant letter. Rather than help the farmer by the terms or the language of the letter, it only sought to belittle them. Just as an indication – here they have a poor old farmer, a white hat, straw in his hair, a red face, and riding a donkey! I think possible the donkey is supposed to represent the Provincial Government! This is what they intend to say – some of the mineral tax arrears go all the way back for 14 years. That's bad, because each year the pay-off gets a little bigger. "It sure ain't no way to run a business" – either yours or the Government's. I can certainly agree with that; it certainly is not. Did they explain the way there could be a 12-cent per acre levy instead of three? Did they explain how the arrears were sent out 10 years after the Act came into force? I have one tax notice right here with me now, and it was sent out December 30, 1955, and the arrears on that parcel amounted to \$105.60 – this, after the farmer in question did not even know whether he owned the mineral rights! There is another indication of rank discrimination against the farmers of this province.

What has been the result of this tax? We have had commissions, court hearings, confusion and chaos. The Speech from the Throne indicates nothing tangible that will correct the situation in the province at the present time. One of the Ministers made the statement that, if they were to protect or warn the farmers, they would be infringing on private rights; and it was amazing to me to read in a newspaper, about a month ago, that instructions had been sent out to people in towns, villages, etc., warning them not to let peddlers come in, and try to 'gyp' them of some money on different bids. They were told to place a little card in the window, and if any peddler saw the card in the window, and still came into the house, they were to report to the R.C.M.P. Now, I wonder what it would be like if they sent the same letter out to all the farmers, telling them to put a little card in the window to stoop lease-hounds from taking advantage of them.

I want to point out the tremendous increase in school taxes and municipal taxes as a result of 14 years of policies of this Government, and the tremendous arrears that have built up, in spite of 15 of the most prosperous years this province has ever enjoyed in regard to production of crops, livestock and by-products. I am going to quote the school tax figures, and bring them up to date. They are from a brief that was presented to this Government by the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association.

The school tax figures for 1957 show the following increase since the C.C.F. Government took office, or since 1944: Cities – from \$2,658,000 up to \$9,330,000 in 1957, or an increase of 251 per cent, or nearly four

times as much. Towns - \$634,000 up to \$3,088,000, or 387 per cent increase, or nearly four times as much; Villages - \$687,000 up to \$2,109,000, a 207 per cent increase, or over three times as much; Rurals - \$5,630,000 up to \$17,453,000 – a 210 per cent increase and over three times as much.

Total taxes in that period of time have increased on the averages by three and one-half times as much. The average school tax per farm in 1957 was \$174. The average municipal tax per farm in 1957 was \$372. According to the School Trustees' Brief in 1956, the average tax paid by the people of Saskatchewan amounted to \$73 per person. This was the highest municipal tax in any province in Canada, except Ontario. The income per person in Ontario was considerably higher than that in Saskatchewan. Per capita income is the measure of ability of people to pay taxes; it shows what an average income is. In Saskatchewan in 1956, the municipal tax was a considerably larger part of the per capita income than in any other province. Per capita municipal taxes have increased from \$37 per person in 1944 to \$79 in 1957. The average rural municipal taxes, \$29 in 1944, were \$99 in 1957. By March 31, 1958, total accumulated arrears for all municipalities showing deficits increased during 1957-58 from the year before; there were eight more towns, 51 more villages and 48 more municipalities.

Mention was made in the Speech from the Throne of roads. The Government takes credit for the tremendous increase in expenditure on roads. Now, we do not dispute the Government's figures. We all know that tremendous spending projects are going on by this Government; but what we in the country are concerned with is whether this money is being spent efficiently, is being spent wisely.

I would like to point out one instance where the tremendous expenditures have not been justified. I want to cite the case of Highway No. 39 which runs from near Regina into and through the Premier's constituency. This was an outstanding example of misuse of public money for highway construction. Before 1948, parts of this highway were re-built and the whole was blacktopped. The cost of this project was about \$2¾ million. The work was rushed to make as good a showing as possible before the 1948 election, and, because of the haste and faulty methods of construction, this road was worn out in three or four years. The blacktop disintegrated; huge ruts developed over sections of the road by 1952. Trucks broke down; cars could not pass each other, and the highway had to be re-built before the 1948 election. It was then completed, and another one built at a cost of \$5½ million. Then they boast about the huge and lavish sums they are spending on highways!

I want to point up the results of those different policies on the rural population of this province. In the years 1946 to 1956, we had a loss of over 22,000 farm units. In this period, arrears of municipal taxes had risen to over \$16 million, and arrears in the larger school units to almost \$10 million. On top of that, after losing 22,000 farm units, we had a loss of population of 200,000 rural people from the years 1946 to 1956. I would point out, also, that the high per capita cost of municipal taxation in this province will become higher as the rural people diminish in population. So, when we point out the different discriminating policies of the present

Government on the people of this province, we can only see that present Government policy is not to help the people, but to try and eliminate the farm problems of this province by eliminating the farm population.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: - What have they done to protect the people? We all know that, in spite of the denial by the Premier of statements made at Gull Lake some years ago, in regard to eviction, we still have had over 2,000 evictions and cancellations of agreement and mortgages in this province. To check on the reason that the farmers are faced with the financial difficulties they confront at the present time, and to place the blame right on the shoulders of where the responsibility belongs, all we need do is look at the budget allocation for agriculture in Saskatchewan, as compared with Ottawa. In Saskatchewan, we find that only 3.5 per cent of the revenues were allocated to the farmers of this province last year. Even worse is that the Conservative Government at Ottawa, in their estimated expenditures for this year, have allocated only 1.07 per cent. So I think the farmers and the businessmen have every justification for taking their case to the Federal Government. I would suggest that when they come back, they make arrangements to present their case to the Government of this province, also.

The Premier seems to dwell on the fact that the farmers and the labouring people of this province should amalgamate, and I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that, in view of the past record of the Government of this province in its discrimination against the farmers, and in view of those who seem to be heading up the international unions which he would try and have the farmers amalgamate with, I know for a fact that the farmers will have no part in any such unholy union. The reason they are not going to have any part in such an unholy union at the present time can well be pointed out by a little article in 'Reader's Digest'. In that article it suggests – yes, the Government may commend themselves, and smile complacently; but here is why the farmers are not going to have any part in it: because the leader of the international union, as listed in this article, has 17 colleagues with crime records. Of the men close to him, there are five dozen who have been tried for crimes up to and including murder. The people of this province have nothing against unions; but they do not want to be controlled by unions from outside Canada. They will belong to a respectable union, but not anything that seeks to govern their lives and their affairs.

The fact that this Government has had no definite ideas of how to assist the agricultural economy is not any surprise to me, because their own provincial President has pointed out to them – I wish to quote some of his words; this is taken from 'The Forum' April, 1952, and he has this to say:

“Who nowadays is either much disturbed or much aroused by the socialist program, and where can you find a Socialist Party that has had a fresh idea in the last ten years.”

That was Dr. Carlyle King who said that in 1952, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that same thought runs through your Speech from the Throne. Do you know

what he went on further to say? These are not my words, they are his:

“Do you know what is wrong with the C.C.F. Party? Not enough of your leaders have been in jail.”

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - Not that they shouldn't have been!

Mr. McFarlane: - Because we have had 14 years now in which individual freedom in this province has become more restricted every day; 14 years in which we have been access to the Courts being denied in favour of Government Boards; 14 years in which we have had some of the greatest economic bungling under socialist-planned economy and socialist planners; 14 years of rank discrimination against the farming people of this province. And, because the Speech from the Throne, as outlined by the Premier, would only point up more of this type of regimentation, I have no alternative but to support the amendment introduced by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald), which reads:

“We respectfully submit that in the opinion of this Assembly, Your Honour's advisers have failed to take action to lower farmers' production costs, or to provide urgently needed financial assistance to local governments.”

Therefore, because the original motion offers no positive security for farmers of the province; because it offers no constructive ideas or corrective program for the agricultural economy, I will not support the motion.

Mr. Barrie (Pelly): - Mr. Speaker, I want to join with all previous speakers in this debate, extending to the mover and seconder of the motion now being debated before the House, my congratulations on having done a very good job with a very difficult task, when you take into consideration the material contained in the Speech from the Throne – or I might say the lack of material contained in it, with which we have to work. I also want to extend my congratulations to all those speakers who have thus far taken part in this debate, and particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), for the very illuminating address he made in this debate last Tuesday, and particularly for the various items and points which he brought forward which were not contained in any forecast of legislation or policy of the Government, on behalf of the agricultural people of this province.

The Speech from the Throne, in my opinion, was a very keen disappointment, and was barren of any forecast, as I have already mentioned, of any real assistance to our farm population, who find themselves in very difficult circumstances at this particular time. I don't think any person in this province will deny this particular problem, which is facing the agricultural people, and which reflects into the rest of the economy of the province, is not urgent and serious; because we have had, in recent weeks, a

very intensive indication of that very thing, in the response that has been given to the farm organizations and other organizations in what is called the "March to Ottawa" – not only response in signing the petition, but also very substantial financial response, and this work, the promotion, has been entered into by all classes of people in the province. Chambers of Commerce in many towns have conducted the canvass, and they have well over 200,000 names on the petition. I understand that petition to the Government at Ottawa is going to be presented within a matter of about two weeks by a delegation of over 500 people from this province. In view of some of the things that have been said in this House by previous speakers in this debate, particularly some of the things which were just mentioned by the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane), I think these people who have these several and urgent problems on their doorsteps are perfectly justified in the action they are taking, because in the past, and no doubt in recent months, we have had delegations go from the farm organizations, and various other bodies in this province, in small numbers to Ottawa. We have heard very little about it. Of course, results have been nil; but this move surely is justified in trying to bring about some publicity, which will not only have effect on the Government of Canada, but also on the people in other parts of Canada, to this immediate problem.

When we look at the inaction of this Government in this province we see some of the things that are not done, which might have been done to relieve part of the difficulties which our farm population are experiencing. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, this particular problem is largely and substantially that of Federal Government action, still it doesn't relieve this Government of some responsibility. The member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley just spoke before me, and he made some reference to when this "March to Ottawa" was over, that consideration might be given by the farm organizations and farmers in this province to a "March on Regina"; and I must say, I think that might possibly be justified, too. I think it would receive throughout the province of Saskatchewan the same wide-spread support, both personal and financial support, that the "March on Ottawa" has received up until this time.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: - I want to deal with just one small item that affects the farmers of this province, and I believe this Government, and particularly the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) will have this brought to his attention by numerous people, at various times, and that is in connection with the timber in this province, and the process by which the farm people in this province have to obtain timber grown and produced in Saskatchewan for use on their farms. Prior to the holding of office in this province of the present Government, the administrations previously had a very different policy, and, as it affected farm people in particular, it meant that farmers, particularly those close to the wooded areas, were able with a very small cash outlay, and some effort and energy on their own part, and some hard work, to obtain lumber to build houses, livestock housing, and all the necessary uses of lumber on their farms, for a very nominal fee. But many years have elapsed since that policy was in effect, and today we find many of those same farmers have reason for wanting a considerable amount of lumber, in some cases, to repair those buildings that were built

with the cheap lumber, and, in some cases, to replace them entirely and in many cases, where they have gone into livestock, to provide new buildings for their farm operations, particularly for housing livestock.

Today we find in this so-called 'socialist' province a real monopoly here in the Saskatchewan Timber Board. They monopolize, by the favour of the Government, all spruce lumber produced in the province. There is no policy whereby a farmer with a small cash outlay today can go and obtain the lumber; but he is forced to go to the Timber Board and pay exorbitant prices – as much as they can get for this spruce lumber – and in many cases it is grown and produced just a few miles from his farmstead. I think if we look over the annual reports of the Saskatchewan Timber Board, no one will deny the fact there have been tremendous profits. This particular Board, with the Department of Natural Resources – the peculiar part, to my mind, is that it has been sponsored, promoted and owes its being to those people who do not believe in profits. The result is that this very matter (you may call it a small matter) of the high prices the farm people have to pay for building materials today, certainly enters into the cost of production on the farm. This is something this Government could do something about. The result is that many of the farmers, today, have not the financial capacity to buy lumber at these high prices, and those who are able, well then, it is certainly an added cost to their farming operations. Those that are not able to purchase lumber at those terrifically high prices, suffer in their production and probably are in a stage of carrying on their farming services in a manner that is uneconomical. So I say this is one item this Government has some responsibility for, and could assist the so-called cost-price squeeze of the farmers, and not endeavour continually to try and lay the whole responsibility on the Government in Ottawa, irrespective of who they may be.

Now I want to turn to certain remarks made by the Premier of the province on Wednesday. I was rather amazed when he seemed to take great credit and made great claims about the millions of dollars this Government has spent during their term of office. Well, I don't think anybody will dispute the fact that they have been, and are, very lavish spenders. I think in many, many cases they have gone to the extent of extreme extravagance, but they have had, fortunately for them, the ability to spend at this very high rate because they, for most of the time they have been in office, have enjoyed the greatest period of prosperity this province, and the people of this province, have ever experienced up until this time, with the result they are collecting very high taxes, and they have huge extra revenues coming in compared with what governments of other days had, and they have financed a lot of this spending by very large borrowing on the credit of this province. The Federal subsidy they receive under the Federal-Provincial Agreement, and which was mentioned by the Premier himself, on Wednesday, in recent years has amounted to as much as, or in some cases more than, the total budget of previous administrations prior to 1944. That being the case, we would naturally expect we should have much more in the way of provincial services; much more in the way of provincial public buildings and roads; there should be larger grants for education, hospitalization, and such like. We should have better power and telephone facilities than we have before, with the tremendous amount of money that has been spent, and spent on such a large scale, we naturally expect something for it. I don't think they can take too great

credit for what we have today, seeing they bragged about their extravagant expenditures. But is large-scale spending any criterion to go by as to prudent, sound, economical administration? I think the measure to go by is the value received for such expenditures, and if we apply that yardstick to this Government, then I will say it has failed miserably. I doubt very much if we have received full advantage, full value, and full benefit for the tremendous expenditures they have made.

I want to point out that this and succeeding generations have, are and will pay dearly for these extravagances and these huge expenditures the Premier seems to take credit for and is so proud of.

Now I wish to turn to something a little different. The members of the Legislature know due to certain agreements, I have a very limited time, but I would be remiss in my duties as representative of the Pelly constituency if I did not make some mention of our native population, the Indians. I was very pleased to see, and to know, in the summer of 1958 there was convened in the city of Regina – or I believe it was at Fort Qu'Appelle, to be correct – a Conference of all Indian chiefs and councillors and certain officials of various departments of Government, to discuss the problems of our Indian population. I noticed in the Speech from the Throne it forecasts a similar conference, or a continuing conference, this coming summer, and I sincerely hope something really worthwhile will come out of these conferences. I want to point out one other thing, and that is the Government of this country and the Government of this province, and the non-Indian population are the people who must provide the leadership in any change for betterment the Indians are going to have. They are a very deserving group, but while small, they have had very little attention up until this time, I regret to say. They have been too long treated by us white people, or so-called white people, as second-class members of our society, and they have developed, due to our attitude to a very large degree, an inferiority complex, and they cannot be expected and they will not, I say, be able, to provide the initiative to help themselves. So I hope that out of these conferences some of our Government's men – some of our citizens – will take hold of this particular problem and try to evolve some system of leadership whereby they can be integrated into our society. One of the first moves, I believe, that should be made, because I believe it would be the thing that possibly would lift the Indian up and make him believe he was being treated equally with others, is the granting of the franchise. It might go a long way to restoring his pride of his race.

There is one other matter in this connection, one, I think, I have spoken of before in this House, and that is we have to take the responsibility for most of the Indian's problem, and one of the worst problems, if not the worst, which has to do with most of the trouble our Indian population gets into, is the consumption of alcohol. This particular problem is entirely due, in my opinion, to the existing laws and regulations affecting the consumption of alcohol by Indians, and it has probably promoted within them a greater desire for use of alcohol, and consumption of alcohol, than if they had been used, had been treated, and had been extended the same privileges as you and I. I notice from the Bills that are on our file here that a move has been made, with the consent of the Federal Government, to extend to these Indians a privilege equal to the rest of the population. It is my personal opinion

that doing so will tend to solve the major part of the problems now confronted by the Indians. We have had within the Pelly constituency, in the matter of a few weeks past, three murders on Indian reservations, and in each and every case alcohol was at the bottom of it. So I hope I will not be misunderstood when I make a plea in this Legislature, and I hope it will be heeded outside, that people don't want to have stuffy, bigoted ideas regarding alcohol and Indians.

I want to turn now to a matter that is probably getting closer to my home – the summer resort of Madge Lake. I mentioned this resort previously in the House, and I believe Madge Lake is a very well-known resort in this province, which, situated in Duck Mountain Forest Reserve, is one that is patronized by many people, some of them from very long distances. But by far and the large majority of people who go to Madge Lake during the summer months to enjoy some relaxation, and take their families there on picnics and that kind of thing are from within the range of 35 to 40 miles of the resort. Last summer we had a very unfortunate incident, I don't know why; but in the resort area, around Ministik, the Government-owned and operated concession and cabins, and in the privately owned cabin area, we had a terrific time with bears. Some consider this a joke, but it was a very serious problem there, because most people are afraid of bears, and particularly so when, later on last summer, we found in the province of Alberta a young girl at a similar resort was not only molested by a bear, but was killed. Many people in the Madge Lake resort brought this to the attention of certain officials of the Department, and asked why something could not be done to remove or destroy these animals that were running at large – not one or two, but many of them – and it went unheeded, with the result that, to my personal knowledge, many families with small children, who have made it a practice year after year of going to Madge Lake and spending a few days or a few weeks, were so upset over this particular condition that the mother packed up her children and took them back to the farm, or village or town, or wherever they came from. The bears were allowed to roam at large all summer, and in the fall they did a very substantial amount of damage to private property, and to Government property. Finally, late in the fall or early winter, they decided to destroy them, and I believe there were 15 or 18 bears shot, surrounding the resort area at Madge Lake, last fall. I hope the Minister of Natural Resources in particular will consider this matter favourably, and give consideration to this. If they do not want to destroy these animals, if they are there another year, then move them out to some other part of the reserve so that they won't bother and annoy people who are trying to relax.

I just want to mention two or three other small items in connection with these summer resorts, and what happened, last year, at his resort at Madge Lake. People go out during the summer to enjoy a few weeks relaxation and in some cases a few days. Most of those people are not law-breakers. Most of them obtain a fishing licence if they are going to fish, and try to keep within the laws, and they try to relax, and so on. But we have regulations. My personal opinion is and was, in connection with fishing that certain people in the Department are misinterpreting these regulations. I am just going to give you one example. It says in the angling regulation, or the 'Angling Guide' put out by the Department, that no person shall, while angling, use more than one fishing line, except in winter angling through

ice. I am not an expert fisherman, but I find the majority of sport fishermen are something like a golfer; when they go out to fish, they have three or four rods. Most of them, I believe, have very expensive rods and reels they use for casting, and then they have a rod that they use for trolling behind their boat; they have a cheaper rod, a stubby, short rod, and then they have a third one that they use for still-fishing. So it appears the interpretation given by the Department officials to that particular thing is those people are committing an infraction of the law, if they are found on the lake in their boat with more than one rod to a licence. So, for a man to go out fishing he has to anticipate before he leaves shore whether he is going to troll, cast or still-fish. I don't know who is responsible for drawing up these regulations, but my personal opinion is, and I have argued this with certain officials in the Administration Building and the officials at Madge Lake, that I believe they are misinterpreting this regulation. I want to advise the House that, last summer, there was untold annoyance by the officials of the Department in making people return, probably a mile or a mile and a half to the shore, and deposit their rods, if they had more than one, and I have never seen any person, in my experience, standing up and waving two rods around. But the fact they have them lying in the bottom of the boat, they have to return to shore. In some cases they seize this extra rod, and I think this is a little bit ridiculous.

Then there is another little matter of piers or wharfs at Madge Lake. A few years ago people used a pair of oars, but today most people have outboard motors, and some of them have very large ones. It is very inconvenient, in fact impossible, to draw up along the side of the beach and lift one of those heavy motors and all the paraphernalia that goes with them out of a boat, onto the beach. So away from the public bathing beaches, very often in front of the cottages, people constructed some kind of a little slip (in some cases very substantial ones) for the convenience not only of themselves, for anybody was at liberty to use them. I have in mind, in particular, men who spent days and spent in excess probably of \$300 or \$400, in building a very substantial wharf, and they never prohibited anybody from using it. At the end of June, last year, certain officials in the Department of Natural Resources went around and said: "No more wharfs; take them out"; and they had these people agitated. I can assure you that I was afraid to go near Madge Lake, last July, because the people came to me and wanted to know – "have they gone crazy?" I hope the Minister of Natural Resources will point these things out. He told me some Recreation Committee had made these recommendations, and he began telling me they were interfering with the shore line. That may be so. I said to him: "Until such time as the Government is prepared (and it will be a tremendous task) to provide adequate facilities at Madge Lake to accommodate all the boats; but if the Government did provide those facilities then I would see some sense or reason in hounding these people, and prohibiting them from having these piers or wharfs."

There are many other things I should like to deal with in connection with the summer resort of Madge Lake, but I just hope the members of the Government, particularly the Ministers of Natural Resources and of Information and Travel, will take these matters into consideration. All we ask, and all I would expect, is that they use reasonable common sense, because we know there have to be regulations, and we know they have to be enforced; but we have to use common sense along with them.

I would like to deal very briefly with the Time question. All I am going to do is mention this. The people of Pelly constituency are not at all satisfied with the legislation now on the statutes, and I regret to say that practically 100 per cent did not observe it. One thing I do see in this – and this is a serious matter – is the disrespect and disregard for law that this has brought about, and the conflicting statements made by the Ministers of the Crown, allowing certain individuals not to comply with one statute, and so on. This is a bad thing. Regard for the law, whether we like it or not, is something that must be upheld in this country, or we lose everything, and I hope that something will be done. Just leave the people alone. I cannot see any real need for uniform time in this province.

Another matter which has affected my constituency, and of which I have received a great deal of criticism is the matter of The Commercial Agents' Act. I want to be quite fair in this. I believe the intentions of those responsible for the Act were good. I notice the Attorney General has mentioned on certain occasions that this Act was brought in for the benefit of the merchants and small businessmen, and I believe he was sincere when he said that. But results since the first of January seem to indicate something different, because, if it was working out as the Attorney General expected it to work out, then we would find the Chambers of Commerce, the Boards of Trade, and the businessmen solidly behind it. They must have been lacking in the constituency of Yorkton, and I believe that this dissatisfaction will spread. I am just making mention of this, hoping the Government will take it into consideration and, if a mistake has been made, correct it before it goes too far.

I am getting back closer to home now, and to a very unpleasant matter which has occurred in the village of Pelly. I believe most people, through the press or the radio, have heard something about the situation we have had, and the controversy which took place, in connection with some parents in the village and a teacher in our school. I am going very briefly to outline just what has happened, because I will frankly admit the press in some cases has exaggerated certain aspects of this particular case, but at the same time I assure you there is something seriously wrong. Last August, when the school in Pelly was opened, there were seven children whose parents did not allow them to attend the school, due to certain controversy they had with the Board regarding a particular teacher. Those seven children have not attended school yet, and are not attending school today. The School Attendance Act of this province has been ignored entirely and I have every reason to believe it has been ignored with the sanction, if not the interference, of Department officials, if not the Minister. A very unsatisfactory condition exists in the community of Pelly today. There are neighbours who have been friends for years, and who now do not speak. There are certain individuals, such as this one particular teacher, though he has been reprimanded by the Minister, concerning whom nothing definite has been done. These children are supposed to be, today, taking correspondence classes, which they were refused last August, and the community of Pelly has certainly received very adverse publicity, by radio, in the press, as well as on TV. Meetings have been held. The first meeting that was held was in the city of Yorkton. I don't know why the official of the Department could not come right to Pelly, the seat of the trouble; but possibly there was good reason why he met in

Yorkton with the parents, with representatives of the Unit Board, the local Board, and representatives of the Teachers' Federation. Nothing transpired from that meeting.

Then in November, an inquiry was held in Pelly, and the members of that Committee, I think, were very competent men. They were in Pelly for two and a half days during the first part of November. Nothing more was heard until about the middle of January when there appeared in a press release, which I assume was handed to the press by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), and I might say that the first intimation the teacher in question had of the reprimand was when a newspaper reporter called him by 'phone after school on the day this appeared in the paper, and asked him for a comment. This chap had to tell him: "Well, I don't know what you are talking about"; so the reporter told him: "Don't you get the 'Leader-Post' in Pelly?" He said, "Yes, but it is about an hour before it comes in here and is delivered." He had to wait until he got the 'Leader-Post' to read what had been said in the way of reprimand, before he could make a reply to these people. He had to call them that evening. I think the Minister could have had the courtesy of at least seeing the letter of reprimand was in the hands of the person concerned, before it appeared in the press.

The result is this: Today we still have these children not attending school; we have this dissension in our community; we have placed the local board and the unit board, the staff of our school, in an unenviable position. We are wondering what is going to be the effect in the future. Some bungling and neglect of duty and responsibility occurred somewhere, and I am inclined to place it in the lap of the Minister of Education and his staff within the Department. No matter which way it goes, whether they interfered and stopped the ordinary process of The School Attendance Act, which I believe would have settled this matter in a week or 10 day, if it had been applied at the proper time; if they interfered, then they have to accept the responsibility for the situation today. If the unit board or attendance officer failed to comply with the Provincial Statutes, then the Department and Minister are also responsible for not seeing that they did. So it doesn't matter which way it goes, I say that the Department of Education (and that is the opinion of the members of the local school board, the unit board, and the majority of citizens of Pelly) is responsible.

What I would like to know is, what is going to happen? Is this going to go on indefinitely, or is this matter going to be resolved? I think it is up to the Minister of Education and the officials of his Department to see that this matter is resolved. Six months have elapsed since this incident first occurred, and I am afraid it is liable to spread.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is indicated in my remarks that I will not support the motion, but will support the amendment.

Mr. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): - Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the speaker who preceded me, this afternoon, in congratulating the mover and the seconder for the able job they did in presenting the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would particularly like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for

his contribution. The merits of his speech are best able to be observed by contrasting it with the speech that followed. The Leader of the Opposition certainly indicated that he had the vigour, the vitality, the initiative and the energy to provide this province with the leadership that is required to take this province where it deserves to go. The other speech indicated that this province, under its present leadership, has reached a standstill, and they are now prepared to defend their big fat record.

While this particular case is fresh in our minds – the one the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) just brought up – I would like to make a few remarks in regard to it. It is quite likely true that, because of the publicity this particular case got through the press, certain opinions were arrived at throughout the province that were certainly not desirable opinions and have done grave harm to the teacher in question. We on our staff watched this case quite closely. Following the case in the papers we read something about the teacher having said there was no God; he was a Communist and all the rest of it. We decided we didn't want to see any teacher with those attitudes teaching in a classroom. We didn't get any more information until the next paper came out and we were informed that this teacher had been very indiscreet. So, when we were hashing the thing over, we decided there must be something to it – this fellow must be a Communist. We went on – and I am not saying I put my opinions across; we just discussed it every time we met in the staff and tried to come to a conclusion. Then, when the last issue came out saying the teacher had received a severe reprimand, that confirmed our conclusions.

I am not blaming anybody; I am just saying that what we read all across this province might have been bad reporting and publicity, but I am saying that because of that reporting and publicity, this teacher, to my mind, has been labelled throughout the length and breadth of this province as a Communist and a man that doesn't believe in God. Because that impression was left, someone owes that teacher a public apology – either tell us in the paper publicly that he is not guilty of the offence, but don't cover it up. In the news article we always believe there is more to it than meets the eye. He was indiscreet; he received a reprimand; six children do not go to school because of what he said or did. Certainly this thing must be serious and rave, so come out and tell us what the score is, and don't put this particular teacher in a bad light throughout the whole province. Something should be done, and I hope consideration will be given to this matter.

The other day when I listened to the Premier's speech, I might say that I enjoyed certain parts of it. I enjoyed those parts that I agreed with, and the one I agreed with particularly was this quotation from J.K. Galbraith from the 'Affluent Society', in which he made a significant statement. He said: "On this continent we have become the victims of advertising propaganda." I think if the Premier had pursued this, he could have given us a few amusing incidents that appear in the ads in our press all the time. If we are to believe everything these ads say, they have the ability to put hair on bald heads and they can take it off where you don't want it; if you have bow-legs they can pad them up so they look straight; in fact they can give you any kind of padding you desire; they can cure headaches; they can cure other aches, they can cure pains. Certainly, we the public are

submitted to this barrage of utter nonsense, and it would be a laughable matter – if it did not represent a million-dollar industry or more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you an amusing incident about this matter of advertising and victimizing certain people. I say that I want to tell it to you – if the others don't want to listen they don't have to – I think you will enjoy it. The particular victim of this ad was a brother of mine. Now I cannot account for his actions, but perhaps it was due to a little degree of vanity. He had the misfortune of growing a super-abundance of hair and he thought that, before he went to the beach, he would like to remove the hair that was growing on his back, so that he wouldn't look quite like a bear. So he proceeded to immediately contact this firm that was advertising some hair remover; it cost him a dollar. This particular concoction came back in a small can. The directions said to apply evenly and thoroughly on the affected parts and leave it to dry for a couple of minutes and then remove. So he opened the can – it was a sort of a pasty goo – and he smeared it evenly, smoothly and quite thickly, and after two minutes time the stuff had hardened so much that he couldn't take it off. The only way he could get it off was to rip it off – and the hair came off, roots and all.

Now that is an example of being, I imagine, victimized by advertising. Ever since that case I have been extremely suspicious of people who advertise in the papers saying that they can cure all, and I have never been victimized by this sort of advertising since – not even when the C.C.F. cure-all party advertised to the people in this province. Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of an economic ailment or a social ailment or pain or ache that a C.C.F. Party couldn't cure? I haven't, I'm still looking for one.

The C.C.F. Party in Canada could certainly issue a tremendous challenge to our brilliant cartoonists to portray in a cartoon a picture of this society as it is painted by the C.C.F. Party in Canada. First of all I will only attempt to sketch a small corner of the picture. I imagine the C.C.F. Government would have to have a multitude of arms. These arms would be reaching out in all directions and, in the process of reaching out, they would be putting lids on the prices of the farm machinery; they would be taking lids off the produce of the farmers' produce; pigs would all be growing at the exact rate, so that they could supply not these mythical demands of the people but the needs of the people, just as the needs arise; the hens would be laying a nice stream of eggs which would find their way to market in a very orderly fashion. That's only one corner of the thing, and each of these farmers then would go home with their pockets bulging with their exact fair share of the national income, and that would be a remarkable thing. That poor little field growing out there would be covered by crop insurance. There are more things that would have to go on this picture; you couldn't end it there. You would have to put up industries. Here in one corner you would have to have an enterprise with very little profit right alongside an enterprise wherein everybody shares in the profits. Then there would be no unemployed standing in a line-up; these unemployed people would all be going to work etc., etc. There is no end to it.

So, as I said, I am not easily victimized by the propaganda of

these advertisers; neither am I easily victimized by the cure-all C.C.F. Party. No thinking person should be. I don't think there is any party in this country that can say there isn't a think or an ache or pain that they cannot cure, and even if they could, I still wouldn't support them because – imagine how dull it would be living in a society where all you would have to do is live! There would be no competition; there would be no challenge; there would be nothing to strive for. All the competition would be eliminated. I couldn't make profits. If I did, they would have to be controlled and it would be a terrifically dull place to live in. it would remind me of going to see a hockey game where each player had his own puck. It wouldn't be a very interesting game to watch; neither would the planned C.C.F. society to live in.

If there is one thing that the C.C.F. Party has learned well from our advertisers then certainly it is how to advertise. And what are some of the media they use to advertise? Well, we all know them. Here is a picture of a handsome gentleman with a good crop of hair – the report is recent, but I don't know how recent the picture is; but it says in the report, "To the people of Saskatchewan from the Provincial Treasurer, Saturday, February 14th, sponsored by the Saskatchewan C.C.F." The Hon. T.C. Douglas next, then Mr. Brockelbank was supposed to go on. Every day, practically, they're on TV; day after day, after day. They certainly know how to advertise. Not only do they use their Ministers to appear on TV to advertise, but each Department advertises as well. I have one Return here that gives a list of all the publications issued under the authority of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, with the cost of each during 1957.

What do we find here? We find \$12,927.40 "Power Talks" – they must have been powerful talks for that money: "Modern gas living" - \$3,738; "Highlines" - \$5,213; "Electrical farming in Canada" – a publication (I thought this was the whole electrical business, not just the publication) - \$30,000; and a report from the Saskatchewan Power – well, that's understandable; a guide to care for electrical motors - \$754; year guide to kitchen and laundry - \$15. Then there are these little ones which we will skip over; but let's go to some more of these in the thousands: "Square-dancing booklets" - \$2,929. Talk about advertising! They have advertising plus, not just advertising. And, as I say, they have learned their lesson well from this propaganda of those who are trying to sell us hair removers.

In the picture they presented, of course, everything is going to be run harmoniously and smoothly as I have already indicated, though I haven't completed the picture. Let us judge this picture as it is painted by the C.C.F. on the merits of their performance in this province. According to them they can iron out every possible ailment, every possible thing that confronts us; but when it came to a small matter of ironing out the time, I wonder how smoothly that thing worked! Everybody mentioned it. A Committee was set up; they spent approximately \$26,000 (they always manage to spend something) to take the vote; the vote came in and still no action. Then, last year, they finally decided on a uniform time. But the Premier didn't hesitate to castigate the Opposition for not accepting their responsibility. He says: "How does the Opposition accept their responsibility" They were on the Committee, but they said: "Sure, we will go along with the idea of

uniform time, but you name it'." He said the Opposition were shirking their responsibility. Every piece of legislation they bring in has a loophole whereby they can blame the Opposition if it doesn't turn out right.

As was mentioned recently by my hon. friend from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) this Government doesn't believe much in profit. I should amend that statement. They don't believe in small profit, but they believe in big profit. The member from Pelly indicated some of the timber operations in his area, and he asked the Government for consideration to supplying lumber perhaps at a more reasonable cost to the farmer. It was revealed, the other day, in Public Accounts Committee, that in one operation alone the Timber Board was able to obtain timber, approximately 1,600,000 board feet, at a cost to the Timber Board of \$45 per thousand or \$47.25, depending on whether it was stacked in the yard or whether they had to go and get it. Now what is that lumber to be sold for? We don't know, but if we go to the retail lumber market, we find that the average price for lumber of that nature is \$80 a thousand. A profit of some \$35 a thousand board feet! Now there is profit – and this is the outfit that doesn't believe in profit!

We can readily see a few of them ready to get up on their feet and say that they are against profit, "but we are using all that profit for the benefit of mankind and for the benefit of this province." I wonder how much of it is finding its way back in benefits to the people of this province! Why not give them the direct benefits right off the bat, without channelling it through all your different Departments? Give them the direct benefits right off the stack of lumber – not wait until it is channelled through all the Departments, because then it loses its effectiveness. If you want to make a contrast, for argument's sake, the profits of any outfit or any corporation also benefit this country through the various forms of taxation – corporation taxes and what have you. Those taxes find their way towards benefiting the people of this province and this country. The provinces gladly accept all the taxes from the industries within their particular province.

I would now like to turn to a problem which I approach in all humility, and one which I feel that I am perhaps not too qualified to speak on. There are many men throughout this country and perhaps in this Legislature who could do a better job of it. This problem is unique, since it is universal. The problem is dangerous; the problem is imminent and above all, the problem overshadows everything that we do in this Legislature today. The problem has been mentioned before in this House, and rightly so. I wished, at the time, that it had been expanded upon and dwelt upon, because I would sincerely like to hear any expansion of it. The problem I am referring to is going on all over the world, today, and that is the struggle, or the war, for the mind of men. I say the problem is imminent; only men like Willie Brandt and J. Edgar Hoover, who has followed the problem since 1919, can indicate how imminent it is. It is dangerous, because at any moment now it may flare up into world conflict. Then, too, maybe before the end of this Session, we, the members of this House, may be called upon to take a stand on the Berlin situation, and if we are told that we cannot communicate freely with West Berlin what stand would we take. Would we say: "We must carry on our communications?" The papers, yesterday and the day before, have indicated the problem to us. We have to determine whether this man Khrushchev is bluffing or whether he is not – or whether we are just going to wash our hands of it all and say, "let Berlin go, too."

The problem, again, resolves itself, I believe, into two phases; and it is basically a moral problem; that is, we either adopt the tenets of atheism, which puts the ultimate supreme authority into the hands of the State and subjugates the individual to the regimentation and regulations of the State, with no belief in morality of any description, or opposite, the Christian viewpoint, which teaches the dignity of the individual and permits each individual to work out the destiny of his own life for the purpose he feels he was created for, without any interference from the State to force his mind to certain patterns of thinking.

Atheistic Communism also has its greatest ally in atheistic materialism, with which problem we are primarily concerned. All too often in our western society we are ready to compromise a good principle because of the material benefits that we are eager to obtain. Many examples of this could be cited.

In regard to this problem I refer (and I regard this as a 'must' for every person in this Legislature to read) to the book called 'Masters of Deceit' by J. Edgar Hoover, just published in March, 1958. Here is outlined the plan of the communist nations to subjugate the world. In it, we will find such quotations as this:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to co-operate in their own deception; they will leap at another chance to be our friend; as soon as their guard is down we will smash them with our clenched fist."

This is the Mein Kampf of the Communist Party, and nobody is more aware of it than J. Edgar Hoover of the United States.

To give you some more recent quotations:

"Khrushchev: 'I say now that we will never go against the program of Lenin and will follow it to the letter in the future. We are not going to reject what we have created.'"

That was said in 1955. In 1956 Khrushchev boasted to American diplomats that Russia would defeat America, and he said: "We will bury you."

This book contains the complete operation of the Communist organization in the United States. To illustrate, briefly, how easy it is for a brilliant man or woman to become duped by this particular menace, this threat to society and threat to all mankind, I would like to read just a brief case —

one which Hoover says is one of a thousand: Barbara Harper told this story. She had been graduated in 1929, Phi Beta Kappa, from Washington State College, majoring in English. Then she went to Spokane to try and find a job. Those were depression days, and her story is all too typical. Hoping for a better world she began to study Marx. Deeply impressed she joined the socialist and then the communist party. Her rise was rapid. Later she was transferred to Seattle where she occupied some of the highest party positions in the Washington State organization. This was the state of her mind then: "I will go to gaol if I must, but I will remain a Communist"; and she did so for the period to 1945.

So we can see that it is easy for a brilliant mind to become duped. I gave this background because I think it affects us both directly and indirectly, because the greatest defence, not only is it considered by Hoover but by many of our leaders, against this menace is a high moral standard. The first thing we must do is see that the thing we are supporting is a thing that we are willing to lay down our lives for. We must also investigate to see not that the thing we are supporting is the right thing. That is why I question – not the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan, but some people in the C.C.F. movement who make these statements throughout Canada, and I tell every individual, myself included, to give heed to these statements and see just what they mean. They have to be interpreted some way. Socialism, as is indicated in what I have just read to you, was the first step of this woman towards Communism.

"David Lewis of Toronto, National Chairman of the C.C.F. Party, said Friday that C.C.F.ers need not fear for the purity of the socialist movement during the move to reorganize it. He told the annual meeting of the Manitoba C.C.F. Party that the new movement was called first by the labour unions, but the C.C.F. was taking the lead in its development. A Committee set up by the Canadian Congress of Labour and the C.C.F. to work out plans for the new party have been working to complete unity, without deviating one iota from the political ideals of the C.C.F. itself. We shall have the political instrument to take over the power of the Government in this country, and in many of its provinces, within a relatively short time. Those who fear the purity of socialist ideals suffer from the same kind of insecurity that people suffer from when they are afraid of anything. They can't have the necessary faith in the rightness of the socialist ideals and the socialist philosophy."

Well, I don't have that faith. I don't believe in the socialist philosophy. I think, too, all of us realize, and we agree, that in order to meet the onslaught of this menace, which is actually a war for the minds of men, we must be able to present a good united front and high standards of morality.

This citation struck me as being very singular and important. It was made to a temperance group which met in Saskatoon:

“It is a pleasure and a privilege to gather in a gathering such as this and spend a few hours in an atmosphere of zeal for the restoration of the dignity of man, for in almost every walk of life, in almost every outlet for the energy of man, there is something or someone who is more eager to drag him down from his exalted position as the masterpiece of creation, eager to enslave his heart and soul by pampering, glorifying and even crippling his body. And it is all too apparent in the world today that one of the murderers of the dignity of man is the abuse of alcohol.”

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are forces raging to destroy and degenerate man so that he becomes a beast, and one of them is the abuse of alcohol. Another, which is in the same category, is the misuse of drugs and narcotics. Those who are promoting these things are the ones most guilty.

It is in this light that I, personally, would want to assess any new legislation – by considering the moral aspects of it. It is quite true that we cannot legislate for morality, but certainly we can be instrumental in removing anything that will encourage immorality. This matter of drinking, of course, is largely an individual matter that each individual will have to decide for himself. I feel that no individual can go wrong if he follows the admonitions of his spiritual leaders – his minister or priest, whoever it may be – with regard to drinking, and he should seek that help very early.

I would strongly emphasize that, although there is some teaching taking place in our schools today in regard to the harm of both alcohol and narcotics, that teaching should be intensified to such a degree that each boy and girl, before he leaves high school or before he leaves public school, will be aware of the harm that can befall him – not necessarily has to, but can befall him – if he misuses any one of these things that are available to him.

I feel that it is unfortunate that our present outlets – the beer parlours – will still be permitted to continue, because those who have already established their drinking habits in the beer parlour in its present condition will not change their habits regardless of the outlets. The outlets will only increase the drinkers, over and above the fellow who spends his time in the beer parlour. The fellow who frequents the beer parlour will not go and pay exorbitant prices to get his liquor elsewhere.

Then, too, I think it is important that we keep trying for high standard of morality in our classrooms, and also have a high standard of spiritual values in our classrooms. Before I go on with this I think, too, that we have some responsibility in regard to the obscene, licentious, cheap and degrading literature that is finding its way to our news-stands across the country. The Government, and many other organizations, see fit to censor films, but we do not see fit to remove these so called ‘pin ups’ and the obscene literature that finds its way to practically every news-stand across the country. It is not necessary for me to bring them into

the House to illustrate just what kind I mean. I am sure all members are aware of the type of literature that is finding its way to these news-stands. Personally, I think that we can take that into consideration – to try and get that stuff removed from the news-stands. There must be a way to do it. Church organizations and women's groups are running around trying to gain support to eradicate that type of literature, and we sit idly by and let them continue. Now that is an influential factor in attempting to degrade the morality of man and we must recognize it as such.

Then, too, we must try for a high standard, as I have said, of morality and spiritual values in our classrooms. In this regard I would like, for a few moments, to discuss our Teachers' Training Institute. By and large I am one who, having gone through it, will support the Teachers' Training Institute program to the hilt. I think it is a good one in many respects, and I think it is as good as you can expect anywhere in Canada; but there are certain inherent weaknesses in that program, and I think we should point those out and consider them.

First of all, it is felt that the admission requirements are inadequate. Admitting students with such low averages suggests that intelligence is not a prerequisite for teaching. More attention should be given to the personality, character and capabilities of the individual. If he does not possess high standards of morality he is not in a position to impart these to his students. Secondly – and perhaps we are not in a position to do anything about it – the training period is too short. It is not possible in one or two years to train a teacher for the great and immense task that confronts him in the classroom. Thirdly, having two separate courses to choose from, each pursuing a separate course, is not a desirable situation. The course at Teachers' College provides for more practise-teaching experience than the course at the College of Education. The College course does not include many subjects taught at the Teachers' College, yet one year at either institution, plus higher academic classes, gives a student the same teaching certificate. In other professions, such as law and medicine, students master comparable skill before being granted a licence to practise.

Here is one thing I think we should pay particular attention to – the fact that the Teachers' Colleges are the responsibility of the Department of Education places them directly under control of the political party in power. This poses the possibility of political indoctrination of student teachers through staff appointments and through speakers who are invited to address the students. For the year 1957-58, out of 11 outside speakers invited to speak at Saskatoon Teachers' College, six were Government employees. Why should the student body be addressed by the Executive Director of Government Crown Corporations, for example? Why not – and far better – by the head of the Department of History at the University?

Premier Douglas: - May I ask my hon. friend what he is quoting from?

Mr. Klein: - I would be very glad to tell you. This is written by a teacher who has three degrees, B.A., B.Sc., M.A., and a teacher who has the courage to stand up and point out to us what she feels is the inherent weakness of our teacher training.

Premier Douglas: - I didn't ask for a description. I wanted to know who it was.

Mr. Klein: - I will give you the name later. I will accept full responsibility. I don't want to mention the name of this author in the House.

Premier Douglas: - Well, give us the publication and we can easily find it.

Mr. Klein: - The publication is 'Our Family Magazine'.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Is it Hilda Neatby?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: - Would you give the date of the particular issue.

Mr. Klein: - January, 1959. Now, the fifth and important one, too, Mr. Speaker, is false doctrine:

"The complete freedom given to the instructors in planning their own courses and in the selection of texts makes it possible for an instructor so inclined to indulge in ideological indoctrination. One of the most frequently criticized courses being given at the Saskatoon Teachers' College is Social Foundations of Education. Students complain that many of the ideas advanced in this course go contrary to the thinking of Christian faith. Said one former student: 'The good and the beautiful are passed over and the false is stressed'. Another remarked that any student opposition to the ideas being propounded in the course 'creates antagonism on the part of the teacher'.

"Related to the course in Social Foundations is a test of a Controversial Issues Rating which the student is asked to complete at the beginning, and again at the end, of the course. We question the intended benefits of such a test when it includes such items as: '1. If Canada had more men like Stanley Knowles in office we would get along much better'."

This is in the Teachers' Training Institute of this province, and the student who is eager and anxious to get a teaching certificate – if you, Mr. Speaker, were one of those students, would you dare oppose this?

Another Controversial Issues Rating test is: "I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew." Then the student has to prove his ability to discuss this.

This is one I don't know what they would label:

"No matter how they may act on the surface, men are interested in women for one reason only."

Controversial Issues for 'teenage young people preparing themselves to become teachers of the province? Can you imagine the intelligent conversations that must emanate from such a question as: "No matter how they may act on the surface, men are interested in women for one reason only?" I don't see that that would stimulate great ideals of discussion or anything else.

There is another one:

"One of the main values of progressive education is that it gives the child great freedom in expressing those natural impulses and desires so often frowned upon by conventional middle-class society."

That is another Controversial Issues Rating topic! And these boys and girls are preparing themselves to become teachers in this province.

"We further question the intended benefits of such a course when the one magazine to which the students are asked to subscribe is 'The Nation', a weekly published in the United States and known for its very pronounced left-wing tendencies."

I might add, Mr. Speaker, this is a step in the way of improvement; I had recommended to me for good reading 'The Daily Worker'. To go on:

"The underlying philosophy which permeates much of the instruction is pragmatic materialism. Spiritual values, so important in teaching, are played down on the pretext that they might be offensive to atheists who might be in the class. Progressive ideas are encouraged in the matters of discipline, in the relative value of subject matter versus pupil adjustment, standards of achievement, integration of school subjects, etc."

Now, as I said, I have no complaint with the bulk of the courses offered at the Teachers' Training Institute. At the time I took my teachers' course in Moose Jaw, I questioned what on earth we were taking Social Foundations for. I wasn't able to find the answer then and I still can't find the answer now. To me it seemed to be for us to investigate these old-fashioned, mid-Victorian traditional ideas that we might have had before we came to the Normal School, and see if those things would stand up in the light of pragmatic philosophies. That is the only intended benefit I could see. I could list some personal experiences that I had there, but I don't imagine it would do any good; but I think this is a matter that requires investigation, particularly when we consider it against this background of 'imminent danger' in which we find ourselves, and the great threat facing each individual no matter what walk in life he is pursuing today. We dare not lose the battle for the minds of men.

I think it is quite obvious from the remarks that I have made that I have no intention of supporting the motion, but I will support the amendment.

Mrs. Cooper (Regina City): - Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I want to join with the others before me in congratulating all members who have already spoken.

With regard to the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) I agree with the previous speaker when he said the speech was alive, interesting, and certainly it did keep us awake; we enjoyed it very much. But when it comes to the logic of the argument he presented – well, that's a different story, and I am sure his criticisms that were levelled at the Government were very adequately answered by the hon. Premier of the Province.

I was quite interested in some of the things that were said this afternoon, and before the member (Mr. Klein) leaves, I would like to comment on some of the things he said. It was quite amazing his idea of social and economic planning; I wouldn't call it a vision but rather a delusion. However, there was one thing he said that certainly was wrong. He said that the C.C.F. Government believes that they can cure every pain in the world. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is at least one pain we can't cure – not until after the next election. I'll leave it to you to figure out what that one is.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): - He was right in a lot of other things.

Mrs. Cooper: - I was also very much interested, both yesterday and today, in the speech from the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) and in the speech of the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane). We had these two gentlemen put on record their opinion of labour. Now, it isn't the big things one says; it's in the little things that you really feel a true attitude of people towards labour or any other thing. I am always interested in the fact that whenever any person is going to make a vicious attack on labour, they always start out by saying, "now I love labour; I believe in unions, but —"; then they go right ahead, as these two gentlemen did, and use the same kind of tactics that the most vicious and reactionary anti-labour forces use, and it is often . . .

Mr. Weber: - Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member if she believes in the International Teamsters' Union coming into Saskatchewan.

Mrs. Cooper: - A perfect example of what I have been trying to say; just a perfect example. This is their attitude and they show it very plainly, because they may be able to find an example of some union leader in the States, who has got into trouble, they drag these things out and they try, by implication, to make people think that all labour unions are in the same category. Now we know exactly what the Opposition are trying to do; they have been trying hard to do this same thing for a long time. They want to try to divide farmer and labour, but farmers are wiser than you think they are and labour is wiser than you think they are. They know that the fortunes of labour and of the farmer are bound up together, and I don't think all the anti-labour talk that you can give here will convince the intelligent farmers or the intelligent labour people that they haven't interests in common.

I would like to mention on other thing. I notice the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) is gone. I would like to say this one thing.

I realize that both members who brought up the case of the teacher in their district meant very well; but if there really is hard feeling (and I am sure there is), and if there is an embarrassment there for the teacher concerned, wouldn't the most sensible and the kindest thing to do, be – not to bring it up here, but to talk it over with the Minister? If you really wish hard feelings to die down; if you really wish to save embarrassment to the persons concerned, then I would suggest the sooner you let it die down instead of bringing it up here so that it will once more be spread all through the province, the sooner the problem will be settled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many announcements in the Speech from the Throne that I welcome wholeheartedly, and I am sure they will be welcomed warmly by the people of this province. There was a good deal of good news in the Department of Education. The fact that once again this year, there are to be substantial increases in grants for education, and that there is to be further help in financing school capital programs is welcome. I was also delighted to know that our new Technical Institute will be opened in the fall. This is another step in rounding out our program for education in this province. It is going to provide very much-needed skilled personnel for industry, as well as give hundreds of young Saskatchewan people an opportunity for much better job opportunities if they wish to go in the lines of the skilled trades or skilled technical lines. So, that is another thing I do welcome.

Of course I was delighted that we have been able to announce the program of Provincial Scholarships for bright students who can qualify. In this day and age, when education is so vitally important, we can't afford to lose the maximum contributions of any bright student in this province. I am glad that this scholarship program is going to be in addition to our Student Aid Fund. I have always felt that one of the most rewarding and one of the most-far-sighted things that this Government has done was the setting up of this loan fund. Since our Student Aid Fund was set up, over \$1¾ million have been spent, and some 6,000 students have benefited from our loan fund, and now that we are going to add a scholarship fund to this, I think in all honesty we can say that no young person in Saskatchewan, who has the ability and the desire to take a university education, will be denied that education because of inability to pay. This, I feel, is something the Government and the people of Saskatchewan can be very proud of. Of course, the introduction of these scholarships is just one more step in what has always been the aim of the C.C.F. Government – to try to provide more equality of opportunities in the field of education.

Also, I have been most encouraged by the increased interest in the field of adult education in this province, and I would like to congratulate the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) and the staff of the Department of Education for the very vigorous and very rewarding work they are doing in the field of adult education. I think that the opening of Saskatchewan House was a milestone in the field of adult education. I think most people know that the Saskatchewan House is located in the residence of former Lieutenant-Governors. The building was renovated and a very beautiful job was done in the renovating, and it is now extremely suitable for the purpose for which it is being used. There are classes in a great variety of subjects going on, and you will be interested to know that in our evening classes over there at Saskatchewan House, we have anywhere in the neighbourhood of 800 students

taking advantage of these classes.

Recently, there has been a new departure which, I think, was a very interesting one. Day classes have been instituted for unemployed people, where they can go and take classes in any subject that they wish, to help bring up their educational standard. In this day of specialization and automation, the lot of the untrained person is very difficult; it is grim, and it is getting more difficult all the time. As automation takes over it will continue to be difficult, and so this is a wonderful opportunity for these people to go ahead and bring up their academic standing. I think this sort of thing is something that could be, and should be, copied all across the Dominion of Canada. There are some 40 people taking these day classes now in adult education, and I should point out that Saskatchewan House will be used not only by Regina people, but it will be used for institutes and educational conferences of all sorts for people all across the province. In fact, I had the privilege of attending a very interesting two-day institute on social welfare problems, in Saskatchewan House, recently.

Another thing that I welcome in the Speech from the Throne was the announcement that there is to be additional help in providing low rental housing in the cities. I believe that low rental housing is the greatest housing need in Canada today, and I have been very disappointed, and I have found it hard to understand why, so many of our urban municipalities have not taken advantage of the very generous provision in the National Housing Act, that has been there for some time, whereby the three levels of Government can join together to build this low-rental, low-cost housing. As you will remember, the Federal Government will put up 75 per cent of the cost and the remaining 25 per cent of the cost was to be divided, in Saskatchewan, 15 per cent for the Provincial Government and 10 per cent for the city., Now the Government is suggesting that they will pay all but 5 per cent of the cost of this housing, and certainly that should be a great incentive, because the 5 per cent means not any more than the cost of the land. Actually, besides the fact that it is going to provide much-needed housing, it is really a good financial deal for the city, because they can collect taxes on this new housing, and actually they will make money on the deal. So, I do hope that all our urban centres will make maximum use of this generous provision.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that mention is made in the Speech from the Throne that an amendment to The Attachments of Debts Act will be made to assist wives and children in collecting money payable under alimony or maintenance. In this connection I would like to call the attention of the Attorney General, and of the Government, to a matter that has been giving the women's organizations in this province a great deal of concern for a long time, and I believe that the Attorney General has received a brief from the Provincial Council of Women and also the Cabinet has received this brief.

I think most of you will know that the Provincial Council of Women is the co-ordinating body for all the major women's organizations in the province. The problem deals with the welfare of wives and families where there is divorce or separation. At the time of the divorce, as you know, the court awards a sum that it feels is fair in relation to the husband's earnings, and that money is supposed to be paid to the wife. So far so good. But,

when the husband defaults on his payments and falls behind, a very difficult situation is created for the wife and family, and the wife has to go to court, take court action to try to collect that money, sometimes not only once but again and again. Now, the money that is to come in to here and that is rightfully hers is usually not a very large sum of money, but if the money is not forthcoming the family is in serious straits. The wife cannot really afford to go to the court to take proceedings and, of course, if the husband leaves the province, the wife is then in a very difficult position indeed, and she cannot afford the expense of trying to trace him. Most women in these cases are working and, as I said, they cannot afford the expense. Not only that but every time they have to go to court proceeding against an ex-husband or husband there is an emotional involvement which make it much more difficult. If the wife becomes destitute, the Department of Social Welfare may help try to trace the husband and collect the money; but there is no government agency to help the woman who, by her own efforts, is managing to get along without social aid.

The brief points out that, in most American States, the husband is required to pay the money – not to the wife but to an officer of the court, and he is called ‘a friend of the court’; and when the husband falls in default, the officer of the court automatically collects the money and sends it to the wife. They say that where this method has been tried, the situation has improved for the wives by 75 per cent. I know you can’t always collect it all. If the husband wants to evade his responsibility, he may find ways and means of doing that; but we do have reciprocal agreements with other provinces whereby we can trace people and collect from them, and certainly it is very much easier for an official of the court to do this sort of thing. He knows more how to go about it; he has more know-how than has the wife that is trying to find out where her husband is.

Now I realize, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Attorney General, that it would make some additional work for the courts or for an officer of the court – maybe not too much legal work, though there would be a good deal of paper work involved; but, as pointed out in the brief, the number of people involved is not so great. The average number of divorces in the province, they say, is 250 in a year, and you have to add to that number those who are separated. If you divide this amount of work among the 21 judicial districts it isn’t going to make too much work for any one of the judicial districts; and if the wife does become destitute and she and the family become a charge under the Department of Social Welfare, then what is paid out in extra money by the Attorney General’s Department may be more than compensated for by savings in the Department of Social Welfare.

I believe the suggestion by the Council of Women is a very reasonable suggestion, and I think it is a very helpful suggestion. I hope it will be thoroughly explored by the Attorney General’s Department with a view to bringing in legislation – either by this method, or by any other method that he can find – that he may feel is better and will remedy this situation. I am sure that this matter will get a good deal of attention from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal more I wish to say about the Speech from the Throne, and so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 9 – to amend The Education and Hospitalization Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): - Mr. Speaker, I think there is one significant sentence in this memo. It says: "With the exception of one section, section 28, which, as you are well aware, is a letter of request from a local solicitor, the balance of the amendments are considered desirable for administration purposes, but not essential." In other words the purpose of this is for clarification. I may say there is one problem we are having. Today there are many people who do not buy outright their automobiles. Someone made reference to this in Public Accounts Committee, yesterday morning. What they do is lease the car by the year, probably for a two-year or a three-year term. The owner of those vehicles is actually not the user. The user of the vehicle is the person who leases it; yet, today, it is probably questionable whether we have any right to collect the tax from that person. This is to clarify that particular point. That is one of the principal things we have in this Bill.

There are other minor amendments, which I think we could better discuss in Committee when we can talk back and forward. I would, therefore, move the second reading of this Bill.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): - Mr. Speaker, in reading this over very carefully, I can't quite see the reasoning of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, because it seems to me that the Act specifically looks after conditional sales, which is a hire-purchase type of agreement.

Mr. Speaker: - Does the hon. member wish to ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Fines: - No, she is making a speech. It is quite all right to make a speech.

Mr. Speaker: - Not until I have put the motion to the House. It is moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines that Bill No. 9 – An Act to amend the Education and Hospitalization Tax, be now read the second time.

Mrs. Batten: - Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't realize you hadn't brought that up. As I was saying, this seems to me to include people who rent, actually, rent, not buy on condition, such articles as typewriters, lawnmowers, and numerous miscellaneous articles, and I can't see this being anything but a nuisance tax. We know very well how much of a nuisance the Education and Hospitalization Tax is. Its justification is that it supplies much-needed funds; but I can't see where the additional tax revenue from this will be very great. However, I can see where it will be an obstacle to a lot of people, and will, in many cases, necessitate people obtaining a licence who now don't have such a licence, for the collection of the Education and Hospitalization Tax. Anybody who is in the business of renting any personal property would be liable to collect this tax, and any person who rents such personal property would be paying this tax.

It seems to me that the purpose, the principle, of the Act when it was passed was to tax the consumer when he purchased goods, not when he rented goods. Surely we don't intend to start taxing rents. Therefore, I object very strenuously to the inclusion of this. I don't see that it serves any valid purpose; I don't see that it is going to obtain a substantial amount of revenue for the province – if that were the justification, I could see some place for this, but it doesn't pretend to do that. It is merely a nuisance to a lot of people, and will probably make it more difficult to rent. I imagine that there is no exception here – you would have to pay Education and Hospitalization Tax if you rented a car from a U-Drive. I can't see how it would be exempt, and, therefore, those people would have to be licensed to collect this tax. Certainly, it is at entire variance with the principle of the Bill as this Legislature originally passed it, and, therefore, I object very strenuously to it.

I might say while this Bill is before us, that I object very strenuously to quite a lot of the things that have been taking place under the provision of this Act. It seems to me the regulations that the Department has passed have been much broader and much wider than the provisions of the Act itself; and that the Department of the Provincial Treasurer has taken upon itself, in its provisions, not to exempt things from tax that have been exempt under the provisions of the Act. For instance, farm machinery is supposed to be exempt under this Act, and yet, when you come to read the regulations passed by the Department, you find that only certain farm machinery is exempt. This can cause a lot of trouble and a lot of inconvenience to people who, quite honestly, thought they were selling agricultural machinery solely for use in agriculture and that they are exempt, and then found that they were being assessed tax. I certainly don't think we need to provide that Department with any more lines with which to hook additional tax where it isn't warranted by the principle of the Act, and the principle in the minds of the people who passed the Act in the first place.

Mr. Coderre (Gravelbourg): - Mr. Speaker, I think, from the little that I can gather in the short time we have had to study this Bill, that it is another wedge in the cost-price squeeze. We have been complaining about the cost-price squeeze, and I think the squeeze the member for Humboldt mentioned a few moments ago. It does not mention what particular items – whether personal, tangible items coming up for rental would be taxed. That means to say that a farmer, who is in the unfortunate position of not having certain types of machinery on his land, would go to a dealer who had taken some machinery on trade-in, and it could be taxed on his rental.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - That's all rubbish, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Coderre: - The possibilities are there.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Rubbish!

Mr. Coderre: - There are an unlimited number of items on which taxation

is being put on the rental. It is not an article that you purchase; it is not a sales tax and, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Humboldt, the Education and Hospitalization is a sales tax. Therefore, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that not having had the time to fully look into the matter, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Mr. Speaker, I have no objection if the hon. gentleman could accomplish anything by doing so, but from what he has just said I don't think it would do him much good.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.