

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Thirteenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

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

On the Orders of the Day:

WELCOME TO MELVILLE STUDENTS

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): - Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a welcome to the Grade XII students from Melville High School. They are sitting in the Speaker's gallery, and I hope they will enjoy their stay in the city, today, and that, before this afternoon is over in this Legislature, they will have an opportunity of watching us at work in a way which may not only be educational, but some extent entertaining enough to hold them here for some time.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Monday, February, 23, 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. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): - Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I spoke in the debate I first of all outlined some of the concrete reasons why I thought that the Speech from the Throne was good for the people of my constituency, and more, generally, the people of Saskatchewan. I spoke about such items as the promised aid to education, the promised aid to urban roads, and about such subjects as public low-rental housing. I also touched upon the Provincial Technical Institute which is currently being constructed in my city, and spoke of the beneficial aspects that this institution would have for Moose Jaw, for the adjoining area and, of course, for Saskatchewan as a whole. After that I cited the depressed position of the farming population of the province, and went on to point out that there was a corresponding depressed condition among any wage and salary earners in the province and in Canada. I said that the Canadian farmer and the Canadian worker have, by reason of these problems, as indivisibility of interest and must work together, both in economic and political fields, not simply because it is feasible, but because all of the reasons that I gave really compel them to take action in unison.

Social Credit and Liberal members speaking in this debate have indicated that they do not accept this thesis. I think I pointed out yesterday that my hon. friend from Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) had said in his remarks during this debate that the interests of the two sections, labour and farmer, were thoroughly incompatible.

I should like now to refer to some additional remarks made by my hon. friend when he attacked labour unions in this House. His remarks have been echoed in part, by some comment from other members opposite me. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker: I don't think anyone is more sincere or honest than I am in wanting to see corruption of all kinds rooted out everywhere, wherever that corruption may be, including the labour movement of this country or the United States. When I say this I want to say quite categorically, that the A.F. of L – C.I.O. in the United States, and the Canadian Labour Congress in this country, have proved by their action and by their activities that they also are opposed to corruption and have fought it actively, unceasingly, since their inception.

Govt Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. Davies: - I would like to say that, if there is any evidence of corruption in the labour movement of Saskatchewan, or anywhere in this country (but I refer particularly to this province), let the hon. members that introduced this subject raise these questions, and the labour movement of this country will see that they are investigated. Specifically, the Canadian Labour Congress would be the first to consider them.

The remarks of my hon. friend from Meadow Lake have gone much further than a reference to the Teamsters' Union, which, I think, was one particular organization that part of his remarks were directed to. He has called for a policy of ousting all of the international union organizations from this province, and he has said that he agrees with the remarks and the activities of Premier Smallwood of the province of Newfoundland in the loggers' dispute. The hon. member has called for what I think is extraordinary legislation, in that it exists in no province of this country, not even in Newfoundland, nor in the provinces of Alberta or British Columbia which have Social Credit governments.

These views and recommendations, in the light of the character and the activities of the labour movement as a whole, are really unwarranted reflections on that trade union movement. I say that the workers of the two countries are inseparably bound by trade union organizations simply because the activity of monopolies, or large companies, works on a bi-national basis; historic reason why there are international unions. For all that an International union means, in definition, is a union that has membership both in the United States and in Canada.

I think the remarks of the Premier of Newfoundland, as they have been reported in the press, call to mind the actions and antics of another Liberal Premier of some twenty-one years earlier in the province of Ontario. I refer to Premier Hepburn of that day, and perhaps some in this House will remember that he said that the Congress of Industrial Organizations would

never come into the province of Ontario to organize the depressed workers in the steel, in the auto, in the rubber and other industries of that type. Well, I think history has pretty well shown what has happened there. The workers wanted that organization; they have it; they are much better off because they have it.

I say that the issue in Newfoundland is not an issue of a foreign-dominated union, but an issue of a group of workers who are trying to wrest some very moderate demands of a fifty-four hour week, for \$1.22 an hour, from a corporation which is foreign-owned itself. If there is any issue in the Newfoundland dispute it is that of a foreign-dominated corporation which, I suggest, Premier Smallwood is serving in the actions that he is undertaking today.

Now, if there is any question of what dominates the trade union movement in Canada, I think we may go to more unbiased authorities than, perhaps, myself. I want to say that the trade union movement of Canada makes its own policies, makes its own decisions, and makes them democratically. The Gordon Commission made an inquiry into this facet of operation, and I'm going to quote what they had to say, because I think it says exactly what I tried to point out during this debate. The report said that "the Canadian members of international unions exercise a wide and substantial measure of economy in the areas of collective bargaining, including the use of the strike weapon." It went on to say, "there is little evidence to suggest that the expansion of Canadian industry has been impeded by international union extraction of excessive returns to labour, or that the pattern of wage results achieved differs in any significant degree from that of a Canadian union." I don't know how the position could be more aptly summed up than in that quotation, Mr. Speaker.

There are 15 million unionists in the United States. There are another 1½ million unionists in Canada. With some exceptions, the movement is, as I have said, a sincere, honest and, on the whole, well-administered group. In the United States, the banks employ approximately the same number of people as does the American labour movement. A study made in 1955 showed that there were 42 indictments of bank employees, and 35 of union officials. That seems to suggest a rate of dishonesty (if I can coin a phrase) that is not disproportionately high.

I want to say that there are countless examples of corruption in society. We all know that. We know about them in civic government, in provincial governments, in national governments. In our own land, there are quite a few examples. The hon. member for Meadow Lake could possibly refer to the province of British Columbia for some examples. But we do not condemn government as an institution because some people in it are guilty of dishonesty, or corruption, malfeasance or whatever you like. We employ the processes of the law and of the ballot to remedy this wrong-doing. It seems to me that the wrong-doing of some union officials – a very small part of the labour movement – has been somehow transformed into an attack on the whole labour movement of this country and the United States; and it is not surprising to note that these attacks synchronize with efforts to impose anti-labour legislation on unions. I am personally glad to note, in the recent American elections,

that, in five or six states where right-to-work legislation was being voted on, it was emphatically and completely rejected.

I want to point out something else for the record. More often than not, corruption, where it has existed in trade union circles, has arisen because of business practices and because of their practices in connection with trade union, Victor Reisel – I think everyone knows the name – who is well-known as a columnist who spoke out against the racketeers everywhere, including those in the labour movement, has placed the heavy blame for labour racketeering on businessmen who co-operate and sponsor union racketeers. He said, “They are more guilty than the racketeers themselves.” The promotion of company unions, the promotion of all those methods that sought to restrain unionism, were made by the very elements that were later used in the realm of union corruption, and that is where it had its roots.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time on this subject because I thought it needed airing, and mostly because of the publicity that resulted because of remarks that have been made in this House. I feel very keenly, personally, the reflections, as I view them, that have been made here. I think that everyone of the province’s 45,000 union members would like me to rise, as I have done, and say what I have said today and yesterday.

I want to say that unions are human institutions. They have made mistakes, and they are probably going to continue to make mistakes, in an honest way; but, basically in the mass, they are clean institutions. They have helped the country. They have helped promote legislation for all the people that would not be on the statute books, today, if they hadn’t, in the first place, raised the conception of it and created the public pressure to have it put into effect by Legislatures and governments.

I think in a time of constantly retracting liberty and retracting ownership of industry, that unions actually constitute the bulwark of democracy in this country and everywhere else. It is a very significant thing that, in the totalitarian countries, the first object of attack of the dictators has been the trade unions; their first act has been to smash the trade unions. Trade unions in the last 50 years have supplemented the political democracy that we know with a basic industrial democracy; they have created a field of education for hundreds of thousands of union officers, shop stewards and people who work on union committees; they have learned first-hand something of the business of democracy that they would not otherwise have learned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for me to relinquish the floor of the House to the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood). I dealt extensively, yesterday, with the Speech from the Throne. I believe, like every other human document, it may have some flaws. It is easy to find flaws in anything; but it is terribly difficult to build anything. I find the Throne Speech to be an outline which looked ahead and forecasts better things. As such, I am going to support the motion made by the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown).

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): - Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me, this afternoon, to specifically compliment all those who have taken part in this debate, but I would like to especially mention the mover and the seconder of this Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think they did a very workmanlike job of their undertaking, and I think they performed a real service for the people of Saskatchewan in setting out clearly the situation in regard to the public business here.

I would also like to heartily congratulate the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), who has just sat down; and I would like to align myself personally behind the very able presentation that he has just made. I think the facts that he has outlined for you, yesterday and today, bear a very strong resemblance to the truth.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): - A resemblance to the truth, he said.

Mr. Wood: - That is a good deal more than I am able to say of what sometimes emanates from across the floor of this House. I note, Mr. Speaker, that the members sitting to your left have not shown themselves to be unduly hampered by any slavish adherence to reality. No doubt this is fostered by their respective parties' lack of governmental responsibility both here and in Ottawa.

Two sessions ago, the Liberal members in the Standing Committee on Municipal Law moved and voted for an amendment in that Committee that said, in effect, "that this committee recommends to the Government that the whole province be placed in the same time zone, and that the time for that zone be designated by the Government." I thought then that I had seen the ultimate in irresponsibility. I guess I was rather naïve. Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) has surpassed that by forgetting that any such motion was ever proposed by his henchmen, and is suddenly taken with the idea that we shouldn't have uniform time after all. It is quite all right for him to change his mind, but he need not put his chest out so far, and be so arrogant about it.

Mr. McDonald: - I haven't changed my mind.

Mr. Wood: - I think there is a considerable lack of accuracy in the charge by the Opposition of discrimination by this Government against the farmers. If the members opposite ever really thought they actually needed an answer on that one they got it, yesterday, from the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet). As I sat here while he spoke, I felt proud to be on the same side of the House as that of the Government which has so championed the cause of agriculture in this province.

Take, for instance, the removal of the education tax on farm tractor fuel which the Leader of the Opposition cites as an example of discrimination. In 1956 there was a tax of 11¢ per gallon on gasoline used in automobiles and trucks in Saskatchewan. While this tax did not apply to purple gas used for

industrial purposes, such as farm tractor fuel, excavating, road construction, elevator engines, power generation or commercial fishing, the 3 per cent education and hospitalization tax did apply.

At the 1957 session the tax on the gasoline used in motor vehicles was raised to 12 cents. This is a reasonable tax in view of the fact that the total revenue from such tax and from motor vehicle licences is in the neighbourhood of \$7 million short of what is being spent each year by this province for roads and highways. It also compares quite favourably with taxes of like nature in other provinces across Canada. At the same time the 3 per cent education and hospitalization tax was left on purple gasoline for all commercial uses, except where it was used for agriculture purposes. In other words, all users of gasoline in motor vehicles experienced a raise in taxes, but, in the case of the farmer and for the farmer only, a large portion of the sting was taken out by the cancellation of the 3 per cent tax on farm fuels.

This, in my opinion, was definitely favouring the farmer. I am sure it was due them, and I strongly favoured the action. In fact, it was my honour to introduce this matter into the Legislature that year. However, I think that if this is the Leader of the Opposition's idea of discrimination, he needs to buy a new dictionary.

Another person who, I think, is a little off base in this regard is Mr. Irvin Studer, former Liberal member of Parliament for Swift Current-Maple Creek. In writing in the 'Swift Current Sun' of February 13th, Mr. Studer has some rather harsh things to say to those who are working for the "March on Ottawa". I will not take time to deal with them here as I believe the farmers themselves are quite capable of handling that small chore. I would like, however, to draw attention to one paragraph which in my opinion, is quite uncalled for, and reflects the same carefree abandon, which the members opposite have in dealing with the facts. May I quote – with your permission, Mr. Speaker:

“Why is it that the Premier of Saskatchewan who proclaims that Saskatchewan has advanced and prospered in development and production of mineral oil, gas and other wealth, much greater than agricultural wealth, and yet none of this wealth has accrued or been supplied to farmers, and they have to depend on the Federal treasury to sustain them?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this doesn't quite make grammatical sense, don't blame me.

We are all aware that the mineral development in Saskatchewan is beginning to pay off for the people of this province, approximately \$25 million being taken in by the Government from that source, last year, possibly somewhat less during the present year. We are also well aware that the money was used to help make up some \$26½ million which was spent on Education, and which was quite a bit less than half covered by the education tax. It helped to pay for some \$36½ million spent on Public Health,

only about \$15½ million of which was covered by taxation. It helped pay for the \$32 million that was spent on highways and municipal roads, less than \$25 million of which was covered by the gasoline tax and motor licence income. Part of it was used to help pay for the \$12½ million expenditure on Social Welfare and Rehabilitation. Time does not permit me to tell you of all the different ways in which all the people of Saskatchewan shared in this income from our mineral wealth, to say nothing of the \$5½ million agricultural program which was so ably outlined, yesterday, by the Minister of Agriculture, and which is spent largely for the benefit of the farmers alone.

I repeat, all the people of Saskatchewan shared in these benefits, and if Mr. Studer thinks the farmers did not, I can only say he must think farmers are not 'people', but only perhaps some sort of peasantry who are not entitled to share in the privileges or responsibilities of society. He knows as well as anyone that the economic plight of agriculture in this province is due to the discrepancy between the price structure of the things to be sold by the farmers, and the things they have to buy, and is entirely the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is not due to any lack of ability to produce which it is the role of the provincial government here, to foster.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a farmer, and proud to be a backbencher on the side of a Government which has faced up to its responsibilities to the people of this province, including the farmer.

The hon. members opposite have also mentioned the 'municipal ineptitude', of this Government. I have had the privilege of being on a municipal council for nine years and witnessed some of this so-called 'ineptitude'.

One thing I noticed is that in 1943-44 the total assistance to municipalities or roads, bridges, ferries and secondary highways was less than \$700,000 while the money voted for the same purposes, last year, was approximately \$5¼ million. I recognize the fact that there was a huge difference in the dollar values then and now, but by that time our economy had come out of the doldrums of the depression, and was busily engaged in our war effort and money was in circulation. Any way you care to frost the cake, I'd much rather have \$5¼ million in times like these than \$700,000 in times like 1944.

Then, in 1943-44, the Provincial Government collected the Public Revenue Tax from the municipalities which had been put on by the Liberal Government in December 15, 1917, and had been retained by them and the Conservative administration until it was taken off by this Government in 1952.

Mr. McDonald: - Who forced you to take it off? You voted against taking it off yourself.

Mr. Speaker: - Order! Order!

Mr. Wood: - The hon. Minister of Agriculture told you, yesterday, that if this tax were in effect, today, it would cost the municipalities at least \$2¼ million. Back in the pre-C.C.F. days it must have amounted to at least twice the grants that were given back to the municipalities.

I know that I was Reeve of the municipality of Saskatchewan Landing at the time that this tax was taken off, and I know that to this small municipality it meant a saving of close to \$4,000 a year. You can call this 'municipal ineptitude' if you like, but I'm all for it. I think what the Leader of the Opposition meant was that this Government is inept at shearing the municipal sheep as compared with former governments.

A lack on the part of the hon. members in the Opposition is responsibility to face up to fact is seen in their approach to farmer-labour relations. They apparently feel especially qualified to deal with the subject because none of them come from anything other than a strictly rural constituency. They then proceed to paint with impunity vivid pictures of labour unions as a group of ogres controlled by foreign gangsters. They also are not above endeavouring to drive a wedge between the farmers and labour, which are the two most important segments of our population. Personally, I have no use for foreign gangsters be they labour gangsters, political gangsters . . .

Mrs. Batten: - You like the home-grown variety.

Mr. Wood: - . . . or industrial or financial gangsters; but I believe that labour people of this country are better able to handle labour gangsters than the people of the country as a whole are able to handle the other gangsters I have mentioned.

The trouble is that the Opposition appears to feel about working people the way Mr. Studer appears to feel about farmers – that they are not really 'people'. I have found them to be good, hard working, democratic, God-fearing citizens who are quite prepared to deal with any of their leaders who usurp too much authority, as are the farmers prepared to deal with Mr. Studer or the Federal Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to throw a little light on the morass into which the hon. members to your left, by their own fumbings, have endeavoured to lead us. I would now like to go on to the good solid ground of the Speech from the Throne.

First, I would like to deal briefly with the Government's program to endeavour to provide housing for low-income groups. Of all the suitable places for a government to invest a little money, I know of none better than that. Decent and suitable accommodation, such as has been provided for elderly people at our various housing projects for senior citizens, should be made available to a much larger section of our society. The Speech from the Throne indicates that, at this time, this Government is prepared to take over from cities the cost of any survey necessary to assess the need for such a project in the locality, and also to leave only 5 per cent of the cost to be put up by local bodies.

There are several other things in the Speech from the Throne that I would like to draw attention to, such as the great work of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. The people of Swift Current, I know, are very happy

to have the CBC programs brought to them through their local station CFJB-TV, through the facilities of our Telephone Company. I would also like to speak of the great industrial strides that have been taken here, and of the new program of scholarships for University students and many other things that are in this wonderful Speech.

I must say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I do not support the amendment, and take great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): - Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will congratulate the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood). I could brand him with the same faint praise that he credited the hon. member from Moose Jaw with, and say that his speech had some 'faint resemblance' to the truth; but it was very faint, and one could hardly see it.

I do want to congratulate the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies). I think he made a very fine speech in defence of the things he believes in. I don't think there should be any misunderstanding; I think he was on very firm ground when he came to the defence of labour, and when he came to the defence of unions. I do not think he was on quite such firm ground when he began to attack Premier Smallwood. I certainly am not coming to the defence of Premier Smallwood, because I don't know the problem before him at all; and I am more or less convinced that neither does anybody else in this House. It happens to be a local problem, and I am sure that Premier Smallwood is quite conversant with all the details, and we certainly have not got the information on which to either condemn or condone his actions; and I don't think it is up to us to do so. He certainly is not responsible to us in any way.

I would like to say that the Speech from the Throne, this year, has set a new record – a record of inadequacy; and in this, I think, it mirrors quite faithfully this Government. I would like to say that the Speech from the Throne sounded very much like the report of a 'caretaker' government; but I wouldn't like to insult all the good caretakers of this province. There is a place in society for caretaker governments – in times of great and prosperous, booming economy, when prices are stable and costs are not too high for the amount of profit that can be gleaned by those people who are engaged in industrial activities, in times of employment and when crops are good; but this is not the time and place in Saskatchewan for a caretaker government. We have problems, very serious problems – and this is the time when we need a government with vision, with intelligence, with planning and with courage. This is not the time for the Government on your right, and the Opposition will substantiate this indictment of this Government. Not only that, but we, as the Opposition, do offer an alternative.

I would like to say, first of all, that I condemn this Government because they are out of touch with reality; they simply do not seem to realize that Saskatchewan has serious problems today. Backbencher after backbencher got up and declared himself delighted, pleased, happy, satisfied. Well, maybe their constituencies are enjoying a boom that certainly we are not enjoying in Humboldt, because my people are far from delighted or satisfied;

and I think that is true of most of the people of Saskatchewan. I think the people of Saskatchewan realize the inadequacies of this Government far more than this Government seem to realize the problems before it.

One of the things that, I think, this Government should face up to, and do so as soon as possible, concerned the continual loss of our population. The 'Star-Phoenix', the so-called "friend" of the Liberal Party – and I think it is a friend, because, as one of our international students said, "A friend is one who stabs you in the front", so I will call the 'Star-Phoenix' a friend of the Liberal Party; as our "friend" has pointed out, this is not the fault of the C.C.F. Government. Well, maybe so. There might be some argument there; but at least this Government should realize (which they fail to do) that we are losing population, that we are not even retaining our natural increase. I would like to point out – and there is no doubt about it – that in the latest D.B.S. report there is a short paragraph about population figures and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read it. Maybe this will convince the Government that we are not making the gains that we should in retaining our population. On page 2 it says:

"Since 1958 census the population of Canada has increased by 7.5 per cent. The provincial rate of growth over this period was highest in British Columbia at 11.7 per cent . . ."

Then they go on to say:

"Population growth in the Maritime provinces in this period was somewhat below the national rate, at 5.2 per cent. Slower rates of growth were also shown in Manitoba at 3.3 per cent; and Saskatchewan (at the tail end of all the provinces of Canada) at 1.7 per cent."

Those are the facts. Those are the figures. Don't ignore them.

The hon. junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) smiles. She doesn't believe it – after all, it is not a C.C.F. publication.

I want to say, too, that if we look at the Speech from the Throne, which is supposed to be a report of the problems facing the Legislature and the proposed solutions for those problems, we don't even see a mention, in the numberless paragraphs, of the 'March to Ottawa'. Surely anybody who is in touch with reality today realizes that this is one of the most important things that is happening in Saskatchewan today; but apparently they weren't aware of it when they prepared the Speech. The people who are not elected representatives, the people who are agricultural leaders in this province, are doing something about the crisis that is facing us; while the elected – the so-called representative members of Saskatchewan – aren't even aware of it; they don't even mention it in the Speech from the Throne! But they find time and place to mention the fact that they are going to build some new park benches!

Is this a Government that is in touch with reality? This Government says it is making great strides toward a more balanced economy, yet it makes not one suggestion for the reduction of farm costs. The Speech from the Throne, representing a party that is doing its best to climb to power on the back of already over-burdened labour – and that is exactly what this party is seeking to do in its negotiations – has two proposals for labour in the Speech from the Throne. It is terrific! One is the repeal of the exiting right to make ex-parte application for an injunction, which lasted all of four days, Mr. Speaker; that is, the injunction could only last four days. The second is to give employees of tenants the right to collect up to \$500 of their arrears of salary from a tenant where the landlord has detained his good – and that is after the Sheriff has received his 5 per cent.

Are these the plans – is this the assistance that this Government is giving labour? You, the champions of labour! This Government is out of touch with reality, because it is still searching the “class struggle” in Saskatchewan, where none exists. In order for the C.C.F. to exist at all, they must convince a large segment of our society that they are being discriminated against; that they are being imposed upon, that they are being exploited by another segment. This was fine as long as the C.C.F. were in the Opposition, as long as they weren’t in power; but now that they are the Government, what possible excuse can they have for saying that anybody in Saskatchewan is oppressed or exploited? They have no answer, and this is the dilemma of the C.C.F. Party today; and this, Mr. Speaker, is one of the greatest dangers of materialistic socialism, because socialism is created by and bound by a concept of historical struggle between classes and without it, it cannot exist. Therefore it has to create and inflame dissention, envy and fear, even where there are none to start with.

And this is the amazing part of it! On one hand the C.C.F. Government dines and wines and flatters and bribes and seduces Big Business to come in and to become senior or equal partners with this Government in industrialization. Big Business borrows money, which is being guaranteed by the people of Saskatchewan; we are pledging our future that they will repay. We borrow, or the Government borrows, money from Big Business. It is a nice, happy family. But, at the same time, the C.C.F. backbenchers, and even some of the Ministers, are getting up and broadcasting appeals to incite and inflame hatred, to make people think that the Liberals are aligned with the mortgage companies. Well, I am aligned with a mortgage company. They hold a mortgage on our home, and we have to pay them back; but that is the only partnership I have ever had with a mortgage company, and the sooner it is terminated the happier we will be.

The Attorney General, on one hand, seeks the advice and the approval of the finance companies before instituting his famous judicial reform; at the very same time Hazen Argue, in the House of Commons, was called them ‘sharks’. On one hand the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Neibrandt) said that these big corporations are sapping the life-blood of the workers; at the very same time the hon. Provincial Treasurer was giving us a Bill in order to guarantee \$10 million to the Steel Corporation. In effect, the hon. C.C.F. members in this House get up and with bleeding hearts and dramatic gestures say: “We love the workers; we love the farmers; we hate Big Business; we

are going to defeat Big Business. These are our firm undying convictions; but if you people don't like them we will change them." That is exactly how much conviction there is; that is how much consistency there is in any of the speeches that we have heard to date.

The Premier, after concentrating for two Sessions on industrial development, has, this year, returned to his humanitarian, socialized planning; and it is a good thing. I think he is on better ground. He made a very enjoyable speech full of expression of goodwill on an international scale, with not one concrete proposal for the betterment of the lot of the people in Saskatchewan; and after all, we are his responsibility.

I was quite amazed when one of the young students from the University, who had listened to the Premier's speech, came out and commented on what a wonderful speech it was. She said, "My, it was like something I had read some place." I didn't bother telling her that she probably had, many times. She went on to say: "When is he going to get up and tell us exactly how this is going to be done?" She was all ready to stay. I told her I didn't think she had better wait, because to date we have had no concrete proposal from the Premier furthering his speeches.

Thirdly, the Government has lost touch with reality because it continues to hold in its poor and feeble hands the reins of government when it no longer has the confidence of the people?

Premier Douglas: - Do you want to test that?

Mrs. Batten: - Mr. Speaker, the Premier has had lots of opportunity to speak on the air; I have only got a few minutes; and if he will just keep quiet I will listen to him afterwards.

Premier Douglas: - Make some proposals, then.

Mrs. Batten: - I am making you a proposal. I am doing more than that. I am giving you a challenge, Mr. Premier, and I hope you take it.

Mr. Speaker, I will prove to you that the people of Saskatchewan no longer have confidence in this Government. First, because this Government and its members boast that they do not listen to any advice from the Opposition; that they do not listen to anybody except card-carrying C.C.F. members – and there aren't so many of you any more. Even those convinced socialists who used to believe in you have become disgusted by your lack of logic and your lack of conviction and your lack of courage; and they, too, are leaving you.

Secondly, the members across the way have no concept of their responsibility as elected representatives of the people in their constituencies, and I will prove that, too. I see that the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) has come in, and I want to say this while he is in the House, because I have never heard such a vile attack on the people who elected a member as I did, the other day, when the hon. member from Saskatoon spoke. I am only drawing this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because there is no one here

representing those poor people from Saskatoon. They were entirely undefended, and that is as good an argument as I know for a ward system in a city.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: - I am sure that the people of Saskatoon would be very interested to know just what kind of representation they are getting in this House. Instead of getting up and speaking for the people of Saskatoon, instead of demanding a few things from this Government for the city of Saskatoon, he condemned the very people who are trying to do something for that city, people who cannot talk back to him in this House. And I think this is most significant in spite of all the propaganda – and we have had nothing but propaganda, thousands and thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' hard-earned money, Mr. Speaker, pays for propaganda; in fact, the Premier and the Hon. Provincial Treasurer are so well-known and so popular that all the little children who watch TV and listen to the radio know them just as well as they do Mickey Mouse or any other little character.

Premier Douglas: - You are dating yourself now.

Mrs. Batten: - They are not half as lovable, but they certainly are as noisy.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - How do you know?

Mrs. Batten: - I want to say this – and this proves my point conclusively – that you people have lost the confidence of the people. In 1956, in the provincial election, you received 45.2 per cent of the votes cast in that election. In two years . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: - What did your party receive?

Mrs. Batten: - We are not the Government.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - You are a long way from it.

Mrs. Batten: - Not so long. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat (if the hon. members can contain themselves), in 1956, in the provincial election, the C.C.F. Party received the mandate of the people who gave them 45.2 per cent of the votes cast in that election. Two short years afterwards they got in 1958, 23.4 per cent of the votes cast. Have you not fallen from grace?

Mr. Speaker, we are not the Government – you people don't realize that. You keep asking us for advice, you keep asking us to lead you by the nose and show you what to do; but we are not the Government. Wake up to that fact and show some leadership!

I have this to say, Mr. Speaker: if these people across the way meant any of the fine sentiments they echoed throughout the province, if they really and truly want to represent the people, then do so. I challenge them to do just this: go back to the people as soon as possible, get a mandate from

them and show that you have their confidence. Does this Government, this poor spiritless, listless thing, have the courage to do that? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, I doubt it very much. Even as Marxist socialism is merely communism without violence, even so, C.C.F.ism is nothing but socialism without integrity and without courage.

The C.C.F. did not invent trade unions. The C.C.F. did not invent co-operatives. Those things were invested by the very people who have created them, the very people who are working in those trade unions now, and who are working in those co-operatives now. They needed no political patronage, and they don't need it now. And if you people don't learn to keep your cotton-picking fingers out of things like co-operatives and unions, you will destroy the very preciousness, the very independence and good that is in those things.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - You'd better tell Premier Smallwood that?

Mrs. Batten: - I haven't got too much time or I would go on with that. Apparently it interests the people across the way; they probably haven't heard any of these historical facts. So many of them are so young in their knowledge that they think everything grew up and was created by the C.C.F. Nothing happened after 1941! I am simply amazed that they did not change the dates in Saskatchewan to make this year 1915 instead of 1959. After Joshua stopped the clock – the Hon. Attorney General – I never did get the time straightened out, and neither did anyone else in Saskatchewan.

The purpose of trade unions and the purpose of co-operatives is not to destroy anybody. It is to assist each other and to make this place a better society for everyone. That is why I wish to congratulate the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) for his fine address on trade union, exhibiting exactly that type of spirit. That type of thing should never become a cat's-paw for selfish political interests, by the Liberal, Conservative or C.C.F.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we in Saskatchewan need leadership; we need the courage to tackle and recognize the problems that are before us. One of the first problems that I think we should tackle, which this Government has failed to do, is that of education. Certainly we have been making piecemeal contributions. We have been trying to stop up the gaps. We have been trying to keep the system rolling when it has shown signs of slowing down entirely. This not planning; this is not leadership; this is not vision; and if this Government would show some we would have a better and a more equalized system of education in this province.

Of course, it is very difficult to prove to the Government that this is needed, because they remind me very much of that delightful story which the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) tells about the animal farm. According to them, everybody has equal opportunities, but some opportunities are more equal than others; and that type of thinking is very difficult to straighten out. We in the Liberal Party advocate, and we will continue ad-

vocating until you or we, ourselves, put this in, a Foundation Program for education.

This has been explained to this House and nothing was done about it, and, very briefly, for the benefit of the people who might be listening, I want to say that the Liberal platform and the Liberal policy is: after a thorough survey of the curriculum has been made and we know exactly the standard of education that we want in this province (and I hope it will be of the very finest), then we will assess, or someone will assess, the cost of operation, the cost of salaries, the cost of building expenses and the cost of transportation, along with other incidental expenses. Then a mill rate will be set that is equalized throughout the province, and I think that is essential. I don't know if the hon. members opposite are aware of the discrepancy there is in the mill rate for schools in this province. In the rural municipality it goes from a low of 8.2 to a high of 35 mills. After all, it is not a local responsibility, although I think the administration should stay there. As we see our population not only leaving Saskatchewan, but our population from the rural parts of the province moving to small cities, towns and villages, it is a provincial responsibility which should be taken by the whole province. I think if we had an equalized rate, and if we had assistance from the provincial funds on that basis, it would not only help the local governments, but would give us equality in a true sense of opportunity and education for our children.

My time is fast running short and I would like to make a few other points. We on this side have talked, and will continue to talk, for more local government assistance, for grid-road maintenance assistance. We hope that some work will be done towards assisting small communities to establish water and sewer installation. We insist that a vote be taken before there is any type of wholesale reorganization of larger units.

We are happy to see that there has been a change in the Social Aid program so far as local governments are concerned, but, of course, there is no guarantee that the per capita assistance costs will not keep rising, and we do not think that, in the long-range view, this is satisfactory. We think that the whole scheme of social service should be reviewed and revised. There are many injustices in it; there is a lot of red tape in it, and you have fine workers who would, if working under a better system, be able to render far greater service to the people of the province, and a lot more of the tax money would go to the people to whom it belongs. I think until this type of revision and reorganization is made we are going to be losing a lot of money along the way, we will be failing to assist the people who need assistance, and we will be giving inadequate assistance where we do give it. We will not be helping these people to re-establish themselves.

Now we, as Liberals, do not look on people as 'classes'. To us they are individuals; they are people, just as you and I are people. For this reason, I as a lawyer, would be quite happy to sacrifice that deep-carpeted, that lovely cushioned, that very hygienically ventilated and lit courthouse solicitors' lounge in Saskatoon to make sure that mental patients had at least one small experimental hospital somewhere close to their

own homes. This Government has been promising that for 14 years at least, but not one step has been taken towards it. I had hoped that the hon. lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) would again add her voice to my feeble one asking for the building of this hospital; but apparently she, too, has given up hope.

Mrs. Cooper: - Give me time!

Mrs. Batten: - At the same time I do want to thank the Government, and I do this quite sincerely. The Government has finally implemented three of the ideas that we in the Opposition have been asking for and advocating, and I am very happy that we convinced them to do so. First of all, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer, last night, in second reading, agreed that the deductible \$200 property damage clause would be removed; that is, if a car accident occurs, the \$200 that ordinarily was payable for the other person's car will be paid out of the insurance funds. This is something that we have been begging for in Crown Corporations Committee for a long time; and maybe he will make other concessions, especially next year.

Secondly, I would like to that the Government for following our advice and converting the Fish Marketing and Trading Services, presently owned by the Crown Corporations, into co-operatives; presumably they will be used by the people of the north. I only hope that this isn't the type of gift that one should look at very carefully, because the last time we went through their financial statements they seemed to be getting into some difficulty. I hope this is a generous and true gift, with no strings attached.

Thirdly, the Government has finally – after all the talk that they have heard and that we have expelled from this side of the House – decided to give some credit to the small farmers. This is something that we have been very anxiously begging for, and I wish to congratulate them for finally getting around to see our point of view. This is one of the few occasions where, even as an Opposition, we feel some compensation, because, at last, we have been listened to, and they have done something for the people of Saskatchewan on our advice.

I hope that the Government will make a few other changes this year that will be of great benefit to the people of Saskatchewan. Two of these are administrative changes, and I sincerely hope that this Government will see fit to put the Highway Traffic Board and Liquor Sales and Outlets under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, where they properly belong. Surely these two Departments should be operated with a view of enforcement. The object in these Departments should be good enforcement and obedience to the law, preservation of the law, and not collection of fines.

I have a very interesting letter – it was written to me but it was reported in 'The Leader-Post' of March 26th, and was written by a gentleman from Moose Jaw. In it he says – and I want to read this, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is apropos:

“We read of traffic accidents, drunk driving, alcohol tests but, lest we forget, every one of us in Saskatchewan is in the liquor business. The drunken driver and the unfortunate alcoholic are more or less by-products of our own enterprise, and Premier Douglas is one of us.”

So let us take these duties very seriously and let us make sure that we have the very best possible administration in the Department where it belongs. I certainly have been embarrassed to think that our liquor laws are being administered, by, or our Liquor Act is under the supervision of, the Provincial Treasurer, as if our only object was the collection of money.

I was also very embarrassed to hear on a broadcast, I think it was called ‘Fighting Words’, where they, as you probably know, Mr. Speaker, quote somebody and then everybody guesses who it is. In this particular instance Mr. Cohen said: “I won’t ask you to guess who it is, because you wouldn’t know him. It happens to be the Provincial Treasurer from Saskatchewan, Mr. Fines.” Of course that was very insulting to me, because I thought everybody knew our Hon. Provincial Treasurer. The quotation was to the effect that – and I think I am quoting correctly: “I would not be caught dead in a Canadian beer parlour”. Saskatchewan beer parlours, Mr. Speaker, are Canadian beer parlours, and this remark comes from a man who is looking after the administration of these beer parlours.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Mr. Speaker, may I categorically deny the statement as ever having been made.

Mr. McDonald: - Oh, sit down.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - You keep quiet and mind your own business. May I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement. I have not made it at any time.

Mrs. Batten: - I cannot withdraw the statement, Mr. Speaker. If it isn’t true, it isn’t true; but I certainly heard it on the air.

On the other hand, I hope that with this change in the administration the Hon. Attorney General can take over these two Boards, and the Provincial Treasurer’s load, which is already heavy, will be lightened, and maybe he will be able to introduce some further measures to alleviate the tax burden of the citizens of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because this Government no longer knows even its own principles; because this Government, although very anxious to plan for other people and for other groups, has lost the ability to institute or plan, or originate or reorganize its own activities, economically and well and effectively; because this Government has lost popular support; because this Government lacks the courage to take its responsibilities and introduce

legislation because it has to set up Committees and Commissions – and there are any number of them, such as the Time Committee, the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, the Continuing Committee of Local Government, the Judicial Inquiry Committee, Liquor Outlets Committee and so on – not for the purpose of getting advice as much as for the purpose of hiding behind these Committees and Commissions when they bring in legislation that they are afraid the people of this province will not like; because they no longer have any courage, because they have no longer any vision or plan, I will not support the motion, and I will support the amendment.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): - Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to extend my congratulations to the speakers who have entered into this debate to date. I am quite certain that, from many of the addresses which we have heard during the course of this debate, we have learned very much. I would like to say that all of us, I am sure, enjoyed (as we always do, particularly those on this side of the House) the address of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), who not only makes a good address, but at the same time makes a very good appearance here in on the Opposition side of the House. I want to assure her that I am certain after the next election, be it this spring or next spring, he will be sitting across the way in the place of the Hon. Attorney General.

Before proceeding with my remarks, I would like for a moment to deal with one or two questions of local interest in my own constituency. Before proceeding with remarks with regard to Government problems, I would first like to extend congratulations to the leaders of the 4-H movement in my constituency and also in this province, who have played a great part in providing our younger people in this province and throughout this country and the country to the south of us, with activities which provide educational opportunities, social opportunities and community opportunities, for those taking part in these organizations.

I was very pleased to read in the 'Melville Advance' only the other day that the Melville 4-H Poultry Club had managed to win the top honour in the Provincial Efficiency Winners in 4-H Club projects in this province. There are 169 4-H Clubs in this province, and of those 169, I am pleased to say that two of the three top winners in this event came from my constituency: the first, the Melville 4-H Poultry Club, and in third place, the Lemberg Grain Club. I would like to take this opportunity of extending my congratulations to the leaders of these groups, to the parents of the children who, after all, must well play a part in this upbringing, this education in 4-H work; and as well to the organizations which sponsor these young people, and lastly, but not least, to the efforts of the young people of the 4-H Clubs to better themselves, to better agriculture in this province, and to better agricultural opportunities for Canada as a whole.

Before leaving local affairs, I would like to make one or two comments with regard to issues affecting the people of my constituency. About two years ago now, I took it upon myself to write to the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation with regard to the providing of natural gas service to the people in my constituency. Shortly after I took the matter up with the Minister, a delegation came in to see him from the constituency, representing almost all the communities I represent in the provincial Legislature, asking for natural gas service. Only this fall, finally, an announcement was made that the city of Yorkton would, in the year 1959, receive natural gas from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Since that time the people of Melville, and the surrounding district, have been requesting the Government through the Power Corporation to provide them with services equal to the people of the city of Yorkton. I am quite certain that the line, wherever it is built, will come closer to the town of Melville before it reaches the city of Yorkton, and I see no reason why the citizens of the town of Melville should be overlooked, should be by-passed, to provide gas to the city of Yorkton, only for the reason that the Government gives, namely, that they can say they have provided gas services to all the cities in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would just like to say, before leaving that topic, that I hope when gas is provided to Melville, that it will be provided in such a way that the other communities in my constituency (and there are quite a number that can be served in the proper manner) will be supplied with gas, if not before the town of Melville, as shortly after as it can possibly be done.

I have an impression that the Power Corporation may not accept the recommendations that I am making. I am going to say to the Minister that I cannot very well accept the statement he has made, after announcing, four months ago, that gas was going to be installed in the city of Yorkton this spring or summer – and they are already signing up subscribers in the city of Yorkton; they tell me they haven't even decided how they are going to get the gas there yet. Here is an announcement made four months ago that "City of Yorkton is Going to Get Gas", and the Power Corporation, with all their experts, haven't yet been able to decide how they are going to get the gas to the city of Yorkton. Well, I hope that before the year is over they will make that decision, and I hope they will make it in a way which will service the greatest number of people that can possibly be serviced through the installation of that gas in the city of Yorkton and the town of Melville. Of course, the best way they can do that is to service all the communities that lie in the area of No. 10 Highway, which goes through the towns of Fort Qu'Appelle, Balcarres, Lebreton, near Lemberg, Abernethy, Neudorf, and the smaller communities of Duff, Lorie and places of that type leading up to the town of Melville, and then on to the city of Yorkton. I might say that Melville has an advantage that the city of Yorkton hasn't got, as far as I know. Melville has many of the people in their town already hooked up to a gas system, and there will be very little difficulty in getting the people of the town of Melville to subscribe and take gas, if it is installed in the town for the service and the opportunity of the people living there.

Having stated that, Mr. Speaker, I want to leave matters of purely local interest and spend a few moments dealing with questions of provincial policy, and, with questions which the Government has at times made laws about and then has refused to put them into effect. I think because of the fact that the time on the air has almost drawn to an end, that I should for a few moments make mention of the issue that has become very famous in this province. It is an issue I can assure the members opposite they have not made the proper decision on, and that is the position of having to decide whether or not they were going to break the law that had been passed by the Legislature of this province, instead of stating that they were prepared to enforce the law that was passed here in this Legislature. I am going to read, this afternoon, from 'The Leader-Post'. It isn't in their words, Mr. Speaker; it is in the words of the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson). It is a piece he put in the October 3rd issue of the paper at the time the Time question was flourishing in the province shortly before the time was actually changed. I do not want to read the entire article, but I would like to read the last part of it, which seems to be somewhat contradictory to statements that were made later by the Premier of this province and the hon. Attorney General. This is what it says in this article by the member for Souris-Estevan, and I want to say here that I give him a great deal of credit for the stand that he took. I only wish, being a young man entering into public life in this province, that the Government he sits behind as a representative, has had the courage to stand behind him on the stand he took on this Time question, then as a younger man, he could say that he was proud to be a representative of the Government of this province. But this is what appeared in the article on the editorial page of 'The Leader-Post':

"I want to make some observations about the 1958 Time legislation, as it affects the economic, political, social and recreational activities I spoke of earlier. The Statute Law Amendment Act not only defines the Time standard to be observed in Saskatchewan, but also to amend certain sections of other Acts with reference to Time. Government offices open to the public will observe hours of opening and closing as laid down in the legislation – (which they did not do) – relating to them, and as defined by the Statute Law Amendments Act"

Then he goes on to say:

"No major change is made in the provisions for closing hours of shops, stores, etc., during the week before Christmas. During the other days of the week, shops will be governed in accordance with sub-section (2) of section 247 of the City Act, which states: 'All shops shall be and remain closed between the hours of six o'clock p.m. and

five o'clock a.m. of the next following day. The time of day when six o'clock occurs can be determined by referring to the definitions of The Statute Law Amendment Act'.

"Penalties" . . . (mind you, the Attorney General and the Premier said there were no penalties, but the member for Estevan didn't agree; I imagine he got his advice from the Attorney General):

"Penalties for contravention of this section makes a proprietor liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$100, or in default a term of imprisonment not exceeding six months. Similar provisions are made in The Town Act . . ."

This is one of the members of the Government side of the House, Mr. Speaker:

"Garages, new agents, drug-stores, etc., are not required to close at six p.m. No provision is made for closing hours under The Village Act and The Municipality Act. In local government elections as well as provincial elections, the time legislation makes clear what time is to be observed, and the posting of notices of poll nominations and deadline, and opening and closing of polling booths. The effect on school hours would be the same; the time standard to be observed is clearly defined, Section 200 of The School Act provides that schools shall be held from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon, and from 1:30 to 4:40 pm. each school day. These hours may be shortened or altered by the school board upon receiving permission of the Minister of Education. Such permission is granted provided educational services and standards are not undermined. It is obvious that school bus route times can also be changed.

"Recent reports indicate that certain individuals are unwilling to adhere to the Time standards as defined in the legislation. It is true that no penalty is provided for having a clock that does not show the time accurately, but penalties are provided for engaging in certain activities at certain times of the day or week, in contravention of the Lord's Day Act, The City Act, The Town Act, The School Act, The Liquor Act, etc."

I might mention that the only one of those Acts that was enforced was The Liquor Act, where beer parlours were forced to remain on the Time; and when the Government states there were no penalties under this Act, how were they able to enforce the ruling on every owner of a beer parlour in the prov-

ince of Saskatchewan, if there were no penalties in the Act? Why didn't they disobey the regulations as set down by the Government of this province? Just one person in every town was required to keep the law.

Mr. Thorson (Souris-Estevan): - Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I want to make it clear (if it is not clear in the article from which my hon. friend is quoting) and which he attributes to me, that at no time did I suggest that there were penalties under The Statute Law Amendments Act. When I referred to penalties in the article from which he is quoting, I referred to penalties under The City Act, The Town Act, and some of the other Statutes, but never penalties under The Statute Law Amendments Act.

Mr. Gardiner: - Mr. Speaker, I believe that is what I read from this article, and that is what I have stated here. That change was made in most of the Acts of this province, where time was concerned, and under every provision of every one of those Acts there are penalty clauses. For anyone to say, after putting that into those Acts, that there wasn't a penalty clause attribute to this legislation, in the final analysis is actually trying to hood-wink either somebody in this province, or the members of this Legislature. I could not for one moment, as a younger member, come in for my first term, having placed legislation before this House for the first time, and then having, after it was passed by the members, the honour of having legislation that was proposed by myself passed by the majority of members of this House, and then to have the vacillating attitude, if not irresponsible attitude of the Government following statements that appeared explaining the Act by the youthful member for Souris-Estevan.

I am going to say here this afternoon, that I took the stand throughout my own area (and I'm not ashamed to say that I took the stand) that, as a member of the Legislature of this province, I could not go and tell anyone to break a law that was passed here, whether I was opposed to it when I sat in the Legislature, or whether I was for it. This is the stand I took. I think it was the only honest stand that any member of this Legislature could take, and if I suffer for it politically in my own area, I will take those consequences. Any time it relates to the honest efforts of a member of this Legislature in upholding the laws of this province, I hope I will be able to say, as a member, that I have unconditionally at all times done everything possible to see that the laws passed by this Legislature were honoured and kept by the people of the province.

When we are discussing the question of Time and the Government enforcing the law, I think it is probably an appropriate place to bring in the question of the Department of Education. Already during the course of this debate mention has been made of an unfortunate occurrence in this province in relation to the question of education. I would like to say here, as one who has had a great deal of interest in education in my own community, having served as secretary of our local school board for the last 10 years, having myself three children attending our local school at Lemberg at the present time,

attending a school that I had the privilege myself of attending quite a number of years ago, I feel I have as much interest in the question of education as any hon. member sitting in this House. I might say that I can feel quite sympathetic with the case that was brought forward by the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), and I hope and trust that something will be done, because I know something of the dealings between school boards and teachers, and also with the Department of Education, although we try, as far as possible, to keep as far away from the Department of Education as we can, knowing some of the things they have tried to do from time to time. In the relationship between teachers and school boards which I have seen, most of them have been friendly and co-operative. I believe because of the fact that in our schools (and I take some of the credit unto myself since the time I have been school secretary) I have done everything possible to bring the teachers and trustees closer together, and I think it has been good for the education of our children. I hope that in the years ahead, anything that I have to do with regard to education will be able to forward the efforts of both teachers and trustees in our schools, with the hope that it will provide better educational services for our children. However, we have had one or two things take place within our constituency this last year which are of some interest to the Department of Education, and which are of some interest to myself and the people I represent.

There are four areas, as most members know, that have not been established yet as larger units. The Department of Education, at the request of the executive of the South Melville Superintendency, requested a vote in our area in the past year. I think perhaps they thought the vote was going to pass; I don't think they would have held the vote if they hadn't believed that at the time they called the vote. However, it was one of those cases again where the Department of Education have no regard for the wishes of the people as such. They called a vote on the larger unit two months before the annual meeting of the Trustees' Association, which was held in the town of Melville, was to take place; about two weeks following the regular date of the annual Trustees' meeting. I think, if the Minister had been a little more patient, if his Department had been prepared to wait and take their case before the Trustees' Association, meeting in convention with representatives of the majority of the school districts in that area, that he might have had a little better chance (if he had any at all) of having the larger unit legislation passed in the particular area of which I am speaking.

What happened once the vote had been called? A meeting was held of the Trustees' Association – the annual meeting. At that meeting there was no doubt about the views of the majority who were attending. The majority wish was that the vote should be recalled, but of course that was impossible at the time. So it went ahead, and I might state that, five years ago, when a vote was held in the same area, it was defeated by 150 votes. This time I am not certain what the majority was, because I haven't had an answer to the question I asked in the House with regard to this particular matter; but I know it was by over 700 votes that it was defeated this time, and the defeat was not because of any political vote. There were no politics involved that I know. I did not attend one of the public meetings that was held, not even the one held in my own community, because I did not happen to be home

that evening; I was attending a meeting of my own outside the area altogether.

In my own town they brought in two officials from the Department of Education; two speakers from outside our area, one from the Yorkton area – a paid official of the Yorkton larger school unit; not a trustee of the unit or anything else, but the Secretary of that particular area; and they brought in a trustee or representative of the Trustees' Association from south of this city we are meeting in today. Four speakers, Mr. Speaker, to try to convince the people of one little community- and do you know what happened? Five years ago there were 40 who voted for the larger unit. After this meeting there were only 28 who were still prepared to go along and vote, and support the larger unit system. After listening to two officials of the Department of Education, and two speakers – one representing the secretaries of larger units, and the other representing the Trustees' Association in this province in the larger unit areas, still the people of that particular town voted against the Unit, although many promises have been made during both votes – many inferences. Many people may say there were no promises made. Possibly not; but there were sufficient inferences of all the great things that were going to be done for our town if we would only come out and support this larger unit measure. I can say that the people there, to my knowledge, in the past, politically or otherwise, have never been bribed by an offer of any gain that might be coming to their town, when it comes down to a matter of principle with regard to the matter of democratic principles. So I am proud to stand here today and say that, without any persuasion from me, without any interference from myself in any way, shape or form, unless I was asked for my opinion on this particular matter, the people of that community and that area turned down the promises which were made by those in charge of that vote, and decided to continue as they are today, at least until after the next provincial election. They will then perhaps get true justice from a new government in this province.

There are one or two things which happened during the taking of that vote. The same thing happened five years ago in the taking of the vote on that occasion, and it has been one of the reasons why, as one interested in education during the last few years, I have taken the stand that, as long as this particular factor remains in the organization of larger units, I cannot give it lukewarm support, let alone wholehearted support, as an advantageous change in the educational system of our province.

A few years ago in the Department of Education we had men known as school inspectors, whose job in those days was to go out and see that the teachers in the various schools were carrying on their duties as teachers in a responsible fashion. This Government came into office, established the larger school unit, and then changed the name of these men from inspectors to superintendents, and they placed men, who had never held any responsible position in the organization of schools, as such, outside of, possibly, teachers in their own right; they placed them in positions where they could have a controlling influence, if they so desired to use it, over many of the problems affected the Boards in larger units, and even in independent schools if the superintendents were able to exert their influence in that particular field. I am not saying that this is a general thing that has been done, but it is a thing that has been done in certain areas of the province, where – perhaps it was the fault of the individual in question, or perhaps the fault

of the Government – these individuals have wielded more influence that they should have over the affairs and operations of the schools in their area. So I say here that I thin it is due time that school superintendents in this province went back to see to it that the education of our children in the schools by the teachers was carried on in a proper manner. I am sure if that is carried out, that the trustees – those who have been given the honour by their own people of running their own affairs – will be able to look after the administration of their affairs in connection with education in our province. So I hope that, in the future, that possibly there will be some change in connection with the work of the superintendents in the Department of Education, less interference in administration affairs and more attention paid to the teaching of our children in the schools.

There have also been unfortunate cases in the past, and I think they are still taking place, in connection with education. A few years ago, under the guise or so-called adult Education Branch many of us remember the attempts by the Department of Education, through the Adult Education Branch, to try to bring socialist doctrines into the organization in the educational field, and also, in many cases, right into our schools. A year or so ago we had a meeting of our Home and School Club in Lemberg. At that time one of the officials of the Department (I believe it was Mr. Bates, if my memory serves me right) came out to address the Home and School Club, and he brought with him what is called a “Student Problem Check List”. He circulated this among the parents at the meeting, and asked them to go back and form themselves into small groups, that night, to discuss this check list and come back at the end of the meeting. He made it quite clear at the beginning that the Department was not pressing this; it was truly a voluntary thing; it was something they wanted done only for the good of their children. That was the beginning.

We went into our groups and considered the different problems mentioned in this particular check list, and some of us were astounded, to say the least, at some of the questions o the list. The hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) mentioned some of the questions that were being put to students, in relation to problems, at the Teachers’ College. In a way, I might not be too surprised at seeing those questions asked at the Teachers’ College – outside of the political ones. Some of the others might possibly be asked for certain reasons; but I would like to give you an idea of some of the questions that were suggested we should pass out to students in Grade XI and XII classes, then they should bring it back, if they so desire, to their teachers. If any of these problems are bothering hem, they could then discuss them with the particular teacher in their class.

I don’t know whether every one of these teachers is equipped, or has the education or know-how for handling children or young people in relation to problems mentioned on this list. I do know, like any other profession, that there have been those I have met in the profession that I wouldn’t surely want advising my children on many of the problems mentioned on this check list that our children might have problems with. I am going to read some of these questions, not all of them. Here we come to some which I consider

are some of the most objectionable ones: “Boy-girl relationships; seldom having dates; awkward about making dates; no place to go with friends” – these are the things you are supposed to decide if they are a problem to you, and then you are supposed to come back and discuss them with the teacher, and he is supposed to be able to answer them, I suppose. “Being unattractive; uninterested in the opposite sex; not permitted to have dates; necking; telling what makes marriage successful; knowing what causes marriage failures; going steady; kissing . . .” You can go on right down the line of problems, “boy-girl relationships”, and then they are supposed to go to their teacher, and they are supposed to say, “Well, maybe I’ve got a problem with regard to one of these things; tell me how it can be solved”.

Of course, we find “home and family problems” – this is another interesting one: “No suitable place at home to study; getting along with brothers and sisters; desire for more freedom at home”. What young girl or boy in Grade XI or XII wouldn’t think they should have more freedom at home? I think the majority of them would. “Desire a finer home”: Surely this is not a question that should be placed in a questionnaire such as this. Every one of us, of course, should desire a finer home, but this, to my mind, is putting into the minds of children dissatisfaction with conditions existing in the home, and asking them to go and discuss problems of that type with their teacher at school.

We could go through this list, and when we hear about the list the teachers are getting at Teachers’ College, they are astounding questions, but not so astounding when we know the people who are sitting across the way here. We know the people who have been in charge of the Department of Education . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): - Would the hon. member answer a question? Would you mind telling the whole truth about the list, and its purpose?

Mr. Gardiner: - You’re getting the whole truth! I’m not trying to give the balderdash you give us, you know.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): - You ought to be ashamed of yourself!

Mr. Gardiner: - Mr. Speaker, I’m not going to waste any more time with the Hon. Minister, because I am sure it would be falling on deaf ears in any case. But there have been statements made in this House in connection with education; I believe there were questions made with real intent, and probably feeling that they were true. One statement, the other day, was that we had more students, since this Government came into office, going to school than ever before, and that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Who made the statement?

Mr. Gardiner: - We had more students in schools in this province in 1932-33-1937-38 than we had in 1956-57, which is the last figure quoted in the Department of Education reports, with the exception of the report for 1957-58, which we have not as yet seen, and do not have the

figures for. But we have not had more students in our schools since this Government came into office. They are just getting back up now to the point where they were in the 1930s – and I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, at that time we were in the depression. People did not have a great deal of money, but at the same time we were in a position to provide education in this province up to Grade XII to a larger number of children than the present Government has had to make provision for since they have been in office. So, when you speak of the problems of education, they happened in a much more serious fashion than we have at the present time. I believe, at that time, myself and others like me were also getting a better education than my children are getting at the present time in the schools of this province.

There has been some reference by the Premier, and by members on this side of the House, with regard to keeping promises and also with regard to party policies. I am pleased to have here some statistics. I might mention here, before proceeding and getting off topics that are closer to home, that I believe that, in relationship to the Throne Speech, we should first ask ourselves when we read this document whether or not it provides solutions to the main problems that are affecting the people of this province at the present time. Secondly, whether or not we feel, as members of this Legislature, that the Government of this province is prepared to give, as the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has mentioned, leadership to the people of Saskatchewan in providing any benefits that might be provided by the Government of this province through legislation. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is the responsibility of each one of us to determine whether or not new legislation that will be placed before us will be serving the best interests of the people of this province.

We have heard a great deal said in the past, and I imagine we will hear more before this debate is over, with regard to the question of health services. This has been a pet topic of the Premier and his party since they came into office some 15 years ago. There have been statements already read into the records of this House with regard to promises that were made by the party sitting opposite us today. In relation to responsibility, we must well determine, as members of this Legislature, whether or not the funds that are going to be voted are being collected in the manner in which they should be collected, and also to define whether or not the promises, the vows, that were made by the people sitting opposite have been fulfilled to the people of this province.

Mention was made, the other night, with regard to the statement, that was presumably made by the Premier, of \$8 per head per annum being the cost of health services. I am not going to use that as an example of one of the promises. Here is what was actually stated: “Let there be no Blackout of Health: “The C.C.F. will therefore set up a complete system of socialized health services, with special emphasis on preventative medicine so that you and every other resident of Saskatchewan will receive adequate medical, surgical, dental and nursing hospital care, without charge.” Then we go to the bottom of the list: “Of course money must be found to pay for services which are free to the persons receiving them”. I want you to listen to this very closely, because this is right close to home. Before the election, the C.C.F. were quite sure they could find plenty of money,

and here is how they were going to get it. This was a resolution passed at the annual C.C.F. Convention, 1943, reported in 'The Saskatchewan Commonwealth', in case anyone wants to look it up and verify it, of August 2, 1943. Here is what it says:

"The Convention recommended funds for health and social services should be paid out of consolidated revenues" (listen to this) "through which corporations and individuals contribute on a basis of ability to pay, together with such funds as are made available from the social development of our natural resources" (and this is the important part – just listen to this): "Recognizing that any form of flat burden contribution is, in reality, a poll tax, and as such, largely means the distribution of the income of the needy among themselves" . . . (listen to that) ". . . placing responsibility for their care upon those least able to provide it, and relieving to a considerable extent those in more favourable circumstances financially from even their present contributions".

That was the way in which the C.C.F. Party in 1943 was thinking. They did exactly the opposite, as the elected representatives. So often we hear the tale over the radio, or over TV: "Here's a democratic party; all you have to do is to get in, and then you're sent as a delegate to Saskatoon or Regina. You make a resolution, and we'll do it right off the bat. We're a democratic Government!" Here is some more information. This is the C.C.F. Program for Saskatchewan, "Know what you are Voting For:", reported in 'The Saskatchewan Commonwealth' of May 24, 1955, just a few days before the election which placed these men opposite in charge of the Government of this province:

"The following ways of financing this program" . . . (I might imagine that is the program of the C.C.F. Party which they put before the people) "will be open to the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan . . ."

I want you to listen to this because of the fact that, without this quotation – I bring to your attention the possibilities that you had, as a socialist government representing the ideals of Socialism in Canada; the opportunities you had and refused to undertake, and the refusal to enact the principles which you believe in:

"First" (and listen to this; this is usually what they are doing, anyway) "press for Federal aid, for increased old age pensions, education and health services . . ."

That was the first thing the new Government was going to do. That is usually what they do. They sit down until somebody else does it, and then they take credit for it.

“They can and surely will” – just listen to this one; “They can and surely will save money by the elimination of graft and inefficiency in the public service.” Did you ever hear anything so ridiculous! They have been in office for 15 years and they, as far as I know, have never found there was any graft before they came into office. I don’t know if there is any now, but they have never been able to find if there was any before. As far as inefficiency is concerned, there has been so much inefficiency since this present Government came into office that to make reference to previous Governments is the most ridiculous thing our hon. members across the way could do.

Now, Clause 3 – “Can refuse to pay the high interest charges currently levied to service the Provincial debt” – and they have been piling on more debt every year and paying interest rates since they came into office as fast as they could. Here is a funny one. If you think the others were comical, you ought to read Number 4. “The C.C.F. Government can obtain revenues from the wholesale distribution of petroleum products”. The wholesale distribution of petroleum products – that was one of the ways they were going to get money. Have they fulfilled that promise, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, or Mr. Premier, as he stood the other day and said: “We fulfilled all the promises that we gave to the people since we came into office.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - We sure did.

Mr. Gardiner: - Then he said – this is something I didn’t believe when I read it – “The C.C.F. Government can obtain revenues from the further development of electrical power distribution”. In other words here they admit (I didn’t know they had admitted it before) that that is the way they were going to finance the province. They were going to go out and charge rates that would be able to provide other services to the people of this province through the sale of electrical power not only to farmers, but to residents in our urban communities. That was one of the policies. So we realize today that they can make some money in the Power Corporation, and that they put it back into general revenue at the expense of the farmers of this province, largely.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: - Next, Mr. Speaker, “The C.C.F. Government can obtain commodities and machinery along the lines indicated above for petroleum products.” Then last – they even put this last in those days; it is perhaps about the one only they tried to do anything about at all, and they put it last: “The C.C.F. Government can raise money from the development of natural resources”. That was the last way. They were going to use that as a last resort, if none of the other principles of Socialism that they reiterated in the previous clauses helped them, then, as a last resort, they were going to make it out of the natural resources of this province; and, of course, that is exactly where they made it, because what greater natural resources have we than the farmers of this province. That is where the Government for this province has gotten their money.

Here is the Premier himself speaking: "Mr. Douglas suggested ways in which the C.C.F. proposed to get money to pay for its social service program – "Saving considerable money by taking the Civil Service out of politics, and by setting up purchasing boards to buy Government supplies." Well, he has done that to a certain extent as far as buying Government supplies is concerned, but as far as taking politics out of the Civil Service, Mr. Speaker, the previous Government that he so often speaks about were just 'Babes in Arms' with regard to politics in the Civil Service in comparison to the Government that we have in office today.

Just one reference with regard to political influence in the government service. For years in this province one of the Departments, it was always considered, no matter what party was in office, except one, during the term from 1929 to 1934, was to be kept entirely free of political influence and political appointment, was the Department of Education. Only once before this present Government came into office was the position of Deputy Minister of Education ever offered to a political candidate in this province, or to one whose political inclinations everyone knew, and I say here, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

Mr. Gardiner: - . . . that if there is one Department – well wasn't Mr. McCallum a C.C.F. candidate? Wasn't he?

Opposition Members: - Sure he was!

Mr. Gardiner: - Sure he was. The first time in the history of this province, and here is the Premier – boy, he gets up and talks to the people when he goes around the country, and he says, "Look at the machines we had before – but (he forgets to say) "You should see the machine I have got back at home, because I have got a beauty". Here we have, for the first time in the history of this province, a man who has been a candidate for a political party appointed to be in charge of the educational system of this province, a place to which no one who could be considered to be influencing the children of this province, to my mind, should be appointed over the heads of men who have worked in that Department down through the years and know the administration work. I am sure the present Deputy Minister did not know it when he entered the Department. There are men who have been there for years and served this province well in the field of education, who have served through two governments – men who at no time have taken part in any political activities during the time they have been in their positions. Those men are still with the Department, but they have placed over their heads a political head, who could see to it that the wishes and desires of the masters, the C.C.F. Party, were put into effect for the education of the children of this province.

A few years ago, we used to hear a lot more from our friends across the way. They were a little braver in those days. We used to hear statements from men like Mr. Winch and others about the fact that they had the teachers in this province corralled and they were going to be able to influence the minds of the children in this province, so that, sooner or later, there wouldn't be anyone with any other political philosophy left here except the

socialists. Those views have been expressed by members of the C.C.F. Party in this country.

When we listened to the Premier, the other day – I don't like to go back to this little document I have in my hand, but I think it is so interesting particularly to my friends across the way. I just want to get this one particular item, because the Premier mentioned, the other day, what their policy was. Here it is. He was talking about the socialization of industry, the fact that the C.C.F. no longer are opposed to private industry going into Saskatchewan. He likes to leave the impression that the C.C.F. was always that way – “we have always been friends of private enterprise”. Then here is what was said on socialization of industry: “The final objective of this group is to socialize industry in its entirety. The wording of the objective is: “Social ownership of all resources and the machinery of wealth production”. This, therefore, includes all industry. We recognize the rights of the individual to own personal property which he can use for his own comfort and well-being. Personal property is inclusive of home, clothing, furniture, etc.” – and they don't even mention the farms; they don't even mention that they can own the farm or own personal belongings. Yet the Premier of this province, after standing up in support of the principles that were established when his Party was set up, will get up in this House and cry crocodile tears to the members of this Legislature, and say: “Oh, you should keep hands off! I believe in private enterprise; I believe in business coming into Saskatchewan.” In fact he says that if it won't come in on its own volition, “I'll go out and take all the wealth of this province, and I'll buy its way into the province of Saskatchewan”.

That is what he says today. That is what he says at the conclusion of his first promise – how he was going to get the money. He charged the daily paper for getting large printing contracts as payments for propaganda, and that the taxes were used to keep a political machine. Those were the statements he made; but if you look at their printing contracts and compare them with those of any previous Government in this province, then the Premier should hang his head in shame for ever thinking that he made the remark which he made here to the people of his party, as a way in which they were going to provide the money to give the social service to the people of Saskatchewan. All he has tried to do is to force the people through propaganda, through political and government propaganda, and even bribe them with these statements, because after a while, you know, if somebody tells you something often enough, sooner, or later, if no one answers it, you are going to believe that maybe he's really going to do it, that he's really going to achieve what he says. Of course, our Government repeats itself so often that if some people do not believe it, then it is going to be a very odd thing, in this day of advertising and publicity.

This was the second day: “Raising of revenue by government engaging in revenue-producing business”. Revenue-producing business? Well, they have started a lot that they hoped would produce revenue. A lot of them went ‘broke’, and the only ones that have shown any spirit at all have been those that they could tell the people that they had to do it, whether they liked it or not – the only way in which they have been able to provide any

revenue-producing industry or business for the people of this province to receive social services properly.

The third one is merely a repetition of the previous one, but I want to mention the fact that the Premier himself has given this pledge to the party and the people: "Setting up commodity boards to sell goods now being sold by monopoly". I wonder where these Boards are?

Mr. McDonald: - The Timber Board!

Mr. Gardiner: - Oh yes, the Timber Board. I don't know whether there was a monopoly in that field before, or not. I wasn't too interested at that time; and if there wasn't there has been in the last few years. Sad to say to the people of Saskatchewan, in spite of the fact, as some members have pointed out previously in this debate, that we, the members of this Legislature, have some charge over the affairs of the Timber Board of this province, they still charge prices as high as any of the great monopolies that I know of in the lumber business in this country. Some of those monopolies will come in and even sell it cheaper in this province than the Government in this province!

This is the real joke: "The taxing of interest payments to Corporations outside the province . . ." At present between \$35 million and \$45 million were going out of Saskatchewan in interest payments", he said. That's where he was going to get some money.

Then the last one: "Sponsoring the development of natural resources by public or co-operative ownership" . . . "The establishment of secondary industries, such as grain alcohol, protein, wheat starch, wheat syrups, synthetic rubber, plastics, anti-freeze and linseed oil". That was from an address by Hon. T.C. Douglas, at Weyburn, June 13, 1944.

Mr. McFarlane: - It's a good thing he didn't bring it in and introduce it . . .

Mr. Gardiner: - This is the final one to which I want to refer with regard to the Premier: "T.C. Douglas, C.C.F. Leader, declared in an election campaign speech here Thursday night, that the C.C.F., if given power in the June 15th vote, would shift the basis of taxation from land and consumption to profits of mortgage companies which, he declared, went out of the province. Mr. Douglas said \$40 million went out of the province this year, and taxation from this would provide one of the sources for financing the C.C.F. social program." What happened, Mr. Speaker? Oh, he got some money. He didn't get it from the mortgage companies. He got it from the farmer again. He chased the mortgage companies out, and then he couldn't get any money from them!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: - What a deduction!

Mr. Gardiner: - I believe I should say now a word or two in regard to municipal affairs. During the last few years in particular, those who have been in charge of municipal affairs in this province, in spite of the statements of the Minister of that Department, in spite of

statements of members of this Government, have not been satisfied and are not satisfied today with the actions of the Government – my friend from Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) stood up and said the municipal men in his seat were quite pleased with the Government of this province. I don't believe he thinks they're quite pleased, because I haven't met a municipal man yet, many of the C.C.F. members, who have been completely satisfied with this present Government, if even partly satisfied. When he says they all think the grid road program is a wonderful thing, I don't know. I sat in on three municipal meetings about two weeks before coming into this Session, any the one thing that was impressed on me at every one of those meetings, by the reeve and the councillors, was the one big problem of financing the grid road program, and financing the municipal shares. Of course, I made a point of telling them that, if they had been prepared to accept the program of our party at the last election, they would have had their grid road program paid for by the Government of this province, and I said, after next year (if they wait that long) you'll get the justice you deserve!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - They still don't believe you!

Mr. Gardiner: - I think when we read what has been happening to per capita taxation in this province, where the rural per capita tax has increased today up to the point where it is \$106 per capita in the province of Saskatchewan, we have reached the point where it cannot go any further, in spite of what members of this Government might think; in spite of what members of the C.C.F. Government might think.

I don't believe they are sincere when they stand up and say they think the municipal men are happy with affairs at the present time, or that they are happy with the present grid road policy of the Government of this province. I know that in my constituency, they are not, and I am going to make here today, the suggestion that was made to me here only the other day – it is part of a suggestion I made also, I believe, in the Throne Speech debate last year, and which regards the grid road system in our municipalities in our province. There are some municipalities that cannot afford, in spite of even a 50-50 or 60-40 contribution, to tax their people further in order to raise the money to take advantage of this system being offered by the Government. What they are asking today is a supplementary system whereby the grade of road would not be so expensive to build, or possibly they could build a road for, say, \$2,000 which would be practical, and would give a reasonable service to the people they represent. It would only cost those people through taxation \$1,000 instead of the cost we are made to pay at the present time under the grid road system. I think the poorer municipalities in this province deserve some consideration in this line, and I think the Government should take under consideration a policy in that connection.

References have been made by members across the way when they ask, from time to time, "Where are we going to find the money – where are you going to find the money to carry out all these things you're talking about?" Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to read out too many figures, but I can find \$11 million of it, since this Government came into office, in connection with the profits of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. We could find another few million in the profits that have been taken from the people of this province

through the Telephone system. Though they are actually service corporations, though they are not profit corporations, although the Premier in his promises to the people of his party stated that they should be profit-making organizations to bring in revenue to provide some of the services promised by the C.C.F. Party; but in spite of the promises that he made, in connection with power to the farm people of this province, over half of the cost of that plan could have been met by the profits of the Power Corporation over those years. In other words, the only reason there has been any profit is because of the fact that the farm people, desirous of having power, have been prepared to pay \$500 in order to have an installation on their farms.

Only the other day, one of our members mentioned the publicity and the propaganda put out by the Power Corporation, and, up until three years ago, there was roughly one-half million dollars of the taxpayers' money absolutely wasted by the Government of this province in advertising and publicity, much of it political propaganda. How about the pamphlets that appear at election time known as 'Progress'. Have you ever seen it? A few years ago they used to have it in the lobby of the King's Hotel. I don't know who put it there. Most of our members stayed at the King's Hotel at that time, and every day when we'd come down, here would be a bunch of these 'Progress' pamphlets on a table, showing what had been done in the last four years. It has been put out just before election campaign – before the last two elections, at least; put out at the expense of the people of this province, and the last one cost the people \$20,000 – pure political propaganda!

Our Premier across the way smiles. He can get up and talk about the terrible Tories, and the terrible Grits, how they used to take the well-earned money out of the people's pockets! I don't know how some of the gentlemen that sit behind there, some of the gentlemen that know better, can sit and listen to a man who deliberately, without any proof, makes statements of the type he has made. Fortunately today, we have the proof of the actions of the Government across the way – one of the most deliberate political machines we have ever had in this province.

There is one other matter I want to make reference to, and I want to support in this the hon. member from Humboldt, and that is in connection with her references to her desire to see the Highway Traffic Board and the Liquor Board, as it is presently set up (possibly the new outlet Commission, or whatever it is to be called) placed in the hands of a different Minister of the Government, transferred from the office of the Provincial Treasurer to the office of the Attorney General of this province. I think it is only fair for the protection of the citizens of this province, because of the fact that I mentioned this at the beginning of my discussion, with regard to Time. With regard to Time, the Government refused to accept their constitutional duty in enforcing the laws of this province, and I am going to say here today, Mr. Speaker, that had this Government during the last 14 years, enforced the liquor laws, or even tried to enforce the liquor laws in this province, we wouldn't be in the position that we are at the present time, with the people unsatisfied with . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he know that the Attorney General's Department is a department that is today charged with the responsibility of the enforcement of liquor laws in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Gardiner: - Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is responsible for the enforcement of any law, I imagine, in this province; but unless the Liquor Board itself carries out the statutes, I am sure the Attorney General is not going to try to prosecute them. Talking of new outlets – we don't need any new outlets, according to an answer handed down the other day. One club in this city received 119 liquor permits during the past year – almost one for every two days they could be open. Just one club in the city of Regina! If that is enforcement – if that is trying to enforce the spirit of the liquor laws of this province, I cannot believe that we should leave the present Minister in charge. If the Attorney General's Department won't enforce it, or if his Department issues a permit in order to let people make mockery of the laws of this province, then I think in all fairness that the new Act, if we are going to hope to have it enforced, or if we are going to hope to have it respected by the people of this province, must be placed in the hands of another Minister of the Government of this province.

The member for Humboldt has already stated that she believes, and I do too, that any Minister who is in a position where his job is to try and collect sufficient revenues to operate the business of this province, is not the department that we want in control of the sales of liquor, from which some of the profits that are realized from that sale, go into the Treasury of this province. We want to have all those laws in the hands of the man who is responsible for carrying out, and enforcing the laws in this province. After the unfortunate results over the Time question, I hope and plead and ask the Government of this province that, if they are going to change the liquor laws of Saskatchewan, they will enforce these laws; they will not allow them to become, the way the present laws have become over the past 14 years, discredited by the people of this province due largely to the inability and, I believe, undesired of our Government to carry out properly the enforcement of the laws of this province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - You'd better back that up with some facts.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - He doesn't need facts; fiction is better!

Mr. Gardiner: - I am told when they set up this Committee, they did so because of the fact they had become convinced that what they observed couldn't be enforced. When anyone in the position of enforcing laws in this province or anywhere else, admits defeat, admits that he cannot enforce the laws in this province, then it is time instead of setting up committees to deal with the matter, that we get rid of the Government that we have in this province at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that the hon. member was referring to me when he said that the person in charge of enforcing the laws admits defeat when he cannot enforce the law. If that statement is directed at me, I want to demand the gentleman to back it up with the evidence, or withdraw the allegation. That statement should be substantiated or withdrawn.

February 24, 1959

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): - Sit down!

Mr. Gardiner: — I said “in my opinion”, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: - I don't believe it is necessary to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Gardiner: - Before closing the discussion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to one or two items in connection with urban government in the province. In the last few years I have had some opportunity to take part in urban administration in Saskatchewan, and the references that have been made here, by the hon. member for Humboldt and others, with regard to some improvements that should be made to urban centres, strikes very close to home, particularly in connection with water and sewage connections for our smaller centres. I believe there is one project that could be undertaken by this Government, or any other government, with great credit to the province.

For 14 years we have the record here as to what the record is in the province of Saskatchewan: “how many centres in Saskatchewan have installed water and sewage?” This includes all cities, towns and villages – 45 as of March 15, 1958. Only 45 centres in this province have both water and sewage. “How many centres in Saskatchewan have installed water systems only?” Eight. That is the extent of the program to date by this Government – they haven't helped in this particular program even to bring these services, to a very great extent, except perhaps in the buying of a certain percentage of the debentures that were sold to make some of these schemes possible. Every one of them was made possible due to the efforts of the local communities in this province, and I am going to state one fact. There are some here who will say, “Well, I know you want us to spend a little more money”. I have no objection to the Government of this province, or any place else, spending money, providing it is spent in such a way that it brings benefit to the people of our province and country.

One way this could be done, to help to provide services of this kind to our smaller urban communities, is by seeing to it that some of the (I suppose others have mentioned this, too, so I might as well) so-called political patronage of the Government should be circulated around the country, as well as in the cities of our province. When you look at Public Accounts you see that everything is bought in the cities of Saskatoon or Regina, or has been bought from somebody in eastern Canada. If we say, “Why don't you buy it out in our local communities”, the answer is, “You people would complain because it would cost you a little more money”. Ever since the Government came into office it has done everything in its power to bring to their knees the small urban communities, financially and every other way, in the province of Saskatchewan. It has done everything, through its policy of centralization, to bring many of our communities in Saskatchewan to the point where they know they can no longer carry on in a financial way, and yet they sit across the way when we get into Public Accounts and say, “Oh, we can't do that. It costs a little bit more money, if we bought it out at John Jones' in your own

constituency”.

This morning, going through Public Accounts, we were checking the Health Regions, and about one-third (I would say) of the cost of them comes from the local taxpayer direct. All of it originally comes from the local taxpayer, but about one-third of it comes direct from the pockets of the local taxpayer and every car in my own constituency of Melville, every car in the Yorkton-Melville Health Region was purchased from one garage in the city of Regina – a total of \$21,000. I don’t know whether that is going to place our communities in a position where they can continue to operate, where they can continue to provide the needed services to their people. If everybody did what the Government of this province is doing, we might as well close up shop insofar as small communities in this province are concerned. They have been the main instigators in seeing to the centralization of power and centralization of all facilities; so the end of many of these small communities has been made much more rapid than it would have been, if we had not had the present Government in office.

The urban communities have great costs, great expense, great responsibilities to the people of their communities, as have those who are in charge of the affairs of the rural municipalities of our province. I think they deserve some share of the revenues of this province in a direct form from the Government of this province, and particularly so do the small rural communities deserve that assistance.

The other question of local interest is the question of telephone service. I understand that here another committee has been established. The hon. member for Humboldt objected to the matter of committees and commissions, through government and should be operated by the representatives of the people. Today when we sat in Public Accounts Committee, I began to wonder what we are even here for. What are the members of this Legislature even sitting here for, when Cabinet Ministers take it upon themselves, as members of this Legislature make inquiries in Public Accounts, to stand on their feet and publicly ridicule people of this province. This is not the first time this has happened, but I hope it will be the last. I am quite certain that the Minister in charge of the Department, if he had been left alone by the Cabinet Minister in question, would have quite nicely handled the situation in Committee.

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, discussions of a Committee cannot be discussed in the House, unless the report of that Committee is before the House. If we’re going to start discussing committee work in the House, we would all have to be given that privilege. You are out of order.

Mr. Speaker: - The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Gardiner: - Mr. Speaker, if I can’t take this year’s, I can refer to last year’s, because the same thing happened in the Public Accounts Committee last year. I believe that, when any Minister of a Government has arrived at the point where he is not prepared to let the people of this province have the facts (I don’t care what the facts are) placed before them, whether he thinks they are ridiculous or not, any member in this House

has the right in committee to ask any question on Public Accounts without being ridiculed by the Minister of this province. The fact that Government members do not desire information does not mean that the members of the Opposition do not desire it; and I can certainly tell you that in Public Accounts now and in the future, I can assure the Ministers in charge of the Departments that we will ask every question we wish, if we think it is in the public interest to ask it, and we will make known all the facts we possibly can with regard to expenditures of the people's money in the province. That's what we are here for. If we have to stay until the summer holidays, I would say it would be the job of the members of this Legislature to sit here and see that the business of government in this province is done in a sensible and sane manner.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Who are you trying to impress?

Mr. Gardiner: - Mr. Speaker, I am drawing my remarks to a close this afternoon. In relationship to the Throne Speech, as far as my constituency is concerned, personally I can say to the members on the Government side of the House that I do not believe there is any reason for any resident of my constituency to cast a vote for the Government of this province. Take the one example that I mentioned at the start of this debate regarding the problem of gas for one of the main centres of this province. In spite of the evidence down through the years, of that town supporting the Government on that side of the House, they have hardly received a one cent piece in either public buildings, or public expenditures of any type, unless they were the same type that every community is entitled to such as grants for schools, or assistance for hospitals. The hospital in the town of Melville was built before this present Government came into office. To my knowledge, the telephone building was built. There is no court house. Although this Government has been requested for a court house, there is no court house, and the Government of this province has even moved the sheriff who used to live in that town. Maybe he wasn't moved by the Government, but he has moved to Yorkton. He carries on his activities there and drives to the town of Melville once or twice a week.

That is the service the people of the town of Melville have received from the C.C.F. Party, for the political support they have given down through the years. It is quite surprising to me, with men sitting in this House on the Government side who have been residents of that town, that one of the main centres of this province over the past 50 years has been entirely neglected by the Government of this province during the time they have been in office. Three of the members that have been sent here since 1944 have been representatives of that party. I don't know whether they spoke while they were here; whether they asked for things for the Melville constituency, or tried to get things; or whether the Government had really written it off as an accident if they ever won it. I don't know whether that was the reason they have done it in the past, but I think it was only by accident if they thought they could win the constituency of Melville.

I am quite certain the people of Melville, after the support they have given in the past, are not going to be prepared to continue that support any longer, with the so-called promises of the members of the Government.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - Mr. Speaker, who are those three C.C.F. members who represent Melville? Just to get our historical facts correct, who are the three?

Mr. Gardiner: - There were two, and one who called himself a "United Reform" man. Mr. Herman was a member here for six years before this Government came into office, and later on, there have been two Liberal and two C.C.F. members in the House here since the time this Government came into office. That third C.C.F. fellow has been long forgotten. He never came into the seat after he was elected; he was never back during the time he served for that constituency, to my knowledge, and I think I can quite safely say here today that, as far as my constituency is concerned, and with the facts that the members on this side of the House have placed before the members of this Legislature, and the people of this province, the people are only waiting, as the member for Humboldt stated, for an opportunity to turn this Government out of office. I am quite certain that the constituency of Melville will agree with me when I say that, because of the neglect in municipal matters and the poor administration in the Department of Education since the inception of this Government; because of the political control that has been exercised by the Government of this province, and the fact that they refuse, on different questions, to respect the laws of this province and carry out the laws as given to them by the members of this Legislature, I certainly cannot support the Throne Speech, and will vote for the amendment.

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): - Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate, and I would like to congratulate all those who have taken part, not in the spirit that I agree with all things that have been said. Certainly not either in the time consumed or the loudness of the voice that is used so often. But, rather I would like to congratulate all because I don't doubt their sincerity. I think everyone who has spoken has been quite sincere in what they have had to say, in the high hopes of making all of the other side of the House believe as they do.

Now, as a Social Credit, it is most amazing to hear my friends to the right criticize the Government for having socialists, and the members of the Government repeating again and again that the Liberals and the Conservatives are basically alike. Well, I would like to say that both accusations are absolutely true. I would, however, like to congratulate the C.C.F. in that they are the only honest socialists that we have, and the two old line parties are socializing us faster, under false pretence, than the C.C.F. I may not get much sympathy from either side of the House when I say this, but that is my true conviction.

While listening to the members of the Government labour in their efforts to praise the program outlined in the Speech from the Throne, it reminded me of a three-legged stool, propped on their Hospitalization Plan,

their Power Corporation and their Car Insurance Plan. Their frantic effort to strengthen these three props, no doubt, is because of their realization of what happens to a stool when any one of the props gives in.

On Wednesday, the Minister of Agriculture made a comparison of the cost of bringing power to farms in Saskatchewan and to the farms in Alberta. Though I am not here to defend the Alberta program, I must say that a half-truth to me is just as bad as a falsehood. The \$2,000 that he quoted, if that figure is correct (I don't know) must represent the total cost of bringing power to the farmer, but the \$600 he has used for Saskatchewan costs is only the farmer's share of the cost and the balance, we know, has to be shared by the people of Saskatchewan. Because of the misrepresentation of this truth by the Minister yesterday I feel that a clarification is in order.

First of all, let's get this single little truth into our heads: there is nothing free, and someone along the line must pay for it. It is ridiculous to try to make people believe that the \$600 and the \$2,000, as quoted, are fair comparisons. In Saskatchewan only farms within two miles of the power line can have power; while in Alberta anyone can have power if he is willing to pay the extra costs involved. The \$2,000 must be the cost of a line to someone a good distance away. Statistics show that about the same number of farms are electrified in Alberta as in Saskatchewan, and that the people of Alberta are quite satisfied with their Rural Electrification program was demonstrated when they voted against public ownership several years ago.

We hear so much about the industrial development of Saskatchewan, and no one in this House would dispute the fact that production in Saskatchewan has increased; no one argues the fact that some industries have come to Saskatchewan in the last years; no one argues that mineral production has increased in the last three years. No one argues that we have more farms served by electricity that some years ago – but that to me, Mr. Speaker, is not the point at all. The true value of anything can best be arrived at by comparing it with another object designed to give a similar service. For example, a person wanting to buy a car would decide by comparing cars; when buying a home we shop around comparing houses; a teacher will assess the progress of a student by comparing his progress to that of other students. So after hearing of the wonderful, yes almost unbelievable progress we are making in Saskatchewan, I thought it quite proper and correct to compare our progress with that of other provinces, and that to me, Mr. Speaker, should throw a new light. After all, we do live in a time of change, and it is not whether we are making change and progress, but we are making the progress that others are making? That, to me, would be a proper and healthy yardstick to use in measuring our progress.

Now, because the physical conditions and the natural potentialities of Saskatchewan and Alberta are very similar, most of my comparisons will concern these two provinces. Also, in these two provinces they have had their respective parties in power for a considerable time, so that present conditions and the present rate of development must be the result of the policies practised by these individual governments. Another reason I chose these two provinces

is because I feel that industry comes to Saskatchewan in spite of the C.C.F. Government; and the number that has come here is but an indication of what could be happening in our province if we had a government that is, by principle, a free enterprise government. The comparisons I want to give are not related, but touch many separate and different segments of economic growth and activity: the degree of responsibility the Provincial Government assumes in providing services, the results the people get from the administration of their affairs, and the benefits the people are getting from the development of their natural resources, and so on.

Now, the first of these comparisons deal with taxation. The Premier, when he spoke on February 19th quoted figures on spending by the Government for highways, comparing what they spent when they were last in power, with what is being spent today. This point is weak, because increased costs, the inflated dollar, the greater need for more and better highways, all enter into the picture. In 1944 there were 139,000 automobile vehicles registered in Saskatchewan. In 1957 there were almost 300,000 motor vehicles registered in Saskatchewan. So you can see there is a far greater need for more highways, there is a far greater need for better built highways – because of the large trucking industry we have today, and so just to compare the two figures of expenditure is a very, very poor way of actually telling the people how much better this Government is.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, I could say that this Government has failed because the per capita tax has increased very considerably from 1944 to 1957. For example, in 1944, the per capita tax in Saskatchewan was \$31, and in 1957 it was \$73; in towns it was \$23, today it is \$58; in villages it was \$20, today it is \$43; in rural municipalities it was \$28; today it is \$99. Now to use these figures to prove the failure of this Government would be unfair. Just to use this comparison of figures for 1944 with today is a weak way of measuring progress. So that is why I think comparisons in a different way are more effective.

I will certainly not get through here now, I'll try to rush through this first part and then I'll call it 5:30.

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member finds it more convenient to call it 5:30 now, wherever he wants to break off, I'm sure the House wouldn't object.

Mr. Elias: - No, I'll quickly rush through this; I think I can do it. Now, although grants to municipalities have increased, the total grant today represents a smaller share of the total municipal revenue than it did in 1944. What part of the municipal revenue is provided by taxation? I'm not using figures in dollars and cents, but what part of the total revenue used by municipalities is provided by taxation? In 1944, in the cities it was 60 per cent, but today it is 69 per cent, so city citizens have to bear a greater share of the total revenue used in cities than they did in 1944. In towns, in 1944 the taxation provided 76 per cent; today citizens have to provide 85 per cent of the total revenue required. I don't think that is relieving the burden on citizens. In villages, it was 82 per cent, and now it

is 91 per cent. Rural municipalities is the only place where they have had some relief; it was 84 per cent and today it is 82 per cent, but in all other groups the citizens of 1957 have to pay a greater portion of the total monies required for municipal administration. To carry on that comparison a little farther – in 1950, in Saskatchewan town citizens had to provide 83 per cent; in Alberta it was 82 per cent; in 1955 towns in Saskatchewan had to provide 86 per cent while in Alberta only 67 per cent in taxation. So you can see that in Alberta the citizens were being relieved of a greater part of their burden. In villages the same thing is true. In 1950 village residents had to provide, through taxation, 88 per cent of the total required and in 1955 it was 90 per cent, but in Alberta, in 1950, the citizens through taxation had to provide 92 per cent but in 1955 only 72 per cent. In rural municipalities the same thing holds true.

I was rather interested in a tax notice that was handed to me. In Alberta they have to state right on the tax notice the total amount they want to collect from taxation, but on the same paper it is required to submit also a statement of the grant to be received by the particular municipality, but it city, town or village. I have this one here from Edmonton. The total to be collected in 1958 was \$16 million, but they have to show on the same statement the total grants that the city will be receiving, and that is \$12 million. So that the total that the city will require for their operations is \$28 million, but the taxpayer, when receiving the tax notice, has the whole picture, namely his share . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Political propaganda!

Mr. Elias: - . . . of municipal financing and that of the government's, Oh no, it isn't that at all, I think it is just playing fair to the citizens – that's all it is.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before – it is only by comparing ourselves with others that we can properly appraise ourselves. It is not a question with me – have we had industries coming to our province, but have we had our fair share. It's not a question of have we made progress in our industrialization program, but have we kept pace with others. It's not a question of having received more results from our present administration – but have received as many desirable results as we could have received. In spite of increased grants the taxpayers are carrying a greater share of municipal expenditures today than 14 years ago – so the Government share has not increased.

I want to bring the following comparisons in now – touching on various areas of our economy and show that this Government has not kept pace with other provinces. I make no apologies for making comparisons, others have done it in the House, and I have said before, I think it is the only healthy way of really appraising ourselves.

Now, Saskatchewan is supposed to be the province where most is done for labour. One of the most important things to labour is the size of the pay cheque. Well let's see how labour fairs in this respect in our province. I have here the average weekly wages and salaries from 1947 to

1957, in both Saskatchewan and Alberta, that we have in manufacturing, construction, transportation, trade and service. I am not going to dwell on all these figures but the total average for these 11 years for manufacturing in Saskatchewan is \$50 and in Alberta it is \$53. In the construction industry – Saskatchewan \$51, Alberta \$55; these are weekly wages. Transportation - \$55 in Saskatchewan; \$57 in Alberta. Trade - \$44 compared to \$45. Service - \$31 to \$34, so that the average for all industries in Saskatchewan, \$46.79 and in Alberta it was \$49.22, and in all the years Saskatchewan was considerably lower. Now, what is the average weekly loss to the labourers choosing to work in Saskatchewan? In Saskatchewan, in 1957, the labourer would have lost \$3.02 per week, or a total yearly loss of \$157.04.

Well, let's go on to another comparison. We have heard a great deal of the great diversification that we are experiencing in Saskatchewan. Now, just how far have we diversified our economy and how invulnerable have we become! I maintain that the income of Saskatchewan citizens is still very subject to the violent year-to-year fluctuations of the agricultural income. Let's compare this rise and fall of personal income to the farm income fluctuation. I'll take the years 1952-53-54 to illustrate my point. The net income received by farmers from farm production in 1952 was \$614 million, and the personal income that year was \$1,436 and the next year there was a drop in the farm income – a drop from \$600 million to \$484 million and we notice there is an immediate drop in the personal income to \$1,319. In 1954, there was a considerable drop in the net farm income received from farm operations. It was down to \$145 million and the personal income dropped \$927. The next year, 1955, incomes from the farm was up a little and immediately we notice that the average person income is up also. So we see that there is a definite pattern – as farm incomes drop the average person's income in Saskatchewan drops; as farm income ups we have the average personal income also coming up. This is due to the lack of sufficient growth of other incomes. Now, what are the effects of this? The effects of this are directly and pronouncedly reflected in retail business and person income, as I have already illustrated.

Now, let's take retail business in Saskatchewan. Retail business in Saskatchewan dropped by 10.2 per cent from 1953 to 1954 – that was the big drop; our retail business dropped 10.2 per cent and in Alberta it dropped only 2.4 per cent, and so we see that retail business is not affected as much in Alberta as it was in Saskatchewan. In Manitoba it dropped only 5.8 per cent – this is on page 4 of the Retail Business of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The personal income in Saskatchewan dropped by 20.8 per cent in 1953 to 1954, and in Alberta it dropped only 9 per cent. Again we notice that we are far, far more affected by any rise and drop in farm income. So, I can't see how this claim of great diversification of industry in Saskatchewan has any grounds at all.

The percentage of the increase of total personal income from 1946 to 1956, a period of 11 years, was only 91 per cent in Saskatchewan, where in Alberta it was 131 per cent, and so no matter how you look at this, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is always far behind.

I have here another comparison of retail trade, from 1946 to 1956, which will further substantiate my argument. In 1946 to 1956 in the whole of Canada, there was an increase of 148 per cent; in Manitoba there was an increase of 107 per cent; in Saskatchewan it was 135 per cent; in Alberta 178 per cent, and in B.C. 169 per cent, so retail trade per person in Saskatchewan was the lowest of the three western provinces, in the 11 year period. As I said before, I think the responsibility for these must be assumed by our present Government because they have been in for a period long enough that they should be willing to accept these responsibilities and these charges.

Here is another comparison – another way of judging activity in the province. What is the value of construction contracts awarded by the provinces? In Manitoba (I am comparing the years 1946 to 1957), Manitoba increased by 624 per cent; Saskatchewan increased by 316 per cent; Alberta increased by 379 per cent and British Columbia – 392 per cent. Again, of the three western provinces, Saskatchewan made the lowest – that is the lowest rate of increase and I am not only interested in progress but I am more interested in the rate of increase, because if we have stayed behind now, and if this lag continues, where are we going to be, comparatively speaking, in the next few years? I think this is a very, very serious question that we should consider. In Saskatchewan, I'm glad we are making some progress, but as I said before – are we making enough progress? Are we making as much progress as we are rightfully expected to enjoy?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Sure we are.

Mr. Elias: - In Saskatchewan it rose 40.8 per cent, but in Alberta they increased by 168 per cent. I figured this out on the per capita basis. What is net value of the increase and the net value of production on the per capita basis? In Saskatchewan it rose 36.8 per cent; in Alberta it rose 96.8 per cent. We have heard so much, so very much, about industrial development taking place in Saskatchewan. I would just like to quote the lady member from Regina:

“No one could listen to the Speech from the Throne, nor the Address of the Hon. Premier without being impressed. I am very much encouraged by the great progress which is taking place in the province, in the development of our natural resources and in the increased industrial activity, and in the general diversification of our economy. It has been pointed here that two-thirds of our wealth now comes from non-agricultural forces; that mineral production has now reached almost the \$200 million mark. The construction in the province of Saskatchewan is at its highest peak, and that production from manufacturing has reached \$326 million in 1958.”

I am not going to argue with one of these statements – not one of them, because they haven't proved anything, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Fines: - What are you trying to prove?

Mr. Elias: - I don't have to take the lady to task at all. In her closing remarks she gave two reasons for Saskatchewan's industrial expansion, and I wonder if she would give credit to the C.C.F. Government for both of these. These were the two reasons: one is that the province is rich in natural resources. Who is taking credit for that? No credit is due to them for that. The second reason was that Saskatchewan has a Government in power that has a long-range plan for the province. Well, that may be true, but results cannot come from a program of long-range planning alone, but rather, I think, from an active program of progress. We have to have an active program. Similar claims that I have read here are those made by members opposite continually, hoping to enchant the public. I, for one, do not dispute the validity, but without a program of progress, Mr. Speaker, it is only half the story.

Here are some statistics on the manufacturing industry, and I am again comparing Alberta and Saskatchewan. For the years 1946 to 1956, first of all the number of manufacturing establishments: in 1946 we had 955, in 1956 we had 973 – there is progress here – not too much to brag about, is there? In Alberta they have increased from 1,515 to 2,150. Look at the comparative progress – what is the degree of progress? The percentage increase from 1946 to 1956 in Saskatchewan was 3 per cent, while for Alberta it was 63.5 per cent. That makes the picture a little more clear, I think, because we are beginning to see where we actually do stand in this race of progress. Take the number of people employed; of course we have lost so many people to these other provinces that they naturally would have a greater number of people, but again – from 1946 to 1956, do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we had actually a drop of just about 3.6 per cent. We had less people employed in industry in 1956 than we had in 1946, and in Alberta . . .

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member where he got those figures?

Mr. Elias: - I don't intend tabling all of these . . .

Premier Douglas: - I'm just asking for these particular figures which you are quoting now.

Mr. Elias: - I got them from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Premier Douglas: - That doesn't answer the question. What volume? Is this dealing only with employees and employers, or does it only deal with manufacturing, or all industries?

Mr. Elias: - I just took the comparative figures for Alberta, so the picture would still be the same.

Premier Douglas: - No, it wouldn't be.

Mr. Elias: - I'm not interested in the numbers employed – I'm interested in the increase – that's what I'm interested in. In Alberta they had an increase of 64.9 per cent. Now, let's go to salaries and wages. From 1946 to 1956, the total salaries and wages paid to these people in industry: in Saskatchewan it went up 92 per cent, but in the corresponding period in Alberta it went up 246 per cent. What is the gross value of products? In Saskatchewan we had an increase from \$168,356 to \$301,000 and in Alberta they had an increase also, but the percentage in increase in the 10 years in Saskatchewan was 59 per cent, and in Alberta was 173 per cent. Why are we lagging in the manufacturing industry; the number of establishments, the number of people employed, the salaries and wages paid, and the gross value of products? In every one of these we are lagging behind.

Here is another one: 'Gross Mineral Production' in Saskatchewan compared to Alberta. Here I have the years from 1944 to 1954. In Saskatchewan, we grew from \$22,291,000 to \$87,131,000; in Alberta they grew from \$51,066,000 to \$325,974,000. Those figures do not mean too much; we're only interested in the rate of increase. In Saskatchewan the increase for those years was 290 per cent, but in Alberta it was 538 per cent – again another phase of activity in which we are still behind in the rate of progress. I am very much alarmed about this. Here is a very interesting comparison, one that very directly touches our very lives. We firmly believe in progress, because we are all talking about progress, and we believe the people should fully enjoy all the benefits of science and technological advancement. I firmly believe this. We live today, Mr. Speaker; not yesterday. We live in the age of cars; not in the days of ox-carts. We live in the days of micro-wave; not in the days of the Indian runner; we live in the days of modern facilities; not in the days of pit toilets and slop-pails. Let's see what progress we have made in this field, of providing service for people so that they can enjoy the good things of life; the things that science and industry is able to provide for us. Just how many of these facilities are we enjoying? I am very glad that the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) has given an appreciative ear in this regard. What progress have we made? Reference was made to this by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), but he didn't give the comparison, so I'll finish the story, if he doesn't mind. Comparing the years 1946 to 1956, I'll just take the towns and villages. Towns and villages that have both water and sewage facilities; in 1946 there were 13 town in Alberta that had both water and sewage, and in Saskatchewan we had 12, so in 1946 we were almost on an even keel with them. In 1956 there were 70 towns in Alberta that had both water and sewage, and in Saskatchewan we did make some progress – we had 29. Let's see what happened in the villages – people living in the rural areas; in Saskatchewan in 1946 there were no villages that had both water and sewage, and in Alberta there was one. But what's the picture today? In Alberta in 1956 they had 50 villages that had both water and sewage, and that's a good number of people who are enjoying these facilities; how many villages in Saskatchewan in 1956 had both? Not a single one. Do you call that progress? Is that really progress? I figured this out on a percentage basis, too, to complete my story. In Alberta, regarding water and sewage in the towns, they had an increase there in the number of 432 per cent, and in Saskatchewan 141 per cent. In Alberta (this is almost a ridiculous figure) they went up from one to 50, and it is a ridiculous percentage there. It is in fact 4900 per cent. Saskatchewan has made no progress as far as the villages were concerned.

In the town of Rosthern they are getting water and sewage now; but they are certainly going to pay for it through the nose, because I notice they have to borrow \$118,000 at six per cent interest to bring those facilities to their people, and of that \$88,000 is interest. In Alberta they have funds made available to their villages and towns at two per cent instead of six per cent. I call that Government for the people – not on the people!

I could give many more comparisons, Mr. Speaker, and although progress has been made, I would say it is not because of this Government that we have, but rather in spite of it. The comparisons I have given are a cross-section of activities within our province. In every area of activity Saskatchewan is lagging behind. The question is not have we progressed, but have we kept pace with progress elsewhere? The responsibility for this apparent lag between us and the fellow in the lead can only be laid at the feet of the Premier and his colleagues.

The program outlined in the Throne Speech lacks vision and vitality. It is characterized by the usual complacent attitude, and will not result in the actions for which we have waited so long, and have received only a program of planning. So, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): - Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Neibrandt) was speaking, last evening, he made reference to the Anderson Lodge, which is a home for the aged, at Yorkton. He gave the impression that this socialist Government had been wholly responsible for the erection of that Lodge. This was, to my notion, a disgraceful disregard for the generosity of those who were responsible for paying at least 80 per cent of the cost of that home, which amounted to about \$250,000. The main source of that 80 per cent was two Scotch bachelors who homesteaded just west of the Manitoba boundary and east of Yorkton who, through their hard work and thrift, accumulated a fairly comfortable fortune. Their names are James and John. L. Anderson.

Mr. James Anderson passed away some years ago and John. L. Anderson passed away not so very long ago, but he decided to donate a large portion of his savings to erect a home for the aged in Yorkton. I understand that the amount was in the neighbourhood of \$165,000. He left that sum in the hands of three men – Dr. Houston, Sr., Howard Jackson and Joe O'Reagan, a solicitor. During the period from the time when they got the money and the time it was used for the building they had enhanced the amount to the extend of some \$180,000. In addition to that \$180,000, the city of Yorkton gave another \$20,000. That left the Government to pay approximately \$50,000, and I want to say that it was no generosity on their part that they paid it; it was their obligation to pay it, according to the law of the province.

In addition to that, thousands of dollars were given by individuals, business firms and social organizations, with which the Home was furnished. I don't know why the hon. member should have disregarded this history unless

it was due to the fact that he couldn't expect a similar donation from a Socialist, whose characteristics are to take and not to give.

I want to say further that it is not conducive to further contributions of this kind if the generosity of the people involved is going to be disregarded. I know for a fact that, had Mr. Anderson known that his contribution was going to be used to glorify a socialist government, he wouldn't have given a single cent, because there was no system that he resented more than Socialism. He was a private enterpriser, a hard worker and thrifty, as is natural to his nationality.

I have made this statement, Mr. Speaker, in order to make the records right; and I want this placed on the records of this House.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): - Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would first like to compliment both the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, as well as other speakers who have taken part in the debate. I know that the mover and seconder did a lot of hard work in preparing and presenting their speeches; they were both a credit to their respective constituencies, and I am sure the people of their constituencies are very proud of them.

I really had no intention of taking part in this debate. I was going to wait for the other one, but after listening to the debate going on to seven days, I have come to two conclusions. Listening to the speeches from the Government side, I have come to the conclusion that the Speech from the Throne is a good one. I have also come to the conclusion that the members on your left, sir, really don't seem to have the ability to distinguish the difference between the sheep and the goats. It reminds me of when I was a boy on the farm and the old fellow on the next section to us owned a mule. This mule, like most mules, had a habit of kicking; but unlike other mules, every time he kicked he coughed, and every time he coughed he kicked. We never did find out whether he was kicking at the cough, or coughing at the kick. After listening to the speeches from the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion they don't know whether they are kicking or coughing.

As I said, I think the Speech from the Throne is a good one, and the members from this side of the House have proved it; and it is only because of some of the ridiculous remarks made by the members on your left, sir, that I decided to stand up.

Starting off on the first Tuesday, the Leader of the Opposition made remarks asking about the removal of the education tax from farm fuels, then went on to say that the farmers were discriminated against, and he complained that the tax had been put back on gasoline. I would say there is a basic difference: the tax on your farm fuels was a tax on a certain segment of society; but the gasoline tax is a tax on all the people of the province who use a car or truck. I am not a bit ashamed, and I am not a bit afraid to stand up and defend that to my people. I drive 20,000 to 25,000 miles

a year, and I am going to be paying a lot more towards the roads of this province than my neighbour who only drives 4,000 or 5,000 miles; but that is the way it should be.

I was amused at the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane). He complained about the Government giving orders that our people, our civil servants, were to buy Co-op products, whenever possible. Of course he went on to say (and I am not doubting his word) that he hauled all his grain to the Co-op, and he dealt, whenever possible, in the Co-operative stores. But you know what most of the Opposition members fail to realize is the basis of our philosophy. We are not a bit ashamed to believe that we should be dealing co-operatively. We believe in the co-operative philosophy, and we think that, wherever possible, this Government should patronize the co-operative movement. That is part of our movement. And then he went on and made quite a statement; he said there was a lot of political influences in the co-operative movement. I think that a lot of the people in the co-operative movement are now just beginning to realize who their friends are. Don't let us forget that the greatest enemy that the co-operative movement has in the world, today, is monopoly capitalism. Don't let us forget that. And the greatest enemy of monopoly capitalism is the co-operative movement.

If you look at the records of the political parties in Canada today, there is only one party that is ready to fight monopoly capitalism, and that is the C.C.F.

Govt. Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. Meakes: - Quite a number of years ago, the British Co-operatives in England went into politics. They went into politics because they realized there was only one political party that was going to fight for them. You know back about May 1st there was quite a hullabaloo in the press – and this hullabaloo will point out just what I am driving at: the Minister of Natural Resources made a statement concerned a farm-out deal with the Co-operatives. The next day (I think it was), the oil companies came out and said it was terrible discrimination and everything else. Then the following day, on May 3rd, the Leader of the Opposition came out with a statement. Of course he was very careful. He never said that we shouldn't be dealing with the Co-operatives, but he did say, in part:

“It seems to me, however, that it is only fair and reasonable and sound common sense that the companies which have done the work should have the right to bit for the privilege of developing the resources. This privilege is being denied them.”

He did not point out that, if it had come to a bid, our Co-operatives didn't have that kind of money and wouldn't have got the bid. He didn't point out that, if it had been run under the process that he suggested, the oil companies would have got it and our Co-operatives wouldn't. Oh no, he didn't mention that.

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I want to assure the hon. member that it wasn't my intention that this should be a cash bid. The Co-operatives have the right and the facilities to bid on a royalty basis, the same as any other company, and there is no discrimination.

Mr. Meakes: - Certainly I agree with that, but I do say that they couldn't afford it. The Co-operatives haven't got the money or the finances to make the type of bids that the big oil companies could make.

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege, they wouldn't need any money.

Mr. Meakes: - My friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley went on and started talking about the delegation to Ottawa. One of the things he said that kind of amused me was that one of the reasons this delegation was going to Ottawa was that it had to undo some of its socialistic policies. After sitting and thinking about that for a while, the only conclusion I could come to was that he is against the Wheat Board. That is the only socialistic policy that we have in the grain trade in western Canada.

Then when he went on to talk about discrimination against the farmer s- he talked about the mineral tax being a discrimination against the farmers. Well, to begin with, he didn't say that there was only a very few farmers who had mineral rights in this province; it is a very small percentage. A good number of the mineral rights are in the hands of the big companies and actually we are not hitting many farmers with this mineral tax. But here we have another basic difference between my hon. friends to your left and the ones on your right, sir. We believe that the minerals of this province belong to all the people of this province, not to a privileged few. It was on that basis, I believe, that this tax was brought in.

Then he went on and read from a document a statement Dr. King had made, that there hadn't been enough people in gaol. Well, Mr. Speaker, just because people go to gaol it isn't necessarily a disgrace. A lot of people have gone to gaol in the last 2,000 years; some of them went to gaol for no reason, and these are the people Dr. King was referring to. We can go back to the time of the Bible when Paul was in gaol. We can come down through history and find men who believed in something and were ready to go to gaol rather than give up their beliefs. They were the people Dr. King was referring to.

He went on with the statement where it said something about making people think. Often when you go to gaol – I have never been there, and I don't know whether my hon. friend has or not; but some of the great thoughts of history have come to people while they have sat in gaol. So I, for one, am not ashamed of the remarks of our political president, Dr. King.

Then he went on, and he was doing the same as an awful lot of the Opposition members are inclined to do, he was trying to drive that wedge in between farmer and labourer. He says the farmers will have no part in joining with labour. Well, Mr. Speaker, to me we have one basic thing in common, labourer and farmer; we both make our living by the sweat of our brow and by our hands. I think that is the best basic for joining any group of people together. And we have another interest; we both have a common enemy – monopoly capitalism. I would say also, as a farmer, that if we don't join with labour we are stupid. When you look at it percentage-wise across Canada, you will find that the farming population is about 15 per cent; and, if you believe the Gordon Commission, it is going to be down to about 8 per cent by 1980; and the farmers of Canada have never got anything out of either the Liberals or the Conservatives parties. We have only one place left to go, and that is to amalgamate with the labour people, who have so much in common with us. I don't think the attacks or the endeavours of the members on the opposite side, in this House and in the press, are going to drive that wedge in between farmers and labour. I will leave my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley alone now.

Mr. McFarlane: - Oh, keep on; I enjoy it.

Mr. Meakes: - Then the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) got up and made a statement that kind of shocked me. He was discussing the farm problem and he said that economic units depended on the individual farmers. As one who has lived on the farm all my life, I am a little sick and a little tired of hearing this term 'economic unit'. Certainly under present conditions and the economic structure that we have today, it makes it pretty hard for anybody to have an economic unit. But farming is more than just an economic unit; it is a way of life. To anybody who was born and lived on a farm all his life, as I have, we don't want to leave it; it is where I want to live and where I want to die. You know, Cicero said, a good many years ago, in discussing farming:

"That of all occupations from which gain is secured, there is none better than agriculture; nothing more productive; nothing sweeter; nothing more worthy of a free man."

Dean Swift wrote – and I would suggest that my friends across the way ought to read this:

"Whoever could make two ears of corn, or two blades of grass, to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind, and do more essential service to his country, than the whole race of politicians put together."

Then there was that great negro, Booker T. Washington, and this is what he said:

“No man can prosper till he learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem.”

I would say to my hon. friend from Meadow Lake – you know, Bob Edwards, the Editor of the Calgary ‘Eye Opener’ at one time said:

“City people envy farmers, but not to the extent that they take advantage of the continuous opportunities to be one.”

It always amuses me when my urban friends talk to me about the wonderful life a farmer has. Of course, some of my urban friends are people who have lived on farms and some of them are not; but I often wonder what would happen if they were faced some morning, with a dose of cholera in a litter of pigs, or had to practise midwifery in bringing a calf into this world. I don’t know who would be more frightened, the calf or my urban friends.

Then he went on and he talked about the Unions. I cannot help but mention it because I am shocked to think that any man in this country would make such remarks. My friend from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) made a very able rebuttal. Possibly I shouldn’t have been too surprised, because, you know, the political party he belongs to have come forth with some very reactionary remarks. I consider the statement made here as very reactionary.

Back in 1953, in this city at a Convention, Mr. Blackmore stood up and defended McCarthy and McCarthyism. In 1956, down in Nokomis, Mr. Kennedy made the statement that it would be all right if we had left Hitler alone. So possibly I shouldn’t have been too surprised.

Then our friend from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) got up and made quite a bit of fuss about the policy of the Timber Board. He wasn’t the only one, because several have talked about it since. He said it was no good; but what he doesn’t want to forget is that if the policy of the previous government had been carried on until this time, our timber resources would be gone; it was only through conservation that we have any left. And again I say to him that it is only by the basic principle of this Government, that the natural resources of this province shall belong to all the people of this province, that we have any timber resources left. As I said before, this is the basic differences between them and us. Our resources should not be for a privileged few.

He said that the people were having to pay too much; there was too much money being made on it. After all, I think the yardstick by which we should measure this – are the people getting full value for what they are buying? I think they are. At the same time the revenues from our natural resources are coming back into the coffers of this province.

There is one thing where I must agree with the hon. member for Pelly; that is when he was discussing our Indian friends. I, too, hope that, in the not too distant future, they will be full citizens the same as you and I.

I agree that we must accept these people as equals, as the white people have never done up to this time.

We listened for a while to the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) and the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) and after they had finished and sat down I walked out into the members' lounge and I phoned Percy Brown, our Provincial Secretary, and suggested that they hire these two gentlemen to go out and organize for the C.C.F. Their speeches are the basic reasons that we have a C.C.F. Party . . .

Mr. McDonald: - There aren't any vacancies.

Mr. Meakes: - Their speeches proved that the Liberal Party needs to be buried. I am not the only one who thinks so.

Mr. Lopton: - What did Mr. Brown say?

Mr. Meakes: - He said he didn't think they were worth the money; but you know, Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who thinks the Liberal Party is on its last legs. Why, even some of our Liberal friends think this.

Mr. McDonald: - At least we have legs.

Mr. Meakes: - I have here a clipping from 'The Leader-Post' of November 3, 1958, and I quote:

"The Liberals must win in 1960 or the party may die. A Liberal defeat in the next Federal election could mean the death of the Liberal Party in Canada, the Provincial Liberal Federation was warned Friday.

"We have to make up our minds that we must win the 1960 election (this was referring to the Quebec election) said Jean Louis Gagnon, a Montreal newspaper man and chairman of the Federation's publicity committee."

Mr. Foley: - Why don't you pronounce the name properly?

Mr. Meakes: -

"Because, if we lose, it might well mean the death of the Liberal Party not only in Quebec but all across Canada."

"He was addressing the Federation's fourth annual convention.

“Liberals across Canada are experiencing a ‘crisis’, he said. The Liberal Party once flourished in Britain, France, Belgium and Italy, but today it has either disappeared from those countries or has been relegated to an extremely secondary role.

“We should keep in mind that the same thing could happen in our own country. In the provincial general election of 1960 we will be playing our last card. If it is not strong enough we will lose the game.”

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my friends across the way that they are in the same position as the Liberal Party in Quebec – on the way out.

Mr. McDonald: - At least we are playing in the game; you didn’t even get into it.

Mr. Meakes: - Then the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) spoke, and I am sorry to see that she is not in her seat. Of course I can understand her feelings; she felt that she had to get up and defend the last Liberal Premier in Canada. I felt a little sorry for her.

After she sat down the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) got up; he had quite a bit to say about education, Time and gas. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he had a lot of the latter two commodities, and he needs more of the first. The thing that surprised me most of all was his stand on the Liquor Committee. He went on to criticize that this Government had felt it necessary to set up a Committee to study the liquor outlets. Yet the first two members to mention the subject in this House, a year ago, were the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Humboldt.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I was raised in the Liberal Party and I had quite a little bit to do, at one time, with the Liberal Party . . .

Mr. Foley: - You’re a turncoat!

Mr. Meakes: - . . . and I know all about the Liberal Party of those days. Going back to 1942 – I could go further back than that; but, in 1942, that was the year there were a lot of nominations going on all over the province. The Liberals didn’t know whether the election was going to be 1943 or 1944, and, as I have said before in this House, my father was a municipal secretary, and at that time we had what was called ‘wheat acreage deductions’. In one week five inspectors drove into our yard. One came around to see whether I had sown too much wheat; the next one came around and he measured the oat field; the next one measured the barley field . . .

Mr. Foley: - Why not tell the truth.

Mr. Meakes: - I am telling the truth. The next one came around and he measured the summerfallow, and then this other fellow came in and he said: "By gerry, I'm lost." I asked him who he was hunting for, and he said: "I'm the inspector for grass." The strangest thing was that in six days there was a Convention in Kelliher. That was the time that Dr. Collins was nominated in Touchwood. All these six inspectors were in the Kelliher beer parlour that day supplying free beer for the delegates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to our agricultural problem, I have to report that the situation in Touchwood constituency is as bad as it has been for the last three or four years, and it is getting worse; but I am going to leave that for another debate.

However, there is one thing that I would like to mention before I sit down. I, too, would like to take a stand on the 'March to Ottawa'. I think most people in this House will agree that there have been some ridiculous remarks made about the March to Ottawa, especially by the Federal Minister of Northern Affairs. I think that the remarks he made only proved that his party is the same as the Liberals: when they are out of power they are ready to do anything, but when they are in power they are ready to do nothing.

I would just like to tell you what the Liberal Party does when they are in power and what they do when they are out of power. I have here a clipping from the Wynyard 'Advance' of May, 1957. It covers a meeting held in Wynyard. They talked of the "impractical solutions" put forward by the C.C.F. Party. They say that cash advances would only benefit the large farmers in the Rosetown, Biggar and Assiniboia, Kindersley constituencies. It is a funny thing, you know. There was an election in 1957, and four months later the Liberals were on the bandwagon hollering and screaming for cash advances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks that I have made, I am quite sure that everybody in this room knows that I am going to vote against the amendment and vote for the motion.

Hon. R.A. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): - Mr. Speaker, I don't think I would be able to enjoy the Debate on the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne at this Session without getting interested enough in it to participate. I must say that, for the two or three days of the discussion, I have enjoyed it. I particularly enjoyed the address of our Premier which, I believe, summed up and epitomized the philosophy of the C.C.F. better than any statement that has been made in this House during my ten years here.

I could have gotten by without having to become involved in this debate, had it not been for some remarks that were made today. I want, first of all, to say that the farmers of Hanley constituency and all the people of Hanley constituency applaud this Speech from the Throne as one which carries

a very worthy program to the people of Saskatchewan. People of Saskatchewan are getting so used to getting good programs laid before the Legislature at annual Sessions that perhaps now they are become a little surfeited with the excellent programs which this Government has been in the habit of bringing forth. I look back at some of those barren and decrepit documents that passed for Speeches from the Throne in the days of the preceding government, and I cannot help but marvel at the gall and at the unrestrained optimism of my hon. friends, if they think the public are going to take them seriously in their criticisms of the Speech from the Throne.

I am sorry that the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) is not in her seat. I will, therefore, refrain from making a reply to some of the statements which she made in this House, this afternoon. There is one statement, however, which she made that I feel I must repudiate, and that is her statement that the Attorney General should be given some additional responsibility. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members, that I am not deceived by this viper-like attitude. I am not convinced, nor am I persuaded, that there is anything but a poisonous fang hidden behind this backhanded compliment. I cannot help from saying that I have now some difficulty in convincing my colleagues that I am a trustworthy member of the C.C.F. group here in the Legislature. I want to hasten to say that I cannot imagine what I have done wrong that should warrant such kind treatment from the member for Humboldt and the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner).

Mr. McDonald: - Rumour has it that you are a Tory!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - That, of course, is a malicious slander; something which my hon. friend can't say.

I listened with some repugnance to the performance of the hon. member for Melville, this afternoon, and I cannot help but feel that the things which I used to read about the Liberal Party and its performance in this Legislature during the 'twenties and early 'thirties must have been true, after all. I thought that the stories contained in the 'Regina Daily Star' of that day about the perfidy of the Liberal Party were pure inventions of a malicious editor; but after having listened to my hon. friend, I can conceive that there was perhaps some truth to these peculiar shenanigans that were indulged in by the Liberal spokesmen in the Legislature at that time.

The hon. member spent about twenty minutes trying to convince the House that, somehow, there was something inconsistent between what the hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) had to say, for example, about the Time question, and what I or the Premier had to say on that subject. The hon. member tried to create the inference, the illusion, that the member for Souris-Estevan had said there were penalties for violations of this Act, and that I had said there were not. I think that is a fair summary of what the hon. member said. He tried to accuse the Attorney General and the Premier of attempting to tell people that there were no penalties for violation of Time, or in Time statutes and bylaws. This, of course, is not true.

Mr. Gardiner: - It certainly is in regard to Time.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Well, I happen to have here the only press release which I get out on the subject; and since my hon. friends can't read, I trust they can hear, and I will read to them the relevant portions of the release – perhaps I am justified in inferring that because he may be dumb, but he is not necessarily deaf. But I will read him these statements from the press release, and I will ask members to judge for themselves what was said.

Mr. Gardiner: - Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney General on what date he made this statement?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - December 4, 1958.

Mr. Gardiner: - That was about two months after the action was taken.

Premier Douglas: - No action was taken.

Mr. Gardiner: - You never said a thing until December 5th.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friend was complaining about in this House, this afternoon (and he can wiggle all he wants, but he cannot escape it), was that I had made a statement that we would not impose penalties on those who ignored Time legislation. I will just read to him some extracts from that statement. I said:

“Apparently some people believe that the province has legislated to compel citizens to observe for all purposes Mountain Standard Time in the winter, and Central Standard Time in the summer. That is definitely untrue.”

That, Mr. Speaker, I may say, is a paraphrase of what I said in this House when the legislation was before the House a year ago. My hon. friend tried to say now that I was undermining the laws of the province. I went on to say:

“The effect of the legislation is to standardize the legal meaning of time where any reference is made to it in a statute, bylaw, or contract.”

The release went on to say:

“although it was hoped people might accept the principle of uniformity in their day-to-day activities, there is no compulsion upon them to do so. The Attorney General cited the example of a town grocer, who may keep his clock at any time he wishes, and open and close his store any time he wishes, providing he does

not violate any opening and closing bylaw. If, for example, the municipality has a six o'clock closing bylaw, then the grocer must close his doors by 6:00 p.m. Mountain Standard Time in the winter, and 6:00 p.m. Central Standard Time in the summer. This does not require him to keep his clock on the lawful time; it only requires him to obey the bylaw".

And this is entirely consistent with what the hon. member from Souris-Estevan said. I did not disagree with anything he said, and the statements that were issued by myself and the Premier were not in disagreement. But my hon. friend, taking advantage of the fact that he was on the radio and members of this House were too courteous to interrupt him, proceeded forth with this malicious interpretation of the facts which apparently fills his mind, on the air, and of course assumed that somehow he would get some political advantage out of it.

Mr. Foley: - He will, don't worry.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - This is the kind of cheap political politics that the people of Saskatchewan are fed up with, and I say this to my hon. friend here in the evening, when there is no broadcast, so that I won't be accused of trying to gain any public advantage over him. My hon. friend then went on to say that the Civil Service of this province was a well-organized political machine, and that the Attorney General's Department was neglecting to enforce the law. There has never been a time since this Government was elected that those charges and allegations could be supported. I say that those allegations are true with regard to the previous Liberal Government of this province, and everybody knows they were true. Everybody knows it! I suggest that every hon. member of this House knows that, in the days of the previous Liberal Government, the Government, the Attorney General even, gave specific directions to the police of the province directing them to carry on political activities for the Liberal Party. Every member of this House knows that there was political interference from the Attorney General himself in the days of the Liberal Government, in the operation of the law enforcement agencies of Saskatchewan. Everybody knows that, and my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) knows it.

Mr. Danielson: - You're telling a bunch of lies!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - I'm telling a lie when I say it? There are apparently some hon. members in this House who don't accept the statement that the Attorney General of this province, under a Liberal Government, interfered with, injected political interference into, the police force of this province.

Mr. Loptson: - Entirely false.

Mr. Danielson: - Are you able to prove it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - I shall – for the information of . . .

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Attorney General ought to support that statement with some facts.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Yes, I was just coming to that, Mr. Speaker. This province at one time had these allegations made (the very ones which I have just made) right on the floor of this Legislature, and the Government of the day decided that these allegations should be investigated. So they appointed a Royal Commission consisting of Mr. Justice McKay, or Mr. Justice McKenzie, and Mr. Justice Embury, who devoted days and days to the hearing of evidence and to the finding of facts, and brought in a report. This report is headed, “The Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into Statements made in Statutory Declarations and Other Matters”. This report is some 180 pages in length, and it proceeds to document the findings of the Commission; and I shall read, just at random, some of the findings of the Commission, which, as I say, will substantiate the charges which I made in the House here; and I hope that the hon. member for Melville will hear them.

Mr. Foley: - What date is it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - This is dated 1931. This is not in inquiry by the Conservative Government of that day. This is an inquiry . . .

Mr. Danielson: - What about the Rawluk inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - . . . by a judicial Royal Commission of Appeal Court Judges of this province – incidentally, some of whom were elevated to the Bench under the Liberal regime – at least one of them that I know of. Here are some of the allegations:

“(1) Constable Arnott drove his care for Mr. Paulson, M.L.A., at election time, his expenses being paid by the Government.”

If that is not using the police force of this province for political purposes, I say to the hon. member for Arm River, what is it?

“(2) Corporal MacRae was recognized as a Liberal worker in the Hon. Mr. Patterson’s constituency, and was actively involved in political work in the election.”

These are the findings of facts by a Royal Commission. Another one:

“Improper political influence was exercised by Liberal politicians to interfere with the placing of certain policemen at certain places.”

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: - How do you like that?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Another one:

“Corporal Knowles was sent from Willowbunch to Preeceville to vote in the 1925 Dominion election at public expense.”

Another one:

“At election time the police were restrained from properly enforcing the law with a view to benefiting the Liberal Party in a great many instances.”

Another one:

“The police at Biggar, Swift Current and Moose Jaw were instructed to investigate the Ku Klux Klan and to make confidential reports to him which were in turn communicated to the acting Attorney General, the Hon. Mr. Davis, who must bear the responsibility for this political activity.”

Another one:

“Inspector Duckworth was instructed to keep away from the riding of Estevan before the election of 1925, for purely political reasons.”

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General improperly instructed Commissioner Mahoney to place the services of Sgt. Bennett at the disposal of Mr. J.N. Fisch (now His Honour Judge Fisch) to assist in the preparation for trial of a civil action of a highly political nature, taking him away from the performance of his proper duties, and thus interfering with his duties.

These are just some of the findings of fact by a Royal Commission into the nefarious affairs of the Liberal Government and a Liberal Attorney General in Saskatchewan. I suggest to my hon. friend from Melville, that if he wants to avoid sharing the particular aroma of Liberal partisan politics, then he had better reform his conduct in this House]; but I suggest that he is not doing so.

We are having the spectacle of the Liberal group concerning themselves over petty, trifling little things, which, of course, they are entitled to do; but concerning themselves practically not at all with the important issues of the day; concerning themselves over the price of oats in some transaction; concerning themselves with things which I suggest resemble most strongly the activities of a black bear nuzzling through a garbage pail in a public park.

Opposition Members: - You're the garbage pail!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - This kind of attitude toward public problems will not earn for the Liberal Party the esteem of the voters of this province, and I regret more than anyone else that it was necessary for me to inform my hon. friends opposite – apparently there were some things

they did not know about the Liberal Party; I regret it was necessary to reproach my hon. friends in these matters. I say, if my hon. friend for Melville or any other member in this Legislature, knows of any lack of enforcement of laws in this province, if he will supply me or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with the details of the incident, he can be assured that proper action will be taken. I say to him that, so long as this Government occupies the treasury benches of Saskatchewan, and so long as I occupy the position of Attorney General, there will never be an accusation, or even a suggestion which can be supported by facts, to the effect that political considerations have entered into the administration of the police affairs of this province.

Govt. Members: - Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - My hon. friend can sneer, or giggle or whatever it is he does over there, to his heart's content; but if he has any accusations to make or any suggestions to make, then I say he should either 'put up or shut up'. He has no right to insinuate that the same kind of political chicanery exists in this Government that he knows so well existed in the government which preceded this one. He has no right to make those insinuations and accusations, and, if he knows of any instances or facts which justify those irresponsible assertions that he made here this afternoon, he should provide the details.

I want to say just one thing about the 'March to Ottawa'. I am very happy that the public response to the farm leaders of this province has been so excellent on this matter of a march to Ottawa. I think they and the farmers of Saskatchewan deserve every commendation for the efforts they are making to obtain justice and equity at the hands of the Government of Canada. I think it is right and proper that no member of this Legislature ought to try to take any partisan advantage over the fact that the Federal Government has failed to fulfil its commitments; that it has failed to keep its promises; that it has failed to do ordinary common justice to the cause of farmers. I think, however, while I for one do not want to be accused of trying to exploit any political advantage from this situation, I do want to say that my hon. friends ought to be very wary of supporting this proposal because (if they remember) all these people are asking of the Federal Government is that they rectify the gross injustices that were dealt out to them by the Liberal Government in 1956-57, because, for the two or three years for which the farmers are asking redress, the Liberal Government was in power at Ottawa. For those two years the farmers want an adequate price for their products, even a price related to parity, in spite of the fact that the farm organizations and the C.C.F. and many other people in Saskatchewan were urging upon the then Liberal Government that they should be giving parity prices at that time. It is, of course, typical Liberal performance to try to resurrect themselves by jumping on the bandwagon of a farmers' movement, whose whole claim for justice is based upon the treatment which a former Liberal Government meted out to them in 1956-57.

Premier Douglas: - They're sure nice and quiet!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: - Yes, they're sure nice and quiet now!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - I think it would be much more honest and much more courageous if my friends opposite were to get up in their seat and say, "We are just as much opposed to this march on Ottawa as the Tories are". Why don't you stick to your principles? Why don't you say that the farmers are not entitled to parity prices in 1956-57? That's what you said then. The mere fact that you are now out of office suddenly has freed you from all the restraint and bonds that ordinary decency and principle impose on most men.

Mr. McDonald: - You'll feel better after the next election!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - I would suggest that instead of doing a right-about-face on this thing, you should stick to the principles which you enunciated in 1956 and 1957, when the Prime Minister said he wouldn't be a party to any subsidy for agriculture. I think you should stick with that. It sounded good then to some Liberals, and 'big business', and I think you should stay with that story, and not change it now because you are out of office.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go at any greater length into the Throne Speech debate, as it has been pretty well gone over by members on both sides of the House, other than to say that I will enthusiastically vote against the amendment, and eagerly support the motion, on behalf of my constituents.

Mr. Ross McCarthy (Cannington): - Mr. Speaker, I, like the Attorney General, had not intended taking any part in this debate, and am going to dispense with the preliminaries of congratulation. He started to discuss something that happened in a Committee. I think probably he was out of order in doing so, Mr. Speaker; but having brought up one item in which I had a part, I beg leave to reply to the statement he made. I want to say to start with, that we've heard a lot . . .

Mr. Speaker: - Would the hon. member confine his remarks to the debate?

Mr. McCarthy: - Yes, Mr. Speaker; this is in connection with an item on Public Accounts of a matter of \$2,000 that had been sold to the farm at North Battleford. I simply inquired what it was; I didn't inquire of the price, or anything else; but another member of the Committee jumped up and read us a big, long lecture, accusing us of trying to make political capital, and talked to us like a bunch of school children. The Attorney General brings up the same matter on the floor of the House. I was the one who asked the question, and I want to tell the Attorney General that I do not have to take any advice from him as to my conduct. I believe that I know how to conduct myself properly. I was asking a simple question - what the item covered. There was no political implication at all; but they are so tender on anything we say in Committee, they immediately accuse us of some sinister actions. Why do we have a Committee on Public Accounts, if we can't ask questions? We're sent here as an Opposition, and an Opposition has some responsibilities and some duties.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - I did not say you had not the right to question.

Mr. McCarthy: - Yes, but you expressly said also that it was a political kind of fishing for some political advantage; I forget the word you used, but it was sneering. You talk about insinuations! You cast more insinuations in five minutes than come from this side of the House in half a day or a week! As to your insinuations regarding our position on this wheat march, I don't need to take any advice from the Attorney General in my conduct with regard to y opinion on farmers' problems. I was contributing to farm organizations, I wouldn't wonder, before the Attorney General was born, and I have been doing it down through the years. When he gets up and insinuates (as he did) that I have, for political reasons, not been true to my principles, I object to it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Sorry, if you misunderstood me.

Mr. McCarthy: - I didn't misunderstand you; I know too well. I don't think that I am entitled to sit here in this House and be subject to this type of abuse and insinuations. It's all too prevalent on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that if they can't meet our argument, they throw across insinuations, innuendoes and accusations.

Just while we're on the subject, the Attorney General said if anybody would tell him anything that is wrong, that isn't being enforced in this province, he'll do it. Well, I suggest to him that he has a wonderful field – just a wonderful field. Go down to the southeast part of this province and clean up the oil mess!

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy: - You appointed a Committee that said there was no doubt there was fraud in those deals, and you only investigated one when you should have investigated three. Your Committee said that; but what do you do? You suggest, or somebody suggested – I think it was the Committee that suggested; all right, I beg your pardon – I want to be honest about it – that you appoint a Committee to go around the law. That is, if I've got a complaint, no, don't prosecute the fellow; but get somebody to make out a new deal, and we'll wash that fraud off. If the Attorney General is sincere in his challenge that if anybody points anything out to him that isn't in accordance with the law, that he will do something about it, I tell him to go down to the southeast part of this province, and take his report of the Committee that investigated one company, and investigate two more companies, and then I will believe he is sincere in his talk.

The question being put on the proposed amendment by Mr. McDonald, seconded by Mr. Cameron: That the following words be added to the Address:

“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” –

it was negatived by 33 votes against 13.

The debate continuing on the motion for the address:

Hon. J.H. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): - Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a very interesting week on this debate. From the other side of the House there has been a lot of very optimistic political talk, and, of course, it is everybody's right to speak as they feel. I have in my hand 'The Monetary Times' for February, 1959, and on page 14 you will find 'The Ottawa Notebook'. Turn over to page 18 and there is a sub-heading: 'Some Observations on the West and B.C.' I am not going to read about all of it, but just one paragraph in regard to Saskatchewan, which reads as follows:

"In Saskatchewan, the people still like Premier Thomas Douglas, the C.C.F. leader, and he seems destined to get his fifth verdict in a row. The Liberals offer no real threat; the Conservatives recently rejuvenated provincially, even less so."

That is an editorial entitled 'Ottawa Notebook', in 'The Monetary Times' of February, 1959. I wouldn't advise the hon. Leader of the Opposition to buy it, because there isn't a bit of comfort in it for him!

Mr. McDonald: - I would like to ask the Minister who wrote it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - It's an editorial, it's not a signed article. It is the responsibility of the magazine.

Mr. McDonald: - That was written by the Industrial Development Office!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that the Ottawa correspondent for 'The Monetary Times' is Austin Cross.

Mr. McDonald: - But the article was written by your own Industrial Development Office.

Mr. Danielson: - Skullduggery!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Well, here's what they say about Alberta: "In Alberta, the folks are getting ready for a change":

"Hon. Mr. Manning is having his troubles with his aging Social Credit regime. On the other hand, the Liberals under Grant MacEwen seem to offer a reasonable alternative, and they might return to power".

"The P.C.'s offer small opposition thus far, and though they get a clean sweep provincially, the Federal picture over the years reveals the fact that what Alberta does federally and what she does provincially are rarely ever the same."

Mr. McDonald: - Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Mr. Speaker, it's a wonderful thing. Austin Cross wrote one paragraph; he was biased; he was wrong; it must have come from the Industrial Development Office of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan! Then I read the very next paragraph to it, and the Leader of the Opposition says: 'Hear! Hear!'

Mr. McDonald: - You still don't deny it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - My hon. friend, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson) rose in the House, this evening, and quite properly mentioned the generosity of the late Anderson Brothers, in regard to the Anderson Home in Yorkton. I want to assure you that no one on this side of the House, or no one connected with the Government, would want to belittle or pass over that kind of generosity. I certainly hope that those very fine brothers have gone to their eternal reward, and I think we should hope that the hon. member for Saltcoats will have the good fortune some day to be in the same constituency again.

The hon. member for Saltcoats said that it was no credit or no generosity on the part of the Provincial Government in paying 20 per cent of the capital cost towards the Anderson Home, because they were only acting in accordance with the law. That is right, Mr. Speaker; but who made the law? It wasn't the Liberal Government that made the law. They never gave any help to building an Old Folks' Home. It was our law which was passed by this Legislature with a C.C.F. Government here.

Mr. McCarthy: - You said we never gave anything to any Old Folks' Home. We built the Home at Wolseley under a Liberal Government.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - The hon. member for Cannington just finished his speech a couple of minutes ago, and apparently he didn't get it all off his chest!

Mr. McCarthy: - Well, I just want to keep the records straight.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - I listened also with a good deal of interest to the hon. member for Melville, and it was full of sound and fury; it was somewhat entertaining, but not too interesting. I am not going to take time to deal specifically with the things he mentioned; I don't think as far as the subject in which I am concerned, my answers or comments are called for, because I don't believe anyone will remember very long what he said.

The hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) apparently now likes us to have in the Speech from the Throne something in regard to what is wrong; what is troubling Saskatchewan, but is a responsibility of the Government at Ottawa. It is only a year or two ago since our hon. friends opposite thought, if we put a word in about the Federal Government at Ottawa, that it was really putting political propaganda into the mouth of His Honour

the Lieutenant Governor; but the situation apparently has changed to a considerable extent.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) mentioned the municipality of Prairie Rose, No. 309 (there's no reason to keep secret the number and name of the municipality), and he pointed out there had been an increase in taxes in that municipality. There has been an increase in taxes in almost every municipality because of the lack of price control and the increased costs of operating, and the increased costs of production. But the tiding he did not tell about the municipality was that, last year, that municipality got grants in assistance to the tune of \$18,000. I would suggest, if the members want to look it up they go to the library and get the book. The municipality has over 20 miles of provincial highway running through it, and it is one of the best municipalities at the end of 1957 in regard to arrears of taxes. The arrears of taxes at the end of 1957 in this municipality were only \$12,464. You can always take a part of a story, and give a wrong impression. As a matter of fact, if I remember correctly, someone who is sitting very close to the member for Meadow Lake had some very strong remarks to say about 'part truths' in his speech tonight.

The hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) was reading some headlines from 'The Leader-Post', and, if I got it right, he raised one headline which said, 'Forest Revenue dropped \$1 Million'. Then do you know what he went on to do? He complained about the prices that the lumber is sold for by the Timber Board. You see, the hon. member said there is no relation between the price the product sells for and the revenue from forest resources. I don't know – I'd be a little suspicious.

I want also to comment about his remarks about wild life crop insurance. The premium paid for wild life crop insurance is very low, very cheap. The thing is, if there is any insufficiency in regard to the wild life crop insurance, it is that the people who might use it are not using this form of insurance, but they are taking the risk themselves, and, of course, you cannot take insurance on your house after it has caught fire. You can't wait until the ducks come and light on your wheat, and then expect to get insurance.

Crop damage by wild game is nothing new. We had a lot of ducks here in the old days; we had a lot of big game, deer, elk, etc. I have seen fields of stocks on the homesteads up in my country (which is much like the country where my friend comes from) completely destroyed by deer and elk. In those days we knew it would be useless to go to the Liberal Government and say, "I want some damage because the game destroyed my crop" – we knew we would get no place. I would like to point out to the hon. members that this crop insurance is one other little 'first' thing that was done by a C.C.F. Government, here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McCarthy: - That isn't crop insurance.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - It is crop insurance against damage by wild game. There has been one thing proven in this debate anyway and that is – we certainly have free speech in the province of Saskatchewan. Everybody must agree that they can say pretty well anything they want to say, and the fact that it has been free is no guarantee that it contained good logic or always had due respect for the facts of the case. That is another question altogether.

After I listened to the hon. members from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) and from Turtleford (Mr. Foley), the two school teacher members of the Legislature, I remembered that one of them was making some complaint about our teachers' colleges. After I listened to this speech, I was convinced that the teachers' colleges probably should be investigated unless they have changed somewhat since they have graduated. I have never heard speeches that were more illogical than the speeches set up by those two members in this Legislature. The member for Turtleford said: "No one will be more happy than I to see industrial development;" but it occurred to me that I never see happy people with such long faces as they have over there.

The member for Notukeu-Willowbunch was criticizing the profits made by the Timber Board. He said the cost of the lumber was \$45 a thousand, we sell it for \$80 – profit \$35. It isn't that simple. The lumber has to be dried; it has to be planed; there is a certain cost in the handling and all the rest of it. I would certainly be happy if the profit was \$35 a thousand, because it would mean more revenue for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I am sorry it is only a few dollars per thousand.

Then he tries to make something of it, and he suggests that instead of taking these profits, we should sell the lumber at cost to the purchaser that comes along to buy it. Well, we produce in Saskatchewan only enough lumber to supply about one-quarter or less of the demand for lumber in Saskatchewan. One of the first problems we would be up against would be: to whom would you sell this bargain lumber? How would you allocate it? He said you would sell it to the farmers. Which farmers? Would you sell it to the farmers in Willowbunch or the farmers in Kelsey constituency? If they were in power, they would know what farmers they would sell it to – the Liberal farmers, the key Liberal farmers. We don't do that. If we sold this lumber at cost it would be bought up by merchants. The merchants would sell it and make the profits. That's what would happen; it would be an excellent opportunity. Instead, the lumber is sold at a reasonable price, a price which is actually less than the general retail price for lumber, and the profits go to the benefit of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. My hon. friends – yes.

Mr. Foley: - Is it not so, Mr. Minister, that the Timber Board has sold lumber at a higher price in this province than lumber was sold in neighbouring provinces? Is that not a fact?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - No, Mr. Speaker. The policy of the Timber Board has been to maintain at their piling yards in Saskatchewan a price which is a little lower than the market would stand, and I think that policy has been carried out throughout. The policy for selling lumber outside the province to other parts of Canada or to the United States is to get the best price that is possible to get.

Mr. Foley: - I refer specifically to the Community Rink built in my seat – a community service. The lumber was bought more cheaply in Alberta than it could be secured from the Timber Board of Meadow Lake. I have that on very good authority.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Well, Mr. Speaker, that's all right. I have no complaint about that at all. If anybody in Saskatchewan has a chance to get lumber at a bargain price – don't go pay a higher price at the Timber Board; go and get it from outside the province! Saskatchewan gains twice; gains once in the fact that you, for that project got cheaper lumber, and gained the other time in that we get a better price for the lumber that we produce and sell to the United States or eastern Canada. I have heard lots of stories like that, but they don't bother me. I think it is perfectly all right, if you can get cheap lumber some place else; but be sure you are getting cheap lumber. I heard also stories like that that didn't turn out to be true at all.

The member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) said that farmers used to be able to get cheap lumber up in the fringe area along the bush; their buildings are not getting old and need replacing and so forth. They can still get lumber through settlers' permits in the area along the forest. That is still available. Spruce was available, the last I knew. I didn't ask the Minister this year whether it is still available, but those permits are granted. Now, they are limited in amounts per farm, but we could give away all the lumber on permits and get very little for it. You have got to consider whether you want to do that, or whether you want to have more revenue to do other improvements and to give other services to people throughout the province of Saskatchewan. But you can still get permits if you are a bona fide farm settler within 20 miles of the forest area and you haven't exhausted your quota.

Mr. Barrie: - I'd like to ask a question. Can you assure me that farm settlers living in the district north of Arran, Pelly and Norquay can get permits for spruce lumber where they can pick out carloads and have the lumber sawed themselves, on a permit basis?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't assure any particular instance; I don't know how far away it is from the Provincial Forest and the available lumber, but he could take that up with the Minister of Natural Resources. Give him the land location and he could tell the actual situation.

The member from Pelly also mentioned that you were only allowed to take one fishing line with you when you went out fishing. That is absolutely wrong. I took this up with the Department of Natural Resources and with the Minister – it is absolutely incorrect. No one has been prosecuted for taking two or three or four lines, and none of that equipment has been seized because they had it with them. What you are not allowed to do is to fish with two lines at the same time. I don't get too much chance to go fishing, but when I do, I always take at least two lines with me. If the hon. member wants to get these things straightened out, he doesn't have to wait until he can bring them here into this Legislature. All he has to do is drop a line to the Minister of Natural Resources, or call in to see him . . .

Mr. Barrie: - I did discuss this with the officials of the Department – the man in charge of the southern area of the province for the Department of Natural Resources, last fall.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - It is exactly the same place that I got my information – was through the Minister and the Deputy Minister, and the man in charge of the southern district. They have not prosecuted; they have not seized any equipment. I am not surprised that the member for Pelly finds it a little difficult to make up his mind as to what equipment he wants to take with him when he goes fishing, when he can't get a thing like this figures out.

To come back for a moment or two to the member for Turtleford, and again I want to say seriously to the Minister of Education – I could suggest that it is not fair to have people going around having people checking up on our driving licences. Some of us, when we get on, may have to take a test, and so forth; but here you let people go on teaching school with the poorest mathematics in the world. I would suggest you check them up. He said the grid road program calls on the rural municipalities to meet more than half the cost. I don't know where he has been, because, last year and this year, the Government has been paying 60 per cent of the cost; has been doing the surveying, and has been spending a large sum on general engineering services for the construction of the grid road program. It is far from half. Why does the member want to say these things wrong, when he must know what is right? Then he says, nearly one-third of the rural municipalities are not participating. Mr. Speaker, there are 296 rural municipalities, and 267 of them have participated this year. That's a long piece over two-thirds of them participating. I would suggest his mathematics be checked over.

Mr. Foley: - Mr. Speaker, if you add the L.I.D.s to that, I think you will find the mathematics will be correct.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - The L.I.D.s are 100 per cent in it, so that would make the situation worse still.

The hon. member for Turtleford also said he had a whole lot of things he wanted to have explained. He said, "I want the Minister to justify these things", and then he mentioned the mineral tax. The mineral tax has been in effect since 1945. It is the part of the Minister, first of all, before he

supports the putting in of this tax, to be convinced that it is a just and fair tax, and will bring revenue worthwhile; secondly, to see to it that the tax is properly explained to the people of the province. But after that, it is not the Minister who justifies the tax; it is the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Three times the Liberals have gone out in this province and promised to repeal the tax, or take it off farm lands, and three times they were defeated since this tax was imposed. Now, I admit that nobody likes taxes, but everybody except my hon. friends opposite know that if you are going to do good work, if you are going to have improvements and give service, you have to have taxes for revenue. They don't seem to realize that. I don't have to justify it; it has been justified.

Then he said he wanted the Minister to justify the increased gasoline tax and motor licences, and again I want to say the people in this province want roads; they realize it costs money to build them. The gasoline tax was increased, and still the Government was re-elected. As a matter of fact, I don't think even the Liberals had the nerve to go out and promise to reduce or remove the gasoline tax. It was to their credit that they didn't go that far, because they knew that it certainly couldn't get them any place at all. People want roads, and they are certainly getting roads as they never got them before – in the highway system, gravelled highway, hard-topped highway, and in the grid road system which is certainly appreciated by the people of this province.

Last year 25 per cent of gas tax and licences was used for local roads and bridges. Some of my hon. friends are going on shouting about sharing these taxes. They are shared now. They were shared long ago, while they were sleeping, and a good generous share is going to the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I think I would like at this point, to have the privilege of adjourning this debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 9:45 o'clock p.m.