

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 22, 1960.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming a group of students from St. Joseph's Separate School in Saskatoon, who are under the care of Mr. Loran and Mr. Bauman, who are in the Speaker's Gallery. I am sure we all hope they have a pleasant trip and also an informative one, during their stay here in Regina.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed from Friday, February 19th, 1960, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson, seconded by Mr. Thibault, for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation): — When the debate was adjourned on Friday afternoon I hadn't taken the opportunity to offer my congratulations to some of the previous speakers. Naturally, I would like to join with those who have congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Motion. I think it proper to give special mention to those two, and one or two others that I will name, the mover (Mr. Thorson) particularly, because it isn't often that public affairs are graced with the recruitment of such an able, conscientious, and brilliant young man and, undoubtedly Saskatchewan is going to be a better province for the life that he and his generation and those like him will live, then it was many years ago. Improvements will continue.

I would also like to mention our friend from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), who made such an able address on his 'maiden' attempt in this House. I think maybe his appearance here is something that those of us on this side feel with a great deal of pleasure and those on the other side must view with a good deal of alarm, because, prior to the calling of the by-election, we

February 22, 1960

were told that this was going to be a “barometer” of political feeling in the province, and that the defeat of a C.C.F. candidate there would indicate clearly what was going to take place when the next election comes around and the consequences . . . yes, the “caretaker government” we were called, and the fact that we were able to recruit to our ranks as a candidate one who in his personal life and in his municipal life had already gained the respect of all those who knew him was willing to offer himself in the cause of a political party with a philosophy such as ours, and because elected in spite of the cohorts that the opposition put in in their attempts to defeat him. That is a clear indication of a political barometer of this province . . .

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — It cost you a lot more money than it did me.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — And our friends across the way need have no expectations that they will occupy these seats after the general election is over.

I would like to give special mention also to the House Leader of the Official Opposition. He stated his party’s position with clarity and ability, and I think that all of us over here were interested in what he had to say, because it left no doubt in our minds at all about the position of himself and those who support him in the House and outside. I do want to congratulate him, however, as I say, for his clarity, and while I don’t agree with his position, I still recognize his ability, and I have occasion to feel sorry sometimes that such excellent ability in such a gallant young veteran is not also coupled with wisdom in the field of public affairs.

When we come to the Premier’s rebuttal on last Wednesday afternoon, I don’t think that I have the eloquence to describe in proper terms the speech that he made. He set out the position of this party without any equivocation, clearly, so that anybody who at all has the ability to learn and the capacity to understand, will know why the Speech from the Throne appeared as it did this time.

The disappointing part is the attitude of the Opposition which has been made manifest I think to the public, toward the various things that are contained in the Speech from the Throne. Every single thing in it is an indication of an improvement in some of the existing programs in the province or the institution of some new program. Nobody here on this side of the House, and nobody in their right senses, would expect that all the farms in Saskatchewan and all the villages are going to be immediately served with water and sewer facilities over night; but to hear some of the Opposition talk, you would think that this was not even a program worth considering. As I go on with my address, this afternoon, I think the attitude of the Liberal party and our two charming social credit friends on your extreme left will be made very clear.

It should be obvious to anyone that the time is now ripe, with the

practical completion of the Power Corporation program in the rural electrification field and in the provision of gas to as many centres as possibly could be reached, that this is the next stage in the program. When we started the rural electrification of ten or twelve years ago, when it was conceived and started into operation, nobody at that time expected that you were going to electrify the whole of Saskatchewan in any one particular year. The program anticipated anywhere from 5,000 to 7,000 rural hookups each year, and adding those towns and villages that had been unserved before that as the program progressed. The stages were completed on each program from year to year until now we have reached the point where it has been told, and quite truthfully, that there are very few farmers left in Saskatchewan who want to take power who have not power available. I know, I listened to some of the Opposition talk a while ago about the reasons why they could not have power in the days when they were in authority in this province. I am going to deal with that before the afternoon is over.

Many words have been said in this debate by people on the other side in opposition to what is proposed in the Speech from the Throne, and not one single new idea has been advanced by any of them. One funny idea, yes; but I said new worthwhile ideas, if I can possibly put that qualification on. Our friends in the Social Credit group tried, in the brief time at their disposal on the air, as many others have tried with much longer speeches, and whole books, to explain the Social Credit theory. In reading the article in the 'Leader-Post' after those speeches of theirs, by Mr. Davis of the 'Leader-Post', I find that he is very confused also about Social Credit, and apparently did not have an explanation that satisfied him after the two gentlemen spoke. I don't understand why the confusion should exist about what Social Credit means, because there is an official document on the Statutes of Alberta which gives a very clear explanation of the Social Credit philosophy. I will put it on the record, this afternoon, for all people to read and listen to, and the quotation I'm going to give, in order to help out my friends of the Social Credit group in their explanation, will be found in paragraph "D" of Section 2, of Chapter 20, of the Revised Statutes of Alberta, which is the Alberta Social Credit Realization Act, and this is the definition of Social Credit according to those who should know it, and I quote:

"Social Credit means the power resulting from the belief inherent within society that its individual members in association can gain the objective they desire."

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there can be nothing clearer than that. Some day, as the writer of the 'Leader-Post' points out, they may take time off the air to exemplify and expand on that in the House, so that those of us who are still in doubt as to what it means will not be left in doubt any longer.

So I did not expect our Social Credit friends to agree to everything in the Speech from the Throne. It would not be conceivable that those who sit on the Opposition side would ever agree to everything that comes from the Government side of the House, but it was a bit shocking to find out what

February 22, 1960

they were opposed to. For instance, they have in their opposition their stated intention of voting against the motion which is the acceptance of the programs outlined here. They stated that they are going to be against a universal medical-care program . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — It can mean nothing else when you are voting against the things that are contained here, because that is what the proposal is. They do not want farmers and small urban settlements to have water and sewage, and they have indicated quite clearly that they are opposed to the motion and, therefore, everything contained in the speech from the Throne. They are opposed to the proposal to increase the generating capacity of the Power Corporation, why, I don't know. They didn't say why. They said they were going to vote against the motion and, therefore, they are against that part of the Speech from the Throne. They are opposed to the improvement in the 'phone service and assistance to rural telephone companies — why, I don't know; but they are going to vote against the motion which is acceptance of the things in the Throne Speech. They are opposed to the establishment of health regions; they are opposed to the development of more recreational areas; they are opposed to the increase in payments to widows whose husbands are killed in industrial accidents; they are opposed to the building of the small community-style hospitals, such as announced in the Speech from the Throne, because they are going to vote against the motion. They are opposed to the increase in the grants to the anti-T.B. League; I have never heard of such opposition before. Of course the Liberals are, too, but I will deal with their reasons for opposition later on. They will vote against an increase in the proposed scholarship grants to Grade XII students, and they are going to vote against the motion and every worthwhile proposal contained in the Speech from the Throne. That was the sum and substance of their decision to vote against the motion moved by the Member from Souris-Estevan and seconded by the Member for Kinistino.

Now, there is a reason for this. They would not want this reason stated here, I know, but I am going to state what I believe is their reason: they don't believe that government should be interested in the welfare of the people, as the group on this side of Mr. Speaker does. I am going to give some evidence to support this statement, because I have here a document that indicates that attitude of the two Social Credit governments — incidentally, also, a Liberal government that doesn't exist any longer, to the east of us; but the two Social Credit governments to the west of us, and a percentage of their total provincial budgets that they allocate to welfare purposes each year. I am taking the year where last official accounts can be got beyond all shadow of a doubt, from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I am taking the year 1957-58, both years in which we had Social Credit governments in Alberta and British Columbia, with all the wonderful riches that they got not by virtue of the fact that they are Social Crediters in those government, but by virtue of a long history which placed riches easily accessible in their province and, therefore, made them very wealthy.

If we take a look at the province of Alberta we find that out of a \$223,000,000 budget, they allocate 6.33 per cent to welfare purposes in the year 1957-58. If we take a look at British Columbia, out of a total \$322,600,000-odd budget, they allocate 8.7 per cent of theirs for welfare purposes. There are two tremendously wealthy provinces governed by, what our friends would have us believe, a party who believes in, they say, 'humanity first' like we do, except that they use different methods to achieve their end, and they use less money for the achievement of it, as I have indicated here.

Now we'll go back to our Liberal friends who used to be in Manitoba — they are no longer — and we will see what they did. Their budget, of course, is much smaller than the two wealthy provinces to the west, but it is a fairly hefty budget and even then people should have a right to expect that a government will allocate a reasonable proportion of its money to the care of the less fortunate people, and in Manitoba, in the year I am talking of, they allocated 9.3 per cent. At least, they were slightly ahead of British Columbia and quite a bit ahead of Alberta.

Now we come to Saskatchewan. We have heard a lot of how Saskatchewan has been, according to our friends across the way, miserable. The fact remains that, of the amount of money available in our provincial revenue, 10.04 per cent, slightly over 10 per cent, is allocated for the purpose of caring for people less able than others to care for themselves. That in itself should be all that is necessary to bring to this House to show the difference between the people on this side who believe in 'humanity first' and practise it, and those on the other side who say the words. As I say, I was shocked when I heard our friends in the Social Credit group say that they were going to vote against the motion which is thanks to His Honour for the Speech from the Throne.

Our Liberal friends in this debate, through the remarks of their Leader, have done nothing more than restate the same thing they stated year after year in this House, and no change whatsoever has been noted in their attitude toward the various things that this Government is doing on behalf of the people of this province. The reason why they have only restated their past position is because they have never had a new idea and they don't believe, or at least they won't profess to believe, that under no circumstances, no matter what is done, if it is not conceived and done by Liberals it is little, if any use whatsoever. That has been their attitude always, no matter what good is done, if they didn't do it. Yet, Mr. Speaker, and I speak as a long-time Canadian, born and raised here and many generations of Canadian parenthood behind me and a long history of Canadian lore behind me, I say without any fear of successful contradiction that never in the last sixty years has a Liberal party conceived, proposed, and given leadership to any kind of a policy that would provide a sign-post for the future development of Canada or of this or any other province.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Hear! Hear!

February 22, 1960

Mr. Cameron: — How many years?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Sixty years. I'll come to that . . . Go back a little further than that, further than any of us here can remember, because we were not born, and I'll mention that in a few moments.

Mr. Gardiner: — We were all born.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They have given no leadership, I repeat, in any kind of a policy that would create a sign-post to show that they were going to have industrial, education, health, agriculture, or welfare development in Canada. They excuse themselves, and they get excused by the 'Leader-Post', and now in the last issue of the 'Star-Phoenix' they are excused again, that they could not do many of the things because the last years of their rule were plagued with a depression and then a war. That is the excuse they used.

I think a lot of people would be inclined to forgive them for the failure to have any industrial development in Saskatchewan on the grounds of the depression and the war except for one very serious thing that they don't remember, or don't wish to remember, and which, if they had the courage, here and in Ottawa where they were both represented, they could have done something in both fields. During the war there were industries being promoted by the then Liberal Government of Canada to provide us with the necessary sinews of war. Saskatchewan, with a Liberal Government was completely overlooked, and now they have the affrontery to say that this Government has created a climate that prevents industry, when they and their party in Ottawa and here stood between war industry getting into Saskatchewan, and I say this, that if some war industry had been implanted here during the war years, Saskatchewan would have been in a far better position to face the years after the war, and would have made that much greater contribution to its already great contribution to the war effort.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if anyone can be justly condemned for failure to protect agriculture in this country, their failure to have some of these industries established during the war years is one of the greatest single failures of the Liberal party. I would like to state some more failures: I'm talking of long-term history. I would not have been in this group here if, in my young life and all through it, I could have seen some evidence of what used to be a grand old Liberal party of the early days of Canada, when they were organized to protect the ordinary people against the inroads of the then solidly entrenched Tory past imported from the Old Country. I would not have been here if they had shown those indications; but they never showed any indication. I'm going back into history again, because our friends across the way constantly tell us that we are responsible, we on this side of the House are responsible, for the movement of people off farms either out of the province or into the urban centres.

If the old Liberty and Tory governments that sat in Canada many

years ago, when I was a boy had had any foresight and any thought, and had listened to the early explorers, much of the marginal land that they opened up to help the railroads to earn freight and passenger services by bringing in immigrants and settling on the land, would not have been done. Their whole purpose was to support those industries regardless of the effect upon the people, and then the experience of the country has indicated. Anybody from down in our country knows. Our friend from Gravelbourg knows; our friend from Notukeu-Willowbunch knows; our friend from Bengough knows. Everybody in the south part and many in other parts know that there are areas in this province that should have been left to some other type of agriculture rather than what was introduced. That failure to organize and direct the land settlement of western Canada can be laid at the door of the federal Tory and Liberal parties, who failed completely to look into the future and make some provision. That is the reason why we have some of the movement — not the only reason, but some. Then, while they were doing that, while all this was going on, all the other industries located in the more favorable industrial spots in Canada not only had the natural advantages of their position to enter the manufacturing field to serve the rest of our needs, but actually got protection, so that we couldn't go outside and buy a plough or whatever was needed for household goods or anything else, without having to go through the tariff barrier supported by both Liberals and Tories all through the history of Canada.

Now when we come to electrification, I wonder. Their excuse again was depression. There is no excuse for it at all. If there were I would be the first one to grant it to them. We had during the depression years people seeking jobs. There were lots of people seeking jobs in Saskatchewan and all across Canada, competent and able men, young men who were not wanted in any community at that time, who were told to go on from A to B to C on the freight cars, the highways. They were sleeping in boxcars; they were sleeping in stockyards, and we didn't want their ability . . .

Mr. Klein: — How many unemployed are there in Saskatchewan today?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — We found these young men had wonderful ability later on when we wanted them for a special purpose, but during the 'thirties they were seeking jobs. There were factories waiting for orders, machinery lying idle, there were warehouses full of clothes, there was an abundance of food, much of which was being destroyed rather than let it find its way into the hungry stomachs of that day. Now, there were the brains and there were the other sources of raw material that were quite available at that time to put to work to have more electrification and many other things. There were Tory governments in Ottawa and Tory governments here, and there were Liberal governments in Ottawa and Liberal governments here, and neither Tories here or there, nor Liberals there or here, both of whom had the full power and authority to mobilize the finance and to provide for the organization of all these human and material resources to do many wonderful things, and rural electrification could have been one them. And there was not the courage to do it — and don't say they didn't know better. Don't say that

February 22, 1960

those were old days when people hadn't learned. Their own Minister of Finance in the Liberal Government when the pressure was on — God bless them for doing it! I don't criticize them one bit; but he exposed their paucity of brains when he said during the war days that anything that can be made physically possible can be made financially possible. So don't ever tell me hon. members on that side of the House, that the depression stopped you from rural electrification, or building trans-Canada highways, or paving roads, or building schools, or building hospitals, or doing many of the other things that should have been done. They were there to be done. The material was there, the food, the clothing, and everything. All it needed was somebody with vision and foresight to do it, and they did not have either the vision or the foresight.

I hear outside (not in here because everybody is too polite and courteous in here) and I join with them, when we laugh at our fellow Canadian, 'John', for the 'vision' that he had. We have to give him at least credit for having the vision. He doesn't know what to do with it now that he's got it. We all admit that; but he had one which is more than our Liberal friends ever had. The Liberals never caught a vision. In my lifetime they have never caught a vision. They didn't even have the courage to recruit people with brains and vision that could change their visions into reality if they could have caught them. All they have done since the early part of this century is to float along on the name they gained as Liberals by what was done by McKenzie and Papineau in the early days. That is all they have ever done.

Well, I am not so sure that our Liberal friends know what they want in anything except one thing; they are hungry to sit over here. They want to get on the treasury benches, and that is the only ambition they have. They say a lot of words about other things, but their lust for power has completely submerged all the philosophical meaning of the Liberal party of Canada, as I remember it as a young man. Now I am not the only one to say these things. They don't know how to present their program. They do the best they can, and their leader did an able job with very little to work on; but I want to quote an editorial from one of the biggest weekly or, rather, bi-weekly, papers in the province, 'The Sun', of Swift Current, of last Wednesday, February 17th. I am going to read this editorial, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is worth putting on the record. It is headed: "Brass Tacks Needed";

"We have said before and we are saying it again, if the opposition parties hope to get anywhere in the forthcoming provincial election they are going to have to start driving more brass tacks into their criticism of the present government's policies and reputed failings. Up to now they haven't made a very convincing job of it.

As an example, take the statement recently repeated by the Liberal Leader from Regina, last week, a copy of which

was circulated to all Saskatchewan newspapers, written around the Stanford Report. He said that in order for this province to realize its great potential for industry, as forecast in the report, the people must first get rid of the present socialist government whose philosophy, he said (speaking of the Liberal Leader) is opposed to private enterprise, and that the political climate it has created discourages investment in industry”.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Have a good clap boys, because you only have a minute or two. Get out your weeping towels. I continue to quote from the editorial, Mr. Speaker:

“We are not exactly doubting the Liberal Leader’s statement nor disputing his right to say it; but we aren’t convinced by it, because when we look around us, here, at home, and far afield we are amazed at the way in which private industry including our own has been flourishing the last few years. We don’t know of one business man who isn’t living high off the hog, and who hasn’t the expectation of maintaining that standard within the foreseeable future. This doesn’t look like opposition to private enterprise to us. If it is, then let’s have more of the same”.

I continue to quote from the editorial:

“The point we’re trying to make is this. If the Liberal Leader knows he is right and has facts to back up his bald statement, then he should spread them out and let the electors have a look at them. He should remember that most people are ‘from Missouri’, and they aren’t likely to be convinced or swayed by off-hand statements no matter how reliable the source. If he had produced the cards to trump his statement, it would have made it more politically valuable and the same can be said for his closing statement in the release.”

and it quotes his closing statement in this editorial which is this:

“I am convinced that a Liberal government which will create a favourable political climate for industrial development is our province’s best assurance of realizing the great industrial potential described in the Stanford Report.”

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

February 22, 1960

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — My friends are having a happy time over there.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Then the editorial goes on to say:

“Undoubtedly he knows what he means, but the people who will be casting the ballots won't be satisfied with what it implies. They want to know how the Liberals will create a more favourable political climate and what the Liberal party intends to do to turn Saskatchewan into an industrial paradise overnight. Those are questions the Liberal Leader will have to answer if he expects to convince the majority of the voters. It isn't enough any more for party leaders, or constituency candidates either, to make charges unless they are prepared to make definite statements regarding economic cures. The average elector is always interested in bettering his welfare and that of his community, province, or nation, but he isn't likely to vote against something unless he is convinced that by doing so these benefits are going to be improved. He wants promises nailed down with brass tacks.”

That is exactly what we have been saying on this side of the House for a year.

Mr. Cameron: — Would you like to read this one, ‘Tom’?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I will. This is infinitely more concise and to the point. No one can call ‘The Sun’ a C.C.F. organ. I have known it for a good many years. As I say, that editorial is saying what we have said. If our folks across the way have something of a specific nature that they will do to create this wonderful climate for private enterprise, let them tell us what it is. I suspect I know what it is. I suspect quite well.

Mr. McDonald: — If you know you'd adopt it, ‘Tom’.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They will do the same thing, I assume, with Saskatchewan Government Insurance, with the resurrected and now flourishing brick plant down at Estevan, with the Timber Board, and with many other of the Crown corporations as they did with the Bienfait Briquetting Plant many years ago.

Mr. McIntosh: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They will create a favourable climate for private enterprise by giving some of their private-enterprise friends who may have made the heavy contributions that Blair Fraser mentioned in ‘Maclean’s Magazine’ last fall, to their campaign fund for one dollar, or maybe a dollar-and-a-half — or two dollars because of inflation.

One single idea they have come out with has been to permit purple gas to be used in farm trucks, and they say that this will . . . Oh, I think one of their speakers said that it wouldn’t cure the economic ills, but it will be something. It will mean \$20 or \$25 a year on the average; and we hear the talk, “this happened in Alberta, why can’t it in Saskatchewan”; but nobody tells, either here or outside, whether Liberals or Social Crediters or Tories, that it costs \$25 insurance premium more in Alberta than it does in Saskatchewan for a farm truck. These things are not told by our friends opposite. And what would happen to car insurance if the Government Insurance is sold? Not only farm trucks but in the average motor vehicle, the automobile insurance here, due to Government Insurance, is such that the automobile owner here pays less than half of the cost of insurance premiums in Alberta. So, when they talk about things being done there, this is the fairest way we are doing it here. And what we believe in is not that farmers should be relieved of some of the necessity of making a contribution to the public service, but that they should be treated decently by the Government of Canada, which has full authority to see that farm prices are adequate to enable the farmer to do what he wants to do — and that is, to pay his share.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Take some of your own advice there, ‘Tom’.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Now in talking about this purple gas, one speaker over there said it would only cost a million dollars to do it, and the Government could easily find the money by cutting out waste and extravagance, and he gave an illustration of waste and extravagance. He mentioned the restroom on the Parliament Building grounds which cost \$14,000. I expect all of my friends opposite have done some building; if they haven’t, in the last few years they have many neighbours and friends who have. All building costs are great. Of course it cost \$14,000. Does he call it waste and extravagance? Do they consider it waste and extravagance to provide proper sanitary facilities for the thousands of people who come onto the grounds here during the summer, not only from Regina but from all across Saskatchewan and tourists from outside? Yet they say that is waste and extravagance. You can imagine what kind of a province it would be if that is the kind of expenditures they intend to cut out. But the important thing is that his estimate is so far wrong. If their knowledge is no greater than the estimate given as one million dollars lost by the allowing of purple gas in trucks then, obviously, their estimate of everything is less than fifty per cent right, because the loss would be \$2,500,000 to the Treasury in the present year, if purple gas were to be permitted in farm trucks.

Opposition Members: — How do you know?

Mr. McDonald: — You don't know. I'm going to put that question on the Order Paper. You just proved from your figures that you don't know.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, where do they expect us to get the \$2,500,000? I expect they would like us to cut out some of the things that have been indicated by some of their previous speakers in this House, including their financial critic; what they call our extravagance in providing public service. They would like us to reduce the mothers' allowance or cut it out; they would like us to reduce the supplementary allowance or cut it out. The two of those together would produce what would be the loss of purple gas in one year. I suspect that is really what they want to do, because it is evident from the speeches we have heard from that side of the House, not only this year but year after year for the last 11 sessions counting this one, that they are opposed to many of these things. What do they want? They just want to talk about things they know nothing about. The minute it comes to doing something worthwhile, they don't want anything; they don't want us to make increased grants to the hospital and nursing homes. That is because they have stated their official position is going to be against these motions which are in acceptance of the Speech from the Throne. That takes in all of those to your left. They are opposed to increases in boarding home rates to foster parents, to look after the 1300-odd children we have in foster homes, and who have earned an increase in the amount. They are opposed to all of those things, and they made their position very clear.

If you think they are not opposed, I want to read one paragraph from an editorial on the Speech from the Throne, and on the Premier's speech, as printed in 'The Leader-Post' under the by-line of Mr. Davis, February 18, 1960. This is the one paragraph, and note the words. How fearful they are of the things we are proposing. He says (and remember 'The Leader-Post' is a Liberal paper). I know the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) didn't believe it at one time, but I expect he got straightened around on that, because I have never heard him call it a C.C.F. paper since.

Mr. Gardiner: — I never did!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — And it certainly has never been a C.C.F. paper since I have known it, which is a long time. Here is the paragraph as quoted by Mr. Davis from his editorial on February 18th:

“The keynote of the C.C.F. program is subsidization in a substantial way: subsidized sewer and water systems for farm homes, town and villages; subsidized crop insurance; subsidized improvement for rural telephones; subsidized recreational facilities; finance for re-gravelling municipal roads, and finally, subsidized medical-care program.”

The whole tone is against everything worthwhile, and all those things that are contained in the Speech from the Throne that are worthwhile. That is the 'Leader-Post' attitude; that is the Liberal attitude. It may be that some of our friends don't believe that, but the fact remains that such programs do not exist anywhere in Canada where the Liberals govern. But the tone of the editorial indicates clearly their attitude toward these things; and in case anyone thinks I misquoted, there is the editorial.

If you want a little bit more evidence that they don't believe (and the Tories don't either) because they re-printed an article from 'The Winnipeg Tribune' which is a Tory paper, and 'The Leader-Post' daily printed that last April 2nd, 1958, after the last Federal election, and this is what it says: The Tory 'Tribune' printed it, and the 'Leader-Post' reprinted it with glee and I quote:

"The Conservative landslide is a personal climb for Prime Minister Diefenbaker. It presents him with the greatest challenge of his life. With such a following in Parliament he must watch his every move to prove constantly that he can remain a great democrat in the face of such power. With the defeat of the leaders of the C.C.F. and the Social Credit party, those two groups may wither away on the vine, and eventually vanish from the political scene. This is one of the greatest single accomplishments and developments of the election."

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Listen to this very carefully, my good-hearted friends on the other side; my big-hearted people over there that want to do everything without doing anything. I will continue with the editorial:

"Collapse of the C.C.F. may mean an end to the urging of governments for the continual extension of the welfare state."

And if anyone wants to read it, there is the editorial.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone want any clearer exposition, any more fair explanation, of the real down-to-earth beliefs of the people on the other side of the House, and the people outside lead by Mr. Martin Pedersen, who would like to be in the House here, on any side whatsoever. That is their attitude toward the welfare of every single one of us.

Mr. McFarlane: — What a clown!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — There isn't very much to be said about the Tories. As I said before, their Federal leader had caught a vision. I don't know if it was ever alive; it didn't live long afterwards, but it did live long enough to talk about the northern roads from igloo to igloo, and then he backed away from that, when he was pinned down by being asked to sign an agreement, and by his great vision that has helped build a bridge across the river of Prince Albert, which he had already qualified, and then got mixed up with these igloo roads. I suggest that the lessons he says he learned in childhood, he soon found were not very tenable when he got to Ottawa, when he had to take his choice between the good lessons he learned as a boy, and his ambition to remain in the present exalted position as Prime Minister of Canada. When Mr. Fleming and his cohorts got a hold of our 'John' they soon taught him some of the economic and political facts of life insofar as central Canada is concerned, which covers both Liberals and Tories . . . And the economic facts are, protection to industry. The political facts are all power to Ontario and Quebec, so there we have it; and the social facts of life, so far as Ontario and Quebec and their political figures down there, provincially and federally (and they control the federal politics) — their social facts of life, as little welfare as possible, and then only as much as they have to give to keep the electorate quiet.

Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why I feel disappointed and that what appear to be bright and humanitarian people sitting over there on your left, in both parties, cannot support the worthwhile projects that are envisaged in the Speech from the Throne, and are going to vote against it. Mr. Speaker, you will have no doubt when I sit down where my vote will go when the motion comes before the House.

Mr. Gardiner: — Don't miss your chair!

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to join with all of the speakers who have preceded me in tendering my congratulations to the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson), the mover of the Address, and also to the seconder, the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). Both these speakers have done a very excellent job. I was very much impressed with the refreshing and fundamental philosophy enunciated by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan. It is a very heartening thing to have young men who have a very idealistic viewpoint, a viewpoint that is in harmony completely, I think, with all our philosophies if we claim to be Christians.

I wish to congratulate particularly the seconder of the Address, since this was his 'maiden' address in the House. He did an excellent job, and he has proven the value of the experience that he has gained as a reeve in his municipality, and in handling general public affairs. I am certain that he will give a most valuable contribution to this Legislature before and after the coming general election.

While I thought that some criticism might have been offered regarding

February 22, 1960

the unprecedented emergency assistance provided to our farm people as a result of farm losses due to drought, grasshopper infestation and various other things, such as an exceedingly wet harvest season and snow early this fall, I was unprepared absolutely for the kind of sweeping uncalled for and irresponsible criticism emanating particularly from the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) and the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley). Personally, I felt that these hon. members ought to have known of some of the steps that have been taken to alleviate the general situation.

The extreme and unjustified criticism offered by the Opposition in this regard is not only completely at variance with the facts, but it will not bring credit to the critics themselves. This is the kind of irresponsible criticism that we have become accustomed to on this side of the House; but what my friends opposite do not realize is that it has been proven over and over again, over the past years, that the people of Saskatchewan do not like this type of irresponsible criticism. They would like I think, at long last to hear something a little more constructive. I believe they would like to hear credit given where credit is due.

In my capacity as a Minister of the Crown I can see many opportunities for very constructive criticism to be offered, because no government is perfect. But I do say that I know of no Minister or administration in any province that had more difficult problems to deal with, because of our geographical location, because of great distances, because of the many natural hazards to our basic industry, or any government in this province of Saskatchewan. They should take these handicaps into consideration. This administration has done an excellent job, and it is for this that the people of this province have given this Government credit.

I have learned another thing in the House. I have learned that when the hon. members opposite criticize a particular service or program of government, I have learned that that program and that policy is beneficial, and pleasing and helpful to the people of this province. It was very aptly demonstrated, last Friday, when the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) spoke. He gave a good demonstration of this by his pet beef — that is, to cut up the Power Corporation. Why? Because it is a bad service; because it is poorly managed or because it falls short of providing a beneficial service to the people of the province? No! It is because it is well managed; but he knows the people appreciate the services provided by the Power Corporation, particularly to help the problem of the farmer. So he would like to make this Corporation appear bad in the eyes of the people by holding it up as being a great, grasping, burgeoning, monopolistic, threatening Corporation. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be farther from the truth. It is this kind of criticism that elects C.C.F. Governments in this province.

This type of criticism is much the same regarding other meritorious programs inside and outside my Department. This is particularly true of programs undertaken by the Provincial Government over the past years, particularly during 1959. It is basically true that heavy unforeseen expenditures

to meet emergency conditions do detract from over-all programs that are so important to the people of the province. It is a cause for alarm when great emergencies develop in this province that call for the diversion of funds to bring relief to hard-pressed people. It does mean that services could suffer — such services as provided by the Hospitalization Plan, assistance to education and the many other services, particularly the grid road program, the highway program and the services provided in my own Department. That's all true, Mr. Speaker. There is, therefore, a definite limit to the amount of money a provincial government, from its limited sources of revenue, can make available to meet huge emergencies. particularly emergencies that are in the proportion of a national emergency. The emergency this year, Mr. Speaker, it is agreed by every one, every representative of farm organizations, that this was in the nature of a national emergency.

It has been suggested by the hon. member (I believe) from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) that the Government was caught unguarded for the emergency this year, because we hadn't had any similar experience previously. This is one statement I want to correct, because the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, were exceedingly bad years. \$1,590,000 was spent for grasshopper control in that period of time, plus \$319,000 for fodder assistance, making a grand total spent for agricultural aid and relief in those years, 1947 to 1951, of nearly \$2 million. In 1949, 1950 alone, \$605,000 was spent for grasshopper control chemicals by subsidizing chemicals at 50 per cent of cost, which at that time was \$3.00 per acre. We in the Department felt we could not go on doing this and began a policy of bulk purchase of grasshopper chemicals.

It has been suggested, too, by the hon. members opposite, that this Government has not done anything that puts money in the farmers' pockets or to improve farm income. I give you one demonstration in point, Mr. Speaker, in regard to grasshopper chemicals alone. They cost up to \$3.00 per acre in the year 1949. We progressively, by bulk purchase, brought those prices down to 80 cents an acre, to 36 cents an acre and finally to 15 cents an acre. Isn't that putting money in the farmers' pockets? The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and the hon. member for Turtleford ought to know this, because I think I told this to the Legislature last year, that we were spending \$1 million for grasshopper chemicals to take care of this year's grasshopper infestation: one million dollars to make it possible for the farmers to have these chemicals at 15 cents an acre, not \$3.00 an acre! It is because of this that farmers generally have been able to make generous use of these chemicals, without a heavy financial outlay. It was for this reason that the grasshopper campaigns in 1958 and 1959 have been so successful, and have meant so much in saved crops and income to our farm people. I am particularly proud of this program and I resent these sweeping statements that we have not taken timely action in these matters.

The year 1958 was a bad year, too. We can all recall the drought

February 22, 1960

in the early spring. What happened then? We declared an emergency fodder transportation policy on June 16, 1958. Isn't that quick? We took rapid action. We asked the Federal Government that year to participate. Manitoba had the same problem and the Federal Government finally came into the picture in August of 1958, after we had already initiated our program.

1959 was similar, a very dry spring. Again we asked for shared transportation assistance, but for some reason, perhaps because we were the only province affected, we were told that the Federal Government could not come into the scheme. We announced our transportation assistance policy on July 1, 1959, under which transportation assistance was made available for the movement of haying equipment and the homeward movement of fodder. This policy remained in effect until October 12 of this year when the snow came, and after representations were made to the Federal Government, the Federal Government agreed to participate in the transportation assistance program on a more generous basis, because the distances for transportation fodder and feed would now be much greater, and they came in with assistance. But the Province on its own, Mr. Speaker, made payments to those farmers who had moved fodder between July 1st and October 12th under our own policy, when less generous assistance was available, in order that these farmers would not be discriminated against. We made those retroactive payments ourselves.

One of the most urgent problems that faced us when the snow came was the problem of fodder shortage, and this was one of the first matters that was dealt with by the Federal Government. As I mentioned, they shared the transportation assistance with us — one of the first things that had to be done. One of the second things immediately done was that the Wheat Board agreed to make arrangements to handle tough and damp grain, and I think this program has gone along very well. These were some of the things that were accomplished initially when the emergency first developed. Let us recap. I was in the country when 10 to 12 inches of snow came. I know what it means when snow comes after weeks of wet weather. Everyone pretty well concedes that there is very little possibility that crops will be harvested; everyone would naturally be concerned about feed for livestock. I spoke to several farmers who had only 5 days feed and who usually have their feed up much earlier. Because of the extremely wet weather we were indeed concerned, and quite naturally we called in the farm organizations, and quite naturally and logically we contacted the Federal Government as to what might be done; But what did the new Leader of the Liberal party contribute? He said the C.C.F.'s idea of helping farmers was to holler to Ottawa. That's what he said at that time. I thought he could have made a much more constructive contribution. I have often wondered if that was not what gave Mr. Diefenbaker the idea of proposing that the Province share what was a national emergency on a 50-50 basis. I see my hon. friend from Melville smile. I'm going to refer to him a bit later on, and read some of the proposals that he made that now look extremely ridiculous.

We met with the farm organizations here in Regina. We met the federal Cabinet Ministers and Mr. Diefenbaker in Winnipeg on October 22.

Proposals were submitted, and everyone agreed that this was in the nature of a national emergency and that the national government should extend help on its own. We asked several things. We asked, first, acreage payments. We suggested an acreage payment of \$5.00 an acre to be made available, particularly in view of the fact that the national government had established a precedent when they made an acreage payment available in 1958, when there was not a similar emergency, at the rate of \$1.00 per acre up to 200 acres; and, as an alternative, we said if this wasn't acceptable, then we would like the provision of P.F.A.A. applied to unharvested grain. We also suggested that the national government again reinstitute the 1951-52 legislation under which advances were made to farmers who had unthreshed grain. The latter suggestion has now been complied with.

On October 29, after the conference in Winnipeg, Mr. Harkness advised by 'phone each of the provincial ministers that the Federal Government was prepared to share on a 50-50 basis acreage payments at \$3.00 per acre up to 200 acres. That meant a flat \$3.00 per acre payment up to 200 acres across the board. I contacted the other two provincial ministers, Alberta and Manitoba, and both of them rejected this proposal. We met in Regina on November 6, at which time the proposal was discussed. The three provincial Ministers, on behalf of their governments, sent to Mr. Harkness a joint letter signed by each, setting out the viewpoint of the respective provincial governments in regard to the proposal. The governments of Manitoba and Alberta were firm in their belief that the national government should assume this responsibility, and we recommend that the provisions of P.F.A.A. be made available on an individual farm basis.

Mr. Harkness at that time was away in Europe attending a F.A.O. conference; he made no reply immediately. We therefore took the matter up again at the annual Federal-Provincial Conference held November 23 and 24, and again requested that consideration be given to the proposal submitted in our joint letter of November 6. Needless to say, this proposal was turned down, and the federal authorities advised us that no matter what was done it would have to be shared, that they would insist it be shared, on a 50-50 basis with the provinces. They did inform us that the payments proposed originally on a flat \$3.00 per acre basis could be graduated and applied up to \$3.00 per acre. This was something we had asked because we felt that the payments ought to be related as near as possible to need.

One important point in connection with Mr. Harkness' telephone message to us on October 29 was that at that time we were informed that it was only in cases where 50 per cent or more of the farmer's field crops remained unharvested, as at December 15, that such farmer could qualify for the payment. Therefore, no payments could have been made until after December 15. That same provision was reiterated when we met with the Federal Government in Ottawa, November 24. I came back to Regina, (I think it was about the 26th of November) and reported the matter to Cabinet, and Mr. Diefenbaker wired the Premier on November 27 outlining the proposal I just

February 22, 1960

mentioned. On December 2, the Premier announced on, behalf of the Government that the Province of Saskatchewan would participate in the acreage payments proposed by the Federal Government, without waiting for any further advice from the Federal Government or anyone else. In the meantime, at different stages all through the month of November, announcements were made regarding additional measures taken in behalf of meeting the farm emergency.

For example, early in November, various extensive work-and-wages programs were announced to provide employment opportunities to farmers chiefly in northern Saskatchewan who could take advantage of off-farm employment. On November 13, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. L.F. McIntosh) announced the application at The Seed Grain Supply Act, under which legislation a municipality, under provincial guarantee of 73 per cent of the losses, can advance credit to farmers who require money to buy feed and seed or any other agricultural supplies. On November 17, additional work-and-wages programs were announced by the Department of Municipal Affairs, L.I.D. Branch, amounting to some \$110,000. In my own Department we looked about to see what else we might do. The north was particularly heavily hit, so we made payment to Crown lessees for clearing and breaking, who had cleared and broken land beyond the quota for this year. These additional payments contributed another \$50,000 to farmers in that part of the province who held Crown leases there. Various measures were taken.

I should mention this about Alberta. I don't know in detail what Alberta and Manitoba are doing, but I do know that all three policies are basically uniform. The payments are graduated according to need either two or three dollars an acre. The Provincial ministers met specifically to work out a uniform approach to these problems. There is some variation, but not to any substantial degree. We felt here, and rightly so, that we ought to graduate the payments as well as we could according to need, and it is quite true that we did endeavour to work out a policy based on income. That policy never left my office. It was discussed, and after being discussed it was thought to be impractical and unworkable. The hon. members opposite come forward with a sweeping statement saying that there was such opposition to it that we had to drop it. It never left my office!

Mr. J.W. Gardiner: — How did it get in the press?

Mr. D.T. McFarlane: — How did it get out of the municipal office?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It has been suggested that we ought to find a new basis. The only way one could bring in a graduated scale of payment or any degree of payment according to need under these terms that 50 per cent of the farmer's crop must be unharvested, would be on the basis of considering only acreage and yield. This we have done.

Mr. F.E. Foley: — Will the hon. Minister answer a question, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member for Turtleford can remain seated and I will answer all his questions, for a half hour if necessary.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — On a point of order. This member asked if he was permitted to ask a question. He is not subject to abuse like that. It is up to the speaker to answer.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Order!

May I inform the hon. member for Turtleford, when he asks a question, if the Minister or member takes his seat, it is the signal that he will accept the question. If he doesn't take his seat, he proceeds with his speech.

Mr. McFarlane: — He doesn't want to answer it then.

Mr. Foley: — I just want to ask how it got in the press.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The Alberta Government made a press statement on December 2, that they had turned down the policy. As a matter of fact, they didn't announce their policy until December. We have taken the lead in this matter all the way through. Instead of bungling and being inept and being inattentive, we have stepped right out in the forefront in meeting this situation.

Mr. McFarlane: — Rubbish!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Immediately on receipt of the Prime Minister's wire, we immediately began working on policy. The policy was finalized and approved by Cabinet and sent to Mr. Harkness for approval on November 10. It was returned again and I received Mr. Harkness' wire on December 14 or 15 (I don't just remember which) saying the policy was approved. And our policy announcement was made December 16, one day after! I might say here, Mr. Speaker, the field staff was prepared and briefed regarding policy prior to this announcement in order that the appropriate information could be made available to municipal councils and L.I.D. administrators as quickly as possible. We had to depend on local governments to do this kind of a rush job of getting money to people as quickly as possible in this emergency.

I have been informed today by a press news item that Manitoba to date has only paid \$42,000 of this money to their farmers. I don't know what the Alberta situation is; I do know that they are behind us. By January 21, 11,000 farmers in this province had received their cheques and by this date. At the present time, we have a total of 20,000 applications which will run to a total sum of around \$6 million. For the benefit of the hon. member for Turtleford, I would like to inform him that the average acreage payment is over \$2.70 per acre, and the average payments are \$300 per eligible person.

This could not have been accomplished without the full co-operation of the municipal councils and the field staffs of the various departments

February 22, 1960

who, under the pressure of speed and urgency, have done an excellent job. I must pay particular tribute and give particular credit to the municipal councils who so conscientiously and diligently screened applications. We only receive applications in the Department that have been screened and approved by municipal councils. This was necessary because of the nature of the program and because the local people are at the source of obtaining any information that is required.

I wish to make one thing very clear. We knew when we went into this program that it would not be completely equitable and fair. It was not designed to take care of farmers who have suffered loss of income because of various reasons, hail, drought or what have you. Under the terms laid down, it was the intention of the Federal Government apparently to give some help only to those farmers who had 50 per cent of their crops unharvested as at December 15. We had to work within these basic terms, and we knew that there would be some unfairness. I am also aware, as everyone in this House is, that not everyone is scrupulously honest, but I do feel this that insofar . . . I notice the hon. member for Cannington looked up. I certainly did not mean to imply that everyone in this House was not scrupulously honest. I would hope so. But we do have some problems of this kind. We feel, Mr. Speaker, since we have entered into this agreement on the basis mentioned, we are obliged to discharge our responsibility under the agreement and satisfy the federal authorities as well as we can that applications received and declared eligible actually have 50 per cent of their field crops unharvested as at December 15.

We have provided variations in our interpretation of this. For example, we have permitted salvage crops to be considered as unthreshed, that is, salvage for fodder although not eligible for the payment would assist eligibility. We have also permitted farmers who have skimmed over their fields, particularly with standing crops, and were unable to get 50 per cent — we felt that we would be within the terms as laid down by the Federal Government if we would qualify these for payment. These applications do present problems, but I can assure the House we will again screen them. These applications are being cross-checked with the P.F.A.A. administration.

I think everyone will agree that we should not countenance any false statement being made. There doesn't have to be any, Mr. Speaker. Everyone understands the terms. It is evident municipal councils have done an excellent job, and it appears we will not have too much difficulty on this score, for which I am very thankful.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention this to the House. The Provincial Government's participation in payment straight cash grants in support of farm income is something unprecedented, to my knowledge, in the history of this province. Never before has a provincial government been asked to play this role. Usually, we feel, when it is a matter of such vast importance, that the National Government has some responsibility for maintaining farm income. Particularly, (I might say this in reply to some of the things that have been said by my Tory friends) when the Federal Government has taken millions out of Saskatchewan farmers' pockets by removing the floor

price on eggs and hogs and then turns around and says to us: now pay 50 per cent of this emergency. Particularly, too, when the farm organizations in Western Canada are still pressing the National Government for the overall deficiency payments amounting to some \$300 million, and "John" still hasn't given us the answer yet; he has still got it under consideration, but I think there is a cut-off rate, too. I think he is supposed to tell us something by the end of the month of this matter. Under those circumstances I was rather amazed that the National Government should ask the Provincial Government to pay 50 per cent of these exceptionally large emergency payments. This will be a heavy extra expenditure, and what I have said I think very effectively contradicts the irresponsible and unsupported statements made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and the hon. member for Turtleford.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley made another statement that I want to reply to. He asked a question in the House the other day: "How many tons of fodder has the Provincial Government put in its fodder banks in the years 1957, 1958 and 1959?" Obviously none, Mr. Speaker, because these fodder banks, as we develop them we turned over to local organizations of farmers or co-operatives, or the acreage is leased out on an individual lease basis. To make it look bad we brought out that the Government hasn't put anything in the fodder bank since 1957. He knew better than that.

I want to state that there were some 16 of these fodder banks developed throughout the province. The total forage harvested by farmers in the period 1955 to 1959 is 60,000 tons of fodder. The province, as you all know, from its reserves that accumulated as we were developing these projects at five different locations, made available these reserves over the years and the balance of these fodder reserves moved into consumption early in October. It is true that we have had problems. The fodder stored in the hangars turned out very good; but we did experience very considerable loss with fodder that was stacked, and well stacked, at fodder banks for a number of years. These additional fodder supplies, believe me, came in mighty handy by the farmers who were able to get their fodder from this source of supply. I thought I should mention this, Mr. Speaker, in order to put the record straight.

We are often told in this House that we do very little in support of farm income. What I have said this afternoon so far indicates the tremendous efforts made during this emergency year and previous emergency years, and as a result of other programs, fodder development, the things that we have done within our provincial jurisdiction to improve the farm income situation. I have some figures, in relation to the amount of money that we spent for flood control and drainage, for irrigation, for miscellaneous water developments since 1949, and for dry land forage development, pasture projects, miscellaneous land development and for emergency drainage and so on in the amount of \$5,300,000. The approximate amounts are: for irrigation and irrigation fodder projects, \$2,090,000; miscellaneous water developments, \$400,000, and the total for water development very nearly \$8 million; for pasture projects, \$1,300,000; dry land forage projects, nearly \$800,000;

February 22, 1960

miscellaneous land development, \$265,000. In addition, clearing and breaking programs that enabled young people to become established in agriculture in the northern part of the province or in areas of the province where the costs of clearing and breaking are above \$12 per acre, nearly \$6 million in actual cash, Mr. Speaker. In addition, crop-share repaid amounted to another \$2 million; also for the purchase of land for community pastures. I can proudly say we have increased the acreage in community pastures in this province from 49 to 50 per cent. There are at the present time 105 co-operative community pastures alone, to say nothing of the provincial pastures and the P.F.R.A. pastures as well. These programs that I have just mentioned total up, since 1949, to an expenditure on behalf of improving farm income, by providing farmers with more resources and material to operate on, of over \$18 million. And still my friends say we have done nothing to put money in the farmers' pockets! Nothing could be farther from the truth.

We have announced in the Speech from the Throne — as long as I got in this debate, I might as well go on. I did not expect to participate in the Throne Speech debate until my hon. friends on the other side made their unfounded statements. So I had to get on my feet to answer a bunch of purely irresponsible nonsense. Instead of all this nonsense they would be well advised to offer some constructive criticism, if they have it to offer, and if it is within their ability to do so.

I should mention another program that is really catching on, and that is the program for tree planting. With the grid road program under way by my good friend, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, there is a greater demand for tree planting. The Department, as you know, for a three-year period will pay up to \$48 per mile for tree planting. This year we paid out \$33,000 for planting 1,000 miles of field and roadside shelter belts. This is much more than the entire mileage involved in the Conquest project. This is a vote that could go up to \$400,000 a year, and I would like to see it go up to that amount.

There is also the Veterinary Service District grants that are growing each year, and, of course, there is the Forage Crop program under which we make forage crop seed available to farmers at cost. We have to date filled over 50,000 orders to establish forage crops on very nearly a million acres since this program was inaugurated.

Then there is the Family Farm Improvement Program which I am looking forward to, not only with anticipation because it is a good constructive program, but with some apprehension because in every program that is brought in there are problems, and there will be problems associated with this program as well. But for the hon. members to say these programs do nothing but cost the farmer more money is sheer nonsense.

I was listening to Mr. Pederson, the Leader of the Conservatives in Saskatchewan, talking on T.V. the other night. He made the same statement. He said: "Yes, the family farm program might be all right, but it is

taking money out of the farmers' pockets". I would like to say to Mr. Pedersen that, according to a press statement (and I think it is right) the Manitoba Government (Conservative) has now followed suit and are also going to inaugurate a family farm improvement plan under which water and sewage assistance will be given to bring these facilities to farmsteads. I don't know what he is going to say now. He ought to go to Manitoba and tell the farmers, "this is just taking money out of your pockets". Could anything be more childish than a statement like that?

Either people can pay for these things individually and do these things on their own initiative, but certainly, in the case of farmstead improvement, water and sewage, technical assistance, keeping the cost down is a very important factor, and the possibility of direct financial help will also be a big incentive to such a program, but principally technical assistance and help.

The power program also costs money too, and I have often said in this House, if we are going to wait until we have solved all the economic problems of the farmer — and judging, by the rate at which the former Liberal administration went about solving farm problems at Ottawa, and the rate the present Tory administration is going in reverse, by putting farming prices down instead of up — we might wait for a long time before we inaugurated programs of this kind. So there is no alternative, we must go ahead . . .

Mr. G. Herman Danielson: — That's quite an admission. You're going to the opposite direction, anyhow.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is an advantage from the farmer's point of view and he looks at it in this way. Power has been a big aid to him. He found it difficult to obtain hired help, but he found that power helped him a great deal in this regard. A young man, a new purebred livestock breeder, was in the office the other day, and he said: "You can't imagine, Mr. Nollet, what the power program has meant to me, when I think of the long hours I used to spend pumping water for cattle; now I press a button." And, he said: "I have put in water and sewerage already and I would like to know something about your program." He told me about his farm and I told him what the cost might be under our proposal and he informed me that it would have been a tremendous saving to him. He said: "Do you know, this water program that I put in has been a big labor saver for me, and in the home as well."

So there are compensations, remunerative compensations, for money invested in improving farmsteads. It increases the capital value of the farm as well, so this is not only a needful program, but a beneficial program as well. I look forward to it, and I do hope that I can give some contribution to it.

There was one more question from over there, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to reply to, but perhaps I have said enough. I have given what information I could, and to the best of my ability, in connection with the action taken by the Province to meet the present

February 22, 1960

emergency situation, and some indication as to what has been done, very briefly, over the years to improve the position of the farmers in this province in regard to his production problems. This is strictly provincial jurisdiction, and I feel that we have made a very notable contribution when one thinks of the expansion of the Agricultural Representative Service in the past few years, together with increased specialist services that have been made available. Livestock specialists, farm management specialists have practically been doubled. All of this has helped and certainly we hope that it will mean something in terms of improved farm income.

We know, too, that if the living standards of our rural people are to be maintained, and these services to the rural areas are to be maintained and improved upon, the farmer will need more money. This is recognized by everyone. The Premier, I believe, in the House the other day, gave us the figures, and they are complete for 1957, when one looks at the total farm industry in this province, as an industry it went in the 'hole' by \$125.6 million. Obviously, this industry can't continue to operate on this basis. Why do they keep talking about this or that service costing more? I think we ought to get together and talk more about improved farm income and make stronger representations to our National Government to see to it that we have a comprehensive national marketing and farm income policy that will maintain farm income whether it is a crop-failure year or not, by an appropriate crop insurance plan that will maintain farm income and enable our farm people not only to meet their costs, but to also make it possible to meet the expenditures associated with improved living standards.

Mr. Speaker, there is much merit in the Speech from the Throne, and I certainly will support the motion.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes.

Mr. Foley: — I would like to ask the hon. Minister: If the provisions for the means test, first contemplated, never left his office, how does he account for the press reports from which we quoted when we were making our address? The terms of the means test were obtained from press reported dated about December 12.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Representatives of many organizations met with us. Someone may have divulged the information, but it never came from my office.

Mr. Foley: — One further question if the hon. Minister will permit.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish hon. members would follow the rules in regard to questions. When an hon. member wishes to ask a question he must ask the person speaking if he will permit a question, and I have noticed that very seldom will a speaker take his chair, which is an indication that he will accept a question. If he does not take his chair

then the person knows that a question is not acceptable. I will permit this further question if the hon. Minister will accept it.

Mr. Foley: — Might I ask the Minister: In view of the fact that Manitoba has made a provision of \$2.00 per acre for the farmers whose grain was damp or lower than No. 5, and also the fact that both Alberta and Manitoba have discussed the possibility of paying growers of special crops certain sums in excess of the \$3.00 per acre, if this has been taken into consideration by this Government?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, we have. We have not the same acreage of special crops, but we have made provision for losses to potato growers and also included alfalfa seed and all of these other crops. With reference to damp grain, this was discussed in some detail with the other Ministers, in Manitoba, before the variant policies were finalized; but I don't know whether Manitoba is actually implementing it. Their proposed policy was as follows: up to 5 bushels an acre, the farmer would get \$3.00 an acre; from 5 to 8, they would get \$2.00 an acre, and then between 8 and 12, if the grain threshed damp and was graded No. 5 or lower, he would receive \$2.00 an acre. We raised ours from 5 to 10 because we felt there would be so many administrative difficulties in finding out whether the damp grain was No. 5, or what it was. In terms of money I don't think it means anything. I am not sure whether they actually implemented this proposal or not. They talked about it. We haven't. We pay \$3.00 per acre with yields up to 5 bushels and \$2.00 per acre from 5 to 10 bushels per acre yield.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted one more comment.

Mr. Speaker: — This has gone beyond the rules of time. I wish the hon. member would observe the rule in respect to questions, both those who are speaking and those who are asking questions.

Are the members ready for the question?

February 22, 1960

Mr. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to extend my thanks, and I am sure the thanks of everyone in this House to you who, during your term of office have discharged that office so admirably. I want to thank you, sir, for your impartiality, your dignity and your always pleasant and delightful humor, and that all the more because in this House there seems to be very little humor except that, of course, which is unconscious. I want to say, sire, your job has been discharged so well that I trust that those who will follow you will be able to do so with the dignity that you have displayed.

Mr. Speaker, they say that an atheist never dies, and during the last few days I have become convinced that must be true of parties as well as persons. They say that atheists never die because they always become converts to some type of religion on their deathbed; and we have certainly heard a terrific conversion in the last few days. I think we have with us, and are going for the next few weeks to witness the death struggles of a party that has lost all reason for living; all excuse for living. Amazingly enough (and this makes it all the more sad), this particular party is dying just as it is about to become a bridegroom in a wedding. This makes it even sadder; but I have never heard anyone, any group of people belonging to a political organization, seek to utilize the vitality, the strength, the depth of religion the way the people on your right have attempted to do so in the last few days. I have been shocked and embarrassed because surely, sir, even if your party has lost its reason for living on political grounds, surely you don't have to go to the point where you have to stoop, in your reasoning, in your intellectual honesty, to identify yourselves with Christianity and with democracy and say in effect, as three or four speakers have on the Government side of the House: if you don't vote C.C.F., if you are against the C.C.F. party you are against Christianity and you are against democracy.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You're dreaming, 'Mary'.

Mrs. Batten: — I can give the quotations, if you wish, because the speakers have certainly made them, and I have them here some place. I think it is a little more than I can stomach to even repeat them.

The hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) — not that you would have recognized his position from his speech because I heard no mention of the Department of Social Welfare except when he excused, in very poor terms and reasoning I am afraid, the dismissal of one of his employees. Outside of that I heard no report about the Department of Social Welfare. Mr. Speaker, I think he and his department should make more than

a report; it should make an apology. In addition to that, I would have been very interested to hear the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) tell us, as he said he told other people, just how this water and sewage is going to be put into the homes; but although apparently he can tell other people, he doesn't bother explaining to this Legislature.

Premier Douglas: — He will when the legislation comes up.

Mr. Klein: — Give it to the public first, and then the House!

Mrs. Batten: — But what amazed me was when the hon. Minister of Social Welfare stated that the Premier had set out the principles of the party clearly and unequivocally. I have listened to the Premier, I have read his speech in the newspaper report and I picked up a copy of the official report, and I have yet to find where he sets out the principles of his party. Before I go on, I want to make it clear to my hon. friends across the way who, in their intellectual honesty have accused the hon. members who represent the Social Credit party as being opposed to every detail of the program that is set out in the Speech from the Throne — and surely, sir, that is despicable. I don't want to apologize for the Social Credit, but I certainly do want to say that the hon. members whether they belong to the Social Credit party or the Liberal party or the C.C.F. party, are not voting against everything that is good in the Speech from the Throne when they oppose the Address-in-Reply, and surely my hon. friends know better than that. Unfortunately, I haven't got the air time to say that, and his words went over the air. I only hope that our people are intelligent enough to recognize intellectual dishonesty when they hear it.

Mr. McCarthy: — Their old tactics!

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — That's why you were defeated in the by-election. You were both dishonest and lost the election.

Mrs. Batten: — I would rather be defeated and be honest than keep winning elections the way the C.C.F. have won them.

Premier Douglas: — Is the hon. member implying that the Minister is dishonest?

Mrs. Batten: — Well, maybe the Premier can prove where I have been dishonest, but I think he should substantiate that statement if he wants to make it in the House.

Premier Douglas: — I would be very glad to. I would be very glad to go over your statements in the Kinistino by-election.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

February 22, 1960

Mrs. Batten: — I think the Premier should be asked to withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker, unless he is going to substantiate it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just accused the Minister of Social Welfare of being intellectually dishonest. When I say that she both lost the election and was intellectually dishonest in the Kinistino by-election, she wants me to withdraw it. If she will withdraw the statement about the Minister of Social Welfare, I will certainly withdraw the statement about her.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I have proved exactly how the Minister was being intellectually dishonest. When the Premier calls me dishonest he does not qualify it by saying ‘intellectually. He said I was both dishonest and I have lost the election.

Premier Douglas: — If it offends the hon. lady I will certainly withdraw it.

Opposition Members: — Good show!

Mrs. Batten: — It doesn't only offend me, it offends the dignity of this House and of my constituents and, which is more important, the high office that the Premier holds.

I will not support this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make it clear that my reasons for not supporting it are not because I don't approve of certain of the measures that are listed in the Speech from the Throne. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I approve some very highly.

I had the honour of being the chairman of the Resolutions Committee at the Liberal convention that was held in this city, last fall, and most of the good things that were in the Speech from the Throne were taken wholesale out of our resolutions. And, Mr. Speaker, I can prove that, too, I am, for one thing, quite sure that the Government on your right would never have had the courage to come out and even suggest any type, let alone the wholesale type they first suggested, of medical insurance, if the Liberal party had not come out with exactly that resolution at its convention. I could go, item by item, and point out suggestions that were made by the Liberals in this House and in committees and which were laughed at, ridiculed and ignored, and, at the same time, have now been suggested to the people of Saskatchewan. I don't want to go into detail, but I would like to cite a few. For the past two years (I am sorry the Minister of Telephones isn't here), we have asked a committee that some assistance be given to rural telephones. This is a point of vital importance to many rural people, the people who are far away from any means of communications. In particular, several of the members have made long speeches and we haven't tried to make any political capital out of this, we have simply asked the minister to use some of the money that the Telephone Corporation has been able to accumulate, to give service to these people who have absolutely no other

means of communication, and there has been no suggestion made to us that this could even be considered, but now that there is an election coming up our friends across the way are becoming generous. A little too late for their own good.

Another suggestion that has been made over and over again and was laughed at by the Government speakers, was the suggestion to set up a revolving fund, or a fund of some type, that would assist these small villages and hamlets and smaller towns to set up water and sewage. We didn't ask the Government to go in and do the digging or buy things on a wholesale scale, we simply asked them to make money available to these local governments at a low rate of interest, and this money would be paid back, and in this way we could proceed with sewage and water facilities, and over a period of time all our people would have these facilities.

This Government has been giving assistance to local governments and to individuals on the basis that if they come in and beg them for something, and they have numerous interviews and 'brainwashing' sessions, and if they can convince them that it is politically expedient to this Government to make a loan, than they'll get it.

I would like to give you just a small example of this. I had a complaint from my own constituency, just a few days ago, from a man in local government, and he said, "What's the matter with the Department of Municipal Affairs? We were never able to get additional grants for this road on which the school bus travels until we got a C.C.F. candidate collecting votes, and he came in and said we would get this grant, and lo and behold! we did get this grant for the first time".

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am not going to support this Motion is exactly that. This Government proceeds on its own whim; it does exactly as it likes without any respect for the people of Saskatchewan or this Legislature. This Government has shown no policy, and this Government certainly does not indicate to me today, or in the last few days, any philosophy, any principle, that I as a voter would like to rely on. And I would like to tell you exactly why I say that. Today the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Canada, are asking just what is the C.C.F.? We have heard no mention since this House convened of Socialism. They haven't even admitted that they are Socialists. Oh, yes, in the House of Commons they are proud to be called Socialists, but what are they in Saskatchewan? Are they Socialists or are they not? Surely, when the Premier, as the hon. Minister said, set out the principles of the party so clearly in his speech, surely he could have told us that! But he hasn't. Are they fish or fowl?

Mr. Danielson: — Fish!

Premier Douglas: — That's better than being foul!

February 22, 1960

Mrs. Batten: — I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this speech from the throne shows a lack of philosophical integrity in the fact, too, that it makes no mention of the proposed merger of this C.C.F. party with the trade unions or the affiliates thereof.

Mr. Danielson: — They are not honest enough for that.

Mrs. Batten: — I think that this is a terrible lack, and a very real lack, because the Speech from the Throne although it promises a number of things, outlines no policy on which those promises will be kept. You and I know that as ordinary business men who would deal with other people, unless we can rely on the integrity of that person, unless we can rely on his philosophy, we can't rely on his promises. Yet that is exactly what this Government is asking us to do. If, in this coming election, people are going to vote for the C.C.F. party, they are not going to know exactly what they are voting for, because certainly in this House, to date at least, there has been no mention of this proposed affiliation; there has been no assurance to the people of Saskatchewan that their interests are not going to be sold out — and I use the words 'sell out' advisedly.

I want to read just a few things that have been said by various people in the C.C.F. party about this proposed merger. First of all, I think it is only right to speak first about the hon. Premier himself. I don't think it is any secret that the Premier has been consistently and strongly advocating the new party. And yet mentioned not one word of his advocacy of this proposal in his speech, even in the plan for more abundant living that he was going to bring to the people of Saskatchewan. He told the C.C.F. national convention, however, in July, 1958, that this question brings the C.C.F. to a very important point in its history. Surely the people of Saskatchewan are interested and entitled to know exactly what the proposed history of this party is going to be if that party is going to continue to form a government in this province. He said at that time, too, that he is pleased that labour unions are finding that higher wages are not enough, that the only way to really better their position is by gaining control of Parliament. These are the sentiments of the man who is at the head of our Cabinet.

The same hon. Premier said — and I quote from the 'Leader-Post' of August 31, 1959: "Agriculture has no organization and no bargaining power". This is the man who heads our Government, and he says that agriculture has no organization and no bargaining power. I wonder what the Wheat Pool, the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union and unions of other provinces think about this. True, when you listen to the Government speeches in this House, you recognize that agriculture in Saskatchewan has no bargaining power any more; but surely the other parties that represent large numbers of people are ready to reckon with agriculture, to realize that agriculture has bargaining powers.

There are other speakers, of course, who feel even more boastful about this proposed marriage. I like that expression that one of the hon.

members used when he spoke of this coming wedding, and I want to make it clear this wedding is not between labour and the C.C.F.; it is between the C.C.F. and organized labour, which is only about one-sixth of the labouring force of this country.

What is going to be the position of the farmer at this wedding? Is it going to be that of a stepchild? If it is, surely we should be told in this House what our position and the position of the Saskatchewan people is going to be. There has been no explanation of the proposal made. I wonder if this death-bed repentance that we have been listening to, these promises — “I’ll do anything only let me live” — which have been expressed by the speakers across the way, is not an indication that they are worried about their corruptibility and that it will be recognized! Because, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier himself states that we, as an agricultural province, have no bargaining power, that farmers have no organization or bargaining power, that farmers can’t bargain, what bargaining power will they have in the councils of the C.C.F. party once it becomes amalgamated?

Yet these are the people who have boasted consistently that they are told what to do by the C.C.F. organization. I have been told on several occasions that I don’t need to give any advice to this Government because, after all, I don’t carry a C.C.F. membership card, and the only people they listen to are the people who speak up in their conventions, and they follow their instructions. Now, if that is true, what do the people of Saskatchewan have to expect in the next four years? If they model this on the Labour party in Great Britain, which, indeed, they say they are going to, Mr. Atlee stated in 1949 that the Labour party conference laid down the policy of the party and it issued instructions that must be carried out by the executive, the affiliated organizations and its representatives in Parliament, and on local authorities. That would mean that when this party is amalgamated, when this new party is born, at its convention or conference it will lay down the policies and we will have to accept it when we live in Saskatchewan if, by any ill fortune, we happen to have a C.C.F. government, whether we like it or not.

I see that the unions will, indeed, have great bargaining power at the convention of the C.C.F. party and this has a very basic, realistic reason, a reason that should appeal to the C.C.F. and their type of thinking, because the congress has approximately 1,100,000 members; and if they collect \$2.60 from each one of them, that is going to be close to \$3 million in union fees that this new party will have. Now, Mr. Speaker, any party that can have a guaranteed income of \$3 million, or even \$1 million, is perhaps corruptible. Perhaps for this reason the higher hierarchy of the C.C.F. party is quite willing to sell out; they are quite willing that the people of Saskatchewan should lose their right to be represented by a party that will represent them alone, and they are quite willing to accept counsel and instructions and orders from those who are going to pay that type of money into their coffers.

These, Mr. Speaker, are quite different from the noble sentiments that have been expressed by the Mover and by the hon. Premier himself;

quite different from the words of John Stuart Mill. It amazes me that a young member who, of course, excuses himself as being extremely young. There is an excuse, I suppose; but one wonders how long a man is going to be extremely young; after three or four years in the Legislature if he is going to hold down a man's position, surely he should be fit to be recognized as an adult. John Stuart Mill said that a man should be free to do what he likes in his own concern, but he ought not to be free to do as he likes for another under the pretence that the affairs of others are his affairs. Those who have studied political philosophy know that John Stuart Mill is speaking of liberalism in its early stages, and he certainly knows that John Stuart Mill was not an apologist for the socialist party! Surely he knows that when he spoke of liberty of the subject and, surely, if he has read him at all, he knows that Mill would have been the first man to speak against the encroachment that the state has made in the person of socialist government on the liberty of the individual. It is no excuse, sir, to say that one individual must not encroach on the rights of another, and yet allow the state to encroach on the liberty of all of them.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that never has there been a more dishonest picture painted than has been in this session of this House, when the Government by making its promises of wellbeing to people, seek to identify themselves with democracy and Christianity and have the colossal gall (and to me this is almost blasphemy) of promising to the people of this province a more abundant life — a more abundant life by giving them water and sewage and a prepaid medical plan, without any respect for the liberty of a person, without any respect for the freedom to which these people are entitled. They seek, and they have said so at various times although certainly not during this session, socialized planning, planning to the extent and to the point where they will destroy the freedom of each individual to plan for himself, to build for himself, to invest and to spend for himself. Everything will be fine as long as the Socialists do it for you. You'll have enough to eat, you'll be looked after, you won't suffer if you are ill, but, of course, this is all conditional on the fact that the state will give you whatever you have, and you will not be allowed the freedom to make your own choice.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's silly!

Mrs. Batten: — That's silly? Well, let me tell you how silly it is. There was an example brought forth by the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) — and this is quite typical of the thinking of the socialist government in this province — that as long as you have a state farm and you can keep your Metis population as charity wards of that state farm, you look after them — not too well, but you look after them; they won't starve, even if you lose \$5,000 operating this farm, but you mustn't allow those Metis to take over that farm and control it as a true co-operative, because if they do make money and they do manage, they are no longer wards of the Government and they are independent.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I want to tell you that there was no state farm at Willowbunch.

Mrs. Batten: — I don't know what the hon. member would say the farm was in 1952 to 1955 when it was owned by the Department, when they hired someone to look after it, to manage it, and when wages were paid to the people who worked on it, when the Government owned everything that was on that farm. What was it if it wasn't a state farm? I suppose under the C.C.F. Government, even though the state owns it, it was a co-operative farm, because that has a nice sound. Because the man who was in charge of the project, who had worked for years without monetary subsistence from the Government, or from anyone else except his own salary (which, I understand, went back to the Metis, anyway), when he had managed to accumulate a few assets for a true co-operative then, of course, he was taken over by this Department of Social Welfare. He was appointed to look after the farm, and even after the farm began to make money, and even though it continued to progress, because for some reason or other the Government was not in complete control of the situation, because the people were on a lease, they were threatened with termination of the lease unless they did what the Government said.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That is not so. I make a categorical denial of that statement.

Mrs. Batten: — Well, the record . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — The record shows nothing of the kind.

Mrs. Batten: — The hon. member explained the situation and put it into the record in a letter, as follows:

“You have decided that you would not accept any other project leader” (and I am reading out of a letter that was written by the Deputy Minister of the Department of Social Welfare, date August 4, 1959).
“Since you have decided that you would not accept any other project leader, am I to understand that the Lacerte Co-op. Farm wishes to cancel their lease on the ranch?”

Premier Douglas: — That doesn't mean what you said just now.

Mrs. Batten: — The letter goes on to say:

“Section 14 of the covenant of the lessee in the lease provides that the Co-op. agrees to accept a project leader named by this Department in the absence of Father Blanchard. If the project refuses to accept

the leader we appoint” (and I would ask you to pay particular attention to this, Sir); “if the Co-op.” (and here is the pith) “refuses to accept the project leader we appoint, it would seem to me by that attitude the lease is subject to cancellation under provisions of Section 4 of the general provisions of the lease. Is that what you want to do?”

Who was talking about intellectual dishonesty. If that isn't a threat . . .

Premier Douglas: — That doesn't mean what you said!

Mrs. Batten: — And these are the people who set themselves up as leaders of co-operatives. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if these people were really sincere in their determination to help the cause of co-operatives, that farm would have been handed over and would have been under the Department of Co-operation. It didn't have to stay under the Department of Social Welfare and receive any aid in that form at all. Those people were quite capable, under the capable leadership of their project leader, of developing their own resources and of becoming owners of the land they were leasing instead of employees of a state farm.

I could go in detail, sir, over the speeches that have already been given and show to you, over and over again, how this Government has sought to apologize for what it has done, has sought to obscure the issue that is now before the people. There are but two real issues. These two issues are: are we able to have the progress that we should have and the freedom and prosperity that we should have under a C.C.F. Government, or are we not? I think the people of this province will say we won't be able to, because we haven't had it. It is useless to compare what happened in 1944 and what happens today. The true comparison is: how have we progressed, in comparison with the other provinces in this country of ours? I think that there is one answer and I would like to point this out. The answer comes in the Stanford Report, and I think that the hon. members will all agree with me, that it is useless and pointless to talk about industrial development, increase in mines, mining exploration and things like that, if we can't show that we have gained in population, because if there was a Socialist paradise here, surely people would be flocking here. If there was prosperity here, compared with other provinces, we would be retaining our population.

Now, let us look at the table which was published by the experts hired by this Government, paid by the people of Saskatchewan, and they show us at page 31 of that Report that, in 1944, Saskatchewan had 7 per cent of the population in Canada; in 1959, Saskatchewan had 5 per cent of the population in Canada; and that is Socialist progress! That is how we have kept up with the other people of Canada.

The second issue is this: what is the philosophy, what are the guiding principles, of these people who sit on your right? What do they stand for today? Oh, I could quote you for hours at a time the noble sentiments they have expressed. They talk as if they are the only people who want to see poverty eradicated.

Government Members: — Stupid! Stupid!

Mrs. Batten: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think some of them are stupid enough to believe that. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in Canada or anywhere else in the world who wouldn't, if he or she could, do everything possible to eradicate poverty.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, is this . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Is this a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — I want to see if you take your seat.

Mrs. Batten: — Well, I'm waiting to hear you.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for a ruling. Is referring to members opposite as 'stupid' a parliamentary term permissible in this House?

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, you've said worse than that!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — What is your ruling, Mr. Speaker?

Mrs. Batten: — I don't know whether this will obscure this issue or not. I am sure the Premier wishes that I would get off this subject and wishes, no doubt, that I would sit down. If he would just be patient I will.

The second issue, I repeat, is — and this is vital to the prosperity of our province, and I think that this is something that every voter is entitled to know: are these people Socialists or are they not? Do these people believe in nationalization of industry or do they not? It is difficult to gather from what they now say. The hon. member for Souris-Estevan boasts in one breath that the Crown Corporations are for use and not for profit, and then he draws another good, deep breath and turns around and says that last year, excepting the Power Corporation and Telephones, they made a profit of 14 per cent. It is difficult for simple-minded, honest people to follow this type of speech and, therefore, I would like the clarification of these issues, and I think the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to it. When we know the answer to those two questions, then I think we are prepared to go to the polls and win a resounding victory for the Liberal party.

February 22, 1960

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment or two to clarify some of the statements made by the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) when he went to some length in saying that if we voted against the Throne Speech we were voting against the program outlined for the people of Saskatchewan. Now, he is an old parliamentarian, but when he was in the House of Commons he voted against Family Allowances. So you can see how ridiculous some of his statements are.

I also want to clarify a few things he said, quoting an editorial. The Minister of Social Welfare saw fit to read an editorial from a weekly paper. I have an editorial, too, which I think the Minister might have read. I am not going to read this editorial in full, because of the length of it. I would point out to the House that this is one of the longest editorials that I have seen in any daily paper in response to a speech delivered either by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, or anyone else. This is not a weekly paper which gathers its news mainly from other sources. It is one of the leading daily newspapers in the province. This editorial comments on the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition. I am not going to read this editorial in full, but I am going to give you the beginning and the end:

“Opening the Opposition’s debate on the Speech from the Throne in the Saskatchewan Legislature, Mr. A.H. McDonald made a compelling impression. Mr. McDonald presented a fact-loaded address, broad and practical in its approach, with arguments strongly documented by facts and figures.”

This is the last paragraph:

“If the high note in debate struck by Mr. McDonald is maintained throughout the present session, it will help to provide an informed electorate by the time of the general election, expected in early summer.”

Then they go on in the same trend, pointing out Mr. McDonald’s ability to put his finger on some of the major problems in this province.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — What was the source of that editorial?

Mr. Cameron: — It was from the ‘Star-Phoenix’, dated February 19, 1960. Each year in the Legislature we submitted a question asking the number of gallons consumed by farm trucks in Saskatchewan. Each year the answer came back that the Department had no such information. It is interesting to note that when the press release stated that the Liberals would grant the farmer the right to use purple gasoline in his truck, the Government immediately went to work announcing what the cost would be. The Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) estimated it would be a loss of revenue in the neighbourhood of \$5 million. The Minister of Social Welfare now says the estimate would be \$2¼ million. We asked on the Order Paper an identical question in regard to the number of gallons used in farm trucks

this session. We didn't expect the same answer as in previous years, merely that the Government had no such information. This is the answer as tabled in the 'Votes and Proceedings' in response to this question:

Question: "What was the total estimated gasoline tax collected for farm trucks in the year 1958-59?"

Answer: "Approximately \$2,241,000. (It should be noted we have no accurate information to justify this estimate. However, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics quotes a figure of 18,675,000 gallons of gasoline being consumed in farm trucks. At 12 cents per gallon, which was the rate of tax in 1958-59, this amounts to \$2,241,000)."

The answer didn't say in what farm trucks but in farm trucks used somewhere.

While on the subject of gasoline and gasoline taxes, I would remind the House that I watched the Provincial Treasurer on T.V. in Medicine Hat, Alberta, in which he dealt with this. We live in an area of the province where we can only get the Medicine Hat T.V. station. Sometimes I think this is a great asset, because there is one thing we can say for Alberta — you never see politicians on T.V. except in a few months preceding a general election. The C.C.F. have broken this calm by going into Medicine Hat and pumping back into Saskatchewan the same propaganda that is distributed here.

Speaking of the gasoline tax, Provincial Treasurer Fines said: "You know that the Liberals tell you that the gasoline tax has gone up to 12 cents per gallon." Then, he said: "You know the tax in 1945 was 10 cents per gallon, since then it has gone up only 2 cents. No one can call that a great increase in gasoline tax." The Provincial Treasurer conveniently neglected to point out that the provincial tax was 7 cents and that, during the war, the Federal Government put a 3-cent tax on all gasoline consumed anywhere in Canada, and thus we paid 10 cents per gallon. Immediately after the war the Federal Government removed their 3 cents per gallon tax, permitting the gasoline in all provinces to drop to its original price level. He didn't tell you that when the Federal Government dropped 3 cents per gallon, the Provincial Government picked it up and kept the gasoline tax at 10 cents, and have since increased it another 2 cents to 12 cents.

I read the Report of the hon. member from Notukeu-Willowbunch on Friday (I wasn't here, as I left by bus to go home). However, I am not going to deal with that, except to say that that is not an exceptional case. That is going on in every constituency of this province of Saskatchewan, not that every constituency has a co-operative state farm. But you are dealing with individuals in the same manner. I happen to bring

February 22, 1960

with me some of the conditions that I have been fighting in my constituency. Ever since the Federal Government came into the Hospitalization Plan, every province has hospitalization, and our people in the Swift Current Health Region have not had only hospital, but they have medical. That is the pattern we should be following in this medical plan, because we have had experience in how to operate it. The people have been able to take out not only their hospital cards for the year, but they have been able to take out full coverage on their medical, by paying a certain amount to the municipal office when they pay their taxes.

Then we have had certain experience in the neighbouring Alberta border, where people farm in the summer and move to Alberta for the winter. There was a day when a farmer 'phoned me up and said, "You know, they refused me my hospital card. Without my hospital card I cannot get my medical card." "Well", I said, "That's strange. You've lived in Saskatchewan since 1935 — and I would say that 30 per cent of our farmers in that area live in some point in Alberta during the winter months — I'll take it up with the Department." The Department wrote back and said that the secretary of the municipality had suggested to them that, in his opinion, this man was living in Alberta and was an Alberta resident, therefore, he would qualify under the Alberta plan for hospitalization. Then I wrote back and asked, "Are you basing your judgment on the recommendation of the municipal secretary, or have you other facts?" They said, "The fact that he has an Alberta licence on his car, in our opinion, makes him an Alberta resident. The fact that he has a farm in Saskatchewan does not exempt him from the fact that he lives in Medicine Hat in the winter. Therefore, we are cancelling his hospitalization card."

I had another case where a Saskatchewan resident was farming in Saskatchewan, and still retained his farming interest, but moved to Medicine Hat for a year to run a tourist park. During that time he brought a car into Saskatchewan which was sold to him in Alberta, so there was no tax on it. But when he came across the border, later, to go back to his farm, he put in his application for a licence. The officials came back and said, "If education tax had never been paid on your car, we must collect it." He said, "Well, I bought the car when I was a resident of Alberta, and I have used the car for over a year." They said, "Oh, no! It can be found on the records that you have a half-ton truck on your farm in Saskatchewan, and that half-ton truck has a Saskatchewan licence on it. Therefore we qualify you as a Saskatchewan farm resident and you must pay the education tax on your car. Because of this confusion, I asked for a definite regulation, because it affects so many people in my area. The answer came back: "We cannot enunciate any program. We must deal with each on its individual merits." One man pays education tax because he had a Saskatchewan truck licence. The other man cannot get a medical care program because he has an Alberta licence on his car. Those are the individual cases.

The Minister of Social Welfare took strong exception to some of the statements made by the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). I want to deal with a case in my own home town, Mr. Minister. I am going to give you the background of it. This was a couple who came into our district in 1910. The Minister likes to talk about the pioneer days — they were pioneers, too. They helped to develop the west, with a horse and plough. They lived on land that was almost non-productive. They had a quarter-section of land; they had 40 acres broken. That was all they could break on the quarter; but, by having a few chickens, and some hogs, they were able to make a living. Eventually they became old age pensioners, and the husband reached the age of 96 so the community thought that at this age they should move their house to the village. They approached the municipality, and asked them if they would assume the cost of moving this elderly couple's home into the village, where they could be close at hand to their neighbours, and receive help. They willingly did so, and set up the couple's home. A few years later the man, of course, reaching an age well over 100 was bedridden. They rented out this quarter-section of land, this 40 acres. The renter farmed it half and half; that means 20 acres are seeded each year, and this couple got one-third of 20 acres of crop. Since each was over 70, each got the old age security allowance amounting to \$50 per month. In due course this man was spending more time in hospital than out, and we were finally able to get him into a Geriatric Centre in Regina. This man now is 106. Last winter, they found it necessary to amputate a leg. That man is dying by inches, and he is receiving wonderful care, but the wife is at home alone. She has no income from the farm; she was getting a supplemental allowance, and the Department of Social Welfare notified her, one day, that "We have reassessed your case, and since your income is higher than the amount allotted, (\$1530) we are cancelling your supplemental allowance. We are likewise recalling your husband's card." How did they arrive at the figure of \$1530 per year that this couple was receiving? The village took it up on her behalf. Here is the reply which came to the secretary of the village, outlining why they thought they no longer felt a responsibility to pay for hospital or medical costs. It said:

"You will notice that during the year in November, 1959, the allowance had been suspended, (and we received the following answer):

"May we explain that the husband is a patient at the Geriatric Centre, and is, therefore . . . with the value of free board and room. We suggest that you assess this couple with shelter assessment of \$20; farm income of \$200.83; and free board and room for the husband at \$350. If you do that, you will find that the income, together with the \$660 old age security which each receives during the year, brings it beyond the \$1530 maximum, so we are withdrawing their hospital and medical."

How did they arrive at the \$200.83 farm income? I am going to tell you. She gets one-third share of seven acres from the farmer who rents the land. Of course, you all understand that the land a farmer rents goes into his permit book as well, and he sells only on the one permit book; so her quarter-section of land was included in his permit book. This renter was farming several other quarters of his own. He sent off a 2,000 bushel carload of what he thought would be malting barley. The first sample indicated it would be malting barley. When the returns came back it was not malting barley, it was straight barley. You know, too, that when you sell anything in your permit, whether it is barley or whether it is wheat, it takes an equal quota. You can deliver a bushel of barley or a bushel of wheat. Since this man had delivered 2,000 bushels of barley, the Wheat Board said, "You won't be able to deliver on your permit until the quota for your area has been sufficient to exceed a 2,000 bushel delivery." This farmer couldn't haul any more wheat to town the rest of that year; he didn't deliver a bushel of wheat. During the next fall, knowing he was unable to pay this old age pensioner anything on the very first quota, delivered her share of last year's crop, her share on seven acres and this year's seven acres, to the elevator, and got for that \$200.83. Since it showed as income for that particular year (she had no income the year before), they cut off any assistance whatsoever. And you will notice they include \$20 for lodging (I don't know where it came from); \$360 for board and room, although he contributed a portion of his old-age security pension towards it; \$20 for shelter, \$360. If you add that to the \$660 in old-age pensions, even that amount, without any income from the farm, puts them over the \$1530.

Here are two old people, one 106, the other 74. All they have to live on is \$50 a month which is sent to them by the Federal Government — \$55 now. The husband, who has been here for a year, will continue to stay here in the Geriatric Centre. She is home alone in the little village, with nothing to live on but her \$55 a month, to pay her taxes in the town and on the farm. Then they have the audacity to cut off her supplementary allowance, and they wrote to the village and said; "We would suggest that this lady be covered under the Hospitalization and Medical Plan, but we would suggest that it would be in order for the village to pay the hospital and health region card for this woman."

Mr. Gardiner: — Humanity first!

Mr. Cameron: — We wrote again stating that "this woman has to visit her husband in the Geriatric Centre periodically, because he needs her. She hasn't the money with which to make the trip to Regina. Surely you can do something in these extenuating circumstances." What was the reply:

"We can understand that it is natural that he would receive much comfort from her visits, but if she wishes to visit him in the city we would suggest that the village pay her fare and her expenses, and we might consider reimbursing them somehow, under the Social Aid program."

That is only one individual. These cases can be found up and down the length and breadth of this province. I don't want to be too harsh with the Minister of Social Welfare. I have known him a long while, but I think we would be remiss if we didn't bring to this Legislature which the Premier described as the "greatest court in the land", some of these grievances which we cannot find solutions for. Is it any wonder that the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) cried out in his address, the other day, and I was surprised at the attack he made, because he said:

"It would be desirable to give the northern administration more authority. There is too much red tape.

"I don't want to condemn any of the civil servants, but some of them are not fitted to deal with human beings."

There is a statement by a responsible elected member of the Legislature, sitting on the side of the Government, who has taken the opportunity in this House not only to bring an indictment against this Government (which is bad enough), but to attack the civil service of this province in the same breath. I would say to him, if he feels that civil servants are not fitted to deal with human beings, then that evidence should be brought to the floor of the Legislature where it can be dealt with.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I am not condemning the man who wrote this letter, nor the men who carried out their duties when they fired Father Blanchard from the Co-op Farm. They were carried out as specific orders and instructions and came from the heads of Departments, and you cannot escape the responsibility by putting the blame on the backs of the civil servants.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Is it any wonder, when you consider this same thing we pointed out last year — here was the Minister of Education, chastising and making a big to-do about one lonely school teacher. Today it is the manager of the co-op farm. Tomorrow it is somebody else. Every Department of this Government is full of arrogance, and Ministers of this Government have become so arrogant they think they can abuse these people in any way they see fit.

There is your so-called co-operative farm in the Carrot River area, set up as a state farm and called a state co-operative, for the veterans. You know the sad story. I think it would be well to refresh the House, that I was the one who brought that story to the Legislature, and told

February 22, 1960

those boys came to see me, "Take your story exactly as you told it to me, to the Royal Commission on Agriculture". The result of that story was that the Royal Commission on Agriculture broke off their sittings, went into the Carrot River Valley, examined the situation, and brought back an interim report that was a damning indictment on the Department and the Government officials at that time. Last fall we met members of the same co-operative farm — so-called co-operative, but they are state-owned farms — down here pleading with the Minister of Agriculture, telling him that if he insisted on his pound of flesh, 40 of these veterans would lose their homes. What did the Minister of Agriculture do about it? He as much as said "taxes come first . . . they must be paid." That is the treatment that you get.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, that is not my statement. Come on, now. On a matter of privilege: What is the basis of the statement attributed to me? He is just rattling away as he always does.

Mr. Cameron: — Your statement is in the records of the House, and in the clippings of the 'Leader-Post' which I have with me, and in that statement they give exactly word for word the answer that the Minister gave here.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — This was an editorial in the paper, stating the crisis which faced these veterans in the north, and what you did. Then you get up, mealy-mouthed like you did today, and talk about all you have done for the farmer and for the veterans of the north.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite proper that the hon. member give the name and date of the newspaper in which he says this editorial appeared.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, I'll be most happy to, even though it is very childish. It was the 'Leader-Post', Friday, April 2, 1959. Now then, Mr. Speaker, I have been bringing out the injustices perpetrated upon people in my constituency, upon helpless individuals who cannot fight back against an arrogant government. I would remind you of the teacher persecuted through the press by the Minister of Education, last year. Today it is the man on the co-operative farm who sits with his mouth buttoned up because he is only an individual; and if anybody is going to get justice for him, it has to be the citizens of that community. This poor lady now 74, with a husband of 106, sits alone brooding, because she hasn't sufficient funds with which to live. These are but a few of the injustices of this Government; and to say that, because I refuse to vote for a continuation of this Government in office, I am opposed to the co-operative farm, that I

am voting against all these so-called great things in the Speech from the Throne when I vote against this motion, is sheer nonsense. It is because of the facts I have brought out, Mr. Speaker that I cannot support the motion.

the House recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

February 22, 1960

The House resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I had not thought of speaking in this debate, but I must say that when my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) speaks, I feel more like participating than I do any other time during the Session, because, for some reason he seems to be able to leave more misapprehension in the air than any other speaker, and I somehow have a passion for keeping the record straight and having only the facts recorded; I feel it incumbent upon me to say something about it in this debate.

Mr. Foley (Turtleford): — Flattery will get you nowhere!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Before I speak (I wish to address my remarks particularly with reference to what the member for Maple Creek said,) — I would like to say something about the hon. lady from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), but perhaps she will come in a little later, and I will deal with her remarks then.

With regard to the statements of the member for Maple Creek, I want first of all to deal with his assertion that this Government has betrayed signs of arrogance for the people with whom it has to deal. I have had some experience in the past in this province, and in Canada and other provinces, and I believe it can be said without fear of contradiction that no group of people have ever occupied the Treasury benches of this province who have approached their tasks with a more humble spirit than do the people who presently occupy these seats in the Legislature. I don't think there has ever been a government in this province that has been so ready and so responsive to public demand and public criticism, and so willing to make amends if it does, perchance, fall into error.

We listened a great deal to three or four other speakers on the other side who harped upon the refrain of the Lacerte Co-op Farm at Willowbunch, and I might say that after listening to this dribble for an hour or so, I was at a loss to understand just exactly what it was the Government was being criticized for. I heard the hon. member for Humboldt say, and I quote from the record: "Because for some reason or other the Government wasn't in complete control of the situation, because these people were on a lease, they were threatened with termination of the lease unless they did what the Government said."

As the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch so clearly placed upon the record, the facts were that the Minister of Social Welfare, for some reason best known to him and to his Department, terminated the employment of one provincial employee. I don't believe that it makes any difference to this House, or the people of this province, whether the employee was a clergyman or an ordinary citizen. The fact of the matter is that, for reasons that the Department considered were sufficient, his employment was terminated. Then, when a delegation approached the Minister and the Deputy Minister, it was suggested to them that if they wanted to retain his services, the Department would make a grant equal to his salary if they wished to hire him.

This doesn't seem to be the kind of action of a dictatorial and arrogant government bent upon driving out of service one employee who had been unsatisfactory in the Department. It seems to me that this Government recognized that an employer is responsible and must take responsibility for the people whom he employs. That is no less true of a government than of any other employer, and if the Government had lost confidence in the employee, it has no option, in all honesty and it is the duty of the Government to terminate that employment. But I suggest that it showed a very generous spirit, indeed — not arrogance, as my hon. friend tried to suggest — when the Government said, “If you people are prepared and will to take the responsibility for employing this gentleman, we will see that the means are available for you to do so. We don't wish to have him in our employ, for reasons best known to the Department, but if you wish to have him in your employ, here is the money, you may do so.” This is a far cry from the kind of appearance which my hon. friends opposite tried to put on that plain and simple set of facts.

We had the complaint from the hon. lady from Humboldt to the effect that this party was courting, looking for a mate, and that a marriage was imminent, and she suggested that a marriage would so change the nature and character of this party that it would be false representation to seek re-election under our present name. I suggest that whatever changes are made in the constitution and policy of the C.C.F., it will still be basically the party which the people of Saskatchewan have come to know — a party representative of the wishes and will of the people, and a party with the guts and determination to carry out those wishes.

I want to give the hon. lady and members this assurance, insofar as I am concerned: there may well be a marriage in the offing, but there will be no adoptions of wayward children in this party. This party will not have as its leader a person who is a rejected derelict from some other party.

Mr. McDonald: — That's what you've got now!

Mrs. Batten: — You've got nothing but derelicts.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help feeling, when I heard the Premier, the other day, speaking — when he twitted the Opposition about their apparent unwillingness to make way a seat for the occupation of their beloved leader, that it was a little strange because their instinctive reaction was, “Why don't you people make a seat available?” This came from several across the way, and I cannot help but feel that perhaps there was some justice and merit in their suggestion, because I doubt he would do us more political good than he would do them in this House.

Mr. McFarlane: — Why don't you give him one of yours? You have some seats empty?

February 22, 1960

Mr. Gardiner: — Why didn't the Premier seek a seat in 1942?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There seems to be a tendency, which I have noted of late, on the part of some of the members of this House to try to deceive or flimflam the members into believing that something is so that isn't so. I think we have had a very good illustration of that, this afternoon, when the hon. lady from Humboldt — and I am not saying that she was trying deliberately to be dishonest; as a matter of fact, I think that for the hon. lady something should be said by way of extenuation of her activities here . . .

Mrs. Batten: — I'd rather have your condemnation than apologies, Mr. Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — As a member of the legal profession, I think I may say that we who are lawyers are a little inclined to put too much of a gloss on our arguments, with a view to putting the best possible face forward, or the best we are capable of, in the expectation that if there are a few defects or deficiencies in our logic and reasoning someone will bring them to the attention of the House . . .

Opposition Member: — We sure will.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . and I think I should congratulate the hon. lady for her zeal. Tonight, of course, we had a perfect example of it when she quoted back the letter which purported to support a statement. It is an old story.

Mrs. Batten: — Where were you when I read it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I suggest that my hon. friend go and play the record over, and it would be quite apparent that the letter did not substantiate the allegation which it was apparently intended to support. This, of course, is an old story with my hon. friend, and I think she won't think it unsporting of me when I expose her a bit.

Opposition Member: — Don't expose her too much.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am going to refer to a very well-remembered speech. You will find that on March 7, 1947, we were discussing the amendment to The Vehicles Act. If you will look at Hansard, page 5, you will find that the hon. lady said this, and I quote: "There has been no scientific way of determining exactly what is the way of judging the amount of alcohol in a person's blood stream." Fourteen days later, on March 22, the Provincial Treasurer said, on page 3: "The hon. member for Humboldt has stated that there is no scientific way to judge the exact amount of alcohol in the blood." The very same day, also on page 3, the hon. lady said, "As a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I stated no such thing."

If the hon. members want to find records, you merely look at page 5 on March 7 and page 3 on March 22. Now, this is the kind of flimflam that the house was treated to by the hon. lady, this afternoon.

Take March 7, on page 10, the hon. lady said: "Why is this legislation being proposed? For one purpose only. Not, Mr. Speaker, in order to secure more convictions; not, Mr. Speaker, to prevent drunken driving on the highway, but merely to save the Saskatchewan automobile fund some money." That is what she said on March 7, at page 10, according to the record. On March 22, when the Provincial Treasurer was closing the debate . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I don't know what copy of Hansard he has got, but if you will remember that debate, this went on and on and on, because I had to correct the Provincial Treasurer when he kept quoting, leaving out a sentence, where I said "Of course, the Government is interesting in saving lives; everyone is." — and that is the sentence that the Attorney General is now leaving out again. That went on and on and on.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, flimflam is right!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am sure I'm not clear as to what the point of privilege is, but the statements as they appear in Hansard are these, and if my hon. friend wished to correct them, she might have done so, but she did not. This stands on the record and this is, I think, the recollections of the members of the House.

Mr. McDonald: — Which members?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — "For one purpose only, not, Mr. Speaker, to secure more convictions; not, Mr. Speaker, to prevent drunken driving on the highway, but merely to save the Automobile Insurance fund some money". So the Provincial Treasurer, on March 22, in closing the debate said: "In this debate the Government had been accused of not being interested in securing more convictions for drunken driving, but rather to save the Government Insurance Office some money." Immediately on a question of privilege (as the hon. lady did here a few minutes ago), the hon. member got up and said; "Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, that statement was not made." Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to go over all the inconsistencies and hypocrisies of the hon. member. I just want to say that this thing has got to the point where the members know whether this was a personal attack, which it was not.

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) first of all, has a very compelling voice, and I must say that I remember him away back long before he possessed this very compelling voice of his. But it is sometimes

necessary to put forward something more than mere voice in order to win an argument.

Mrs. Batten: — Why don't you try it, 'Bob'?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We have, for example, his rather niggling and whining story about an old-age security recipient who wasn't qualified for the supplemental payments because his income exceeded the amount prescribed in the regulations. I know it is always hard to bear suffering, and it is always something about which we are most anxious to do something. I am sure there are many people in Saskatchewan who are not enjoying the fullness or the abundance of life which our economy is capable of providing, but I say that the Provincial Government must make its regulations for these things in accordance with its means. Provincial governments have to use their resources and spend them prudently, and to the best possible advantage. What revenue we have we try to handle in that fashion, but we do try to provide the largest possible benefits for the people who have the greatest needs.

My hon. friend is certainly entitled to sympathize with anyone who is in need, and I sympathize with that point of view, also. But does my hon. friend suggest that we ought to pay, or increase the amount of payments, to the point where it forces the treasury into a deficit? Or does he suggest that some sympathetic minister, just dripping with sympathy for these people, ought to say to his staff, "Well, to hell with regulations; give this woman another \$50?" As a matter of fact, this may look on the surface to be a good idea, that the wheel that squeaks should get the most grease, but it is really not fair to those people who don't come complaining about their lot. It is much more fair, I submit, to have a set of regulations which provides as much as can be provided, and then apply those regulations uniformly and without fear or favour to all comers.

I am sure that, when the hon. member was complaining about the difficulty of getting by on \$55 a month, he was speaking the truth. I am sure there are many people who have to get by on \$55 a month, and I am sure that this is a great hardship. The Government, however, and that is known to my hon. friend, has tried to make adequate provision for that kind of hardship case. We have established a formula of social welfare payments by which the municipalities contribute a flat amount; an amount which is based on a per capita levy, and whatever additional money is required is paid for out of the provincial treasury. The municipalities administer these benefits, and they administer them according to a scale or a standard, in this province, which compares favourably with the standard applied in either Alberta or Manitoba. If this, or any similar person finds a real difficulty in getting along on the amount of the old-age security payments, there is a proper procedure; that is, to make application through the proper channel — (the municipal authority), and the money is forthcoming from the provincial treasury to take care of any deficit in the financial requirements.

It seems to me it is much more sensible and much more practical, and commends itself much more to the reason of intelligent people, that a government does take practical steps to meet this kind of exigency, rather than doing, as my hon. friend does, shedding great crocodile tears all over his desk, and shouts and pants here in this House, which doesn't do anything toward the solution of the problem. Nor does it do very much toward public understanding of what the problem is.

My hon. friend remarks about people being qualified to receive the health services of Saskatchewan and rather sadly complains because a constituent wasn't able to qualify for health services in the province of Saskatchewan. This is the first time, I must say, that the hon. member has so complimented the policies and programs of this Government, to get up publicly on his feet . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I was talking about the Swift Current Health Region, which isn't government-operated.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My hon. friends say it isn't right to go back and talk about 1944. Well, let's go back and talk about the early years of the C.C.F. The policy of this Government was to set up that kind of scheme and we did. Most of the money to finance the scheme is coming out of the provincial treasury. My hon. friend, as financial critic, should know this, as he has been told. We appreciate it on this side of the House when my hon. friend gets up and laments the fact that some poor constituent of his may not enjoy the medical benefits of the C.C.F. program, which has been in effect for some 14 years in the southwest part of the province.

Then, of course, he tried to make an issue of this which somehow will reflect some discredit on the administration of the program. "Why", he said, "I have two constituents; one who has his license in Lethbridge in Alberta to drive a car, the other one has a license on his truck in Saskatchewan, and because the one has the license on his car in Alberta, he is being denied the benefit of this program; the one who has the truck in Saskatchewan had to pay education and hospital tax on his truck.

Mr. Cameron: — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — By all means.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, he did not pay hospital tax on his truck, because he had a farm license in Saskatchewan. He was compelled to pay the Education and Hospital tax on his car, and he had had an Alberta licence on it for a year and a half, and then came across into the province. It wasn't on his truck at all.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, the point is, however, that no one is required to take a licence either in Saskatchewan or Alberta, unless he is a resident of that province. If my hon. friend's

February 22, 1960

constituent chose to take a licence in Saskatchewan, it was because he felt he was a resident of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You're more mixed up than ever, 'Bob'.

Mr. Cameron: — Is this the way you proceed in court?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — If my hon. friends will just listen a moment, I will try to make it clear. If my hon. friend has a constituent who buys a licence for his truck in the province of Saskatchewan (which is what my hon. friend said), this is because he declared his residence in Saskatchewan, or declared that he is going to be in Saskatchewan for more than 90 days. This is determined not by the arrogance of government officials; it is established by the statutes of the province of Saskatchewan. This statute had been in affect long before 1944, as my hon. friend should know. This is not a new statute. Of course, you don't expect everyone on your left, Mr. Speaker, to follow what I am talking about.

Mr. McDonald: — Nobody can follow it.

Mr. Danielson: — You can't do it yourself.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I'll ignore the rude remarks.

My hon. friend also got himself into a bit of a box by alleging that the Minister of Agriculture (and I have his words down here) made a statement that taxes come first; are something like a thresher's lien. I don't know whether the Minister of Agriculture said this or not, but I am merely bringing this up to illustrate the kind of argument, the kind of debate, which I think is out of place in this Chamber. When the Minister of Agriculture got up to deny that he said any such thing, then the member for Maple Creek said: "Oh yes, you did; I have it right here." And he waved it around, but he did not purport to read for them; he did not purport to quote the Minister of Agriculture; he slapped it down . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege, if I may. I don't want to interrupt his speech, but he is confusing things so badly. I said that I learned that from the mouths of the delegates who were here . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You said no such thing.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . and the other conditions I was referring to was supported by the press statements.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wish to categorically deny that I ever made any such statement as the member for Maple Creek attributed to me.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member says that he didn't wave the clipping around, then, of course, I must accept his word. But the way it seemed to me was that he waved the clipping. As a matter of fact, when he was asked what the date of the clipping was, he held the clipping up and said: "Friday, April 2nd", and then he put the clipping down as though that settled the argument. The fact of the matter is that Friday was not April 2nd; Friday was April 3rd. I wonder what else out of the things the hon. member read was 50 per cent wrong? It's a lucky thing that he did not try to substantiate his statement as he obviously did not understand what was on the clipping in the first place. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a story in the Leader-Post on Friday, April 3rd, that deals with the subject of taxes on Crown lands, but the only way the Minister of Agriculture's name gets into the story is because the story is the report of a speech made by Mr. George S. Evans of Whitefox, Saskatchewan, in which he says some uncomplimentary things about the Minister of Agriculture. This, of course, from across the House, can be waved . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, on another point of privilege. I also read him a second. I wish he would read from that; "Veterans' Land Crisis".

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You only gave one citation. I wrote it down and it was Friday, April 2nd.

Mr. McDonald: — You didn't take enough notes, 'Bob'!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I certainly don't want to take very much time discussing the policies of my hon. friends opposite, because they have been unchanged since Methuselah. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned Methuselah, because I am sure my hon. friends will say I am wrapping myself in the pages of the Bible.

The gentlemen opposite have tried to extricate themselves from the moral difficulty of casting a vote against the Speech from the Throne and at the same time preserve their freedom to go about saying that they are still in favour of the actual contents of the Speech from the Throne. We heard the laborious efforts of two members who tried to argue that, if you vote against the Speech from the Throne, you can still be 100 per cent in favour of the things that are in it. I think that one of them put it very nicely when he said that the Minister of Social Welfare is an old parliamentarian, and should know that it is possible to be in favour of the Speech from the Throne without actually voting for it.

This means, of course, that hon. members opposite are, in effect, saying that in this Legislature we don't deign to discuss public issues. We merely confine ourselves to voting upon party issues. That is what my hon. friend was saying, in effect, that because they are the opposition, they cannot vote for the Speech from the Throne, even though they believe in everything in it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the course of a few months they will be trying to convince the electorate of this province that with everything that the C.C.F. Government undertakes to do, even though everything that is done is good, there are reasons why you should vote against it — talking about Communism or some other frightening bogey, to try and scare people. As a matter of fact, I believe that the people of Saskatchewan are more astute about these things than are some of the members of this House. They will say, "I have been a supporter of one of the old line parties all my life, as my father and my grandfather before me; but here is a program offered to us by a Government which has earned its spurs as a keeper of political promises."

The voters of this province are not going to be deceived by their political dishonesty or political hypocrisy or political flimflam. They are going to vote because they see a program which fits in with their concepts of the progress of the province, and the things they want to see accomplished in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked longer, and perhaps much more ineffectively, than I had hoped to do on the more obvious and glaring defects and weaknesses in my hon. friend's armour. I hope that, in having made those remarks, I will be excused if I forget at the end to say that I intend to vote for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Gardiner: — Are you apologizing for it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I would like now to turn to perhaps more mundane and less interesting subjects. I would like to give some kind of review of the activities of the Government, and particularly of the Attorney General's Department during the last three or four years.

During the last three years there has been a number of legislative enactments which have originated with the Department of the Attorney General, and which I would like to review and place upon the record, to sort of "square off", this Department in my tenure as Attorney General, and as a member of the C.C.F. Government, during the last four years.

Mrs. Batten: — This is your last chance, 'Bob'. Go to it!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I think I would want to feel that whoever the electors of this province choose to occupy these benches at the next opportunity whoever they may be — and I have complete confidence that the electors will choose wisely and carefully; but whoever they may choose; whoever becomes the servants of the people of this province, I hope that I will be able to say that this Government has left the affairs of the province

in a neater and tidier package than they found them in 1944.

I would like to make somewhat of an itemized report. I would like to first deal with those actions which have contributed to a better and a more efficient public administration, insofar as it affects the Department of the Attorney General. All members will remember that in 1958, an amendment was introduced in the Attorney General's Act to permit the Attorney General to have an articulated law student. This has now been done. We now have had two students enter the Department and articulated to the Minister, and they have written their Bar examinations, and are now fully-trained and full-qualified solicitors for the province of Saskatchewan. I am not boasting of their record on the basis that they received expert instruction from their principal; but I do feel and I do say that these two young men did very well. One headed 24 candidates in the examinations, and the other came well up near the top, also. This policy (which I am sorry to say was opposed in this House) has, I believe, contributed a great deal to the strengthening of the legal end of the administration in the Department. We now have just as high a standard of professional excellence among our Crown solicitors as we have ever had in the history of the province. This has partly been made possible by the fact that we are now able to recruit the brighter young men of the graduating classes of the University, and get them in here and have them establish some seniority, and, therefore, receive some inducement to have them stay and make a career with the Department.

It is a matter of interest that the Law Society is endeavouring to increase and to improve the standard of legal education for law students. There are only three minor phases of training which we are not competent to give in the Attorney General's Department. They are: training in the incorporation of companies, or drawing up bylaws or minutes for companies; the preparation of documents under the Bulk Sales Act, and practical training in the conduct of divorce proceedings. Bulk sales are relatively infrequent nowadays, in practise. Divorces are really just one kind of specialized civil action, and this is something which we admit is a deficiency in our training. We are, however, able to meet everyone of the other requirements of the education syllabus of the Law Society, and in addition to that we are able to attach our students, for a short period, to the Land Titles Office, where he sees a complete range of conveyances, a much wider range than he would likely see in the average law office. In the office of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies he gets a very wide acquaintanceship with the registrations of companies; in the Official Guardian's office, some training in the experience of administering estates. Most offices have to limit the training of students to defence work in criminal courts. We are able to train our students in both sides. We attach them to the office of the Crown Prosecutor for a few weeks, and we have let them out then to do defence work in those cases where the Department is required to defend under the new program of free defence counsel for impecunious persons.

Our students are also able to gain experiences in cases which are being prepared for the Supreme Court of Canada, three or four times a year, and usually a dozen or 15 cases to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. This is

February 22, 1960

all very valuable training for the young man who intends to go into counsel work. The Court of Appeal and Supreme Court cases involve exceedingly complex constitutional matters, sometimes more complex and less constitutional than we would like to have.

I want to say something now about the Land Titles system. This system is much older than the province. We are inclined to take it for granted and forget that every piece of real property in Saskatchewan depends for the security of its title upon the reliability of our Land Titles offices, and there is something more than two million titles on deposit there, none of which could be re-established if the Land Titles offices were destroyed. These Land Titles offices are, therefore, a depository of a large part of the material things which we hold in great store in our society.

We have, as all hon. members know, substantially revised and reorganized the procedures in the Land Titles offices. From the early days of the war, when large volumes of land transactions were undertaken in Saskatchewan, until quite recently some of the offices found it quite difficult to keep up to within 14 days of being on a current basis. As a result, of the new procedures, it has been possible to streamline the functioning of the offices so that I can say, without being inaccurate, that nine out of 10 offices have, since they have been converted, been able to stay within two days of being on a current basis. This, I suggest, will help a great deal to facilitate the handling of real estate transactions, and will save the public a good deal of money in the purchase price of these properties.

Hon. members know, of course, that usually when people buy and sell houses that they have to pay interest on the purchase price during the time that the transactions are being put through the law offices, the Land Titles offices and the real estate offices. This amounts to a fairly substantial bill, and this is being saved by keeping the offices up to date. I should add that the offices are not being kept up to date simply by pushing the employees into harder work. They are being kept up to date because the new system allows for less delay; instead of having large volumes weighing 20 to 30 pounds from one desk to another, it is now done by simply passing the file from one desk to another. Now the work can be telescoped; several files can be passed along at the same time. It can be handled more rapidly because the system is not so cumbersome.

The office is working on a policy for the destruction of dead documents. I spoke of two million titles in our Land Titles offices. There are more than eight million documents altogether, and these documents, by sheer growth in numbers, eventually tend to burst the seams of the offices. Some system of destroying dead documents must be devised and, with the new procedure in our offices, it is now possible to separate the dead documents from the current documents. As a matter of fact, the dead documents are now automatically in a separate file from the current documents, and so a

destruction policy can be very simply and very easily applied. It used to be that all mechanics' liens, for example, commencing right back from 1888 to the present day, were in a continual series, and in order to separate one from the rest, the whole series had to be checked. Now these documents are kept grouped with the land description, and when they are dead or discharged, they are put in a different place, and there is no problem in separating them and destroying them.

We are, as I said, creating a microfilm record of all titles and all encumbrances in titles. I should say, if I haven't made it clear in the past, that this work is going on progressively, and at the present time some 15 per cent of all titles have been microfilmed. The microfilming is being done with regard to each title at the time any conveyance affecting the title goes through the office. Then the title it affects is converted to the new system, and the documents microfilmed.

The new procedures have already gone into effect in all offices, so the surplus staff will, during the next 12 months, be fully engaged in catching up the backlog or microfilming that has accrued since the beginning of the system. This could be a very valuable thing; it may turn out to be of no value at all. If we don't have a fire or a flood or any other kind of civil or military disaster, we don't, of course, need a duplicate copy of our land titles records. It may turn out to be extremely valuable, and for the little it costs, it is cheap insurance. At least we are proceeding with it, and hope to finish it in the coming year.

This new system has made it possible for us to refurnish all our offices with new-type filing cabinets and, in most cases, new desks and all new typewriters and equipment. Those old 1905 typewriters are all gone. The offices look like modern, business-like, up-to-date places.

This conversion program involved a total cost to the province, up to the end of March of this year, of \$309,000. The saving in staff alone which has accrued to us in the past three years, has already amounted to \$169,000 or a set-off of more than half of the total capital cost of the conversion. The saving in staff alone gives promise of a saving, continuously throughout the years, of at least \$75,000 per year. The staff on April 1, 1956, before any conversion was commenced, was 163. On March 31, this year, it will be 134; so it is down approximately 20 per cent — a reduction of about 30 people in spite of the fact that there has been a 14 per cent increase in the actual volume of work done in the offices since that time.

My hon. friends sometimes talk of this Government denying people their civil rights. I notice the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) is not in his seat, but I don't think he would know a civil right if he saw one. The fact is . . .

Mrs. Batten: — He'd be surprised if he saw one!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He forgot to make allowance for the fact that hardly a year goes by without us putting in some statute a right to appeal to the Court from an administrative or quasi-judicial tribunal. It used to be that if a member of the public had some complaints about the conduct of a Registrar of the Land Titles offices, he had to appeal it to the Master of Titles, and then, after following the rules, he could appeal it to the Court. We have provided a much more simple and straightforward appeal, an appeal directly from the Registrar of Titles to the Queen's Bench judge, making it more economical and easier to appeal against the bureaucratic decisions of civil administrators.

I would like to say something about the court reform acts. A good deal has been said about them in the past, and I want merely to point out that most of the disasters that were promised by the hon. member for Humboldt did not come to pass. The freedom which the public now enjoys in the use of Court facilities has worked out very satisfactorily indeed. I have not got with me a 'Star-Phoenix' report of interviews with several leading lawyers, but the interviews all suggested support and enthusiasm for the way in which the new system is working.

We were told in this House that what we were doing was threatening the very existence of the judicial services of the small communities of Saskatchewan. We were told that everybody would go to the cities for legal work, and that this would take away the courts from the isolated areas of the province. Well, there is evidence of that, and I have it here — I would like to put this on the records of the House as part of Hansard, if I may — but before doing so, I would just like to comment on some of the facts which have turned up in the most recent statistical analysis of legal work in the various judicial centres of the province.

It is quite true that there have been increases in some judicial centres and decreases in others, but if we look at the total number of writs issued, the total number of trials held, the total number of surrogate and probate applications granted, and compute the percentage of each of these activities that is conducted in each judicial centre of the province for the years 1957, 1958 and 1959, we find, for example, when we look at the number of Writs of Summons issued, that Regina did increase from 22.7 per cent of the total to 23.5 per cent; Prince Albert has increased from 9.2 of the total to 9.7 per cent; Swift Current increased from 7.4 per cent to 9.4 per cent; Yorkton increased from 2 per cent to 3.2 per cent; Weyburn increased from .08 per cent to 1.6 per cent — doubled; Melville increased from .09 per cent to 2.6 per cent; Estevan increased from 2.2 per cent — to 2.3 per cent; Arcola increased from 4/10ths of one per cent to 1.2 per cent; Kerrobert increased from .09 per cent to 1.5 per cent; Assiniboia increased from 3/10ths of one per cent to one per cent — a three-fold increase.

The point I am trying to make is this: that there was no mass migration of the legal business to the cities; that some of the small communities benefitted and, of course, some of the small communities suffered a loss in some legal activities, but this was the purpose of the legislation. The purpose of the legislation was to allow people to go where it was most convenient.

By and large that was the result, and it is true that in some cases some judicial centres lost business, but in others the volume of business was increased. But there were more small judicial centres which increased their volume of business by 10 per cent or more, and there were large judicial centres that increased by 10 per cent or more. So the fears and apprehensions that were expressed here, in 1958, appear to be entirely unfounded.

I would like to put this on the record if I may, Mr. Speaker, because I think the statistics (this Department doesn't issue an annual report) might be of interest to the hon. members. I won't take time to read it all; I just want to put it on the record officially. I am sure the hon. members will appreciate not having to have it read.

Mr. Speaker: — Has the hon. Attorney General leave to place these tables on the record?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

(Tables inserted after page 80)

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, these court reform acts, passed two years ago have not only resulted in people having a freedom of choice as to where they shall do their judicial business, but it has also resulted in a greater flexibility of work loads among the judicial offices. I have no complaints about this new system. I really don't know what they think but if they don't like it I hope that they would complain about it. The work that is being done is now more equally divided and distributed, and it will make it possible for all of our centres to keep their hand in to the legal game.

The saving in expense to the public which has resulted from this change has also been considerable. It has enabled us to save quite substantially in the cost of administration. In the saving of staff there has been a reduction since April, 1956, from 94 people who ran the entire judicial district system, to a staff of 82, a reduction of 12. The volume of work has increased. I don't have the precise figures with me, but the total volume of work increased by well over 25 per cent in the same period.

An additional factor which made it possible to reduce staff has been the introduction of electrical recording of evidence. This is being done in the principal centres of the province. It is working out very satisfactorily, and it has made it possible for us to do a much larger volume of court reporting with very little more staff. It has enabled us to give a much more accurate service to the courts in the terms of recording the proceedings.

I would like to comment briefly on the present position of the magistrates courts. As you know, the magistrate court has been increased very substantially both in size and in prestige in this province in the last three years. To start with, we have increased their salaries substantially. A magistrate now, with five years of service with the Department, receives a salary approaching \$10,000 which is still barely adequate, as we have never a surplus of the very best qualified people for this job. I think we can say with a great amount of satisfaction that the appointments that have been made in the past few years (and there has been quite a number) have been most satisfactory, and we now have in the province a very excellent group of magistrates, and they enjoy judicial independence as great as any magistrates to be found anywhere in the country. We have increased the number of full-time magistrates from eight to 20, and we have reduced the number of part-time magistrates from six to three. In accordance with the recommendations of the Culliton Committee, we changed the name from 'Police' magistrates to 'Provincial' magistrates. We gave our magistrates in this province something that was unique in Canada; we gave them security of tenure. Security of tenure, I believe, goes a long way to guarantee the civil rights of the people of this province. No citizen needs fear that any magistrate in this province will conduct himself in any way subservient to the interests of the government of the day, so that he may fear encroachment on his civil rights before the courts. We feel that this is a very important guarantee

of the civil rights of the citizens. My hon. friends, who are constantly complaining about encroachment on civil rights, apparently don't know about these important milestones along the way of ensuring our people absolute equality before our judiciary through guaranteeing complete independence to the Magistrate's court from the government of the day.

We have, in addition, provided our magistrates court with much better facilities. It used to be that the magistrates had a spare room in the basement of a garage or the basement of a school, or even the back seat of a car. Well, Mr. Speaker, virtually all of our magistrate courts can sit in proper surroundings; surroundings which permit the attendance of the public and permit the proceedings to be conducted in a fair and proper way.

I think I should similarly put on the record some statistics which will form a part of the records of this House to show the amount of work which is being done by our magistrates. I would prefer not to read it, but it will show you that the amount of work has greatly increased over the years from 1956 to March 31, 1959. It will also show a corresponding diminution of the amount of work the Justices of the Peace do. I would just like to summarize by saying that the total number of criminal trials in this province has increased somewhat in recent years, due, I suppose to the growing urbanization of our economy and larger use of automobiles and so on. The total number of criminal cases under the Canadian Criminal Code for the fiscal year 1956-57, was 8,107; the next year, it was 9,789 and last year, it was 11,037 — a substantial increase here.

Mrs. Batten: — C.C.F. Government!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Under The Liquor Act, however, that increase has not occurred. In 1956-57 there were 5,779, the next year there were 6,833, and last year there were 6,095. Under The Vehicles Act, keeping pace with the larger number of vehicles upon our roads, in 1956-57 the number was 15,495; in 1957-58, it was 19,759; and in 1958-59, it was 23,853. I don't know what can be made of those figures, I am sure, but at least you know just what the situation is. I suppose that part of the reason for the rise in the charges under the Criminal Code and Vehicles Act is because there has been an increase in the number of police personnel in the province, and, I suppose where there are more police more offences are noted and charges laid. Then, of course, there is the growing industrialization and urbanization of the province which always, for some reason, seems to contribute to an increase in the incidence of crime.

Mr. Speaker: — May I ask, while the hon. Minister pauses, if the hon. Minister has the consent of the House to table those documents so that he may be spared the necessity of reading them?

Members: — Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak of another court that was recently set up in the province. I refer to The Small Claims Enforcement Act which vests in our magistrates a civil jurisdiction for claims or damages up to \$200. This court is a new court. It is not too well known and therefore, to date has not handled a large number of cases. But I have here the figures for the months of November last year, when a total of 89 summonses were issued; five cases were contested, 34 judgments were given in uncontested cases, 20 judgments were given in contested cases and the total number of hours spent by the magistrates in adjudicating was 75 hours, or about two hours for each case. Likewise in December there were 32 summonses; six contested cases (this was for the province), 11 uncontested cases, 12 judgments given in contested cases and 19 hours of work. The number for January is a little longer, but this is the extent to which it is being used. I am confident that, as its existence and purpose become better known and the facility with which it functions becomes better known, it will become more extensively used as time goes on. The chief advantage, of course, is the informality with which the magistrates conduct the proceedings; the fact that a party can go, without being represented by counsel, and receive a hearing before a magistrate in a very informal way. The safeguard, of course, is that whoever loses has the right to appeal by way of trial *de novo* in the Small Debt Court before a District Court Judge. I am not saying there are no costs, as solicitor's costs as well as witness fees and such like are followed and added to the debt and collectible by the party who wins.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with those phases of my Department that have a bearing on the protection of the public. The things that I have been dealing with had to do with the efficiency of administration of the Government; now I would like to come to the protection of the public.

First of all, we have instituted a system of providing a free legal aid to persons who appear in police court and have no means of providing counsel for themselves. This was already in existence in our superior and district courts, and it has now been extended to our provincial magistrates court. I think that its success cannot be measured in terms of the number of times it has been used. Its value is that it is always there, standing behind an accused person so that, in an extremity, it will be there for the person to rely on. It is important that its value should not be measured in terms of statistics; but the fact we know it is there gives the accused assurance and gives the court assurance that injustice is less likely to happen.

I would like to say something about The Commercial Agents Act. Hon. members will recall that, in 1958, we brought in legislation to regularize the issuing of licences, formalize it, and put it on a more systematic basis. We provided that for a much smaller licence fee for the province. We cut the fee from \$50 down to about \$10 —there are several classes, \$10,

\$5, the average is about \$10. Prior to that Act going into effect, the provincial licence register showed only 240 licensed agents in this province. That was in 1958. In 1959, the number registered was 1,493, almost six times as much as the previous year.

It may perhaps be assumed that most of these came into the business from outside, but that is not so. A check of the application forms of these people show that an overwhelming majority of them have been residing in the province all their lives, and have been engaged in the business of door-to-door selling without a licence in previous years, and merely came in to be registered because we had a more effective, workable and systematic, system of registering than we had before.

This system, as hon. members will recall, guarantees the payment of the fees to the municipality. It requires that the licences be bonded, and that if he goes into a municipality without payment of the fee, the municipality may recover the fee from the bond company. As a matter of fact, although some municipalities were a little anxious about how this new system work work in their area, it has now worked out very satisfactorily indeed. It is still true that there have been some representations to the effect that some adjustments should be made in the size of the tariff, and this will be done before the next tariff is promulgated. The city of Regina, for example, has done reasonably well with the new licensing system. In 1958, for example, they had a total revenue from peddlers, transient traders, of \$1,698. The following year their revenue was \$3,116. It is impossible to attribute all this increase to the new Act because they made changes in different categories that were outside of the Act; they made some changes in the licensing bylaws of the city. But these revenues do show that the new legislation did not prejudice their financial position.

The new Act insures that, in the case of a salesman who has a particularly bad record, he may be denied a licence to prevent him from carrying on to the detriment of the public. The test of this Act, however, depends on the degree of co-operation and support which is received from the rural and urban municipalities, and from the public generally. It means that the public must be scrupulously careful to deal only with those who are licensed, and they must report to the police any instances of a salesman who comes to their house and is not in possession of a valid provincial licence. Here again is another licensing act which the Government, feeling it was the right of every citizen to have his rights judicially interpreted and the right to have his licensing privilege reviewed, or his denial of licensing privileges reviewed, by a court, here again we provided for an appeal from the decision of the Minister to a judge thus ensuring that there should be no discriminatory orders issued by any arbitrary tribunal, namely the Provincial Secretary.

We passed legislation, last year, as the hon. members will recall, to outlaw the interim ex-parte injunction. This has already paid dividends in the field of labour-management relations in this province. The members

February 22, 1960

will perhaps know that the notorious interim ex-parte injunction is a procedure whereby a writ might be obtained by an employer to prevent an employee from doing something which may be perfectly legal, but, nevertheless, obtained by the employer from the court without the employee being allowed to be present to argue the question. The interim ex-parte injunction was a favourite weapon of unscrupulous employers who wished to use, or (I should say) abused the processes of the court to win their battles with organized labour. In Ontario they were going to do the same thing, but insofar as I know, the Province of Saskatchewan has taken the lead in outlawing this nefarious injustice against organized labour.

I would like to say that another very important and valuable protective measure was the reform of our Bills of Sale Act and our Conditional Sales Act a year or two ago. We have provided in this province (and again we are the first province to so provide) for a central registry of all documents affecting the title to chattels. This central registry is available to all members of the public through their own court house, nearest to them, where they may file their documents for registration. Likewise, they can use the facilities in their own court house to conduct a search of the central registry. This central registry means that a lien holder no longer has to register his liens in two or three different places. It means that he can no longer be deprived of his lien by having the purchaser move the vehicle to some other jurisdiction. It means that there are no longer so many exemptions from the necessity of registering liens. It used to be that if you wanted to search the title of an automobile, you could not be assured that the title was clear simply because the register was clear, because certain people had the right to have their lien preserved merely by having the name painted on the vehicle somewhere, and this exemption has been abolished. Now, if the chattel has been in the possession of the person, who comes to you, for at least 30 days, you can be quite sure that a search of the register will disclose any defect of clearing title. It used to be that if you wanted to be sure of this, you had to search the register in 20 additional districts for most chattels. We have quite informally started a register of serial numbers, and now you can give them the serial number of a particular motor vehicle, and you can ask if it is clear or if there is anything registered against it, and this can be turned up merely from the serial number.

I want to say something about the protection that the Government has extended to other groups in the province. Farmers, for example, have received the benefit of the legislation that we have passed, extending and renewing the effects of The Farm Security Act from year to year. This is the Act which our friends opposite cannot claim any benevolent support for in the early days when, unfortunately, they are on record as opposing it in this House.

I speak of one other piece of legislation that has been helpful to many of our farm people, and I refer to the amendment in the regulations under the Securities Act in 1952, which requires land men in this province to be licenced before they could approach farmers in negotiating transactions

affecting their mineral titles.

I could also remind the House that this Government undertook, in 1952 to assist in a financial way those farmers or people who wished to sue to set aside their mineral contracts, if they found they were defrauded of their rights.

Then, of course, in 1957 and every subsequent year, we extended The Limitation of Actions Act to preserve the farmers the legal rights which they may have had at that time to challenge the mineral contracts which they have entered into. This has prevented the outlawing of these rights of action over the past three years. In addition to that, we have set up machinery designed to assist farmers to renegotiate their mineral contracts with the oil companies with which they may have been dealing. This Prenegotiation Board, I would remind the House, does not represent any confiscatory or expropriatory legislation. It is purely and simply a means for the voluntary renegotiation of these contracts, and it is hoped that the farmers who have applied to take advantage of the benefits of this legislation will get some good out of it. As a matter of fact, in round numbers, there are now some 1,500 farmers who have got in touch with the Board, and these people have until the end of June, this year, to get their applications in order, and then the Board will attempt to deal with their problems.

Before I sit down, I would like to deal with one further aspect of legislation designed and intended to protect the public in the purchase of securities. I refer to The Securities Act and the Securities Administration. This comes under the Department of the Attorney General, and the work is done by a staff of four people who work under the authority of that Act.

A few years ago in this province, certain developments in the field of speculative securities' promotion caused this Government to become concerned with the securities' policy. Following the phenomenal mineral resources discoveries in the early 1950's, potential investors all over North America became interested in the mineral resources of our province. At the same time, taking advantage of this interest, people flocked in from all parts of Canada, and even from the United States, to set themselves up as promoters of speculative stocks, and these stocks were of course, based upon parcels of moose pasture in the province of Saskatchewan. They were primarily interested in selling these stocks to the United States residents, and their favourite method of communication with these prospective customers was by mail and telephone.

This confronted our Securities Administration with new and difficult enforcement problems. I am sure that any practical person will see just how difficult it is to police and control the type of sales pitch that can be made over the telephone. It is, of course, infinitely more difficult when the person, or the 'victim' (as you may call him) lives a thousand or two thousand miles away in another country. When a promoter hired eight or ten or more of these salesmen, each incurring a weekly telephone bill for long-distance tolls of \$1,000 or more, you can appreciate how the problem

February 22, 1960

multiplies. Furthermore, in the prosecution of these salesmen the victim would have to volunteer to come to Canada, or at least as far as the Canadian border, at his own expense. And even if they do come back to Saskatchewan, never having seen their salesmen they would have difficulty in identifying him at a trial, merely by the sound of his voice on a long-distance telephone.

The action which the Government took to deal with this situation was not based upon any rule or principle that a government can be held accountable to people of a foreign country for at all. I would just like to review the policy of the Government in this connection so that I can explain to you the reasons for it.

At the same time that we were concerned about the victimization of American investors, we were also concerned about three very important reasons why it seemed to be in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan to take special measures to protect American investors against this small clique of grasping men who seem to operate with impunity in many parts of Canada today.

First, there is the domestic problem. It multiplies all the problems of law enforcement to have in a community a small group of extremely wealthy people who are living as parasites at the outer fringes of the law. Secondly, exorbitant sums are being diverted by these promoters as promotional expenses, some of which are urgently needed for resources development and, thirdly, their activities tend to undermine confidence in genuine and legitimate Canadian enterprise, making it more and more difficult to finance bona fide developments.

For these reasons, Saskatchewan has called for a cleanup of the 'stockateering' which is rampant in this country today. We say that if it cannot be done by the provinces acting in concert, then we need national security legislation. In Saskatchewan, however, we did not wait for others to move; we took the lead when we launched a firm enforcement policy in this province. We went at it by stages. In 1957, in the fall, we commenced to refuse to license all the new applicants for security salesmen to sell by telephone in the United States. Secondly, in the spring of 1958, we commenced negotiations with the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States to gain their assistance in policing those of our dealers who are allowed to resume selling in the United States. Thirdly, we entered into an arrangement with the Security Enforcement Branch of the State of New York for mutual assistance in preventing the promoters of each jurisdiction from exploiting the investing public of the other. Fourth, we imposed a limit on the mark-up which a dealer would be allowed to skim from his take. Our rate in Saskatchewan, which was 100 per cent over the cost, is considered naively low in the principal security centres of Canada. Ontario, for instance, allows a mark-up of 200 per cent over the cost, and there is one well-established promoter there who explained to me how, by taking options on blocks of shares and selling as a principal, he could see 10-cent stocks in that province for 80 and 85 cents each, without incurring the displeasure of the Securities Commission of that province.

I should say a word in passing about the terms of the arrangement that was concluded with the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States. Perhaps the shortest way to describe it is to quote a paragraph from the Annual Report of the Securities Exchange Commission, page 188;

“One of the most encouraging developments in this area, that is the area of securities enforcement, has been the outstanding co-operation afforded by the Saskatchewan Securities Commission. On May 1, 1959, this Commission concluded an arrangement with the Saskatchewan Securities Commission under which the latter will require broker dealers in that province to refrain from distributing issues of securities into the United States, unless the broker dealer is registered in compliance with the Securities Exchange Act, and the securities are registered in compliance with the Securities Act of 1933.

“This is the only such arrangement which the Commission has with any province in Canada, and reflects the desire of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission that only legitimate issues be distributed from that province into the United States.”

You will, of course, realize that stock salesmen and stock promoters, tend to gravitate to those areas in Canada where they make the most money. When we decided to set up higher standards in Saskatchewan than in other provinces of Canada, we tried to estimate what the loss would be to the province if these salesmen left this province to go to those places where the pickings were easier. The then Securities Commission Chairman estimated that, at the peak of their activities, the broker dealers contributed roughly 2 1/2 per cent of all the development money spent in this province on hard-rock mining properties, and approximately 1 1/2 per cent of the total spent on petroleum properties. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that this 1 1/2 per cent spent on petroleum properties could have resulted in another Leduc in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that this 1 1/2 per cent could have resulted in another Gunnar Mines being discovered in Saskatchewan.

Just as we expected, the “Stockateers and highbinders” moved to the east and to the west. I predicted, when I visited Washington, D.C., last spring, that in the long run we would benefit. We cannot compete with the other “relaxed” type of securities enforcement. We chose, instead, to try to attract greater interest on the part of the investing public.

February 22, 1960

We are committed then, in Saskatchewan, to pioneer in the field of a high standard of enforcement. Eventually, discriminating investors all over the continent will seek out the securities emanating from this province. The broker who operates here can then afford to refrain from high pressure and sharp practice. He can get along on a hundred per cent mark-up because his sales will come easier in Saskatchewan. I predicted, also, at that time, that unless the other provinces raised the standards of securities administration in their areas, American investors would eventually become immune to the high-pitched extravagance and probably high-pressure technique of the bucket shops.

Prophecy is always hazardous, Mr. Speaker, but already in the space of a year the first part of the prediction has come to pass. The reaction has already set in against the free-wheeling type of securities administration. I refer you to a clipping which I have from 'The Vancouver Columnist' headed: "Foreign Cash Running Away from Canada". I'll read just a couple of paragraphs:

"In a bull market year in which London and Paris stock market prices rose by 50 per cent, while those in Germany rose by 70 per cent, it was in part the reluctance of foreigners to invest in Canada which made the tight money so difficult a problem for the banks, last summer."

It goes on to say:

"But it is not only the economic recession which is causing the foreigners to look twice at Canadian projects. Another factor is the latitude allowed under the Canadian, Provincial, and Stock Exchange regulations to company promoters. If not in Canada, at least in other parts of the world investors are beginning to realize that Canada's regulations are not giving them sufficient security and protection."

Saskatchewan predicted that a year ago, and now, of course, it is coming to pass that Saskatchewan, having the highest standard of securities enforcement in Canada, is now in a position, I hope, to reap some of the advantages of the excellent reputation which we have achieved over the past three years in our securities administration.

If this policy is to get dividends, if Saskatchewan is to get dividends from this policy, then the Government, and, indeed, every citizen of Saskatchewan, will have to take every opportunity to establish confidence in the high standard of our securities administration in the minds of the potential investors of North America.

What I have just said applies with equal force to the domestic market for security. Here the problem is simpler, however; only a very small percentage of most highly speculative mining stocks are pushed on the local market. Where violations of the law occurred in this field, the work was relatively easy and the witnesses were readily available. The success of prosecutions to date should demonstrate to any salesman or promoter that he cannot take liberties with the law in selling securities to a Saskatchewan resident. To carry out such a policy, the Government recognized that a specially experienced and trained staff would have to be obtained. We have now recruited, as I have said, a staff of four people, most of whom came from the various securities commissions and are very experienced in their field.

It is the policy of the new Securities Commission to rule out the arbitrary and personalized type of control usually found in administrative tribunals. First, an amendment, as you will recall, was put through this Legislature last year, establishing a right of appeal from the decisions of the Securities Commission to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. This was to make sure the Securities Commission would not abuse its powers, would not unduly abuse Saskatchewan citizens. Secondly, the Commission was required to state to the parties in writing the reasons for every decision which it makes affecting their rights. This provides to the Court of review an opportunity to assess and pass upon and determine whether or not these reasons are lawful, whether or not this licensee was lawfully treated by the Commission, and gives the Court of Appeal the opportunity to reverse that decision, if the reasons are wrong in law.

It is customary for commissions of this and other provinces to call the wayward licensees in and to talk to them like a Dutch uncle. This, of course, lends itself to arbitrary and discriminatory practices. The person who manages to be the "white-haired boy" of the Securities Commission, of course, has no complaint, but the licensee who seems to be picked on by the Commission for no apparent reason, has no way of getting justice for himself, or getting redress for his grievances. As a result of that kind of administration, brokers in one province told me that they had to take elaborate precautions to maintain the secrecy of their meetings with Mr. Cameron and myself or they would lose their licence in their province. They assured me, also, that if they had set up a branch office in this province, that would be grounds for them to lose their licence in that province. In this province we take the view that if the licensee has the required skill and knowledge he is entitled to a licence, and he is not entitled to lose it except for cause, and causes should be determined where possible in the courts and not by the Commission.

Let us briefly review the results of these policies: Revenue to the Commission from fees in 1959 was \$41,621 as compared with \$29,000 the year before; registrations of brokers for 1959 amounted to 72 as compared to 82 the previous year; security issuers in 1959 are 21 as compared with 25 the previous year. One of these is registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States. We had 488 licensed salesmen in 1959 as compared with 541 the previous year. In the enforcement end of

February 22, 1960

the operation in 1959, some 26 people were charged and convicted, and one was charged but not yet brought to trial. Of the five charges laid under the Criminal Code last year, three were withdrawn and two were pending trial at the end of the year. Of the 238 charges laid under the Securities Act 149 resulted in convictions, 44 were pending trial at year-end and 45 were withdrawn.

The Saskatchewan Government has recognized that the basic underpinning of a sound securities and investment industry is confidence. We can, therefore, view with satisfaction the measure of success already achieved as a result of the catharsis which has been applied to the securities industry in this part of Canada.

The filings of industrial prospectuses has shown a gratifying increase as contrasted to the reduced volume of highly speculative mining and oil prospectuses, during the year. We will, in the coming year, expect to see a substantial diminution in the number of offences committed under the Act, and also under the Criminal Code. We will take every reasonable means of publicizing throughout the continent the high promise of our resources and the high quality of our securities. We will continue to press for a national securities administration so that the various provinces will not have to engage in a competitive down-grading of standards.

And so, Mr. Speaker, having reviewed the protective and beneficial legislation that has been entrusted to myself as Attorney-General, I feel that every voter in Saskatchewan who is interested in the protection of our people and the development of our province ought to ask us to support the Speech from the Throne here, when we vote tomorrow.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate in the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for the forthright and able manner in which they fulfilled their duties. I am sure their constituents will be very proud of them. I would also like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the strenuous attempt he made in trying to criticize such a good Throne Speech. I realize that this is not an easy task to criticize a good Throne Speech.

I would like to deal with this document in relation to how it affects people in Touchwood constituency. The Opposition members in the last few days have been attempting to say that agriculture has been neglected by this Government. I say that the farmers of this province are not going to be hoodwinked by the meanderings of such nonsense. Farmers appreciate the many good programs that have been brought in by this Government for their benefit. Grid roads, power, hospitalization, air ambulance, community pastures, free cancer, assistance to education, have all helped to keep the farm people on the farm.

If the Federal Government in the last sixteen years had done as much in the economic field of agriculture to assist the field of agriculture as this Government has done in the assistance in the production end of agriculture, we would not have to worry too much about farmers leaving their farms. We must not forget that the Provincial Government has no control over trade and fiscal policies that affect and assist agriculture. This is a Federal responsibility.

The arguments of the Opposition that this Government is adding to the farmers' cost-price squeeze, is stupid and asinine. If every cent of last year's provincial budget had been turned over to the farmers of Saskatchewan, they would still be in the hold. That means if every school had been closed, no highways had been built or maintained, no social aid, nothing, and we turned this all over to the farmers, they would still be in the hole. Just stop and think. Farm organizations when they went to ask for deficiency payments, they asked for \$300 million. This is what they felt was needed to bring them up to parity, and our whole budget was \$130 million. Just how ridiculous can the Opposition get? Farm people in this province, and all the people in this province, want the services of this Government and they want more services; but what they want is the Federal Government to see that the economic climate is favourable, so that they can have an opportunity of making a decent standard of living without the worry and frustration of poverty hanging over their heads.

First, I would like to compliment this Government and the Minister of Agriculture for the prompt action in regard to the disaster that happened, this fall, in many central and northern districts when the crops were under snow. I first must protest that it was unfair that the Federal Government demanded that the three prairie provinces bear the full cost of this plan. The Provincial Governments will have to bear the total cost of seed and feed, and social aid. This was certainly a national calamity, and it was certainly the responsibility of the Federal Government. Nevertheless, this Government had no choice but to accept, because the people were in need.

I want to comment on the water and sewage program. I don't look on this program as a luxury program, but as a program where farm people may have a few of the amenities of life, and at the same time be able to use water to farm a little more economically. The fact this Government is prepared to assist the villages and towns with water and sewage will certainly be welcomed by the smaller urban centres. This is a field in which smaller urban centres would certainly never have been able to have gone into, without some assistance from the Provincial Government. I was pleased to read that the Government was embarking on a test crop insurance program. This is a most necessary measure to protect the farmer from the uncertainties of rain, hail, drought and grasshoppers, Gardiners and Harknesses!

Mr. McCarthy: — And the C.C.F.!

February 22, 1960

Mr. Meakes: — I now come to the area in which I think this Government has done the most, and that is the assistance to municipalities. The grid road program has certainly proved more popular than even, I think, most of us in our wildest dreams hoped. When travelling through the country, we see these stretches of road coming up. The Provincial Government is bearing 60 per cent of the cost and, since this program started, municipalities within my constituency have received over a quarter-million dollars in grants to grid roads, and you see that one municipality received over \$60,000 in three years. I am sure the people of this province are going to be very happy with that.

As one who seconded the motion two years ago in this House that the Indians be given a vote, it gives me great pleasure to see that at long last we are going to let these people have the rights which are rightfully theirs, and which we had taken away. On a provincial level, we should make sure that in our jurisdiction we eliminate any other barriers that may exist between them. I think we should strive to press on the Federal Government the desirability of integrating these people into our society as soon as feasibly possible. I, for one, can hold my head a little higher, with a little less shame in my heart, and know that, at least on a provincial level, before the law we are all equal.

I am pleased that this Government is bringing in a province-wide universal contributory medical-care program. I believe in this province every family pays an average of \$120 in medical health. I know in our home, last year, we had no major sickness, yet our medical bill was over \$120. I thought the member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) stated it so well, when he referred to the desirability of having no price-tag on health. I have memories, too, when there was a price-tag on health in this province. I could not help noticing an editorial in 'The Star Weekly' dated February 20, 1960, which I would like to quote. This is what it says:

“Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan predicts that the national medical insurance will be in affect by 1970. Only time can prove him right, but it certainly will be a public issue in the next few years. Consider the instructive history by decade of hospital insurance. In the 1940's it was introduced in Canada. Saskatchewan blazed the way in 1947; British Columbia followed in 1949. The 1950's eventually saw National Hospital Insurance a reality under Federal Government auspices, with every province except Quebec, which is now preparing to accept participation in National Hospital Insurance.

Will the 1960's be the auspicious decade for medical insurance coverage for every citizen, for costs of drugs, doctor bills . . . ?”

Further on it says:

“A recent study by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics of urban family expenditures for health shows that the cost of medical services and drugs has risen rapidly. In 1955, the average family health expenditure was \$193. In 1957, the latest sample year, there were \$228. That is an 18 per cent increase in two years, and they are still climbing.”

Further on it says:

“Rising medical costs should help persuade the medical profession that it will serve itself and the public interest best by helping governments to devise the best medical insurance plan possible. In any event, such assurance is inevitable. Few Canadians are so rich that they can escape the haunting fear of sickness or accident, which might loose a landslide of medical bills on them. No matter how thrifty, most cannot save enough to guarantee against all medical emergencies, or if they have a nest-egg for old age put by, it can be wiped out by a month of such illness. Medical insurance banishes this fear. We all pay in small sums, and when a few of us fall sick our expenses are covered. The magic of averages comes to the rescue of millions. As well as being humanitarian, it is also financially possible without ruinous taxation — a conclusion drawn in a study two years ago, by the reputable Canadian Tax Foundation.”

Mr. Speaker, take the evidence — the editorial paper, basically Liberal for many, many years, certainly not C.C.F. — and I feel sure that if this proposed medical scheme is based on the same principles as the hospitalization, it will be a success, too.

I realize that the Opposition don't like to hear us talk about 15 years ago; I quite understand it. You see, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal policy has always been to make lots of promises at election time, conveniently forget them afterwards, and hope that everybody else does, too. So they naturally hate to be reminded that the C.C.F. endeavour to fill their election promises. I want to state here to them that as long as we are around we will keep talking about that good record and all their crying isn't going to stop us.

Mr. Gardiner: — You were a Liberal yourself.

Mr. Meakes: — It seems to me that the Liberal party shouldn't even be worrying about winning the next election; they should be worrying about being the next Official Opposition.

February 22, 1960

Mr. Kramer: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Meakes: — For the Liberal party only is in power in one small province, and apparently are even unable to get candidates in some constituencies of this province. I think that is what they have to worry about. It seems all that is necessary now is to have the funeral and bury the body. Of course, the Liberal party did have a slight blood transfusion, last fall, in the way of a leadership convention, but they got hold of the wrong bottle of blood. You see, one bottle of blood never saved a case of leukemia. All a bottle of blood does to a case of leukemia is to postpone death a little while.

I had hoped that for what I was going to say now, the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) would be in his seat. First of all, I want to say with all sincerity, the hon. member for Maple Creek has my admiration and sympathy for the stand he took during that leadership campaign. I, for one, am always ready to admire a man who is ready to get up and fight for something he believes in, even though I disagree with him.

I took quite a bunch of clippings from the press prior to the Liberal leadership convention. I was sorry when the Leader of the Opposition in this House (Mr. McDonald) felt obliged to announce that he was going to quit the leadership. In the two or three years I have been here, I have come to admire and to respect the hon. member for Moosomin. I think that what went on at that convention proved that when the member for Maple Creek spoke, he at least was sincere. He said:

“I am not an opportunist and I have entered this race with a sincere desire to serve you. Win or lose, I will continue to build, to try to build, Liberalism. I am not sponsored by any group, privileged or otherwise, and I am touring the province at my own expense.”

I for one admired the stand in particular the hon. member for Maple Creek took.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the few more minutes at my disposal, I would like to deal with just a few of the remarks that have been made in this House. The hon. member for Gravelbourg (I'm sorry to see that he is not in his seat) reminded me of something Abe Lincoln said one time about one of his fellow lawyers. He said: “He can compress the most words in the smallest ideas of any man I ever met.” Then he went on and he said that he couldn't see any industrial empire in Saskatchewan. I say: “None is so blind as those who don't want to see.”

Mrs. Batten: — None so blind as he who refuses to see.

Mr. Meakes: — And there were quite a few others who spoke. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) spoke, but he didn't say much. Then on went the hon. member for Maple Creek, just before lunch, and when he spoke he reminded me of my father when he said: "The louder you shout the weaker the argument."

Mr. Gardiner: — Just the reverse.

Mr. Meakes: — Then he went on to talk about this terrific disgrace of this person who had been neglected by the Government. I could not help but let my mind go back to the days when there was a Liberal government. You know, in those days, Mr. Speaker, I drove a livery and it used to be my job to drive relief inspectors. I was lucky, I used to get good pay — a lot more money than the social aid recipients or those on relief. I couldn't help but think of the schedule that was used by that government in those days. It so happens that I have here the maximum allowance — this is from the Bureau of Labour and Public Welfare, September 1, 1937. I can remember those days when I drove those liveries; one person on a full schedule for one month was paid \$7.85, but you see here on the bottom of the schedule are the important instructions to Municipal Secretaries: "If an applicant has meat, deduct 15 per cent; if he has dairy products, deduct 10 per cent; vegetables, 10 per cent." So this person on the farm, getting \$7.85, if he had meat, well, he only got \$6.65, and if he had his own dairy products, his own vegetables, he only got \$5.90. For a family of four for a full month, \$17.75 — for a whole month for four people! But if they were down to the last 35 per cent, they only got \$11.55. Going on down the schedule (they raised big families in those days) a family with 20 persons, oh, they got a wonderful cheque — \$48.25; and if they had their own meat, their own dairy products and their own vegetables, they got the wonderful sum of \$31.35. I would be a lot happier if the criticism which the hon. member from Maple Creek has made this afternoon had come from one who belonged to a different party than the one who put out that schedule in 1937.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — It was less than that.

Mr. Meakes: — Two members of the Social Credit party spoke. The hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Elias) talked about private enterprise, and then he said we should have clearly defined policies. You know the attitude of the Social Credit member reminds me of that satire poem of Robbie Burns; "Holy Willie's Prayer":

"Yet I am here, a chosen sample,
To show Thy grace is great and ample;
I'm here a pillar in Thy temple,
Strong as a rock,
A guide, a buckler, an example
To a' Thy flock."

February 22, 1960

I think that in all fairness, the Speech from the Throne, the document on which we are having this debate, is, in the light of the economic conditions of this province and of the economic conditions of agriculture, a very good document. I think this Government is to be congratulated, and I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am going to support the Motion.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, may I begin by offering my congratulations to all others who have thus far taken part in the debate, even though, of course, there is very much that I cannot agree with that has been said on the other side of the House. I would like to commend, especially, Mr. Speaker, the Mover and the Seconder of the Throne Speech, who, very plainly have given a great deal of thought and preparation to admirable addresses.

Before proceeding with the body of what I want to say, I would like to correct some of the statements of the lady member from Humboldt, who spoke this afternoon. For one thing she pictured only one-sixth of the possible labour people in Canada in unions, and I would like to say that she is only half correct because there is approximately 35 per cent of the total possible organized into the unions in this country. She pictured one and one-half million unionists who would be paying \$2.50, or \$2.60 a year to bring in a fantastic \$3,000,000 for a political war chest in the new party. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that this should be corrected. The Canadian Labour Congress has already made it abundantly clear that as a matter of course, affiliation to any new party that might be set up in the future, will be entirely a matter for the unions concerned within the Canadian labour Congress. In most cases this is going to mean that each local union, in each area, will decide the question of whether or not they will affiliate. Also the Congress has already made it clear that the principle of “contracting out” will apply; that is to say, that in any local union that decides on a course of affiliation where there is a member that does not want to pay dues, all that he needs to do is to so signify, and political dues will not be deducted for that member.

I would like to point out too, that the study paper on constitution for the new party, which has just been brought down gives constituency organizations in the new party a ration of twelve times more voting strength proportionate to numbers than from affiliated unions, farm organizations, or co-operatives. So, in this arrangement certainly, Mr. Speaker, it would be fantastic to presume that there would be the kind of block control that seems to be pictured in the comments of certain of the members opposite. And finally, the most important discussions to date, on the new party have made it clear that all provincial parties will have the fullest measure of provincial autonomy. That means that in Saskatchewan the present C.C.F.

organization will probably not change fundamentally in membership, and of course, because of the very large number of farmers in this province I can't see, myself, where the structure of the C.C.F. as to membership is going to change very much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on from there to the Speech from the Throne and speak about some of the programs that are forecast in that document. I suppose every member likes to speak first and foremost about the Throne Speech from the viewpoint of how this is going to affect his or her own constituency. In this regard, I am extremely encouraged to learn of the number of programs which will aid the City of Moose Jaw. I think the resume of the economy which is given in the Throne Speech — of the economy during the last year — is one of at least considerable optimism. The retail trade is shown at record levels, investment at high peaks, manufacturing, mining, and mineral production are ahead, and so forth. I think that all of this is of particular importance not only for urban communities such as my own, but for all communities in this province.

On the South Saskatchewan River Dam matters that are discussed in the Speech: My city and the officials of organization in my city have been for many years extremely active in promoting the cause of the South Saskatchewan River Dam, and I think its representatives played no small part, Mr. Speaker, in finally bringing about that public pressure that did eventually result in the progress we have seen to date. We welcome the programs that are announced with reference to the South Saskatchewan River Dam in the Speech from the Throne. We hope that as time goes by the slogan that I suggested several years ago in the House: 'Moose Jaw, The Gateway City To The Dam' will be realized in concrete terms. The news that the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw will be finished by the end of 1960 and that there will be a rapid expansion of the trades and technical programs at the Institute, is welcome news too. We anticipate in the city of Moose Jaw that these steps will help the community by training people for new and for existing industry and will help to enhance the City's reputation as a centre of highly qualified technicians and trades. The increase in educational grants, Mr. Speaker, is equally pleasing in a city that has had considerable expenditures to make in the field of education with attendant high operating costs. Coupled with this of course, is the news that we will have more money in the scholarship fund and in other funds that pertain to education.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the proposed medical care plan that it is difficult to see how any well-reasoned case can be made against something which is so patently necessary in our everyday lives. A few years ago the Federal Government in this country undertook a Canadian Sickness Survey. This showed that there were many Canadians who were unable to engage in their everyday occupations because of ill health for a total of 705,400,000 days. Now, apart from the enormous amount of physical and mental strain, and stress, which is intimated for a large number of our citizens by these figures, let's just for a moment take account of the huge loss in wealth and production which results from this kind of enforced inactivity. By contrast, Mr. Speaker, the time lost due to strikes is picayune. Last year, or rather in the year 1958, the last year for which

there are figures, there were about 3,000,000 man days lost because of strikes in the whole of Canada. Compare that figure against 705,000,000 days lost in the estimate of the Canadian sickness survey taken a few years ago, because of ill health. Now let us suppose that half this number of days affects those who have some gainful occupation, so that we have a figure in the order of 350,000,000 days. Now let us assume that we take a conservative figure of some \$10.00 a day as part of the loss of those people who became ill. A little rough arithmetic will disclose that the loss in one year is 3 1/2 billion dollars as an estim . . . 3 1/2 billion dollars. I say, Mr. Speaker, there are those who say we cannot afford to have health plans. Surely, in all reason we cannot afford to be without them, in the terms of these figures.

The Speech from the Throne speaks of action to be taken to raise minimum wages, and the widows' pensions under the Workmen's Compensation Act. These steps, I think, are commendable and will be welcomed by the working population. Increases in minimum wages will bring, I believe, the basic minimum in the province to \$32.00 a week effective April 4th. This will have, in my view, an extremely beneficial effect, not only for union people who after all, generally speaking, are not affected by minimum wage rates, but by thousands of people, Mr. Speaker, who do not enjoy the benefit of trade union organization. It is useful to know that minimum wages protect these unorganized classes and may I say with respect to these rates that while they are beneficial they are modest rates, and can be in no way construed as prohibitive and hurtful to the economy.

While on the subject of employees and employment, Sir, I must comment on the argument which we appear to bear annually, in this House, charging that the C.C.F. Government is responsible for loss of population, or lack of population, in this province. Well, I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who believes that the institution of government is only one factor, one of many factors, affecting employment and the movement of trade and industry. This doesn't seem to be the view, however, of Mr. Irvine Studer, former Member of Parliament for Maple Creek. He is reported in the 'Moose Jaw Times Herald' of December 4th, 1959 as having said "that the major tragedy arising out of the socialist C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan is the loss of our population in other parts of Canada and to the United States of America". I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Studer had ever taken the trouble to check, as I have checked, the Canada-wide figures on emigration to the United States. I have found in checking the period from 1901 to 1958 that the total number of people who have moved to the U.S. from Canada were 2,422,851, and I take it that no one, even among the Opposition wishes to argue that all of these people came from the province of Saskatchewan! The reference here is the 1959 Statistical Abstract of the United States Department of Commerce and the Canada Year Book.

Also, the Canadian Bureau of Statistics in 1951 decided to make the study of trends in emigration to the United States. They took the two years, 1949 and 1950 and classified emigrants by province of origination or residence. Thus, in 1949, Mr. Speaker, they found that 25,083 persons moved to the land of our neighbour. Well now, where did they come from? Eight Hundred and Fifty-four (854) came from Nova Scotia; 684 from New Brunswick;

3,379 from Quebec; 11,446 from Ontario; 4,733 from British Columbia; and note these particularly, Mr. Speaker, 1,445 from Manitoba; 1,422 from Alberta; and 986 from the Province of Saskatchewan.

Pursuing the study in 1950, we found that the equivalent figures showed 25,133 people moved to the United States from Canada in the year 1950; 880: Nova Scotia; 810: New Brunswick; 3600: Quebec; 11,440 from Ontario; 4,311: British Columbia; Manitoba 1,554; from Alberta: 1,580; and from Saskatchewan: 836.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that this study is conclusive. Of course, it is only for a two-year period, but I say the information is indicative of the conditions that prevailed in the two years under study have probably continued since. I say that the figures strongly challenge the thesis of doom which is so often urged by Liberal and Conservative speakers in the province.

Again, on this same subject, Mr. Speaker, we find that the provincial Liberal Leader on returning home to Moose Jaw from a holiday in the United States shortly after was contacted by the Moose Jaw "Times Herald". The result was on January 28th, a four-column headline in that paper and I will quote it: "Saskatchewan's Tardiness: It Made Me Sick". Now his version went: "That while industry in the United States was moving, the situation in this province is terrible". In crossing the border from the State of North Dakota he said that as soon as you cross the border, and this is a quotation: "As soon as you cross the border the activity stops". This, as the heading indicates, made him a "little sick".

Well now, just what has happened in the United States where there is no social democratic government, no socialist government, and where the two old-line parties (if you want to call them that) the Republicans and the Democrats, have held sway for many years politically. What do the figures on population show for the states in the American Union that have an agricultural base and, as I say, are quite unaffected with any socialist virus. Their experience, their population experience, has been very similar to that of Saskatchewan.

For example, the population of North Dakota in 1958, standing at 650,000, was more than 30,000 less than in 1930. The population of South Dakota was just 7,000 more, in 1958, than it was in 1930. The population of Montana, where there has been a very significant increase because of mining and other activities, still did not increase very much in population. It went from 537,606 in 1930 to 688,000 in 1958. During the whole period we find that this same general trend has developed in every agricultural state of the American Union. As a matter of fact, the combined states of North and South Dakota showed a population rise of only 6 per cent from 1950 to 1958, while in the same period the Saskatchewan population rose by close to 7 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the repetition of the Liberal theme on population in

February 22, 1960

Saskatchewan is as injurious to the province as it is fallacious. In the Dakota Governments, whatever the argument raised on population, it would be difficult to conceive of arguments going on in those state governments that blamed the lack of population on some socialist octopus.

Now, returning to the question of government programs, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, first of all that I am grateful, and my constituents are grateful for help which has been given by all government departments, including the Departments of Public Works, Highways, Municipal Affairs, Travel and Information, and Education, to name some of the more prominent which has affected Moose Jaw City during the last year. I want to say that our city has made good use of the road assistance plan, both last year, and intended programs for this year. It has also taken part in other shared programs, to institute storm drainage, bridge repairs and other similar projects. I hope that this type of aid will continue, and will be expanded, as time goes by because, as I have said, my own community has felt very greatly the increased cost of the last few years particularly, and have been forced to increase its local taxes.

I think the biggest thing we need today for municipalities is federal aid to education. I think if we can give the primary and secondary schools the type of assistance that has been recommended by educational authorities in this country, that this would free large sums of money for cities and other municipal governments for use in other programs.

While on the subject of municipal needs, I feel compelled to raise the problem of the taxation methods that are now used in our urban municipalities. The existing basis of taxation on land and improvements, perhaps expedient in the beginnings of this province, seem to us to no longer apply in the same way. It seems to me that we need a new approach. I think the old means we used were only intended, in any event, as a sort of rough and ready approach to the ability to pay, and to equity. In our present-day scene I think this basis of taxation is far removed from the original concept.

I would like to recommend to the Minister of Municipal Affairs especially, the thorough study of these matters to determine if there cannot be some realignment or some new basis, some revised basis of local taxation, which will recognize to a better degree the principle of ability to pay.

I would like to deal with the question of recreation. The Throne Speech deals with several aspects of this, and I don't want to touch on them all, but I do want to say that we are extremely glad that the Government recreational program will be developing a new provincial park at Buffalo Lake. I want to say, that I hope in addition to the required entrance roads, to the park, that all other facilities within the park will be developed as quickly as possible. In this connection, I suppose I should comment on the fact that the municipality adjacent to the Buffalo Pound Lake resort has already made recommendation for assistance in the building of a municipal road which leads to the private resort portion of the area. I would like to ask the Minister in question — I imagine this will be Municipal Affairs — to

give financial assistance in the building of the municipal road at this point.

I would like to refer to some other needs of urban people. I notice that the house is very close to 10 o'clock; however, and I would now like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The following Bills were read the second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting:

Bill No. 15 — An Act respecting Rural Municipalities

Bill No. 3 — An Act respecting Provincial Parks and Protected Areas.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 15 — An Act respecting Rural Municipalities

Hon. Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is really, in effect, a consolidation of The Rural Municipal Act. While it appears to be something that might take considerable length of time, the only amendments there are in the consolidation of the Act are those amendments, by and large, recommended by the Rural Municipal Association. I think those amendments, which are not very many in number, can better be dealt with in Committee of the Whole.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 15.

Mr. Foley (Turtleford): — You mentioned, Mr. Minister, that the changes in the Act were those requested by the Rural Municipal Association, I believe. This seems to me to be a very lengthy document, and I wonder if you might just touch on some of the pertinent changes that are being made in this Act. Are the changes extensive?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — They can very well be dealt with in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foley: — If there are minor changes, Mr. Minister, I think we should be told what these changes are.

February 22, 1960

The motion for second reading was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 3 — an Act respecting Provincial Parks and Protected Areas

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources):— Mr. Speaker, this is a consolidation of the Act, and there are two amendments. One amendment in Section 8, deals with park management. All it does is clarify more fully what the Minister and his officers may do in the development and management of a provincial park. The other is an amendment to Section 12 adding further needs that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make in connection with the regulations; that is, pass regulations controlling horsepower of outboard motors, boats, automobiles, tractor-trailers, and so on, in the parks for general safety, and to control the use, or manner, of keeping animals in the park limiting the period of the use of the park and regulations to prevent pollution and contamination of sources of water in the park. With that, I move second reading.

Mrs. Batten: — Would the hon. member answer a question in connection with this? Why is there a change in sub-section 2, Section 8? I don't know if there is a change in principle or not, where the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is given power to appoint another member of the Executive Council to be responsible for parks.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That was in the Act before, I believe. It will be permissible, but I don't believe it will be necessary.

The motion for second reading was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m., without question put.

**Relative Volume of Judicial Work in
Principal Judicial Centres as a
Percentage of the Total for the Province**

	Writs Issued			Trials Held			S.C. Applications for Probate or Admin.		
	1957	1958	1959	1957	1958	1959	1957	1958	1959
Saskatoon	26.1	27.5	26.3	16.4	22.0	22.9	11.9	13.5	15.3
Regina	22.0	22.7	23.5	25.3	24.9	25.2	13.1	12.4	18.3
Prince Albert	8.6	9.2	9.7	8.0	11.2	10.3	6.5	5.4	5.0
Swift Current	5.6	7.4	9.4	5.7	4.6	4.0	6.4	6.6	7.2
Moose Jaw	5.3	6.1	5.9	9.3	6.5	8.4	7.5	6.2	7.7
Battleford	4.8	5.2	3.8	2.1	2.9	3.0	7.5	6.9	6.8
Yorkton	4.8	2.0	3.2	5.9	5.0	6.2	5.6	5.5	5.7
Melfort	3.8	4.5	3.6	3.1	5.2	4.2	5.5	4.9	5.3
Weyburn	3.0	.8	1.6	1.9	2.4	1.3	3.4	4.2	2.2
Melville	2.5	.9	2.6	5.8	2.6	1.1	3.0	3.1	1.8
Estevan	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.6	3.4	2.3	3.7	5.4	2.6
Humboldt	2.4	2.6	1.2	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.7
Gravelbourg	1.4	1.6	.8	5.0	.5	2.5	1.9	1.7	1.5
Wilkie	1.4	1.7	.7	1.5	.7	.1	2.9	2.0	1.9
Moosomin	1.3	1.8	.8	.7	.9	.4	3.4	4.6	3.2
Arcola	1.0	.4	1.2	.5	.2	1.0	2.5	3.0	1.9
Kerrobert	1.0	.9	1.5	.3	1.2	.7	2.2	2.2	1.3
Wynyard	.9	1.1	.3	.7	.4	.1	2.8	2.7	2.1
Assiniboia	.6	.3	1.0	.4	.1	.4	1.7	1.9	2.2
Shaunavon	.5	.6	.5	1.2	1.2	1.5	2.0	1.8	2.2
Kindersley	.5	.5	.1	0	.2	.4	2.6	2.6	2.1
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

CRIMINAL STATISTICS
for the period April 1, 1958 to March 31, 1959

Offences Under	J.P.'s		Magistrates		D.C. Judges		Q.B. Judges	
	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.
Sec. 221 CCC	6	6	224	203	2	2	1	1
Sec. 222 CCC	11	10	164	150	3	3		
Sec. 223 CCC	53	51	1,071	1,005	9	4	3	1
All other CCC cases	400	395	6,558	6,223	60	42	57	26
Other Federal Offences	304	303	2,131	2,099	2	1		
Total Federal Offences	774	765	10,148	9,680	76	52	61	28
Liquor Act	923	922	5,171	5,077	1	0		
Vehicles Act (Speeding)	1,847	1,845	5,866	5,833	1	0		
Vehicles Act (All other)	3,264	3,257	12,867	12,665	9	3		
Highways & Trans. Act	482	482	514	510				
Education & Hospitalization Tax Act	3	3	148	147				
Saskatchewan Hospitalization Tax Act	12	12	221	221				
Fuel Petroleum Products Act	193	193	561	561				
Stray Animals Act	1	1	6	6	1	1		
Recovery of Wages Act	17	17	34	28				
Game Act	163	162	258	253	1	0		
Securities Act	0	0	41	35	1	1		
All other Prov. Statutes	55	55	541	469	15	11		
Total Prov. Offences	6,960	6,949	26,228	25,805	29	16		
Municipal Bylaws	2,798	2,783	3,499	8,392	1	0		
Grand Total	10,532	10,497	44,875	43,877	106	68	61	28

CRIMINAL STATISTICS
for the period April 1, 1957 to March 31, 1958

Offences Under	J.P.'s		Magistrates		D.C. Judges		Q.B. Judges	
	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.
Sec. 221 CCC	12	12	141	132	3	1		
Sec. 222 CCC	9	9	206	197	7	5		
Sec. 223 CCC	111	111	1,044	965	8	4		
All other CCC cases	513	507	5,383	5,078	46	26	27	16
Other Federal Offences	464	464	1,802	1,779	3			
Total Federal Offences	1,109	1,103	8,576	8,151	67	35	27	16
Liquor Act	1,547	1,513	5,285	5,138			1	
Vehicles Act (Speeding)	1,272	1,272	4,019	4,002	4	2		
Vehicles Act (All other)	4,554	4,545	9,906	9,721	4	2		
Highways & Trans. Act	348	348	251	247				
Education & Hospitalization Tax Act	24	24	206	205				
Saskatchewan Hospitalization Tax Act	74	74	140	140				
Fuel Petroleum Products Act	200	200	429	427				
Stray Animals Act	3	3	5	3				
Recovery of Wages Act	4	3	18	13				
Game Act	173	172	233	228	2	1		
Securities Act	0	0	24	24				
All other Prov. Statutes	165	164	499	340	3	3		
Total Prov. Offences	8,364	8,318	21,015	20,488	13	8	1	
Municipal Bylaws	5,245	5,239	6,705	6,623				
Grand Total	14,718	14,660	36,296	35,262	80	43	28	16

CRIMINAL STATISTICS
for the period April 1, 1956 to March 31, 1957

Offences Under	J.P.'s		Magistrates		D.C. Judges		Q.B. Judges	
	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.
Sec. 221 CCC	33	33	27	25	3	2		
Sec. 222 CCC	18	17	23	19				
Sec. 223 CCC	487	485	393	372	4	1	2	1
All other CCC cases	1,210	1,182	3,703	3,432	30	24	31	17
Other Federal Offences	1,233	1,231	879	855	20	11	11	9
Total Federal Offences	2,981	2,948	5,025	4,703	57	38	44	27
Liquor Act	4,093	4,066	1,683	1,590	1	1	2	1
Vehicles Act (Speeding)	2,394	2,394	530	516	1	1		
Vehicles Act (All other)	9,876	9,862	2,695	2,555	2			
Highways & Trans. Act	389	389	19	14	2	2		
Education & Hospitalization Tax Act	64	64	54	50				
Saskatchewan Hospitalization Tax Act	180	180	47	47				
Fuel Petroleum Products Act	458	458	43	42				
Stray Animals Act	6	6	1	0				
Recovery of Wages Act	5	5	18	16				
Game Act	280	280	34	32				
Securities Act	0	0	0	0				
All other Prov. Statutes	235	230	364	282	1	1		
Total Prov. Offences	17,980	17,934	5,488	5,144	7	5	2	1
Municipal Bylaws	5,664	5,659	3,719	3,593				
Grand Total	26,625	26,541	14,232	13,340	64	43	46	28