

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**11th Day**

**Thursday, February 24, 1949**

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kuziak for an Address-in-Reply.

**Hon. J.A. Darling (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to extend to you my hearty congratulations upon your re-election to the office of Speaker. Some things have been so well stated by some masters of language that it is a very difficult thing to find new words to express the same sentiment. My own attitude towards your re-election, or towards you as Speaker, runs along something of the same lines. Having had no opportunity to observe any other personality in that Chair, I find it difficult to conceive of any other member of the Legislature fulfilling your high office with equal dignity and address. I do most heartily congratulate you.

I would like also to add my congratulations to the speakers who have already spoken, and to the mover and the seconder of the address. The hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) succeeds in this House a gentleman who had earned the respect of us all. He was a man — I am speaking, of course, of Mr. Myron Feeley — who had convictions, who had courage, and, above all, a sense of humour. He endeared himself to us all. I may say that I felt that this Legislature would miss him very much when I learned that the state of his health would prevent him contesting his constituency in the last election. However, we welcome his successor, the hon. member for Canora, in this Legislature. I think he shows promise of being a worthy successor to the doughty warrior who has retired.

The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) succeeds my old friend, Mr. James Aitken who was compelled also, for reasons of ill health, to relinquish an opportunity which doubtless would have been his to contest the constituency of Hanley. I miss Mr. Aitken very much in this House, and I think the constituency of Hanley is very fortunate, again, in the one who has been elected to succeed him. The hon. member for Hanley has everything in his favour; youth, courage, energy and ability. I think he has exhibited those qualities in the House in seconding the address.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition on his elevation to his present position. I do that sincerely. I think any individual who can commend himself above his fellows for a position of prominence is entitled to congratulation. I do not seem to draw aside the veil which obscures the inner workings of the Liberal party, but I must say that the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson), who is not now in the House and I am sorry, always seemed to me, from the point of view of the Liberal party, to do a mighty good job as Leader of the Opposition. I would like at this time to thank him for his kind reference to myself yesterday.

I have listened to this debate so far with mixed feelings. I realize how difficult it is, in fact maybe it isn't desirable, to shed the traditions of political give-and-take in Legislative Assemblies. I feel that public opinion is changing a little in that respect. However, some of us — and I am

not one of them — have great skill in that particular operation, and to them I say: “Good luck. Go to it.” They certainly add a good deal to the entertainment and relieve some of the tedious hours we would otherwise spend in this House. But I have also felt in this session that if some of those who have no skill would realize the fact and save their efforts, we might have been much further along with the business of the session than we are today after two weeks of sitting.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been a soldier. As such, I think he will agree with me, who have not had that advantage, that the strategy of an officer commanding an attacking force is usually to attempt to discover the weak points of the enemy lines and to concentrate the attack on those general areas. This strategy is expected to produce the best hopes for success at the lowest cost. I think that to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as a soldier, that will be elementary. However, in his attack on the government, in his maiden speech as Leader of the Opposition in this Legislature, he threw prudence to the wind and attacked across the whole front. He and his cohorts attacked the government’s health services, and when I say health services I mean everything in connection with our health programme. He was most effectively answered by the hon. Premier and Minister of Health in his reply. He attacked the politics of the government in the field of education. He accused the department, through the use of textbooks — these are my words, not his; they may not be acceptable to him and if they are not, he may object — of inciting our young people to communism in this province, and he was dealt with most devastatingly by the hon. Minister of Education when he replied. He attacked the Department of Agriculture, with special reference to the campaign to combat the grasshopper infestation last summer, and in so doing he sought to disparage the most effective campaign which has ever been launched in this province at any time. He attacked the Department of Agriculture in other respects, and I don’t propose to attempt to answer him in those attacks. The Minister of Agriculture, who is my seat-mate, will reply, I am sure, more effectively than I could. He attacked the Department of Highways. The Minister of Highways has not yet spoken, but I think when he does speak, he will make it very clear that the hon. Leader of the Opposition succeeded only in highlighting the deplorable condition of this province’s highway system when this government took office.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And it’s no better now.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — The hon. member for Arm River has behaved better this session than during any other session at which I have been.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Better wait and see.

**An Hon. Member:** — Look at that smile.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I say, attacked across the whole front and, in my opinion, up to this time his casualties have been very heavy indeed.

He attacked the record of the Power Commission, and he was followed in this attack by other opposition speaker. I listened with a great deal of interest to everyone who touched on power development, because that development

is very dear to my heart at this time, and always has been, and especially when the speakers referred to farm electrification. I have been forced, after listening to the various statements made in this debate, to the conclusion that there is a great need for a better understanding of the problem involved in the electrification of Saskatchewan farms, and in the extension of our power system to include towns, villages and hamlets.

**Mr. Tucker:** — There's need for real action too.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — Both in the present debate and in the press, during recent weeks, much mention has been made of the inspiring progress which has been evident in this direction in our sister province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — I was particularly interested, of course, in the development in our own province of Saskatchewan, and had the question of the Manitoba development not been raised in this House, I might have hesitated to draw comparisons between the two efforts. I would like to serve notice that anything I may say, and I will say, is not calculated to disparage what Manitoba is doing. Manitoba is doing what we are doing: they are facing up to their own particular problem, and they are facing up to it very effectively.

You will notice I used the words 'farm electrification'. I am going to make a suggestion here which can be accepted or rejected by individuals just as they please, but I feel there is some confusion in the minds of the people, in this province particularly — at least I am concerned about this province — when we refer to rural electrification. To my mind, if we mean rural electrification, the electrification of farms, then we have no name for the extension to our power system which connect small communities, and which constitute the primary grid of our power system. I think it is correct to say that every power line which runs through the province from one small town to another, connecting up towns, villages and hamlets, can properly be described as rural electrification. I would like to see us form the habit — a habit which I will have to accustom myself to, as well as others — of referring to that part of our programme as 'rural electrification', and of referring to extensions to farms as 'farm electrification'. I think if we form that habit we will clarify a good many of the statements that we make. Now that is just a suggestion. I am going to attempt to do it when speaking this afternoon. Perhaps I will not be successful as I have shared in the common custom of referring to the whole extensions outside of the cities as rural electrification.

I was referring to the prominence which has been given in this House, and in the province generally, to the Manitoba programme. The inference is generally left that Saskatchewan makes a very poor showing in comparison.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — Mr. Speaker, that is a serious indictment if it is true, unless there are very tangible reasons which can be advanced to account for our shortcomings in that direction.

The speech from the throne forecast legislation designed to facilitate farm electrification. This has been referred to, both in the House and in the press, as being one of the most important pieces of legislation to be brought before this session. I feel that if my poor efforts can do something to increase the understanding of the members of this House of the problem which this Bill is designed to meet, at this time, it should facilitate the discussions and the debate when the Bill is finally brought forward.

In order to perform the duty which I have set myself — that is, the duty of comparing the Saskatchewan development and the Manitoba development in the power field — I propose to go back to the very beginning of power development in the western provinces. Before doing so, I want to read some excerpts from a transcript of the speech of the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). I have no quarrel with the statements of the hon. member for Melfort, except that they quite clearly come from a person who, whatever his sincerity, has very little knowledge of the matter of which he spoke.

One of the greatest needs of our area (said the hon. member) is rural electrification. People want their farms electrified, and they feel that the immediate post-war period was the opportune time to launch a major rural electrification programme. They feel very strongly about having had so very little progress made during the past four years, because, if we are going to deal with the facts, it must be admitted that the main achievement of the Power Commission since the C.C.F. took office, was to take over the power companies providing power in this province. They took over all except one, namely, Moose Jaw, and our people wonder why they did not take it too.

I might say that I do not feel quite safe in assuming that the hon. member was criticizing the government for taking over those privately-owned power plants, or whether he approves of it. The statement is more or less ambiguous in that respect.

Then further on he states:

I would urge upon the government to establish and provide electrical power to our farmers on a basis similar to that in the province of Manitoba where the power lines are built at the expense of the Commission, where the energy is brought right to the centre of the farming unit, and from there on the cost of wiring the buildings and the cost of energy consumed are borne by the farmer.

That, in a way of speaking, will be my text. I promised, I think, that I would go back to the very beginning and trace the history of power development in the western provinces insofar as Manitoba and Saskatchewan are concerned.

The Manitoba Power Commission was started in the year 1919, ten years before the Saskatchewan Power Commission was set up. At that time there was very little development of power in the western provinces outside of the larger cities. The Manitoba Power Commission got right under way and, by 1921, the Manitoba government had investment \$1.75 million in the power lines of the province.

The Commission was already serving at that date, 1921, six towns and a total of 2,399 customers. By 1930 — I'm sorry, I haven't a thing for 1929, about the time when the Saskatchewan Power Commission was getting started; however, we can assume that, if it started in 1929, it hadn't got very far in 1930 — the Manitoba government had invested in this Power Commission a total of more than \$4.5 million, and was serving 44 cities and towns and villages, and had a total of 6,554 customers. A year later the Commission was serving 55 cities, towns and villages and had 10,805 customers. That is what Manitoba had done up to that time.

I want to review the beginnings of the development of power in the province of Saskatchewan. In 1927, a Power Resources Commission was set up in this province to enquire into and report upon the economic and practicability of generating power at central power plants and water sites in the province, and the distribution of the same throughout the province. This Commission brought in a report in 1928. I have here the Sessional Papers of the Legislative Assembly for the years 1928 and 1929. I want to quote from the report of the Saskatchewan Power Resources Commission, as it was quoted in the Assembly by the then Minister of Railways, Labour and Industry:

With the construction or the establishment of such a system, supplied by a number of central stations with radiating lines, there at once arises the question of the provision which should be made to co-ordinate the system. It is evident that it is only by concerted action that some such system could be made available for the use of the extended limits of the province which have been described. If the development of such a system is left to the initiative of the cities or of private interests working from different points, there will be a clashing of interests and duplication of expense in many ways and the desired result would not be obtained as readily or as soon; also the costs would be somewhat higher than if the direction of the whole scheme were undertaken by some central authority.

I continue the quotation:

The erection of a central authority at once suggests three alternatives. One, an inter-city pool which would be empowered to extend and sell to other municipalities. Two, a privately-owned company which would either buy these central plants and extend therefrom, or purchase power from these plants for such extension. Three, the province of Saskatchewan could either take over and operate the city plants and make the necessary extensions or purchase power from the central plants to supply the necessary extensions.

In our opinion (that is the opinion of the commission from which I am quoting) of these alternatives, there are many reasons which point to that wherein the province is suggested as taking over the plants and operating the same, as being the alternative which will prove ultimately of the greatest advantage to the people of Saskatchewan. The three cities should derive benefits from the point of view that their stations will be enlarged to supply greater loads than they are likely of themselves to produce, under practically the same conditions of management and costs of production as they would obtain if they continued to

operate the plants themselves. The supply of electric energy at reasonable rates which would be made possible by such a scheme to a large territory tributary to these centres will of itself create a condition of living in this territory which will indirectly accrue to the benefit of the large centres with which the tributary territory is in continuous communication.

I must apologize to the House for that long quotation, but I think it does indicate two things: first, that the Commission was in favour of public ownership of the power development of the province; secondly, that they visualized a system whereby there would be limited number of central generating plants, and that those plants would be located in the cities, although of course it is not necessarily so that they would all be located in the cities; but they did visualize expansion from the cities.

Now, I quote from the speech of that Minister — that is, the Minister of Railways, Labour and Industry. That hon. gentleman said this:

There is little doubt today where the province stands on the matter of the ownership of these utilities. On every occasion where the people have had an opportunity to express themselves on the question, they have done so with no uncertain voice, and this question of power has been no exception.

As soon as the report of the Commission was published, and even before, I find that the following organizations had expressed themselves. I read from newspaper clippings making special reference to the subject. I shall read only the headings, Mr. Speaker: “Favour for Scheme” is the heading of the Y.M.C.A. Debating Club; “Saskatchewan Union of Municipalities Take Stand on Power Policy, Unreserved endorsement of Public Ownership Passed by Large Majority”; “Regina Labour Party Endorses Power Scheme”; “Favour Placing all Plants Under Government Control”; from the Star-Phoenix of October 4, 1928 — “General Policy of Government Plan Backed by Party. Saskatchewan Progressive Association fully in accord”; Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, September 14, “Farmers Behind Power Plant, says U.F.C. Secretary”; then from the Toronto Globe of July 26, in the editorial column, this brief comment: “The Provincial Power Commission of Saskatchewan has reported in favour of public ownership and distribution of power. Good judgment and foresight have scored again.”

There could be no question of the attitude of the Minister who was speaking. Then he goes on, and here is a quotation from the same speech:

Here in Saskatchewan we are starting off with a policy of government ownership on a virtually clean sheet. There are no vested rights in sites or power plants in any great amounts other than what is now publicly owned, and I would say that it would be the part of wisdom for the cities not to part with their plants or franchises to private companies. It is up to us all to work in the closest co-operation so that we can lay the proper foundation for a province-wide scheme of government ownership for the production, transformation and distribution of power at cost. In this way and in no other can we give the efficient service to our rural districts which these districts will demand and have the right to expect.

I think that makes very clear just what the attitude of the government was at that time.

Now, about this time, even while the gentleman whom I have quoted was speaking, a situation existed in the United States which I feel I would like to draw to your attention, a situation which may have had something to do with the popular opinion in this province to avoid the private development of our power system here. I want to quote something which I can remember very distinctly appearing in the press about that time. I am quoting from the Sessional Papers of the year 1929-30, and from a quotation contained in a speech by Mr. Whatley at that session. He, in turn, is quoting Senator B. Norris of Nebraska.

Down in the United States, at that time, most of the power development was in private hands, and conditions had become so scandalous down there that the authorities set up a Commission, which was called the Inter-State Commerce Commission, to investigate the operations of the private power trusts in the United States. What I am going to quote are words used by Senator Norris of Nebraska with reference to the findings of that Inter-State Commerce Commission, and I quote:

The most important question for solution now before the American people is the preservation of our God-given natural resources, and this brings us at once to the consideration of the power question. Recent developments in this country have clearly shown that the Power Trust is the greatest monopolistic organization that has ever been put together by human ingenuity.

The property controlled by this great combination is greater than the total value of all the railroads in the United States.

Then he goes on:

With its slimy fingers it reaches into every community and levies its tribute upon every fireside. There is no avenue of human activity that it has not undertaken to control.

He goes on to state where it has attempted to exercise its control and to build up sentiment in its favour, and it includes colleges and the schools.

Then he goes on:

The working of this Trust has been secret and underhanded. And where did it get the money to carry on this wonderful campaign of deception? The Power Trust has but one source of income, and that is the contributions made from one end of the country to the other by those who use electricity . . .

I have given you thus only a few samples of the work of this gigantic octopus which is secretly undermining our society, our civilization and our government, because if the activities thus disclosed are carried to their logical conclusion, it seems that this Trust is greater than the government and that it will eventually control the government.

I am sure that some of you hon. members in this House will recall reading that in the press.

So it is not surprising that, when this situation was being aired in the United States, the government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan, and the organized bodies of farmers and municipalities, etc. were outspoken in their demands that we in this province should not fall into a similar error, and yet at that very time private interests were penetrating this province. I want the House to understand that no private interest could gain a foothold in Saskatchewan without the approval or the permission of the government of the day. If the government of that day had wished to stand behind its policy of public ownership, it could have done so. Yet, in the year 1928 — this is a report from the Local Government Board — there was contained in the 1929-30 Sessional Papers a list of 21 towns and the city of Moose Jaw which were permitted to sell their power plants to private interests. I could list the towns: Broadview, Melville, Davidson, Assiniboia, Estevan, Fleming, Radville, Govan, Rouleau, Yellow Grass, Avonlea, Wilcox and Fillmore; and those plants, together with a thousand miles of transmission lines, passed into the hands of private companies. That was done absolutely against the declared policy of the government of the day, against the policy approved by public organizations and by the general public of Saskatchewan. And those lines remained in private hands until this government took over and brought them back to public ownership.

I say that if we had done nothing — and I do not agree that we have done nothing — but bring those lines back to public ownership and restore them and integrate them with our publicly-owned system, we would have made a very definite contribution to the thing that we all have very much at heart — farm electrification. I want to point out that those companies were designed to provide power on the basis of high costs and low sales, and you cannot build up a rural electrification programme on that basis. It is quite the contrary. If we are going to have a successful system of farm electrification, we must be able to provide energy or power at a low cost, and we have to build up the consumption of our customers. It could not be done by private companies, and it was not being done, and a comparison of the rates they charged will show this.

In comparing power development in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, I think it is fair to compare the first 20 years of the life of the Manitoba system with the first 20 years of the life of the Saskatchewan power system. It is fair for two reasons: one, that the period of time is equal, and, for the other, that in both 20-year periods both systems had to face the conditions of the thirties — in Manitoba, their second decade was in the thirties; in Saskatchewan, our first decade was in the thirties — and if there is any advantage accruing to one or the other from the difference, I would say that it accrues to Manitoba.

I haven't got the capital investment of the Manitoba Power System in 1919, but by 1921, as I stated earlier, their capital investment amounted to \$1.75 million, and by 1939 — the end of their 20-year period — their investment totalled \$6,943,000. In Saskatchewan, at the end of our 20-year period, in fact it is only 19 years, our investment was \$21,313,500; that is, \$6,943,000 in Manitoba as against \$21,313,500 in Saskatchewan. That does not look as though we were falling down in our effort at least to provide a power system in Saskatchewan.



Now, a still further comparison. Let us consider the number of meters in use. At the end of the 20-year period in Manitoba, the Manitoba Power Commission had 15,880 meters in use. At the end of our 20-year period, as has been stated already in this House, we have 51,237 meters in use — a difference of 15,000 to 51,000 in 20 years. I want to add something that wasn't stated on the last occasion when the number of meters was given, and it is that this does not include the meters that are in use in the cities of Saskatoon, North Battleford and Swift Current. Those total 20,094. While we do not own the meters or the transmission system in those cities, we do provide them with their power. I think that is a remarkable illustration of the progress made in the first 20-year period of the Saskatchewan Power Commission as compared with what has been done in Manitoba.

But let us go still further. The next one shows Manitoba has not more miles of line than we have. In their first 20-year period they had 1,773 miles of line. In our first 20-year period, we have 4,190 miles of transmission line. If we compare the number of towns and villages served in Manitoba after their first 20 years, they had 140 towns and villages, while we in Saskatchewan have 375 towns and villages. On every count, Mr. Speaker, we have, in our first 20 years of power development, far exceeded the record of our sister province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a logical question for anyone to ask is this: Why is it that, in spite of the difference, our investment is so much greater than the investment in the Manitoba system. It is drawing attention because I think . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? If he is drawing comparisons I would ask him if he has made any comparison of the relative development in the last four years, because the last four years are very important years regarding such development.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — I am glad the hon. gentleman has drawn that to my attention. I almost passed it up. I was thinking of the system as a whole, not being politically-minded. I am trying to give a true picture of Saskatchewan, but I can oblige the hon. gentleman.

In 1944, the Manitoba investment was \$7,260,000. They increased that between 1944 and 1948 to \$12,658,000; an increase of \$5,398,000 in their investment. We in Saskatchewan had in 1944 an investment of \$7,752,000, an investment very similar to the Manitoba investment at that time; but we have increased our investment to \$21,313,500, an increase of \$13,561,500.

Mr. Speaker, as far as meters are concerned, in 1944 Manitoba had 23,583 meters. They have increased that to 40,069 meters, an increase of 16,486. We in Saskatchewan were way behind Manitoba in 1944. We only had 12,989 meters, but in 1948 we had 51,237 meters, an increase of 38,248 meters.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member indicate the . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Let him finish answering the first question.

**Mr. Tucker:** — . . . increase in the number of farmers served in the two provinces.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! When the hon. member gets up to ask a question, the member who is speaking will take his seat to signify he will answer a question.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I understood he wished to answer. If the hon. member does not wish to answer this, it is all right, but I figure he is willing to answer and I would ask if he can give the Legislature the figures of the increase in the number of farmers connected in those four years in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The increase of the number of farmers connected with electricity.

**Premier Douglas:** — Let him finish answering the question you asked in the first place.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I do not think he needs any help from the Premier, surely.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — I think the hon. gentleman will have the answers to all his questions before I am finished.

**Premier Douglas:** — More than he wants.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — In the matter of towns and villages served: in 1944, the Manitoba Power Commission was serving 156 towns and villages; in 1948, they were serving 245 towns and villages, an increase of 89. In Saskatchewan we were serving 146 in 1944, ten fewer than in Manitoba; in 1948, we are serving 375, an increase of 229 towns and villages.

I suggest that when you take this picture it indicates very clearly that we have made very great progress in the extension of our public utilities.

There is something else I would like to draw to the attention of the House . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I ask the hon. member to clarify those figures he has just given. Those figures do not indicate, as I understand it, an increase in the number of towns and villages actually served. They indicate the number of towns and villages served by the Power Commission. In other words, they include where you took over towns and villages already receiving electricity. Is that not correct?

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — Mr. Speaker, after all, here is a question I want to drive home to the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). He made the statement that the immediate post-war period was the same when we should have gone into a system of extension of our electrical system.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Rural electrification.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — Yes, rural electrification. The hon. member was not a member of the Legislature at that time. It may be that he never had occasion to call at the Power Commission office and ask for a power-light extension. Had he been doing so, he would have learned that the gentleman who was chairman of the Power Commission at that time was very anxious to make more extensions than he was able to do, but he was limited because materials were simply not procurable. I remember going down there as a private member and asking for an extension in my constituency, or to enquire into the possibility of getting it, and he said to me: "Sir, we have the money and we can get the men, but we cannot get the materials." There was a shortage of poles at one time. Then there was a time when they simply could not get insulators. Even today it is difficult to get transformers. During the immediate post-war years the Power Commission made use of all the materials they could buy, and, also, they spent nearly \$7 million of their money acquiring companies at a time when they could not have used that money to extend the existing system.

I want to draw a still further comparison between the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You haven't answered my question yet.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — The Manitoba Power Commission is carrying on a programme of rural electrification and farm electrification. They do not have to bother about the portion of the Manitoba population which is in the city of Winnipeg. When you subtract from the Manitoba population, according to the 1946 census, the population of Winnipeg, the Manitoba problem is to provide 419,429 people with electricity. Here in Saskatchewan, if you deduct from Saskatchewan's population, according to the 1946 census, the cities of Saskatoon, Regina and Moose Jaw — and it is questionable if Saskatoon should be deducted — the Saskatchewan Power Commission has to provide electrification to a population of 703,345. That is to say, the number of people that our problem concerns is about 90 percent more than in the province of Manitoba.

Now, a still further comparison is accomplished by exhibiting charts and maps in the Legislature. I am sure you cannot read that map, but it is a map of that portion of Saskatchewan which the Power Commission is attempting to serve. It shows the distinct Power Commission lines, and I have cut the northern part off here and, no doubt, in time we will be penetrating further north than this map goes. I have clipped off the margins so that the thing is all map. That is the size of the area. It isn't necessary that you should read it. It is simply the size of the area that we are attempting to serve. Here is a map of the Manitoba Power Commission lines, to the same scale. Their problem is a very much smaller problem than is ours. They have a concentrated population in an area — you can try it if you like — that will go at least three times into the area that the Power Commission of Saskatchewan is attempting to serve. The hon. member for Melfort says that we should take it right into the farmer's yard, just as they do in Manitoba. I want to draw to the attention of the House that if we were to do that we would be doing very much more than the Manitoba Power Commission. Here in Saskatchewan we not only have to build

the lines, but we have to build the power plants to energize those lines. We are going to have to spend, for some years to come, quite a large proportion of our budget on generating plants or else we are going to run into the trouble that has been run into in other parts of this country and of this world.

Manitoba may not always be in the happy position that she can sit there on a power line and say: "Here, Mr. Farmer, here is your power." There is evidence already that in the course of the next two years, before they are ready for further extension, it may prove that they may already be overextended in relation to the power plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am close to the end of my remarks, but I want to say something about the problem that is facing us in the future. Let no one suppose or assume that in the present power grid all we have to do is to run lines as we have been running them and we will come out with a satisfactory power system in the province.

In this province our energy is derived from a great number of small generating units. You will note that the hon. Minister of Railways, Labour and Industry away back in 1928-29 visualized a system which would be energized from a large capacity plant or from just a few of them. That gentleman had vision; but our system has grown up more or less haphazardly, with the result that we are going to have, as time goes along, to change our system of generation from a multiplicity of small plants to generation by a limited number of high-capacity generating stations placed in strategic positions in the province. We have 29 little diesel plants scattered here and there all through the province, and we have, of course, the larger and sounder proposition of our steam plant down at Estevan. We have a good plant in Saskatoon; a good one at Prince Albert.

When I was speaking to an engineer not very long ago, he used a new illustration which I think might be of value to the members of this House in their attempt to understand what our future development in the province will entail. He said: "Conceive your power grid as a fishing net. Suspend it over the province. That net is suspended by a lot of props; one at Watrous, one at Canora, one at Yorkton." — and at all those 29 points that I named. And he said that as the load grows on that net, it will sag more and more, and what we are doing is to stick in another prop. We are putting in another at Canora this summer; and another one at Watrous; we are increasing those little inefficient plants and we cannot help ourselves, we have to do it. Then he said: "What will have to be done before you have a well-designed power system in Saskatchewan will be the construction of a high voltage grid, superimposed on this low voltage grid, and energized from strategically located plants of high capacity." Then he said: "You could hang your net to the high voltage grid instead of propping it up from underneath with those little uneconomical units."

There are some very logical places in which to develop our large power generating units in the province. This engineer suggested, and it is immediately logical, that in the north-west of the province we have natural gas. We could use that to operate a large capacity generating plant. The Fort a la Corne development, up there east of Prince Albert, will one day have to be brought into use. It is a \$10 million project, and maybe that could be done, but it cannot be done this year. Then there is the plant down at Estevan which can be increased to a still greater capacity. If and when the South Saskatchewan

River project is completed, that will make a very useful contribution from the centre of the province. This engineer suggested to me that it might be cheaper, insofar as the south-west part of the province is concerned, to import power from Fort Peck in the United States rather than generate, unless we have some discovery there in the way of natural gas or a way of piping natural gas.

There is the picture for the future, according to this engineer. I am not an engineer, but it appeals to me; the development of this high-power grid which will be energized from large strategically-located plants from which the primary grid which we now have in process of development will be fed, and the elimination of all this accumulation of small uneconomic plants which have come into being in our haphazard system of power development.

I feel that I have taken up a lot of time in the House, and I want to say that I hope that the hon. members will give some thought to the problem with a proper consideration of all factors involved. This matter of power development is too important to our farmers to become a political football. The farmers are demanding this service, and when I say demanding, may I say that they are making applications, and I find them very easy to deal with. But there can be no absolute justice in the development of this system. As I see it, it can be said to be generally true that no one citizen of Saskatchewan has any more right to this power than another, that no one community in Saskatchewan has any greater right to the service of the power line than any other community. Yet the only way in which you could be absolutely just between individuals and between communities would be to follow the very basically-absurd, ridiculous and costly system of refusing service to everyone until you could provide service to all. We, who are given this responsibility, must somehow find a way in which we can make a choice of the route which our extensions will take. It isn't going to be easy, but we can at least be just to the extent that we can make our extensions where they will serve the greatest number of people per mile of line. That is one thing that could be done. If we follow that out, it will usually result in building the lines which will be the best economic projects.

We have in the Power Commission today somewhere between four and five thousand applications for power line extension, and I would not have it otherwise. I would not wish to have people on our farms who were content to remain, one moment longer than necessary, living in primitive homes.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, as a member sitting in this Assembly for the first time, I have observed with a good amount of interest the debate so far to date. While I have sat, I have attempted to assess statements of the various speakers, and I have arrived at a summary that may run something like this: I have sat and listened to hard-hitting members driving home point after point in their debate; I have heard puns made in relation to family allowances, and I am rather pleased to see the government members availing themselves of this benefit in such rapid succession; I have heard the Leader of the Opposition referred to as a “great shadow”, and I have seen, time and time again, this “great shadow” eclipse the

the brightness of the government's shining star; I have heard previews of the establishment of the beachhead of socialism on this continent. It has been stated, and I have heard utterances of responsible Cabinet Ministers declaring, that no obstacle will divert them from their determination to bring a state of socialism to this province.

In the face of this, we have the announced change in government policy, a policy now claimed as the proper one under which we can expect to go forward in a great expansive movement: "We are on the verge of a great industrial expansion," in the words of the Premier. If we are to go forward on this great expansion, it must be in other than C.C.F. shoes, and with that I am in total agreement.

We have observed, likewise, that all is not well with the industrial corporations. It has been claimed it was labour troubles, and our labour legislation is helpless to prevent them, in many instances. They have run into financial difficulties, and of course this has been enlarged upon. The shoe factory and the tannery have presented many problems, and they have been referred to — quite appropriately, I might say — as 'problem children'. As is the case with all problem children, we either seek to abandon them or to place them in the care of someone else. I only hope that some morning we may not arise to find that these problem children have been abandoned on the doorstep of the co-operatives. While we may have problem children, adolescents sometimes cause greater remorse, and I am rather inclined to put the sulphate and the brick plants in this category. I sometimes question whether the Premier's little jaunt to New York was not in an attempt to find foundling homes for these adolescents.

**Premier Douglas:** — You are wrong on that one.

**Mr. Cameron:** — All through the debate we have heard how the flag of socialism will fly on Parliament Hill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — The government members say 'Hear! Hear!' to that. But what I fail to understand is how they expect the flag of socialism to fly on Parliament Hill when now it is flying at half-mast in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — We didn't have to haul our flag down altogether like you did.

**Mr. Cameron:** — We go into the educational picture, and we find the same story. We find some regions where we have the larger units, and some regions where we have not. We find that people have petitioned for a larger unit, and have not received their vote. Some have petitioned against it. We find, in this same sphere, that great crusading spirit that was to bring to the people, in spite of the people, these great things which were in the interest of the people, has dwindled out of the educational programme. We find, apparently, there is no one to re-spark

it, because, if the larger unit is good for one district — and I am not saying whether it is or it is not — then it must naturally follow that it must be for the interest of all. Then why the hesitancy in forcing the Larger School Unit over the whole province?

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Liberal sabotage.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why don't you hold the vote the way you promised?

**Mr. Cameron:** — We find another period of hesitancy on the part of the government, and until the Minister of Education has brought down his full report, I only wish to say that it is becoming more and more the pronounced opinion of government leaders and military leaders that education should consist of three things: not only should we develop the mental abilities of the child, but we should, at the same time, encourage the spiritual and the physical development. If we go on, we may spend millions in defence to protect ourselves from foreign ideologies, which these foreign ideologies make us subject to attack, and are prepared mentally, spiritually and physically to prevent those attacks, then there is the danger of undermining from within the very foundation upon which our freedom of government is based. I am rather inclined to believe that keeping books in our schools which, rather than take this positive approach in the full development of the child, in the full awareness of the problems facing the civilized and democratic worlds today, take a regressive attitude, are assisting in the promotion of those very ideologies.

In oil development we find the same hesitancy, inaction, uncertainty, we find the Premier speaking on oil development. He mentioned the great expansion about to take place. He mentioned that Saskatchewan had become a 'hot spot'. I agree with him. Alberta, however, was a little more sensitive in practising — perhaps a little too sensitive — and objected to that statement. They went on to show, in defence of their position, that they had earned some million dollars in the last ten and one-half months. But I think the Alberta government misunderstood, because Saskatchewan is the 'hot spot' of the oil industry. As the Premier stated, they are visiting, and repeatedly visiting his office, but not with directives as to where to drill, or what to look forward to; they know those places; but a constant coming in for re-negotiation as to the government's attitude on this whole problem.

We have, in the constituency of Maple Creek, a large area which geologists have surveyed. Test wells have been dug, oil is found there, gas wells likewise; but in spite of the great activity there is no actual development going on. When I speak to the oil men and ask them why we have not a positive development in that constituency, they confirm it has one of the brightest prospects for developing into a great oil and gas area anywhere to be found on this continent. When I ask them why it is not being developed, invariably I get the answer that they are persistent in their desire to come in and develop that area, and that repeatedly they make trips to the Premier's office in order to negotiate with him, but that they come to a semi-settlement and adjustment, go back to their work, continue to develop, only to find a new Order in Council has gone through and cancelled all the work that has been done before.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to get into a great expansion of oil development, then the first step is to cut out this game of cat and mouse with the oil companies. We cannot expect the gas and oil in the province of Saskatchewan to be developed if we keep the oil men half fettered and half free. If it is the intention of the government to socialize the oil and gas industry, to develop it on their own, I would say, let them get on with it. If it is the intention to turn it over to the private individual and private capital, then I would say, by all means, do this; but, by all means, let us work a definite programme, either for or against, so that these particular men will know where they are going, and how.

I heard the Premier remark — and I think it was in the town of Fox Valley during the election campaign, with reference to the present Leader of the Opposition; “Why the Leader of the Liberal party is like a hen in the snow. He stands on one foot and then on the other, and does not know which way to go.” If that is characteristic of the Leader of the Opposition, it is a hundredfold more applicable to the government’s attitude towards the oil men in this province.

Coming, as I do, from the constituency of Maple Creek, I have in that constituency Health Region No. 1 of Swift Current. When the member for Gull Lake (Mr. Murray) rose to speak, I was quite interested in what he might say regarding Health Region No. 1, and whether he would lay before this Chamber a picture of the operations of the Health Region in order that we may have at least some information to guide us in the future. Unfortunately, he had very little to say about Health Region No. 1. In fact, he made only two statements. He said, first, the only ones satisfied with Health Region No. 1 are those outside of the region, and in order to do one better than the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) in explaining the municipal system, he made this remarkable statement: “There is no one within the Health Region of Swift Current who is asked to pay one nickel either for hospital or doctor services, regardless where he may be referred.” Mr. Speaker, I could only think that either the member for Gull Lake is totally ignorant of the situation or, knowing the facts, is not at liberty to divulge them.

**Mr. Murray:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I believe the member stated that I said the people of Health Region No. 1 had nothing to pay if they were referred out on hospitalization or doctors’ bills. When I stated that — I corrected it at the time — the Health Region had nothing to do with the hospitals, but that was true of doctors’ bills.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — He did say that.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I tried to listen to the hon. member’s explanation, but I was particularly interested because he started just before the supper recess, and I copied down the exact wording, because I thought perhaps I had honestly misunderstood him. When we returned after the eight o’clock session, I took down the exact statement again. Now, while I may have misunderstood the words, nevertheless I think the words are exactly as I repeated them. If the hon. member objects to that, it is a simple matter to verify the words, and if I find I am mistaken I will withdraw the remark.



I want to deal, briefly with Health Region No. 1, and I want to say that I am not going to deal with it in a critical manner. It is something which is new. It is something which we people have been attempting to work out alone; a scheme in which we are attempting to supply medical services to that whole area, and it is a scheme that is worthy of merit, and worthy of some consideration. If we are to have a true picture of any particular scheme of this scope, we must look at it from both sides of the ledger; both the points which are favourable, and those which are not so favourable.

We began our scheme in 1946, in which we undertook to supply medical services, including surgery, to all the residents of that area. It has had some three years in which to assess the working of Health Region No. 1. In order to be fair to that region, we have problems there that are peculiar, perhaps, to that area alone. That is, we would not find them in another Health Region. We have a large area, and it is not heavily populated. It is an area, likewise, that is subjected to repeated crop failures, and also an area of low assessment, and we have no large centres within the whole Health Region, with the exception of the city of Swift Current. To further complicate the problem we face there, we have a large area bordering the Alberta boundary, which are removed some 45 to 65 miles from any medical centre, and they have sought their medical attention in the city of Medicine Hat in Alberta.

No attempt has been made by our Board in Health Region No. 1 to bring these medical services to the people in these remote areas. What we are attempting to do there is merely to extend the facilities now in existence in the centres in the area. That is, where we have doctors and hospitals before, we have them yet, and we have not built any hospitals nearer the remote areas, nor have we brought any medical men into those remote areas. We have attempted to concentrate our work on building up the services from the existing centres. I want to point out just now the fact that we have not engaged in a programme involving the spending of any large sums of money in order to bring these services nearer to the people. As I say, we have tried to improve on the existing service which is being rendered. This should be the basis on which we should assess the operation of Health Region No. 1.

We began, in 1946, with this understanding: 25 percent of the cost of operating the scheme was to be borne by a land tax, and 75 percent by personal tax. We began with an assessment on the land of \$100,000 — I am just using round figures here — and with the personal tax. We established a personal tax for medical services of \$10 per single person, \$20 for a family of two, \$30 for a family of three or more. That netted us a personal tax in 1946 and 1947 of approximately \$239,000. That gave us a total levy, for carrying our medical expenditures of approximately \$339,000. By the end of December, 1946 we found this: we ran into a certain amount of uncollected taxes; we had arrears of land taxes of approximately \$12,000; we had arrears of personal tax of \$8,400. To add to the complication, we found ourselves with a deficit of \$79,000.

At the beginning of 1947 we did three things. Like any other business you cannot budget expenditures without being reasonably sure of what your income is. So we approached the provincial government and asked them to assist us due to the deficit of \$79,000 we had incurred the first year, and we got a \$20,000 grant to help us wipe out that deficit. Then we did this:

in order to assure ourselves that the income or assessment we assessed would be collected, we made the municipality responsible for the collection of both the land tax and the personal tax. That is, it works like this: if, at the end of the year, the rural municipality or village has 12, 15 or 20 people who did not pay the \$35 per family for their medical attention, or who did not pay their land tax, then by December 31 in any one year the municipality must forward to the health region, from their general funds, the amount of uncollected personal and land tax within the municipality. As the Act now stands, the way we are operating, any member within the municipality will walk into the secretary's office and demand his health card. There is no dollar down; there is no commitment other than he will, of course, be expected to pay it. If you have transients, or movement of people, as soon as one person changes from one municipality to the other, then the central office notifies the secretary of that particular municipality that this new resident has moved in. If the new resident does not call for his medical card, then it becomes the business of the secretary to forward it to him, so that he receives his medical card, and is permitted then to receive his medical care. We thought by doing this, by asking the municipality to guarantee this indebtedness, if it should occur, and asking the municipality to guarantee this indebtedness, if it should occur, and by the \$20,000 grant from the government., that by 1947 we would be in a position to wipe out the deficit of \$79,000. But, by the end of 1947, we found in place of reducing our debt, it had increased to \$91,000. Now we come into 1948. Again in 1948 we are attempting to meet, not only the current expenditures, but to reduce our deficit. In 1948, the beginning of the term we did three things: we raised the land tax from \$100,000 to \$160,000; we raised the personal tax from \$376,000 to \$474,000. We increased the personal tax in this manner: increased the single person from \$10 to \$15 for medical costs; for a family of two, from \$20 to \$24; \$30 for a family of three; \$35 for a family of four or more. While we have not the financial statement yet for the end of the year, accompanying this increase in taxation we curtailed some of the services we had formerly rendered which we felt was costing us too great an expense.

We used to have, due to the large remote areas far removed from medical attention, a certain area marked off where these people were free to go to the city of Medicine Hat and receive their medical attention there — they had some 60, 70, 75-odd miles to travel. Then we found that while these people were taking their medical care across the border, we had worked on a different system with the Medicine Hat hospital than we had worked with the hospitals within the unit. Within the unit, under the hospitalization plan, certain things are provided free to the patient, nevertheless charged to the hospital. Under the Alberta, seeing it is across the line, they naturally would not supply any services free to the patient. Those patients were asked then to pay for any difference other than the services rendered by the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Plan. Those people sometimes came out of the hospital with \$40 or \$50 owing, due to certain rooms, examinations, special drugs, operating room fees and so forth, which were over and above what the hospitalization scheme granted. Then we found that too many patients, perhaps, were taking advantage of the medical services in the city of Medicine Hat, so we restricted those people in order to cut down the expenses. We allowed only the municipalities bordering the Alberta boundary to go out of the province for their medical attention. The others must go to their local doctor, and may not go elsewhere unless he is referred to some other doctor.

We are attempting, at the present time, to map the area so that eventually no one will be permitted to go outside of the area for his primary medical services, unless he is referred to a specialist for something the local doctors cannot treat. In order to keep the hospitals operating at full bed capacity, we will have to further restrict the right of these people to take their services from Medicine Hat, and thus they will be compelled to go even greater distances in order to get those services. The first two years we granted dental services to children up to sixteen. In 1948 we made a change in that. Prior to that you could take your child, up to sixteen, to any local dentist for treatment, and we found that the local dentists' bills by the end of the year was some \$18,000. So then we established what we called 'Dental Clinics'; put those Dental Clinics on the road in order to service the rural areas, and then we added the restriction that if anyone took his child to a dentist other than the regional dentists, travelling in the clinic, the region would not be responsible for that bill. The regional clinics, so far to date, have only made a small start; they have visited a few isolated points, but the backlog of dental care is so large that they are held months sometimes in place of weeks at particular points. We have the biggest portion of the whole area, for the past year, that have not and will not for some time be able to avail themselves of the dental clinic. Thus, those people have the grievance that if they take their children to a dentist, they must pay the full bill themselves.

We still find in Health Region No. 1 that our isolated towns and villages still have no further — or I should put it this way, still have medical services no closer than they have had before, and we find that in place of the medical clinics, laid out in an isolated community, we find them, during the winter, due to their lack of wanting to go into isolated areas, we find we have one dental clinic working in the city of Swift Current. I do not know how many dentists we have in the city of Swift Current. We have one dental clinic stationed there; we have one dental clinic for the winter stationed in the town of Maple Creek, which has two practising dentists in the town; we have one dental clinic in the town of Leader, which has one practising dentist in the town. In the isolated areas, small villages, hamlets, 45 to 60 miles removed, they must still take their children 45 to 60 miles to get dental attention, and they pay their dentists when they go there. In place of our dental clinics being in the isolated rural areas, there is a tendency, during the winter months, to go into the town areas which are already being serviced.

We put our doctors on a basis of a 25 percent discount on the 1938 fees. If, for instance, you are referred to specialist outside of the region, as I understand it, the region will pay its share of the specialists' charges on the basis of the 1938 fees, and the patient will be expected to pay the difference in the specialists' fees today, which are considerably higher than they were in 1938. We will find many referred cases which are costing them anywhere from \$150 to \$200 for medical attention outside the region.

So I say I would like to counteract that idea that it is not costing the people anything in Health Region No. 1, and that we may be referred anywhere for medical attention. I do not say this, Mr. Speaker, with the idea of belittling Health Region No. 1, but with the idea of pointing out that we are in an area that is subject to repeated crop failures, has an isolated population, and a low assessment of land; are finding, excellent as the scheme may be, I do not think you will find so much objection to the principle or the idea, but

that it is beyond the financial ability of the people to pay; and unless we can find some means either to increase the assistance from the provincial government or some other means to lower the overhead cost, we are going to be burdened with an undertaking that is creeping up each year. It began at \$79,000, and is up to \$91,000 at the end of 1947, and I hope not, but I have been given to understand in 1948 we had a substantial increase in that deficit.

I say again, we have, likewise, with us the Larger School Unit, and much as the advantages and improvements in the schools in some districts . . .

**Mr. Murray:** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? I just wonder if the hon. member knows that in the region — before he leaves that part of his speech — they have an agreement with the medical profession that their budget will just go so much, and it is pro rated among them according to the work they do there?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I did not know that the contract was definitely signed, but they were negotiating with the medical men in order to try to stabilize their income. The medical services were so fluctuating that the busier the doctors were, the higher went up the cost, and they have attempted to put the doctors on a basis whereby they will earn so much for the year and no more, regardless of how many patients they may have to treat after that. In other words, it is a semi-salary arrangement.

I just want to say in closing that we are in a position there to observe the effects of the Health Region, the effects of the Larger School Unit, and those operations on a large scale that we operate ourselves, with our own Board, but I fear that in spite of any great gains or advancements that may have been made, if it continues under the present trend in this province of placing the responsibility of all these social services back upon the municipality, then eventually we will be loaded with a debt that will be beyond our ability to pay. Because of this policy of establishing schemes, good as they may be, and then leaving it in the hands of the local people to finance and work out, then I would say it is too dangerous an operation to expect the rural people of the province to carry, and because of that I shall not support the motion.

**Mr. N.L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for the first time in this new Legislature, I want first to join with other members who have congratulated you, Sir, on your appointment to the office you now hold. I want, also, to extend congratulations to other members, both on the government side of the House and on the opposition side, who have risen in their places for the first time in this House and spoken. I am not an old member, but I did serve in this House for the last four years and I do know how difficult it is to get here and try to express, on your feet, the thoughts that you may have while sitting in your seat. While this is not the first time I have spoke, I still find considerable difficulty in it. For that reason, I say that these men who have spoken previously and made their maiden speeches in this House, to have done as well as they have done, which has been no mean effort, this is something that they should be congratulated on.

Coming into a session after an election, such as we are doing now, certain things that transpired during the election campaign are bound to be rehashed here. It is just, more or less, the same as the good husband and wife discussing the day's business before finally going to sleep in the privacy of their own bedroom at night. However, I intend to say more about this toward the close of my speech.

I wish the member that has just spoken (Mr. Cameron) would have remained in his seat, but I can appreciate his position because there is nothing I want more than anything else after I get through speaking, than a good drink of water and a smoke. I suppose he has retired for that. His comments served well to introduce what I intend to say at the outset of my speech. I want to refer to some of the things that have been done towards health in this province. I want to refer to our Hospitalization Act, and what this Act has meant to countless men and women and their children in this province. Nations and people are, to a large extent, judged by what they have done or what they are doing for those in their midst who are in need. That is one of the yardsticks by which we judge civilization. I don't think we need to hang our heads in this province to any other province in the Dominion of Canada or any other place in the North American continent.

Realizing that, within the limitations of provincial boundaries, there are things that we cannot do that we would like to do. The hon. member for Maple Creek has just got through telling us some of the difficulties they have experienced in their health region. I noticed that he associated himself with that region. It was a good thing to hear. In associating himself with it, and when referring to it, he used the words 'we' and 'us'. I think he must, more or less, agree with the scheme, and I think he gave us a fairly good analysis of the difficulties they are having in that health region. It just serves to accentuate what I am saying, that it is difficult within the boundaries of any small district such as a province or health region, such as he is talking about, to bring in all of the social services that we need, but we will never get anywhere unless we start. We will have to take steps. Those steps may be very hesitant, at first, and there may be many falls, but they are trying to institute, in a limited manner, a system of socialized health services in Health Region No. 1. I hope they are able to succeed. They are experiencing a lot of difficulties, which they no doubt expected to experience. But from the lessons they are now learning in that pioneering health region in their province, we will be able to go on and try to avoid those things that they are having trouble with, or modify them and suit them to our own particular economy. I have talked to many people in this province. Just over the weekend I visited a young couple in the city that have a child. Unfortunately, the child has been ill ever since birth. It has spent considerable amount of time in the hospital. This young couple is just getting started in married life. Their hospital bill would have amounted to some three or four hundred dollars at the very least. Now, young people starting out in married life don't have much of an opportunity if they get a crack like that first thing off the bat. Well, these people expressed to me their appreciation of The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. They said that his \$300 or \$400 doctor bill, which they would have had to pay, will pay for their health services card for a good many years to come. I believe, for most people, if there was some matter by which they could make some agreement with some supernatural power whereby they could deposit a sum of \$10, \$20 or \$30, as the case may be, each

year for the rest of their lives, and that supernatural power would guarantee to them that no member of their family would ever enter into a hospital, it would be an agreement well entered into.

The hon. members of the opposition have tried to bring up isolated cases and compare municipal schemes of hospitalization with our present scheme. Well, that may be all right. It might be a fair comparison in some districts, but I represent a constituency a third of which is Local Improvement District land, a third of which is very low-assessed land and very few people living in it. No municipal scheme could be made to apply to these people. No municipal scheme could be applied, in any of our lower assessed municipalities, that would compare in price to the scheme now in effect in the province. The Health Region Act that this government brought in during the past four years has made it possible for a plan such as the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) has just spoken about to be brought into being. Our Health Region No. 2, the one which embraces a large part of Notukeu-Willowbunch, has not embarked on nearly as comprehensive a scheme, but now they have a method whereby they can plan where they need hospitals, where they need health outposts, and where they need nursing homes, and thereby bring the necessary facilities for health to their people.

Another thing I want to compliment this government on is the bringing into being of a system of hospitalization grants. Last year I asked a question which was placed on the Order Paper in this House, concerning several of the hospitals in my own constituency. I used my own constituency as a yardstick. I would believe it would apply equally to any other constituency in the province, and another reason why I used my own constituency as a yardstick is because I know the situation there better than in other parts of this province. I intend to take one hospital on the far eastern side of the constituency and another hospital on the far western side of the constituency. This is for no particular reason at all, but I am just giving it to you in that manner. I could have given you other hospitals in the constituency. However, here is the equipment grant received by a hospital in Val Marie of the sum of \$5,000 in 1946. Willowbunch, on the eastern side of the constituency, received a building grant for their hospital of \$4,000. Val Marie received a loan of \$3,000 — \$8,000 for Val Marie with which to build a hospital. Willowbunch received a loan of \$4,000 - \$8,000 with which to build a hospital. It is very likely that these districts could not have built a hospital had it not been for these grants. At least, they could not have built the type of hospital necessary to serve their communities. Now, if any of you are ever in these towns, I would like to have you examine these hospitals. Go through them as I have done. They are designed to meet the needs of those districts, and they were built with financial assistance from this government; something that has never been done before.

Then too, in connection with health, we have the air ambulance service. Last year I asked the government how many people have availed themselves of their ambulance service in my constituency. I found out that last year, at about this time, there were over 60 people that were flown in in the air ambulance. The people of my constituency are largely people that live in remote communities where, no matter how effective a snow clearing programme might be, they would never be able to avail themselves of the use of the roads

because they have miles and miles to go over hills and valleys and coulees, etc. To them this air ambulance service has meant a great deal. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking in this debate, I believe he said that we had such a service before this government came into office. We still have pilots with small planes out in the country that do emergency trips, but I shudder to think of what would happen if the air ambulance pulled out of the picture and left the transportation of emergency cases to hospitals. As the Premier pointed out, in his rebuttal, they haven't the facilities in the first place. Those planes are all equipped with radios. When they are bringing a patient in, long before they reach the landing field they are able to radio for an ambulance to come in. They are equipped with staff to look after these planes and make them as safe as it is humanly possible to do so. It is gone about in a systematic manner. When a person is suddenly taken ill, or an accident has happened, they know right away where to get hold of the air ambulance, while, if it was left in the hands of private pilots, private organizations, they might be phoning for hours before they located the correct place to get hold of a plane.

Now these things, the grants to these hospitals, The Hospitalization Act, all of these things have assisted municipalities either directly or indirectly. They assisted the municipalities of taking the burden off the local taxpayer, or hospitalizing many of their people. They have lifted the burden off municipalities in Willowbunch to the tune of \$4,000, in Val Marie to the tune of \$5,000. Now this is no mean help.

We have heard considerable criticism of the Department of Highways. The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson), when he was Leader of the Opposition, happened to hear a song one day and he made a little ditty of it, and he has been singing it in this House about our highways ever since. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been over some of the roads that the previous government built. We have one running out of Assiniboia, No. 2 to the south. It was built, I believe, around 1941 or 1942. That road is completely worn out today. We cannot travel over that road after the first snow. The year before last, the Department of Highways rebuilt an extension on the south end of that road. That road has been in operation and has been travelled over for the last two years and to date there hasn't been a bit of snow lay on that road. That road will last for years to come, and I have been advised that it did not cost any more per mile than the previous road cost the old government. Construction methods of roads now, I will admit, have improved due to the fact of the invention of the LeTourneau. It is much simpler to build roads and back-slope the ditches and make them more serviceable as winter highways. I think wide roads, high roads with shallow ditches are our only answer to winter roads. The business of building a narrow road in a 66-foot right-of-way, where you haven't got room to make a shallow ditch alongside of the road, and then trying to keep it open with a snow plow in the winter time, and every time you go over it you shove the snow up and up and up until finally when the spring comes and the thaws start, you haven't any snow out in the fields, the only place you have any snow is right in the middle of your roads. I think the Department of Highways would be well advised to consider cutting down on its snow removal programme and putting that money into road construction in the summer time. That does not mean, Mr. Minister, that if you are embarking on a comprehensive snow removal programme next winter that I won't be asking you to open roads in my constituency.

Many members have compared municipal grants for road construction in this House. The same comparison holds true of my constituency, as it holds true of other constituencies. Last year I asked a question in the House, asking the Minister of Highways to tell me how much money was spent in grants, maintenance and construction and secondary construction in the different municipalities in my constituency from 1934 to 1948. Well, I will take the Willowbunch Municipality No. 42, over on the eastern side of the constituency, and if I ran over the whole thing you would see the same picture holds true here that does in other parts of it. I will just go down from 1940. In 1940-41, they received a total of \$1,058.16; in 1941-42, they didn't get anything for a grant, but for maintenance there was \$686; in 1942-43, they got a grant of \$750; in 1943-44, it was \$500. Then in 1944-45, it jumped up to \$2,000 of a grant. We entered the picture from then on. In 1945-46, it was \$700, etc. I notice that the increase in grants there in that municipality for roads, from 1939 to 1944, they received \$6,345. From 1944 to 1948, they received \$12,220. Willowbunch also received a grant from the Department of Education of \$800 for the construction of a high school. Add to that the grant and the loan that they received for the construction of their hospital, and I find that the total grant that the Willowbunch municipality received from 1944 to 1948 was \$21,699. Now, the total grant that they received from 1939 to 1944 was \$10,660. In other words, from 1944 to 1948, Willowbunch Municipality received \$11,039 more than they did from 1939 to 1944. That holds true of all the municipalities in the constituency. That holds true of the L.I.D.'s and yet the opposition asks this government to do more to lift the burden off the shoulders of the local municipalities.

Another thing that has been of service to the people of my constituency, and I hope it will be extended, is the bus service of the Transportation Company. Away back in the 1930's — I don't remember the exact year, but I think it was 1937 or 1938 — the Greyhound Bus Company was running a bus down to Rockglen — such as it was — and we thought quite a bit about that service, but they found it wasn't a paying proposition so they pulled out. Last spring the Saskatchewan Transportation Company proceeded to reinstate this service, and it is a service that we appreciate a great deal. We can get on a bus there in the morning and come into Regina. We can spend five or six hours in here, doing any necessary business, and get back home that same night. I have known cases where tractors, combines or other farm equipment has broken down in the afternoon. The farmer has rushed into town and phoned a company here in Regina or Moose Jaw and said: "I need this repair. Please get it on the bus," and that night he is able to pick it up in his local town, and before morning he has it on his tractor and is able to start operations the next day. With our train service, if anything like that happened, he would wait five days, or at least two days before he could get that same repair for it. I hope that the bus service will be extended. I don't think the Transportation Company should be judged by the balance sheet, whether it is in the red or in the black. I think that the primary consideration should be service; service to the remote communities of this province. I am not particularly interested in whether the people in a town in which they have daily train service have bus service or not; they have a service that serves quite well. But in places where there are only one or two trains a week, where people have a great deal of difficulty getting out and getting back in, I think these are the places that the Minister of Highways and the Transportation Company should stress to try and get their



buses into these places. We have, away down in the south-western part of my constituency, bordering on the Gull Lake constituency, a town which the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Murray) described to you the other day. The railroad came in from the west and it also came in from the east, and they quit with about 20 miles in between. All the pressure that we know how to bring has been brought to bear on the railroad company, but they are not interested in completing this railroad. So that gap is there. They get all the business anyway, so why go to the expense of completing the railway. Perhaps, Mr. Minister, if our buses went into there, it might speed up the railroad company a little bit into completing this line, because I have no doubt that the bus company would get a considerable amount of business which now goes to the railroad.

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and other members bemoaned the fact that we haven't a second Leduc in Saskatchewan. I don't intend to say very much about this. Other members have ably replied, but let us, for a moment, look at Alberta. What has oil done for the farmers of Alberta? The government of Alberta has sold its oil resources to the major oil companies. These oil companies have not lowered the price of oil to the farmers. Whatever royalties the government takes from them are charged back to the farmers in the price that they have to pay for oil. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that with this government in office, if and when oil is discovered in this province, every step possible will be taken to insure that the people of this province benefit from the development of that oil, and not the oil companies.

They talked about timber, fur and about fish. Well, I don't know very much about timber. I do know a little bit about fur, and, as far as fish is concerned, we don't have any down south, but it strikes me funny that if the government's policy in this regard were so terrible that those constituencies in which these things are taken out of should, to a large extent, vote C.C.F. I don't understand that. I intend to go into the election returns in these seats later, but it appears to me to be an illogical conclusion on the part of the opposition. The Minister of Natural Resources claims that about 60 percent of the timber cut in the province comes from his constituency. I used to trap a lot down south — muskrats, rabbits, coyotes; we didn't bother with the rabbits except for feed for our dogs because we could only get five cents a hide for them and that wasn't worthwhile skinning them for. Muskrats were 25 cents to 75 cents a hide during the best years of the twenties. I found that just a year before our Saskatchewan Government Fur Marketing Service went into effect that boys down home weren't getting much more for their muskrats and they were getting very little for their rabbits. The year after the Fur Marketing Service was instituted, I find about a 50 to 100 percent increase, with the result that all the boys down there that do any casual trapping are shipping their furs to the Fur Marketing Service. It only stands to reason, Mr. Speaker. Where the middleman is eliminated, where large quantities of fur are brought in and graded and made up into garment lots, that they should have a better net return to the trapper than where the middleman comes out and buys the furs out in the country, because he is going to a considerable expense and he is not doing it for nothing. So it only stands to reason that the Fur Marketing Service is giving the trapper a better return for his furs than he received before.

A lot has been said about telephones. Well, officials tell me that the traffic on telephones is some three or four times as much today as it was a few years ago. They tell me that they cannot begin to get the material to catch up to the needs of the telephone service, and sometimes I get very much put out about the type of service we are getting. I live in a little town where there is only one phone and when I get a call someone has to bring over a message, and by the time I get back to the telephone office the wires are all engaged and I have to wait a half an hour — sometimes I have waited as long as three hours — before I am able to get through to the party I wanted to speak to. But I am pleased to note that there are several lines and extensions built in my own constituency during the past year, and I hope this development will continue.

The other day the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) was speaking about rural electrification. He made one statement with which I heartily agree. That is, in this province, where people live on large tracts of land, particularly true of the area south and west of here along the Alberta boundary and along the United States boundary, where, in order to have an economic unit, an individual will have to have two or three sections of land. That means that he is going to be several miles from his next neighbour. That also means that no matter what any government does, they are not going to be able to bring to him the benefits of high-line power. So something else will have to be done to bring the benefit of electricity to that remote farm home. I heartily agree with the member when he suggested, and I think it was good coming from that side of the House, that the government explore the possibilities of purchasing in large quantities portable or economic electric power units for distribution to farmers of this type. I think he had something there, and believe, me, it will get my wholehearted support.

With regard to our old people, mothers in need of social assistance, I don't think this government need be at all ashamed of what it has done. We have, in my little town, a lady who is in receipt of mothers' allowance. Her husband is a cripple in a wheel chair and they have four children. When this government took office, Mr. Speaker, that lady was receiving — that is four years ago — \$35 a month from the municipality, of which, of course, the provincial government paid part. \$35 a month with which to feed, clothe, educate and hospitalize that family of six. Today she is receiving well over \$100 a month from the municipality and from the federal government. She also is receiving the family allowance from the federal government, which has been of wonderful assistance to many people in this province as in other parts of Canada. In addition to this, she has a card which entitles her and her entire family to medical services; her hospitalization is also paid for.

With regard to old age pensions, the hon. members opposite, whenever speaking of old age pensions, fail to mention that the old age pensioners of this province get complete medical services which is not provided by the government of other provinces of the dominion.

**An Hon. Member:** — They have to pay for it.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — When this government came into office it set up a Reconstruction Department to look after the affairs of the veterans returning from overseas. They developed

a system of allocating Crown lands, and that has been quite a headache in most cases. Instead of putting the names of veterans who wanted a piece of land into a hat and drawing them out and letting the lucky one take the piece of land, they allocated on a point system; so many points for service; so many points for everything that could be taken into consideration; and tried to develop a systematic manner or systematic way in which to allocate these lands. Now it is true, perhaps, that some mistakes might have been made. In trying to deal with a thing like that fairly, there is no doubt that it is impossible to develop a system whereby you will suit every case. But I believe it is far superior to just throwing the names in a hat and drawing them out, and letting whoever came along first take the land. Yet, with a system of that kind, we would have avoided a terrific amount of headaches.

We took advantage of a lot of surplus war buildings that were in this province to develop temporary housing. There was a terrific housing shortage in this province. And the assets which were declared surplus by the federal government were taken over by this province and resold in the fairest manner possible. This was done in order to avoid speculative interests getting hold of these things and building fortunes on what the people of Canada had already paid for once.

We set up the Government Insurance Office with the result that insurance rates in Saskatchewan are low, if now lower, than they are in any other province in the dominion. If we had never written a single policy and had thus been able to cut down the cost of insurance to the people of this province, we would have performed a useful service. This office also looks after The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. The Minister, the other day in speaking of this Act, pointed out the details of the Act and, at the same time, compared it with what it cost for similar insurance in other parts of Canada, so it is not necessary for me to go into that. But I just have to give two cases of people in my own constituency that have benefited under this Act. I have here a letter from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office regarding The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. I don't intend to give the name of this person, but the hon. members can take my word for it that it is true. The young husband was killed in an accident when a tractor he was riding on was run into by a jeep. The tractor over-turned. Payments were made as follows: supplementary allowance for medical expenses before death — \$10; principal sum to the widow — \$3,000; allowance for three secondary dependants — \$1,875; funeral expenses — \$125; a total payment of \$5,010. In this case when the father was killed, there was a child yet unborn. Payment was made for this child when it was born.

Here is another case somewhat similar: the young husband was killed in a collision. To his widow, two children and yet unborn child, his death was a tragic loss. They also faced serious financial insecurity. Saskatchewan's Automobile Accident Act, designed to give protection and security in cases of this kind, helped out. The widow received a cheque for \$5,050. There was \$3,000 for herself, and \$625 for each of her children, including the unborn child; \$125 for funeral expenses, and \$50 for medical costs. Both of these cases happened in my own constituency. Now, if individuals living in the community in which these two young widows were residing were called upon to donate to their welfare, they would have been glad to have done so, and many would have contributed substantially more than what the automobile accident

insurance cost them, but there was no way of giving them any substantial amount of money. It was calling on individuals to take responsibility for doing this. It would be expensive to so organize such a scheme over the province in order to do anything like this, so this government had made it possible for all of us, with a minimum of cost, to provide security for those who may suffer loss as a result of automobile accidents in this province. They have done it in a way that it costs us a bare minimum.

I was one of those people who was a school teacher before the war, and then, while I was in uniform, I was elected to serve in this Legislature and found it inconvenient to go back to the teaching profession, but that was my profession for some 14 years and it lies very near and very dear to my heart. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly interested in what this government and other governments have done toward education. For several years I campaigned in my own community to set up a larger administrative unit under the terms of the old Larger Administrative Unit Act, brought in by the Liberal government. It was an uphill and heartbreaking job. I didn't get to first base. By the time I had one community interested and proceeded to get another one just nicely coming along, the first community had ceased to be interested, and so nothing was done. Then along came Mr. Aberhardt and slapped in the Larger Administrative Unit across Alberta from south to north and from east to west, and he ran for re-election and was elected with a substantial majority. So the people of Alberta must have liked the larger administrative unit. This fall, people in my own community voted on the Larger Administrative Unit in that community, with the result that they voted themselves into a larger unit. Now the entire area of my constituency lies within the boundary of several Larger Administrative Units. I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for these larger units in my constituency, I might have been defeated in this election. However, be it as it may, they have signified their desire to enter into this scheme. I don't propose to debate the merits or demerits of the Larger Administrative Unit here, but the Larger Administrative Unit has shown that it is able to give more and better service at less cost to the people of this province. Argue as they will, the opposition cannot show any different. They can take individual cases, certainly. Before the Larger Administrative Unit went in in our district we were paying a mill rate of 33 mills; one of the highest in the province. That mill rate now will be cut down to 15 or less. In other words, our taxes will be cut in half. Now it is true, there are districts in which the school is closed at the present time due to the people moving into town, or most of the land being incorporated into Larger Farm Units. There are such districts that have no mill rate at all, but when you average the whole thing you find that it runs up around 20 mills over that same Larger Administrative Unit that is now organized.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) mentioned the Drouth Area Debt Adjustment Act. I think he would have been well advised not to say anything about it. I remember when I was teaching school in those years, I had a cupboard full of notes. I thought those notes would be paid some day because there were arrears of taxes piling up, but then the government of the day made a gift to the mortgage companies and wiped out those arrears in taxes, and my notes weren't worth anything until they finally brought in the education . . .

**Mr. Culliton:** — May I ask my hon. friend a question? I don't like to interrupt your speech, but were the notes eventually paid.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Yes. This government has finished paying the debts that were accumulated by the school districts in those years. I want to say this, too, for the benefit of the hon. members, that I was one of the teachers that cancelled all interest on my notes when they were finally paid.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I think the people of the province paid it, not this government.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — In answer to that question, the people of the province always pay, whatever any government spends. This government has no magic formula for making money, and if we did we would be liable to get into trouble with Ottawa about it.

**An Hon. Member:** — They thought they had one.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Anyway, our security was wiped out, so what happened? The education tax was put into effect at that time, and we teachers were led to believe that that education tax would go into the fund as an additional amount in order to pay up our back bills, and in order to increase our salaries which were terribly low. If anyone gets married on \$40 a month like I did, they will know what I am talking about. This didn't happen. Instead of increasing the amount spent on education, by the amount of education tax, as we expected, that didn't happen. And, instead of making additional grants to school districts in order to pay this off, they made a loan to school districts with the result that when good times, in order to meet these loans, the farmers who were now in a position to buy back their mortgages had to pay increased taxes to pay for the taxes that were cancelled under the Drouth Area Debt Adjustment Act. So I say again, Mr. Speaker, the member for Gravelbourg should have soft-pedalled that part of Liberal administration.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Could you tell me when your last note for your teaching salary arrears was paid?

**Mr. Buchanan:** — I know what you are driving at. It was paid before this government came into office, but I don't remember the year. It was paid in about 1941 or 1942. It was loaned to the Board of course, and the Board paid me.

This government has instituted a system of equalization grants. Education is the joint responsibility of all of us. We saw that plan put into effect during the war years. When our young men that had natural ability joined our forces, whether it was the Army, Navy or the Air Force, they weren't asked whether their parents had the money with which to buy them a navigator's education, a pilot's education, or whatever it may be that they required. No. We realized that we needed the services of these young men and so the people of Canada, as a whole, provided the wherewithal to their government at Ottawa to

give these men the necessary education to perform the jobs that they were called upon to do. I mentioned before in this House, I think, the case of one young man who passed his Grade XII examination and he hitchhiked to Saskatoon and joined the Air Force. There they asked him if he had the ability. He had, and so they provided him with a navigator's training. They estimated, at that time, that it would cost \$28,000 to provide him with that training. They also estimated at that time when he received his wings that that \$28,000 was being spent for one hour's worth of service; that the fighting life of a navigator was one hour. Now, that boy came back and started attending university to pick up where he had left off. Well, I have a report here and I know that they did not receive enough money. He was an officer in the Air Force and had been used to spending a lot of money, and saved very little as hon. members who have been in the services know. They are away from home, they are lonesome, they want to do things to cheer them up, and so they spend considerably more than they would if they were receiving the same salary in civilian life. He had been used to a good income. He came back and we sent him to university. I believe all members are agreed that they did not receive nearly enough money, compared with what they had been paid while they were in the armed services, to go through these courses. Many of them came back and wanted to get married and still attend university. It made it almost impossible for them to do so. It made it impossible for this young man that I have in mind to do so. I have here a copy of Hansard in which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is defending the government's policy with regard to the amount of these grants that were paid to veterans. When it was suggested that these veterans be paid more, the hon. Leader of the Opposition attempted to justify the government for the amount they were paying. I don't think that is well of him, being a veteran himself, and realizing the needs of these young men. I think he should have been in there fighting for every dollar that he could get for these young men to complete their education.

Anyway, in war time we felt first that these young men were able to give their service to Canada, and therefore Canada should accept some responsibility. That responsibility was placed on the entire dominion. We in the C.C.F. believe that the local community has a responsibility for educating its children, and that the province, also, has a responsibility to educate its children but that an educated man or woman is an asset to its country as a whole, and, therefore, the dominion should also share in that responsibility.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is the hon. member aware that this programme of providing educational help to veterans is the best programme that has been put on by any country in the world, according to admitted authorities?

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Mr. Speaker, that is no argument. I have noticed that argument used a lot in this House. "Why, we are better than any other place in the world", therefore it stops there. I think we can even become better than ourselves; I think we should become better than ourselves. I don't think it is an argument.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is lots of room for improvement on your side.

8 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Before we recessed for supper I was talking about education. I had almost completed my remarks regarding it. During that last part the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked a question and I answered it.

I want to go on from there with the concluding remarks that I have to make regarding things that came out of the election — we might call it an election post mortem. Post mortems are usually gruesome but interesting jobs, I understand, and I would like to, just for a short period of time, hold a brief post mortem on the election that we just went through this summer.

In my own constituency I want to say I only had one opposition running against me, a Liberal candidate, and as far as I am concerned, he conducted a good, clean, honest campaign, basing his arguments against us on the things that we have heard from the opposition across the way to a large extent, and trying to put forward the Liberal platform. While this was true of the Liberal candidate, I am sorry to say it was not true of the important help that he had. In various parts of my constituency, where they thought it would do the most good, they tried to start whispering campaigns linking me up with the Communist party. In those places where they did that, instead of doing themselves any good, results showed on election day that they did themselves harm. People down south of Moose Jaw are an intelligent people, Mr. Speaker. That includes the Gravelbourg constituency too, hon. member. And they realize that name-calling, mud-slinging and so forth is just the last resort of a very, very weak party.

Much has been said that C.C.F. policies in northern Saskatchewan were rejected by the electorate last June, and then again in the deferred elections in Cumberland and Athabaska. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the election returns for the Cumberland and Athabaska seats. I wish the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) were in his seat because I am intending to say quite a bit about the Athabaska seat. Were it not for the people that I represent and the regard in which I hold them, I should certainly envy the member for Athabaska. I would envy him the opportunity that he has to become a famous man in northern Saskatchewan. He would have to do so little in order to be greatly appreciated by those people in that part of the province. He represents over one-quarter of the land surface of Saskatchewan. It is true, it is not greatly populated, but the people there are a very trusting and a very innocent type of people. I have the rare privilege of going into that seat, and you know when the election returns were in there were some people so unkind as to suggest that, perhaps, Mr. Marion had paid my expenses there. I can assure you that that wasn't true. I could not begin, in the time that I intend to use, to give a picture of the north. The short time that I was there did not permit me to become as well acquainted as I should be with the north in order to speak about it.

We have heard a great deal about the north, in this side. I don't know how many members here, on both sides of the House, have been into the far north, but I have a map of Saskatchewan and in folding that map in two I find that Prince Albert is over 250 miles south of the centre of the province of

Saskatchewan; that Meadow Lake is approximately 100 miles south of the centre of the province. That might give us some realization of the vast extent of the far north. I went up there and I lived with people in one of the remote communities of that constituency. I lived with them for ten days. I wasn't able to talk their language, there were only a few there whom I was able to talk to, and to those few I had to talk in the most simple of English language. It wasn't because they spoke another European language; they just did not speak any white man's language. They spoke Chippewan in this particular district, and I found those people to be very interesting. They were all Metis, or half-breeds as they referred to themselves, and they have in the past had a very limited vision or outlook on life due to their surroundings, their environment, and so their method of conversing or communicating with anyone from the outside is very, very brief indeed. But I found them to be a very friendly people. Hon. members going into the north, or anyone else from outside, will find the most hospital people, I believe, that there are in the province of Saskatchewan. You would also find that they are very curious and yet suspicious. They seem to strike me with this attitude; that while they would like to place their trust in an outsider, they just didn't hardly dare to do so. I found that true wherever I went. I compared notes with other people, white people that had lived in the north for many years, and they assured me that this was true.

The little village that I was in had several interesting things in it. One of the things was, of course, the Hudson Bay store. The other was a very nice church. They had a new school that was built last summer, and they had a small outpost hospital. I tried to find out all I could from them. I found out, for one thing, that these people's economic life is almost completely in the hands of the Hudson Bay Company. The Hudson Bay trader is also their postman, and all the mail that comes to those people comes through the post office and passes through his hands. None of them can read or write English, and so he also has to act as their interpreter for any mail that they may get. I found a peculiar system in effect there. When I was there, some of the family allowance cheques were coming in and some of the muskrat payments. I was in the trader's office when these cheques were coming through and he opened the letters and read out the amount of the cheques to the natives, and then the conversation would be something like this. He'd say: "Well, now, John. You owe me \$75. Your cheque is for \$50. Now you pay \$30 of this and then I will credit your account with the \$30 and you take the rest." Invariably, they agreed with his decision. He would say: "All right, now you sign this cheque." And he would hold out his pen to the native, the native would put his hand on the pen, and then he would sign the cheque, and hand them whatever balance of cash he agreed to give them. I talked to him later about it, and he said: "This is the way we work it: a native in this town can, according to his ability or his honesty, get up to \$100 worth of credit at this store, but he cannot go over that credit, and that poor fellow would have to be very bad if he cannot get \$5 worth of credit." Never at any time are they completely out of debt to the Hudson Bay Store. That was true of this spot and I imagine it was true of others. I only stayed at one spot for any length of time. You can see how, in this way, whether intentional or not, the Hudson Bay dominated these people's economic life.



I went through the school in this place but it was during the summer holidays; this school was very nice, they had the necessary classroom equipment, but I wasn't able to find any text-books of any description, nor was able to find any exercise books. I was told that these books were all locked up and that the teachers were away on their holidays and, therefore, I would not be able to see them. I didn't have any children's books with me, but I did have some 'propaganda' as our hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) pleases to refer to it, and I wanted to see what progress these children were making. I don't know whether I should put it down as a condemnation of the education system in effect by this government — we have been in office for four years — but I did find that those children were unable to read very much and yet that school had been in operation for some five or six years. I think for that reason that we have to exert more efforts towards educating the children of the north. I mentioned that there were only a few people that I was able to talk to there in anything like a conversation that would make sense. There were two natives there that I could get along with fairly well, and the reason these fellows had a broader outlook on life and were able to talk more fluently was that both them, at one time or another, had committed a crime and had been sent to jail and there they got a broader outlook on life and also got an education. So you can see the deplorable condition with respect to education in the north.

Health is even worse. The hon. member for Athabaska, the Independent candidate, and myself sat as scrutineers at this polling place for a whole day, and we watched the voters come in. I wish more members from this House could visit that country and realize the deplorable health conditions of those people. I am not a doctor and, therefore, I would not venture to say what percentage of those people were infected with V.D., nor what percentage of those people were infected with tuberculosis, but I will say it was terrific. There were five people in that community of about 400 that were blind, and I have no doubt that if medical tests were taken that it was blindness from syphilis. There were some half dozen or more that had what we usually call syphilitic throats. The number of cripples was terrific. Some of the natives told me — I don't know how true it is — that the only way they could get the air ambulance service in the north was to go to the head nurse of the hospital and have her call it up for them. So far she had refused to call it for a single native. If that is true, it is not right, and it should be investigated. They claim that in the whole history of the air ambulance service in the north that no native has ever been flown out of this particular spot, and yet I saw young men there that had had accidents during the winter on the trap line, fishing, that were crippled for life. If they had the service of the air ambulance they could, perhaps, have been fixed up and lead normal lives. The reason I was given — I hope it is not right — was that the nurse in charge of getting the air ambulance did not want the natives to come in contact with the outside world. I hope that is not right and it would be a terrible thing if it were.

Their homes are terrifically dirty. We perhaps expect that in a Metis settlement, but I don't see why we should. It is not a necessary thing, and I think examples should be set and trained social workers sent in there to examine these conditions. These conditions, Mr. Speaker, are not conditions of the last four years, not at all. They are conditions resulting from white men's exploitation of not only the wealth of the north but the people of the north as well. The Metis population itself exists as half-breeds because of white men's exploitation, and because of that, I believe, it is incumbent upon

us to do everything we can to help these sons of our own to a decent standard of living. What the answer is, I don't know, but I think this government or any other government would be well advised, in order to publicize the north among the M.L.A.s, to arrange in some way for at least a pass once a year on their aeroplane service in the north, for members of this House, and make it possible, through their aeroplane service, for M.L.A.s representing these seats to travel their seats and get closer acquainted with conditions as they actually are. I would like to go back there. I cannot say that I enjoyed it while I was there because of the condition of the people, but it's a wonderful country and it is going to become, more and more, a source of wealth to the people of Saskatchewan. If we are going to draw wealth from the north, we are going to have to go into it with the very best social services possible.

Once again, I am sorry the member for Athabaska is not in his seat. I am not speaking of Cumberland because I wasn't there, but I would like to compare the election returns in Athabaska. I have them here. In 1948, the C.C.F. vote in Athabaska was 341; the Liberal vote there was 628. In 1944 the C.C.F. vote was only 57, and the Liberal vote was 626. The Liberal vote increased by 2. The C.C.F. vote increased by approximately 300. Now, if that is a condemnation in the Athabaska constituency of C.C.F. policies in the north I don't know what elections are for. We had an increase of 600 percent in our vote, and the Liberal party increased its votes by 2. In the overall northern seats, adding the Cumberland and Athabaska seats together, in 1948 the C.C.F. had 766 votes; the Liberal party had 1,284. In 1944, the C.C.F. had 414 votes, the Liberal party had 868. The C.C.F.'s percentage increase in a popular vote over the 1944 vote was 46 percent; the Liberal increase was 33 percent. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that it is because of C.C.F. policies regarding fur, fish and timber in the north that is having a bad effect on C.C.F. vote in those seats. If there is anything that has a bad effect on C.C.F. votes in these seats, and I am sorry to say it, it is because of the humanitarian things the C.C.F. are trying to do in the north. It is because we are trying to bring education to those people, and there are mainly the Hudson Bay and traders in the north that fear the opening up of that vast world to the natives when they are able to read and write. It is the fear of that that caused them to get out and work against the C.C.F. in the north. That is a terrible thing to say, but it is, in my opinion, true.

Here we have a report prepared by the Department of Natural Resources on the incomes and the various items that the natives receive income from. The opposition maintain that it is because of our fish, fur and timber policies that we have lost the north. Well, as I pointed out, as far as timber is concerned in those two seats, especially in Athabaska, there is very little of it, and so we come to fish and fur. Well, we will compare two polls in that constituency. In Ile a la Cross, the town from which the hon. member comes, the percentage that fish bears to their total income is only 30.42 percent. There the hon. member received a larger vote, a larger increase over the C.C.F. than he did in any other part of the constituency. He received 186 votes to our 28 — that is divided up into two polls.

Now we go up to Buffalo Narrows where fish is almost 54 percent of their total income, and we find there that the C.C.F. was 104, and the Liberal vote was only 66.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That's where all the civil servants were.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — I could go down the list and we would find almost invariably that wherever any great amount of fish was taken out that the C.C.F. vote was higher than the Liberal vote. But the opposite is true of furs. Wherever you get a large percentage of the income coming in from furs we get a small C.C.F. vote. I tried to figure out the reason for it and I came to the conclusion that the natives in the past had been marketing their furs with private dealers and they had been getting all their money in cash. Well, when a native has a lot of money, he is a wealthy man — that is true of a lot of us, too — with no vision into the future, and he would buy things from traders that he would not ordinarily buy. Now, when his payments are spread over a period of time, he does not have any large amount of cash at any particular time. On the aggregate, his payments might be more from the furs that he sold than they were if they sold them to a private dealer, which they are, but the private dealer wants to be able to get these furs and make his killing and, at the same time, have the native with a larger amount of money that eventually goes into his pocket as well. So the private dealers and the Hudson Bay Company have been bitterly opposed to the government's fur marketing policy with respect to beaver and muskrats.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I wish the hon. member had been in his seat when I started talking about his constituency; for the benefit of the member I want to say that I have never found any place in Saskatchewan in which the people received me better. The hon. member himself extended every hospitality to me and we had a very pleasant time when we were acting as scrutineers together on election day. I really yelled as good as he did when the returns were in.

In closing, I would like to say a little bit about the opposition's main cry and that is that we on this side of the House are advocating and bringing into being policies which will lead to communism. I am glad the members want me to talk about this. I hesitated to include this in my address because I believe the more we talk about this fact, there is less accomplished, and people in the country have shown that they are not afraid of us bringing in communism, and they have given us definite proof of it. Members, speaking on this side of the House, have pointed out, with better arguments than I can, how social democracy stands as the world's only bulwark against communism today. And other people than C.C.F. people have taken up that same argument. I have here a copy of a letter from a Priest of the Catholic Church, in reply to a letter in which he had been asked his opinion, and what he considered to be the Church's opinion, of the C.C.F. It is a long letter consisting of three pages, so I am only going to quote parts of it. He says:

I want to make it plain at the outset that I am at one and the same time a Priest and a citizen. As a Catholic Priest, I have a duty to society, and that duty is to preach the Gospel and teach the doctrine of the Catholic Church. As a citizen, I have a further duty to society, particularly in view of the fact that we are living in a democracy. That duty is to participate intelligently in our democratic government by supporting the political party and those candidates for office whom I consider best qualified to form the government of Saskatchewan and Canada.

He goes on and gives what he considers to be the Catholic Church's attitude towards the C.C.F. in Canada and the Labour party in Great Britain, and then he sums up;

I have treated this matter at some length and I have quoted official documents of the Catholic Church to make it plain beyond all doubt that Catholics are free to support any political party, in England and Canada, other than the Communist party. This means they are free to support, if they choose, either the British Labour party or the C.C.F., as the case may be. Any person who creates the impression, by insinuation or otherwise, that the Catholic Church frowns upon its members joining the C.C.F. and giving it their active support is not speaking the truth.

Then he goes on further:

Although I cannot claim an intimate association with the C.C.F. as those who have pioneered it from the beginning, I believe I can say without exaggeration that I have more thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the movement than has anyone else in Canada. I chose Co-operative Commonwealth Federation as the subject of the dissertation which I am submitting for my Ph.D. degree in Sociology. I spent eight months investigating the C.C.F. and its background in every province. I made a particularly exhaustive study of the origin of the C.C.F. as well as of its political and economic philosophy. When I came to know it, I joined it. I did this for the following reasons: first, because in my opinion the C.C.F. programme and outlook comes closer than that of any other Canadian political party to realizing the great moral, social, political and economic truths on which God intended human society to be based; second, because in my opinion, the C.C.F. programme and outlook is more in keeping with the Christian and democratic tradition than that of any other party in Canada; thirdly, because the C.C.F. is the only democratic political party in Canada which seems to realize that economic science is now able to prove that the capitalist system, as we know it, carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction, and is already either a thing of the past, as in Europe, or in the final stage of its decay, as in Canada and in the U.S.A; fourth, because, alone possessing this realization, the C.C.F. has an alternative democratic economic system to offer the Canadian people; fifth, because, drawing its strength mainly from the workers of the cities and the farmers of the plains, the C.C.F. alone of the Canadian national parties, has the independence, the freedom, the will and the power necessary to challenge the invisible government of money in our midst, and so restore to the Canadian people democratic control of their economic system; democratic control of their economic system which has, for too long a time, been concentrated in the hands of a small and irresponsible aristocracy of wealth; sixth, because the purification of democracy and the expansion of freedom, which all men of good will hope for and long for, can come about only as a result of a new vision and a new leadership, evidence of which, in my opinion, is nowhere to be found, in Canada, at least not concentrated and organized for action, except in the C.C.F.

Now, there is the opinion of a Priest, and I don't think there is any more punch enemy of communism than the Catholic Church or its Priests. Mr. Speaker, he says, in language better than I could, what he thinks about the C.C.F. and its Christian principles. He mentions there what we have often spoken about, and that is the inherent contradiction of the capitalist system.

You know, I don't like going back over the thirties. I don't blame the thirties on any particular political party. I blame the depression that we came through in the thirties, the war that preceded it and the war that followed it, on the capitalist system where it should be blamed. As a reminder of those thirties, I have here two little documents. One is a carbon copy of a cash grain certificate of a load of wheat that was sold in 1932. Now, I know that the Conservatives were in office then, but they supported the capitalist system the same as the Liberal party does, and in several provinces of the dominion, Conservative and Liberal parties have joined hands in order to defeat the C.C.F. wherever possible. This is for a load of wheat, No. 1, weight 54 bushels, price 18 cents a bushel, amount \$9.70. Here I have a copy of a statement given to a rancher down in the country of the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton), Aneroid, Saskatchewan, June 17, 1935, Mr. O.C. Anderson, Kincaid, in account with the Sanitary Meat Market, one bull, 1,210 pounds at \$1.25 a hundred pounds, that is \$15.12, less 50 percent commission on a hundred of \$6.05, and for that 1,210 pound bull he got the munificent sum of \$9.07.

Those conditions prevailed in the thirties. We saw a Great War; some of the members of this House, I believe, are veterans of that war. That war was followed, as this one has been, by a period of prosperity, a period in which goods were not provided, not manufactured in sufficient quantity to meet the demands of a war-inflated economy in which we had more money to spend than we usually have. Then that was followed by a depression in which many people went without the bare necessities of life. And then we entered into another World War. That was followed, as the first one was, by a period of high prices, a period of comparative prosperity in some cases. Now, what is coming next, I don't know, but we still have with us in this country the capitalist system, and just as the capitalist system created the first war, inflation, depression and the next war — we are in the inflation period now and it follows inevitably that if we maintain this system we will have another depression. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

**Mr. L.E. Blanchard (Cumberland):** — First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the electors in my constituency of Cumberland for the support they gave me in the deferred election of July 22. Secondly, I wish to thank the government and the C.C.F. party for their very effective campaigning on my behalf. They helped me in many ways. In the first place, during the campaign there were almost as many election workers in my constituency as we have trees. Several Cabinet Ministers took a hand in the campaign, and they were flying hither and thither and yon. Everywhere I went I heard the people say: "There goes some money which our socialist government is taking from us from the handling of our fish, furs and lumber." To cap the climax, the government, a few days before the morning of the election, sent out statements on fur sales, accompanied with the cheques for the amounts

owing to the trappers, and wherever I went the trappers angrily made these statements; their ire was aroused, refreshed by the concrete evidence of the heavy deductions by this government from the selling price of their furs.

I think the government thought it was doing itself a favour by having these cheques mailed out just a few days before the voting. The C.C.F.ers were so blinded by their socialist theories that they were incapable of judging the reaction of the people to the socialist experience which the C.C.F. had foisted upon the people of the north. The mailing of these statements and the cheques served to focus attention upon the extent to which this socialist government was robbing the people of the north of their labours.

The Cabinet Ministers, who participated in this campaign, helped me more at their public meetings than I was able to help myself at my own. They threatened to withdraw from the north and let conditions revert to what they were before this C.C.F. government was elected to power. More than anything else, the people of the north desired to sweep from their shoulders the crippling weight of the C.C.F. octopus. Word went out from the C.C.F. public meetings that the defeat of the C.C.F. candidates in the deferred elections would result in the withdrawal of the socialists and their hated schemes from the north, and a return to the free way of life the northerners had known before the coming of the socialist regimentation and exploitation. As a consequence, the northerners defeated the C.C.F. candidates. Now they expect and hope that the government will honour its threat. The people of Cumberland took the C.C.F. threat to withdraw socialism from the north at its face value. They defeated the socialist government candidates as the only way open to them to express their disapproval of the socialist policies, through their ballots, as they knew that the fate of the government did not hinge on the results in the two northern seats. They were fully aware that the way to seek favours from a government was to elect government candidates; but there was no favour the C.C.F. government could grant them which attracted the people of the north more than the complete withdrawal of the socialist experiments and socialist meddling from the north. Hence, the people of the north repudiated the government and its feeble socialist work.

I see no point, Mr. Speaker, in imparting to this House the details of how these socialist schemes have been operated to the great material disadvantage of the people of the north. After four years of experience with them, the people of the north expressed their condemnation of socialism; they did it courageously in the face of certain knowledge that there is no fury equal to that of the socialists who have been scorned. On behalf of my constituents, I demand that the government bow to the will of the people of the north as they have expressed this will in the deferred elections. I demand that this government immediately relieve the people of the north from this socialist slavery. Within the last few days evidence has come to my attention that the government does not intend to honour the wishes of the people of the north by abandoning their socialist experiment.

I have here a copy of the Flin Flon Miner, dated February 16, from which I will quote:

Mr. Brockelbank also announced that the government will continue its three-fold policy in the north as follows: through facilities

of the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service to get for the trappers the best possible price for their furs; second, through the facilities and influence of the Saskatchewan Fish Board, to get for the fishermen the best possible price for their fish.

The third goes on to mention the establishing of stores in the north.

By that vote of July 22, the people of the north indicated, beyond doubt that they did not want a continuation of the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing through the government boards and agencies, and they do not, as I understand their feeling, wish a continuation of the Fur Marketing Service or the service of the Fish Board unless they are continued on a voluntary basis.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to analyze the voting of last July to emphasize my point. Let me take you to the Cumberland House poll; there the overwhelming majority of the voters depend on fishing and trapping for their living. There were 136 Liberal votes against 59 C.C.F. votes. That is where the C.C.F. candidate made his home, and his field office was the Department of Natural Resources. May I repeat, the vote in Cumberland was 136 for the Liberals and 59 for the C.C.F.; surely a sweeping condemnation of C.C.F. socialist policies. At Denare Beach it went 48 Liberals, 29 C.C.F., and this is where the C.C.F. had one of its filleting plants, and the staff of that plant no doubt accounted for the majority of the 29 votes the C.C.F. received there. Pelican Narrows had 21 Liberal votes against 15 C.C.F. votes. At that time there were 15 employees working for the government at the filleting plant there. It is obvious that these government employees gave the government candidate his only votes at Pelican Narrows. Then take the Island Falls village; the voters there are mostly all Metis who live by trapping and fishing. They voted 53 Liberals and 8 C.C.F. Now let us take a look at the Lac la Ronge poll: the vote there was 121 Liberals and 54 C.C.F. At the time of the election the C.C.F. government had approximately 54 employees at Lac la Ronge who were entitled to vote. Only the people who worked for the C.C.F. government voted C.C.F., and the others who depended on fishing and trapping voted against the government.

In the election of 1948, the people of Cumberland completely reversed the 1944 result. In 1948, as Liberal candidate, I received 58 percent of the total vote, whereas the C.C.F. candidate received only 37 percent, which included the votes of the provincial government employees of the area. In 1944, the C.C.F. received 58 percent of the votes and the Liberals 39 percent. As I have said before, the people of Cumberland voted overwhelmingly against the government, despite the fact that the government was not at stake. They voted as they did because they wanted to get rid of the socialist compulsion, and I say that now the government has no other alternative than to relieve the people of the north from socialist slavery.

My constituents are greatly interested in the development of mining in the north. Most of us live on what is known as the pre-Cambrian shield. It is a mineralized rock formation which stretches across northern Manitoba into northern Saskatchewan from the Hudson Bay. There is a great treasure-house of minerals in which dozens of productive mines are now operating. Although we have 80,000 square miles of such mineralized formation in northern Saskatchewan, there is not one mine operating wholly within Saskatchewan in

this mineralized formation. A part of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting mine at Flin Flon is in Saskatchewan — only a small part of it. If propaganda made mines, Saskatchewan would be the Eldorado of the world. Before the 1948 election the C.C.F. propaganda machine got to work, as I remember it, and they had a great how-do-you-do about diamonds being discovered in northern Saskatchewan. This was followed by the discovery of uranium, gold and other minerals. I hope that the Minister of Natural Resources tells us, during the course of the session, what has happened to the diamond mine which hit the headlines just before the election. Since the war Canada has been passing through a period of intense activity in the development of new mines. In the past, Canadian capital has been interested more in developing mines in Ontario and Quebec, but since this is in a sub-division which is just within the Saskatchewan border, about one and one-half miles from Flin Flon. To anybody living there, it is evident that the Manitoba side — with the imaginary line that divides Saskatchewan and Manitoba — there has been . . . prospecting. In mine development in Saskatchewan this past four years, on the Saskatchewan side of this imaginary line, there is virtually no activity.

Geologists and mining engineers tell me that the formation on the Saskatchewan side is even more favourable than that on the Manitoba side, but capital is fighting shy of Saskatchewan because of the C.C.F. socialist government and its avowed determination to eradicate capitalism.

Comparison of the figures on the staking of mineral claims in 1947 is irretrievable evidence of the intense activity in Manitoba under a free-enterprise government, and the stagnation in Saskatchewan under a socialist government. In Manitoba, in 1947, there were 6,672 mining claims staked, against only 319 in Saskatchewan in that one year. There was a similar disparity in the stakings the previous year. The first step in the development of a mine is the staking of a claim. This activity in Manitoba in recent years is now beginning to bear fruit. Let me read a paragraph from the year-end review of the province of Manitoba, which was published at the end of last year:

Mining in Manitoba also achieved great success in 1948, with the value of mineral production reaching a new high, estimated to exceed \$24,500; a 50 percent increase over 1947. Three new mines went into production and one is nearing the production state. Two potential producers advanced well in the underground development.

Saskatchewan's new mines exist only in the propaganda of press releases through the Bureau of Publications. Manitoba's new mines are turning out ore. Manitoba's Premier does not have to travel over half the world in a vain quest for capital, as the Hon. Premier Douglas did recently in an attempt to interest, first, British capital, then Swedish capital, and, finally, New York capital in the development of our resources. The Manitoba government does not have to spend the taxpayers' money to outfit prospectors of the north and maintain them, as they sought potential mines, as the C.C.F. government has had to do.

At the C.C.F. convention in 1945, unanimously passed a resolution requesting that the Saskatchewan government give consideration to the early development, under public ownership, of gas, minerals and oil. The hon. Premier



has repeatedly said that the policies of his government are determined at C.C.F. party conventions; therefore, this should be accepted as a policy of the C.C.F. government with respect to the development of mineral resources, and not the statements of minor government officials who have been trying to lure money into Saskatchewan. Is it feasible to use the taxpayers' money to develop mines? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the answer will be obvious after I have recounted a few lights in the history of the development of the great Flin Flon mine.

In the first place, the original discovery was made in 1914, or thereabouts. The ore was very complex and unusual, and large sums were spent in devising ways of handling it. Finally in 1927 development work was started, and it was not until the fall of 1930, after approximately \$31 million had been spent, that the mine began to operate. The success of the mine even then was a gamble. Many mines have gone into operation after expenditure of millions, only to close down finally with a heavy loss. Will the taxpayers of Saskatchewan agree to the spending of millions of their money by Mr. Cadbury and the other planners for the development of mines? I believe that the answer would be an emphatic 'No'. The only hope is to do what we of the opposition condemned this government for not doing; namely, adopt policies which encourage the expenditure of private capital in the development of our resources. Furthermore, I do not believe there is any likelihood of the investment of 'risk' capital in large amounts in Saskatchewan so long as this province retains in power a government which is determined to eradicate capitalism.

During the session of the preceding Legislature, the mention of the eradication of capital was the signal for the government members to pound their desks. Let me hear the government members again pound their desks when I repeat: "It is the intention of this C.C.F. government to eradicate capitalism from Saskatchewan." It is a matter of record that this socialist government adheres to the policy outlined in their Regina Manifesto. It can lead to only one end, continued stagnation until we have another government, a free enterprise government.

A particularly sore point with my constituents, and one which contributed to the defeat of the government candidate last July, was the failure of the government to complete the Nipawin-Flin Flon highway. With the typical C.C.F. government fanfare, this government announced in 1946 that this road would be completed in three years at a cost of \$1 million. The three years have passed and there is a gap of possibly 100 miles. Last year, a spring advanced into summer, there was no sign of a resumption of work on the highway. This failure to resume construction became more embarrassing to the government and its candidate as the date of the deferred election neared. Then a few days before the voting, a cook arrived at Flin Flon. His arrival was hailed by the Flin Flon press, and in an interview the cook said, in effect, that he was the vanguard of the road crews who would arrive to man the machinery for the resumption of work on the highway. With an eye to economy — most unusual for this government — it was, apparently, considered less costly to ship a cook into Flin Flon than caterpillar tractors and bulldozers, to kid the people into believing the government intended to continue work on this highway. After the government lost the election, nothing more was heard of the cook.

I just got a return here today, Mr. Speaker, saying the government had spent \$44,978.69 during the past year. Well now, that is not very much of an expenditure on the highway up there, taking into consideration that they received well over \$1 million in royalties from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. I think it is very little money to put back. In the meantime, Manitoba is doing work on the highway from The Pas to Flin Flon.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — With federal assistance.

**Mr. Blanchard:** — Last fall the road had gone to Cranberry Portage with only about 60 miles remaining to be completed to its Flin Flon destination. Apparently, the excuse of the hon. Minister of Highways for not continuing the work on the Flin Flon highway is the failure of the Saskatchewan government to obtain financial assistance from Ottawa. This government is always passing the buck to Ottawa, making the federal government a scapegoat for its failure.

While it is true that Manitoba has received financial assistance from Ottawa for their road funds at Flin Flon, it should be remembered that the Saskatchewan government gets more than \$1 million a year from the Flin Flon mine in royalties, and Manitoba gets nothing.

The hon. Minister estimated that the Flin Flon-Nipawin road would cost in the neighbourhood of \$1 million. If that is so, this government has received in royalties sufficient money in one year to build this road. Saskatchewan would reap untold benefits from its construction. It would open up to the province the Metis and co-operative markets of a thriving city of more than 11,000 persons, which is now Flin Flon. It would open up the area between Flin Flon and Nipawin to lumbermen and fishermen. The area which would pass through the pre-Cambrian mineralized formation would be opened up to prospectors, and I believe that enough business would come to Saskatchewan from the completion of this road to pay for it in a very few years. The people in my area would like to know what value the people of the province received from the \$1 million in royalties the C.C.F. government have collected each year from the Flin Flon mine. They can see with their own eyes where a large part of it has been squandered in silly, socialist experiments. There is one such experiment at Beaver Lake, about 14 miles from Flin Flon, and I refer to the filleting plant. This is an elaborate lay-out, complete with quarters for the staff, which is equipped with all modern conveniences, including running water and electric lights. In fact, it is one of the show places of the north, because of the squandering of public funds to provide advantages of modern civilization which many of us cannot afford. I understand this plant has a modern dwelling for its staff, and, with all the trimmings, cost the people of Saskatchewan something in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 in capital outlay alone, not including what the plant has lost since it was opened in the fall of 1945. In building it, a socialist white elephant, the people of Flin Flon have not shown much originality, for there is hardly a community in the north which does not possess a reminder of the socialist foolishness and blundering which the people call its socialist white elephant. Lac la Ronge has its white elephant in the form of another fish plant which, like the Beaver Lake plant, will be closed shortly. I understand it will be operating until the end of March, possibly.

There are other white elephants. Take the sawmill at Lac la Ronge. A few months ago the Department of Natural Resources established a sawmill at Egg Lake, a small lake near Lac la Ronge. Thousands of dollars were spent in getting out logs around the lake that winter. Some bright boy conceived the idea of building a scow around a tractor and propelling the scow by attaching a propeller to the take-off. This contraption was to be used on Egg Lake to tow out logs to the mill in the spring; but the lake was so shallow that the weight of the tractor kept the scow on the bottom and the propeller turned futilely in the weeds. The scow had to be abandoned. Other means were adopted to get the logs to the mill, but after some of the logs had been cut into lumber, it was found that the lumber could not be got out because of the muskeg. The mill was moved the next winter to the shore of Lac la Ronge. It was planned to float the logs down the Montreal River from Egg Lake. However, the government has built a dam across Montreal River where it pours north into Montreal Lake, and there was not enough water in the stream to carry the logs to the mill. If you, Mr. Speaker, were to visit Egg Lake, you would find the abandoned scow there, and the shores of the lake are strewn with the abandoned logs which were taken out at a cost of thousands of dollars.

When the people of the north see such flagrant examples of government extravagances, is it any wonder that they are pressing for the utilization of government funds to complete such projects as the Nipawin-Flin Flon road? The people would have something to show for the money; the province would possess an asset which would eventually pay for itself many times over.

Before concluding, I have a few more observations on how socialist policies are discouraging private enterprise from taking greater part in the development of our natural resources. What does retarded mineral development mean in the province of Saskatchewan? It means fewer jobs, and fewer opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan, and fewer markets in the province for the products of our farms.

It was during the depression that the Flin Flon mine came into production. Something like 500 farmers in the dried-out areas of Saskatchewan went to Flin Flon and obtained work in the mines. Most of these men are still there; they were quite content with their lot; they have a real sense of security. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company has its hospitalization which is second to none in Canada. The pension plan is second to none. Sick benefits are paid, and millions have been spent by the company for the welfare of its employees. The relations between the company and its workers are of the very best. Everybody would benefit by the development of our potential resources, by reason of taxation under which revenue would be obtained to extend social services for all the people. As a people, and as a province, we are denied these benefits by this socialist government which cannot, itself, develop our mineral resources with the taxpayers' money, and which, by its policies, has prevented other capital from doing so.

As the people in my constituency have so overwhelmingly repudiated this government in the deferred election, I will not support the motion.

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your re-election to presiding over this Chamber. I cannot express in words my appreciation and the confidence which you give me in my task in this Chamber. I am sure all of us on the government side, too, are very proud of the two new members who set this debate off in such fine style. I believe they are going to make a wonderful contribution to this Assembly. I am very sorry to lose my desk-mate for the last four years. I am referring to the hon. member for Watrous (Hon. Mr. Darling). He was quite a help to me, a comfort. He has now deserted me to join the ‘holy of holies’, and I wish him the best of luck. I know he has a very difficult task ahead of him, but I know that he is going to come out with flying colours.

It does seem to me that the theme of the opposition has been, all the way through, that this government has done a wonderful job of patting themselves on the back, but they have not done a thing for the people in the last four years. Having made that statement, they do not try to prove their point, but they go into a long rambling story about international affairs, and how socialism leads to communism, and where they have socialistic governments how bad it is for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say very much about international affairs as I believe we are here to attend to the affairs of the people in this province; but I just want to say that I do not think we here on the North American continent fully appreciate, fully understand, the feeling of those people over there in Europe in what they have been through in this last Great War. I don’t think we understand what those gallant people in Great Britain were up against in that war — the misery, suffering and privation, and mental anguish. They never know from one day to the next whether they would have a roof over their heads, whether they would be severed from their loved ones, whether they themselves would be alive from one day to the next. They stood for hours and hours for a small ration to keep body and soul together. I say I don’t think we fully appreciate those facts. We don’t appreciate the fact that that beautiful little isle was so near to disaster, so near invasion. They could have been just as war-torn as many countries in Europe today. After the victory was won, those people had to make a choice; they could go along with the Churchills and the Chamberlains and the Cliveden set, with their imperialistic policy which had led them into two wars in 25 years; they could go along with them in a policy which, no doubt, would involve them in a third Great War; or they could choose a road with the hope that it would lead to a world of permanent peace. As I say, I don’t think the gentlemen on the other side fully appreciate the position those people were in or they would not get up and criticize those gallant people and, yes, ridicule them because they have a Labour government with a socialistic view for the nationalization of everything.

**Mr. Tucker:** — We are sorry for them.

**Mr. Stone:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, if we are ever going to get permanent peace in this world, the leadership will come, where it has always come in world affairs, from the British Empire.

Going back to the old theme that this government has not done anything for the last four years, well I think, after the last election, we made a pretty fair job. Perhaps we could take from the arguments of the opposition they put up such a pitiful case in the last election that they ran a very poor second. I was rather amused at the deduction of the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton). He said, in 1934 or 1935 the C.C.F. had five members; in 1938 they had 15 — I am not sure if the figures are correct; then, of course, in 1944 they had 47 or 48. So, if history repeats, then the Liberal government will be returned at the next election. But in making those deductions, he overlooked a few little details. He overlooked the fact that the C.C.F. party have gone to the people with a new political philosophy and with a policy that has geared straight to that philosophy from British Columbia to the Maritimes, and it is a new party which is surely growing in this country from one coast to the other.

On the other hand, my friends on the other side are trying to peddle a worn-out programme, jumping and even stealing some of our programme to try and entice votes to their side. I warn the opposition not to get too cocky. I don't blame them for being a little cocky — they have increased their numbers — but I warn them, if they cannot win an election in 1948, under the best conditions of so-called free enterprise, if they cannot win an election when there is more or less full employment and people have money in their pockets and are less politically conscious, if they cannot win an election under those conditions, they will never win an election in this province.

In getting back to what the government has done in the past four years, I think if every member in his House got up and honestly stated what benefits his people had received in his constituency in the past four years, and I say 'honestly' do it, it would once and for all answer that criticism from the opposition. Without boring this Legislature too much, I want to say just what benefits my people have got in my constituency.

In the past governments, it seems to me, they tried to pry whatever they could from the government, especially in election years; if they could get a Court House or a Land Titles Building or a piece of highway or a bridge. You know, if you look over the map of Saskatchewan you will find it dotted with Court Houses, not any too judiciously placed at that, remnants of political plums of the past. Talking about buildings, we have nothing we should be discouraged about in Saskatoon. Anybody who has not been over the university grounds for the last four years will get quite a surprise at the additional buildings that have gone up at the university.

**Mr. Tucker:** — And the big hole in the ground.

**Mr. Stone:** — The city of Saskatoon cannot claim any priority for the university. It is an institution that is for the benefit of the whole province. But there is no denying that the city of Saskatoon does benefit by the fact that the university is adjacent to our city. We benefit from employment, and we benefit from the extra business that it has brought in by the enrolment of students. I say there has been considerable building done by this government, some by the dominion government, in the university grounds in the last four years. That created a very definite problem for the city of Saskatoon. I know there is hardly a nook

or cranny in this province that has not had housing problems. We were faced with an acute housing problem, especially when the dominion government in their rehabilitation plan made available the university training for the veterans. It created quite a problem because many of these veterans, in fact a good percentage of them, were married men with families. Again I say, it is very fortunate that this government had the foresight to set up a Department of Rehabilitation because we realized these problems would arise when our returned men came back. Under the able guidance of the Hon. J.H. Sturdy we did not haggle with anybody; we went in — we had already made a judicious buy in No. 7 airport — and set to work, and immediately made available some 48 units of housing accommodation for returned men and their families. They were available right away at the opening of the university. Progress was made, and today we have some 187 units for married veterans and their families. In that Community Apartment there is a story that can be told in itself. I don't want to rob the Minister of Social Welfare of that privilege, but I do say it is an experiment which has proved very, very satisfactory: community apartments with a community kitchen, nursery, playgrounds and everything. Everybody seems to be happy in those apartments. It was a wonderful contribution, I think, that this government made at a very critical time.

There were also some four very nice bungalows built for the staff of the T.B. Sanatorium in Saskatoon. They are very nice stucco-built cottages, to further assist in the housing problem at Saskatoon.

I forgot to mention that we had some huts at No. 4 airport which were made available for the single members who were taking training at the university.

We also have in Saskatoon a very modern bus depot at a very ideal spot. The only criticism I have of the bus depot is that I don't think the Department of Public Works was quite ambitious enough as I think, in a few years, it is going to be too small, but it is certainly an acquisition to our city. In that bus depot there is a very modern, up-do-date café, very well patronized, and not entirely by C.C.F.ers at that. I noticed there some very prominent business men, professional men, lawyers, who are known not to be on our side. Upstairs in the depot we have various departments of government: the Licensing Branch; the Department of Social Welfare with an office of Rehabilitation; and Health Services; and we also have the Government Insurance in that building.

There has been a considerable amount of work done in our Power Commission plant. The capacity of the plant in the past four years has risen from 22,000 to 37,000. In spite of the installation of a new turbine, I still believe that further turbines will have to be added in the near future. I might also say that we have in our City Hospital a cancer clinic which is serving the northern part of the province. We have a clinic there for the treating of infantile paralysis, and — if it is not already set up, I believe it is in the process of being set up — a mental hygiene clinic.

We also have a very fine network of hard-top roads around Saskatoon. When we came into power I think there was just one stretch from Saskatoon to the junction of No. 12 and No. 5 at Warman — a stretch of, I think, 13 or 14 miles. Now you can go from Saskatoon to Dundurn, on the east and south, and

on the north you can go from Saskatoon to Langham, and on the west you can go on No. 14 as far as Kinley, and on the west again on No. 7, almost as far as Rosetown. This is quite an advantage to a busy business section like the city of Saskatoon, and we appreciate the highways being built into our centre. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all that has been done, and I hope that the government will continue to do these things for our city.

I want to come now to what I consider the most important part, and the things that benefit the people of my constituency more than anything, and that is the assistance this government has given the underprivileged groups in my constituency. I was rather surprised when I went to our office in Saskatoon to know that we have approximately 11,000 old age pensioners being serviced by that office in Saskatoon. No doubt many of these people do come in from other constituencies, but it is quite a number, and I suppose a few of them have dependants. It is hard for me to express what these people feel towards the free hospital card which they have. I honestly believe if they had the choice between the pension and the hospital card, many of them would choose to keep the hospital card. They have never known such security before in this province, in their old age, as they have today.

We have some 125 mothers in Saskatoon who are drawing the mothers' allowance, with an average of dependants of from three to four. We have some blind pensioners, but I want to come back to those groups later.

I also want to point out that these groups of people would be considerable burden on my municipality if they did not have this medical assistance that our government gives them. It is true that there are some old age pensioners who, in sickness, sometimes are helped out by their near relatives. Sometimes the near relatives have to dig down in their pockets previously, and it was not very nice to have to do so, as they could ill afford to do so; but the fact was, the majority of these people — certainly all the mothers on allowance — were a direct burden to the municipality, and it is hard to say how much in dollars we have relieved the municipality by taking these people off as a burden to them.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, in a constituency like mine, I would say, giving it a conservative figure, it would consist of 90 percent of wage earners. I do not think there are very many wealthy people in Saskatoon, and I would say that at least 90 percent rely on the wages they receive from others. It has already been mentioned I think, by the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), how the Leader of the Opposition led a political rally in my centre, and, by those who attended, it was a dilly of a meeting. I did expect that the Leader of the Opposition, being in an industrial centre, would at least devote a little time to the things affecting the people in that particular constituency, and that is labour matters, labour legislation. However, he conveniently slid over that, although he had been out in the rural districts telling the farmers how well the workers were being treated by this government, and how it was coming off their backs, trying to drive a wedge between the farmer and labour.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend has no right to say that I was out through the country stating what he said I stated, trying to drive a wedge. I did not say any such thing in the country.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member is expressing an opinion that you fought the campaign . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, no.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The others have done exactly the same thing.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Your Honour . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The point of privilege is not well taken.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said I was out through the country stating certain things . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I am ruling that the point of privilege is not well taken.

**Mr. Stone:** — One thing the Leader of the Opposition unearthed at that meeting was: he unearthed more communists in that meeting than there were of his own followers. In fact, those who were there tell me that some of his own followers left long before the meeting adjourned, and he was holding a cross-fire debate with some gentleman in the audience from the platform. I had no idea myself there were so many communists in the city of Saskatoon.

Mention was also made of the large advertisements, some of them half-page, some of them quarter-page, put in there by the Employers' Association, insurance companies, mortgage companies, and even independent citizens who love their freedom; they love the freedom to exploit their fellowmen. I would take these as the best election material I could possibly have, because I took them and waved them in front of the workers, that there was their challenge.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Stirring up class hatred, that is what you did.

**Mr. Stone:** — What were the workers going to do about it? Did they want to go back and lose the economic freedom which they had got through this government? I am very pleased that those people did accept that challenge, and I am very pleased to be back here, once more, representing those people in the Saskatoon constituency.

I am not going to take a long time to tell you how pleased we are to have such a wonderful Trade Union Act. I am sure you cannot go anywhere in this world and find a better Trade Union Act than the workers have in this province. I want to say, also, that we are very pleased with The Hours of Work Act, which provides more leisure hours for our workers. In our Workmen's Compensation Act we are leading all the provinces in Canada for benefits to our injured workers. There is quite a story behind The Workmen's Compensation Act, one that I often like to give because I, with other workers, used to come down here year after year, pleading with the Liberal government to do something for these unfortunate



injured workers. You know, in 1929, as a bait, the Liberal party promised to bring in such a compensation act; in fact, they had the Board all set up and appointed, if the voters would vote them back. However, the Anderson government did bring in the new Compensation Act. It was not all we desired, but we did think it was a move in the right direction. We accepted it with the hope that, after some years of experience, some better benefits would be derived from it, when lo and behold, back came the Liberal government, and the very first thing they did was to put in a three-day waiting clause, which said that the injured worker would not get a cent of compensation for the first three days. We fought that tooth and nail, and got nothing until the workers put their own government here in Regina in 1944.

The Liberal government listened to the plea of the employers to reduce the per capita, and down and down came the per capita, until they had to chisel on the injured worker to make the balance sheet balance at the end of the year. There is a big story to that Compensation Act, Mr. Speaker, and I know it only too well. Don't think for one minute that the workers are going to trust their case in the hands of such individuals as the gentlemen on the other side.

I want to say that I am very pleased, too, with the improvements that have been made in The Minimum Wage Act. I am not pleased, altogether, with the wages under this Act, and I agree with the member from Melville (Mr. Deshayé) I think it was, and I assure you that we will possibly try and get the Minimum Wage Board to do a little better. I am pleased with the enforcement of this Act, and with the way in which this government is going about its job to try and enforce the regulations under the Act. The workers who come under this Act are very difficult to organize — I might say that it is almost impossible — as their line of businesses is such that it makes it almost impossible to organize them. They are usually transient, with the big turn-over, in restaurants and hotels. When we came into power, some of the girls in the restaurants were lucky to go home with \$9 a week as wages. There was no limitation to what the employer could deduct from their wages, and I have known the enforcement officer in my cities to go into some of these places to protest and the proprietor has ordered him off the premises. He has further protested, and the proprietor warned him if he did not get off and stay off, he would get on the telephone and get down to Regina. The enforcement officer knew what that meant and promptly got off and stayed off. We are all very pleased that, today, we have a department down here in Regina that will give these enforcement officers all the backing they need to carry out and do a good job for these workers under this Act.

I want to say, too, that we are very pleased to have the protection and security as afforded under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. This is a wonderful benefit for the people in an industrial centre like Saskatoon, where they are continually coming in contact with highway accidents. I remember a few years ago a man, along in years, going to work, and one of these old jalopies climbed the curb and pinned him against a store, and he landed in hospital with two broken legs. There was no recourse for that injured worker; he just had to take the injuries, and the financial expense besides, and he was no further use for any more wages. Thank heaven, this government has changed that kind of condition.

Organized labour has always spearheaded the drive for better aid for the under-privileged and I want to say, on their behalf, that we are very glad this government has done a great job along this line. I spoke a while ago about the mothers' allowances. When we came into power most of these, I might say all of them, had to go out to work to supplement the income of the home, leaving the children at home to get along just the best way they could, and pile up a pretty nice bill for the government for juvenile delinquency. At the present time, we are paying the mothers a pension, we have increased the benefits for the children, and, if there is an incapacitated father, he too receives a benefit. Today most of the mothers are home where they should be, and where we want them to be, looking after their families and raising them to become decent and worthwhile citizens.

I am rather surprised that not one member over there, so far, has taken a blast at our labour legislation. Not one of them. I did expect, perhaps, the labour member over there might do it, the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack). The member is not in his seat at the moment, but I believe he distinguished himself in labour relations, and no doubt he will be the labour critic on that side. I am rather disappointed that they did not blast our labour legislation. They really used to go to town in the last session. They worked harder on labour legislation than any other legislation that came before this House. I say I am disappointed because every time the opposition blast away at our labour legislation, it gives me a good boost back in my constituency.

I want to say how much we appreciate the hospitalization plan. I am plagued every day by a lot of individuals asking why we don't go further and take in the whole full plan. If my people thought for one minute that an attempt would ever be made to break up this hospitalization scheme and go back to the municipalities and the miserable poverty we had under the old Liberal government, where if you had a good municipal administration you would have nothing; I believe if there was ever a suspicion that we would go back to that system again, there would be almost a revolution as far as my constituency is concerned.

I believe this government should, in some way or another, determine whether the dominion government is going to come into this health scheme or not. I believe we should seriously consider a hospital tax, more on the ability of the individual to pay. I realize the administrative costs that would entail. It would be very nice to carry on the way we are doing. I understand that we have the lowest administrative cost of any medical scheme the Minister knows of, but I believe some thought will have to be given, unless we can induce the federal government to live up to the promises made from 1919 to date.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Pass the buck all the time.

**Mr. Stone:** — I say my people would never go back to the kind of government which gave them nothing but lip-service; the kind of government that gave us only lip-service and promises. They will never forget one of the most startling speeches every made in this House in 1934-35 by the then Minister of Health, who is now the Lieutenant Governor of the province. He was asked by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr.

George Williams, when could the people of the province expect a better health programme, and he went into a long talk with a lot of technical terms that a doctor probably would use. He finally ended up by telling the Legislature that British Columbia had already had a survey of their health facilities, and I would like to quote from the speech, taken from the Journals 1934-35, January 28, 1935:

In this province, therefore, we have a health problem which is different from that of British Columbia. A similar investigation should have been made into Saskatchewan conditions, and a report based upon the findings should have been available to everybody.

You see they had not been in power for four years, so they were blaming the previous government for not having this report available.

It is our intention, Mr. Speaker, to compile such a report. Last year a committee was set up under the province's Public Health Act to investigate conditions and gather all data pertinent to the subject. This is a problem of tremendous importance, not one that can be solved overnight. Naturally, all the conditions have to be investigated and the conclusions analyzed and verified in the light of changing circumstances, and, of course, the British Columbia Commission gave us quite an insight into the methods that possibly might be pursued. As soon as all the data has been assembled and the picture is complete, we are prepared, as a government, and with the assistance of the people of the province, to come out and give the people a better medical service. But remember, somebody will have to pay for it. Do not let anyone run away with the idea it is not going to cost anything. Money does not grow on gooseberry bushes, and the only way such services can be paid for is out of the pocket of the people themselves.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He was honest anyway.

**An Hon. Member:** — Go on reading.

**Mr. Stone:** — Ten years later this government came into power and we could not find a blueprint or a plan, or even a little bit of data, which would even suggest the Liberal government intended to give this province and its people a better health programme, or state medicine. That was true, pretty well, of all departments of government. I think they spend the first year going over this province, trying to find what facilities we had available, so that they could map out a programme.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, never again will the people of my constituency go back to these 'do nothing' governments. If my friends on the other side ever have any ideas that they are going to elect Liberal candidates in the city of Saskatoon, they should divorce themselves from that idea immediately, because I can guarantee to them that that will never happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:50 o'clock p.m.