

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature

Monday, March 7, 1949

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Mr. Speaker do not leave the Chair.

Mr. M. J. Willis (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to offer my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer for presenting to us this budget in his usual capable manner. This is the fifth budget address that I have heard in this Legislature, and each one is presented in a clear and concise manner to the members of this House.

I was pleased with the amendments that have been brought in to The Automobile Insurance Act because I know there are several constituents of mine, and I presume in other constituencies in the province, that have desired these two added features in our Automobile Insurance Act. Since we have added these two amendments, namely, the loss by fire or theft with the \$100 deductible, in this bill, another principle has been brought to bear in that a recognition of the year and the make of a car and those cars that were made prior to and including 1932, the insurance will cost \$4.50. The 1933 to 1936 models will cost \$6; from 1937 to 1942, \$8, and from 1942 on, \$10. I would like to ask the members of this House where could you find automobile insurance with six-point coverage that is given for the money, as by this automobile insurance? I read a few days ago where, in the province of Manitoba, it was headlined across the Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune that "Insurance rates were to be raised by 21 percent". Instead of that we have brought it down for two reasons: because, first, the coverage we are given, and, secondly, all motorists are insured. Moreover, this government has indicated that after the experience of a year, if they find that they have surplus they will still go further and bring the deductible down somewhat, based upon the statistics of a year's operation.

In regard to the policy of extension of our power lines — and I have heard it contended "where are they?" — I would like to say that I believe some of the hon. members opposite were in my constituency during the election in 1948, and I do not think they were always rained out. I know the Leader was rained out once when he was in and we enjoyed the rain, but he came back when it was fair weather; however, fair weather did not bring much luck in the poll to him, but we welcomed him to our constituency. I cannot see why they could not see the power line that had been built. He came down the road. They say that we connected a number of towns, villages and hamlets in that extension to the extent of over 100 miles of power line. It was sorely needed, and I am hoping that other hamlets and villages and farmers along these lines will be connected in the years that lie ahead. But the record shows that something has been done. We have found that there are 4,190 miles of transmission lines in this province in 1948, as compared to 1,626 miles in 1944. With regard to the farms connected, in 1947 there were 690 farms connected to power and last year 985 — a total of 1,675. I do not minimize the difficulties of rural

electrification in this province of ours, where we have many areas with sparse population and, therefore, large distances to cover. But we have at least seen there has been extension in our power development. I know, of course, another problem that faces rural electrification is the trend in areas where we have mechanized farming of the rural residents moving into the villages and towns. It is not an easy problem to solve and will have to be done with a great deal of deliberation.

In the field of insurance that is operated by our Government Insurance Office, we have accomplished two main things: first, we have helped to keep the rates of fire insurance down in this province, and, secondly, the profits that accrued have gone back to the people of this province, and not to outside as formerly. Sometimes it is said that our rates are not down. Well, I am going to quote rates this afternoon on a town in which household furniture was insured prior to the government coming in and the same amount of insurance was placed on this household furniture after the government came into the business. In the town of Eston the premium rate is \$1.30 for \$100 coverage, or on \$2,000 of household furniture the premium was \$26. That same insurance with the government was 85 cents for \$100, or \$17 for the \$2,000 policy. Moreover, the Government Insurance Office did not lose money at \$17 as shown by the record of the company for the year.

Mr. Tucker: — Was the \$26 a mutual fire insurance rate?

Mr. Willis: — Absolutely.

I feel the greatest criticism to be offered to the budget by the opposition will be the total amount of it, but let me say, as an individual, have we not found that the cost of everything has gone up. We find that purchasing power of the dollar is down around 60 cents. Consequently, why should we expect the government to finance on a budget that is very low when your purchasing dollar hasn't very much power. Let us be fair. Comparisons have been made with regard to other provinces, but I quote from a clipping in the Leader Post that "the budget submitted by Premier Manning of the province of Alberta has estimated expenditures of \$66,659,000". These estimated expenditures of Alberta included increases for education, public health and public welfare in the main, and upon analysis you will find, in Saskatchewan, the increases are mainly for education, public health and social welfare.

Before I go any further, I would like to analyze some of the criticism that was made by the former Leader of the Opposition. I could not but smile when he claimed that this government was slow in making payments to a friend of his; it took over six months. I have on my desk a letter, and I quote: "Lucky Lake, February 23. Dear Sir: (this is addressed to myself) Re: Graveling of Highway No. 42, three miles west of Lucky Lake in October, 1936." In October, 1936 there were nine local farmers who gravelled by team a little better than one mile of highway. Now they are wondering why this account that was made 13 years ago has not been paid. This is just 27 times as long in making payments as this government was to my friend. I was really amused when he listed out of the telephone directory officials, but I noticed, and I listened carefully, he did not list any government road supervisors who could have been quite easily found under the former administration, and I am afraid the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) made a serious mistake

when he referred to highways and that they were not in a deplorable state in 1944. I feel sure that in many constituencies they were not deplorable because there weren't any. There were only signposts. I often wondered if they were placed in the Elrose constituency as a memorial to the last buffalo. However, I feel the former Leader and some members of his former Cabinet should have got together in respect to highways in 1944.

In Elrose press of June 8, 1944 here is a letter addressed to the electors of the Elrose constituency, and I quote: "Travelling about the constituency, I have been impressed with your need of all-weather highways, and as your representative I can and will secure for you a greatly improved system of roads. Sincerely yours, H. Staines."

Mr. Tucker: — They probably would have done it too.

Mr. Willis: — Well, the Leader of the Opposition says "probably they would have done it". After not doing it for 35 years, we could mark it off in centuries.

I am in agreement with the statement that they needed, but they were needed not only in 1944, but for the past 35 years prior to that date. Since that time, what has been accomplished?

An Hon. Member: — Nothing at all.

Mr. Willis: — All right, friends. I invite him to come with me and I will show him what has been accomplished.

An Hon. Member: — In your constituency?

Mr. Willis: — Seeing is believing, my friend, and I hope you do not wear smoked glasses.

Mr. Marion: — Come to Athabasca.

Mr. M. J. Willis: — The highway has been built from the town of Eston, with a population of over 1,200 to the towns of Eastend and Dinsmore, which allows the intervening towns to have a way out to Saskatchewan. It has been graded and graveled by this government. Now, when friends in the opposition say "nothing has been done", I invite them to come to my constituency and travel over that road, and our people will treat you cordially — I think they treated the Leader of the Opposition cordially when he was in that constituency during the election. I heard that he hadn't time for questions, but I know he is very busy and some of the questions might have been just a little pertinent.

Mr. Tucker: — Right after that meeting, that night, I had to be at a meeting in Battleford.

Mr. M. J. Willis: — We were worried about that Battleford meeting.

Mr. Tucker: — I got there too.

March 7, 1949

Mr. M. J. Willis: — I quite realize the Leader had a long trip, too, and I only wished that he had had more meetings because Kyle poll gave me the largest majority in my constituency.

I have been impressed since I came here by the films that have been shown of our Nation Park. But in order to attract tourists from that great republic to the south, we need highways, and one of the great obstacles to the people coming from the south, particularly to Waskesiu, has been the ferry north of Swift Current, known as Saskatchewan Landing. During the fiscal year 1947-48, 30,743 vehicles, or ten percent of the total vehicles carried by the 41 ferries in the province, passed over and were counted by that ferry; and there were 60,000 passengers. But, at long last and after years of patient waiting and many promises of former governments, I am pleased to announce that this C.C.F. government has awarded the contract to build a bridge at Saskatchewan Landing.

An Hon. Member: —It will be four years before you get it.

Mr. M. J. Willis: — If we get it within four years, that will be 100 times faster than we had hoped from the former government.

An Hon. Member: — You will be out of here then

Mr. M. J. Willis: — I say, further, the dream of many pioneers in that vicinity will become reality.

The criticism of the former Leader of the Opposition was directed at getting rid of the frills in education and public health, and I am afraid that when he touched on education and the elimination of frills he was on very thin ice in the month of March, because, if I remember rightly, during his regime there were no clothes, let alone frills, for those in the education field. This government has no apologies to make for the amounts to be spent on education. We find, in 1943-44, the former administration spent \$4,073,000 on education. Remember this: during that time revenues were buoyant. In 1942 the province had one of the best crops in the past ten years. In 1949-50, this government will spend \$7,613,000 on revenue accounts, and another \$2 million in capital account to be used to make grants and loans for school building and equipment, and another \$1 million to be set aside to provide financial assistance to worthy students. In other words, over \$10.5 million will be spent on education in the year 1949-50. We will have spent over two and one-half times as much on education as the former government in the year 1943-44. Now, what frills would the Leader of the Opposition desire us to eliminate?

The other frill, we have been told, should be eliminated in the field of public health. The estimates of \$10.75 million for 1949-50 show an increase of \$1.3 million over a year ago, and of this increase, over \$500,000 will be spent on our mental institutions; \$171,000 will be spent for the treatment of cancer; over \$500,000 of this increase will be used for hospitalization of cancer cases and old age pensioners. Surely, these increases are justified from a humanitarian standpoint to help those unfortunates in our mental institutes

and the aged who have helped to make this province one of the great wheat belts of the world.

So often we are told in this Legislature what the province of Manitoba is doing. Let me give my hon. friends an example. It is rather personal, I will admit, but last October a friend, in fact the best friend I will every know, was sent to the Winnipeg General Hospital and had an operation for cancer which was only a temporary measure of relief, and was in the hospital for three weeks and his bill at the end of that time was \$410. If this person had lingered and become a bed patient for weeks or months, he would have completely used up his life's savings. Fortunately, in this province a like case would be looked after and cared for by the province. If this was one of the frills that my hon. friend wanted us to get rid of, I can only say that irrespective of what members are elected in the future, this frill will not be eliminated by the people in this province.

I have noted, too, that the expense of the air ambulance has been brought up. Possibly that was another frill. But what has this air ambulance meant to the people of Saskatchewan? Some say it is only helping the rural residents to get into a hospital, but I noticed in the press since I came here that, where we have a 25-bed hospital at Eston, the air ambulance went and carried two patients to the city of Saskatoon for specialized treatment. The people want that service. This government is going to give them that service.

Furthermore, we have recognized that if you are to get medical service in the rural areas of this province you have to provide facilities for medical men to work. I was please to note in this budget that \$300,000 is again being made available for loans and grants to hospitals and health centres which aid the poor districts in the erection of small hospitals, and by so doing they will be able to have medical services and teach young doctors.

In closing, I will admit the budget is large, but we have contended and we still contend we have set the budget to meet some of the human needs of this province, and as long as I am a member of this side of the House I will support a government that places value on human needs and not on the sign of the dollar. I shall support the budget.

Hon. J. T. Douglas (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I feel that I should, at the outset, express to you my congratulations on again being appointed to your high office of Speaker. As a former member of this Legislature, I know that you are well endowed with the qualities that are required for such a position. You have a sense of fairness, a sound judgment and, above all, the integrity that is required for a position of this kind.

I would also like, at this time, to extend to the Leader of the Opposition a welcome to this House. I know that in former years we would have been pleased to have had him here to take up with him and discuss with him some of the statements that he has made across this country from time to time, and I am sure that all members of this House join me in wishing him a long tenure of office. I am quite sure that there is no danger of the Conservative party every easing him out of being the Leader of the Opposition in this Legislature.

March 7, 1949

I would also like to extend to the Provincial Treasurer my congratulations on what I believe to be a very fine presentation of the most outstanding budget that ever was presented to this Legislature.

Mr. Tucker: — The biggest anyway.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — It is the biggest and we are not ashamed of it because that budget being large means that there is being returned to the people of this province more of their taxes than ever was returned to them before. But I want to say that when I listened to the hon. Provincial Treasurer on Wednesday afternoon I wondered how long we could expect him to meet the increased services that we are giving the people of Saskatchewan without, at the same time, raising the tax level of this province, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that he is to be congratulated on the very fine job that he has done in presenting this budget to us.

Mr. Tucker: — What about the increase in taxes?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — It is not my intention to discuss the need of increased revenue, but I would like at this time to recall to the members of this House that if the people of this province expect to receive these increased benefits, then we must look somewhere for increased revenues. I would recall to you that two years ago when this province entered into agreement with the federal government on the field of taxation, it was done after a conference had been called and had placed before it certain propositions by the federal government. I would like to point out that up to this date the federal government has not fulfilled all the promises they made at that time. They made certain promises with regard to increased social services.

Mr. Tucker: — They did not.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Certain promises in regard to a scheme of public investment that would take care of public building and the building of roads and matters of that kind. We are still waiting for the federal government to assume the responsibility in that respect, and to return to the seven province who had made an agreement with the, their fair share of the taxes which we gave up at that time.

Mr. Tucker: — You know they weren't promises; they were proposals.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Proposals is correct, but the proposals have never been consummated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government was sincere in their proposals at that time, now would be the opportune time to again call these provinces together in conference and to further discuss these matters. I know they quite laid the blame for the break up of that conference on the shoulders of Messrs. Drew and Duplessis, but since that time we have Mr. Drew travelling all across this country and telling the people of Canada that he is now the champion of the provinces and that he is prepared to co-operate with the provinces in a new tax agreement. So, I say, Mr. Speaker, now is the logical time for Ottawa to again call that conference because, with the very close

tie-up that appears to exist between Messrs. Drew and Duplessis, Mr. Drew would have to bring Mr. Duplessis along with him if such a conference was called. But up to the present time, we have seen no effort being made on the part of the federal government to again get the provinces together to discuss another agreement on the basis of the proposals they made in 1945.

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about the highways.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Oh, I will tell you about highways in a while. Don't worry about that. There is still a lot of time for highways.

Mr. Tucker: — That is what you have always said.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I notice that the opposition maintain . . .

Mr. Speaker: — if the hon. members have anything to say would they kindly rise to their feet. I think it is high time that his continual interruption from one side to the other side ceased. If you have any questions to ask the speaker, kindly rise and see whether he wants to answer them or not.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the opposition have made the charge that we had lost the rural vote in this province because they did not agree with the taxation policies of this government. Well now, I have made a pretty exhaustive study of the vote that was taken in this province last June, and I find that we did not lose the rural vote. Going over this province and taking the strictly rural vote, I find that we have increased our votes in the rural polls, not decreased. Not only did we increase the over-all vote in this province, but we increased our rural vote; and while I will have to admit we lost some support in the small towns and villages, I think we know where we can lay the blame for that. We can lay it largely on the shoulders of the Chambers of Commerce and the insurance companies. They are the ones who did the work in the small towns and the villages in an attempt to discredit the government. But I want to say that already there is a change in opinion among those people in the small towns and villages. I have talked to a lot of merchants who have told me quite frankly that were they voting again they would again vote for this government. They realize they had the wool pulled over their eyes by the mount of propaganda that was carried on across this province by big interests, a lot of them leading from Toronto or Montreal.

I would also like to tell the Leader of the Opposition — he was boasting about what might have happened if there was a certain change in vote. All it required was a shifting of 1.037 votes to have taken 11 of the members across three ridings of Melfort, Humboldt and Kinistino, it just required a shifting of 15, 16, and 45 votes respectively to have placed those three constituencies in the C.C.F. column.

An Hon. Member: — How about Hanley?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I will also tell those hon. gentlemen that had it not been for the heavy rain that fell that day and the bad roads — yes, the bad roads because most of the people had to travel over municipal roads . . . There is another feature in regard to this that I would like to call to the attention of the House and that is, I find that 55 percent of those of us who sit on this side of the House are here because of overall majority in our constituencies. But I find, of the 19 Liberals who sit across the House, that only 37 percent of them represent a clear-cut majority in their constituencies.

We made a very remarkable showing last June, when you realize that we had a combination of all the political parties in this province lined up against us. That includes the Communist party, as I shall prove in a moment or so. We saw a lot of shot-gun marriages in this province and some of them are not proving out to be too happy. You know, an old Conservative friend of mine was talking to me the other day. He shook his head and said: “I never thought what I would live to see the day when Jimmy Gardiner would have control of the Conservative organization in this province. Nor, either, did I expect to see the day when Duplessis of Quebec would dominate the Conservative party in Canada.” That came from an old Conservative friend of mine, and he wasn’t feeling very happy about it. I am afraid the poor old Tory party in Canada is in rather bad shape; almost as bad as the Liberals.

Before I leave the matter of the campaign last year, there is one other thing that I would like to bring to the attention of this House, and that is that we have done something that we said would happen years ago. We have forced the two old parties together. We have evidences here, right in this House, and while the Conservative member did have his eat moved from the front line row to the back row — I guess he felt he was being fenced in — but he is still part and parcel . . .

Mr. McDonald: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I was referred to here, just a moment ago, as a Conservative member. I want it know in this House that I ran on a joint ticket and that I was elected with both Liberal and Conservative support, and I intend to sit in this chair here, not that one . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Are you asking the hon. member a question?

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, I am asking him a question. If he thinks I am a straight Conservative member, he is mistaken, and if he thinks I moved from that chair to this one, he is also mistaken. It was my own will.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is not asking a question, he is making a statement.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I am very glad to accept the hon. member’s correction. He is not a straight Conservative. I will admit I am mistaken, but I was told so by the Conservative organizer in this province who was my opponent in the last campaign, and he told me the other day, I think in the presence of the hon. gentleman, that he was

here to see that he followed his true Conservative path. If I am mistaken, I am glad to accept the hon. member's statement. However, it is strictly for the proof of what I just said. We have forced the two old political parties into one camp in this province — that is where we want them. There is no mistake in that. Furthermore, they had to get there in order to save a remnant of their support to carry on the fight for big business in this legislature.

Mr. Tucker: — What about communism and you?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Now my friend mentioned communism. I had almost forgotten that.

Mr. Tucker: — Never forget them because they are right behind you.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — You know, when I hear these men talking across the way, they remind me of a man with a guilty conscience. They are always talking about the communists and they are trying to lay the blame on the C.C.F. Well, the C.C.F. never did work with the communists in this province, but I have ample proof here that the Liberals did. Right here. Tim Buck's picture in a large advertisement proposes a Liberal-Labour coalition in the coming federal election. Did the Liberals refute Mr. Tim Buck's offer? Oh no, they didn't.

Mr. Tucker: — What year was that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — That was in 1945. Not very long ago.

Mr. Tucker: — Was it in a C.C.F. paper?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — No, in the Leader-Post. Here is another advertisement in the Leader-Post, "Canada is in danger, the Tory plot unfolds. Make the Labour a partner in government. Coalition of the Progressive-Labour and the Liberals."

Mr. Tucker: — Why don't you read about 1948, where they ask . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — This is very recent. January, 1945.

An Hon. Member: — What about Nelson Clark?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Here is another one. This was taken from the February 5, 1945 issue of the Owen Sound Daily Sun, and was published by the authority of the North Grey Liberals Association, and this advertisement goes on to show the prominent men who were supporting the Liberal candidate in the election, and here they are: Malcolm McLeod, Harold Prichett, C.S. Jackson, Bruce Faggoson, Pat Sullivan and Nigel Morgan. Nigel Morgan is the British Columbia leader of the Labour-Progressive party. These are the men that the Liberals advertised as supporting their candidate in that by-election. Did you get any prominent Liberals getting up and doing as Mr. Coldwell did when they offered their support?

March 7, 1949

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, you did.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Here is Mr. Coldwell's statement:

The C.C.F. will not collaborate with the Labour-Progressive party in any way, direct or indirect. It will not enter any electoral arrangement with them or with any other party whether on a national, provincial or constituency basis. There is a fundamental difference between the C.C.F. methods and philosophy and those of the Communists . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Did your Leader make a statement like that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Yes, he did.

Mr. Tucker: — Read it to us.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I had forgotten to read this, but I am glad you mentioned it.

An Hon. Member: — What about the highways?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well, now you are anxious about highways, and I am very anxious to add to it.

I noticed the member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) who was acting as the financial critic of the government made a two hour speech the other day. I was very interested in it, but I noticed through that entire speech there continued that old note that has been evident in all the speeches in the House during the last five years. While I followed him very closely, because I was hoping he would give me some material for this speech this afternoon, I found there was very little in that speech to answer . . .

Mr. Tucker: — It was really good.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — . . . but there was one thing he said that I agree with him in: he said that a yardstick by which a government should be measured should be to set its attention to expenditure, and I agree with that. And then he went on to criticize this government because we had been lax in our expense in this province. Well, I am going to ask him to refer to Public Accounts of 1935-36. I believe at that time he was Leader of the Government of this province. He will find, at page 99, an item of \$55,940.95 that is set aside for relief purposes. Of that amount \$23,295/59 — almost half of it — was paid out in salaries and expenses. And among the names of some of those who received that were men who were well known in this province as Liberal organizers. And if he will turn to page 307 of Public Accounts for 1936-37, he will find another item of a similar nature; \$60,000 this time for relief, expenses and salaries \$23,619, leaving a balance of \$36,380 for the people on relief. I do not think I would say very much about watching public expenditure after reading those two items, and I can dig up a lot more if it were required.

Now, to accommodate my friend across the way: I noticed that in defending the highway policy of the last government, and the proof that they had

good highways was the fact that in our Manifesto of 1944 we made no mention of highways. Mr. Speaker, that was not required. The highways of Saskatchewan were known from one side of Canada to the other as this nation's worst, and we are just now trying to live it down. We did not have to advertise the fact; everyone knew it. The former Leader of the Opposition said we made no promises regarding highways. That is quite correct. We never will. That is a prerogative we will leave the Liberals Party — to go out and promise highways on the eve of an election. We will continue in the future as we have done in the past. We will go out and build highways and we will go to the country on our record of performance, not on the basis of promise.

Before I go to what we have done in this province in the matter of highways, I am going to, for the benefit of the members opposite, just give them a short résumé of what we did have in Saskatchewan when we took over in 1944. We took over, as the hon. members know, the largest highway system of any province in Canada, and the worst. Of that system of over 8,000 miles, I find that over 70 percent was entirely worn out. That means there was over 5,600 miles of road that had to be completely rebuilt, and that is a mighty bit task. It is pretty hard to realize that in a province as young as this, that you could have a highway system with 70 percent of it entirely worn out. I know that people are justified in asking how it could happen that in a province as young as this, that has spent over \$80 million for highways, should find themselves, in that time, with 70 percent of the system entirely gone. The answer is not hard to see. The answer is that due to the parsimonious attitude of the former government in failing to provide enough money for highway construction, and particularly highway maintenance, is the reason for that highway to have got into the dilapidated condition in which we found it.

The other day someone said that the former Minister of Highways did not build many roads in his own constituency. I would say he did not build many roads period.

Mr. Tucker: — Where did you build yours?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I remember, also, when sitting in this House last year, he made the statement that you require \$300 per mile per year to maintain a mile of gravel road, and I agree with him. But if he knew that, he did not act on the information he had, because on the basis of over 4,000 miles of graveled roads, or roads which had been graveled rather, in this province he should have had a vote of well over \$1 million for that purpose alone. But I find that in the budget which we had to accept when we took over in this province, there was only \$1,000,000 allowed for maintenance purposes, and the year before it was around \$900,000. So that is the reason for the rapid deterioration of the highway system we had in this province prior to 1944.

I remember quite well, when I took office, I called for an inventory of what equipment we had. When I received that inventory I found there was not a single piece of modern construction equipment in the whole Department of Highways. It is true that a few pieces had been purchased, but there were on loan to the Northern Areas Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs. In the field of maintenance equipment there were 61 power maintainers, when there were 200 required, and of that 61, Mr. Speaker, 21 of them were old gas-powered

machines that are obsolete and should have been in the ash can. That is what we had to take over. When I came to check on the personnel of the department — I am not going to say anything about the political organizers; the men who were termed as road inspectors — I found there was a dearth of trained engineers in the Department of Highway, men who had the ability to go out and to build roads that should be built and to give the necessary instruction. I want to say this: on the face of what I found in the department at that time, I would say that engineering meant very little to the former Liberal government in this province. I also found that I was the first Minister of Highways to take any interest in the graduation class of civil engineers in our own university, and I am glad to tell this House that every year since we have taken office we have taken a number of these young men on our staff. In fact, we have taken on as many as we could get. I am also glad to inform you that, by and large, they are doing a good job, and they are making a very worthwhile contribution to the staff, and it is the policy of this government to continue to take on trained men, men who will build up and make a further contribution to our organization.

Mr. Speaker, 1944, saw the culmination of 34 years of Liberals maladministration as far as highway construction is concerned, and I can assure the members opposite that the people of this province are in no mood to again give them the opportunity of going out and doing as they did in the years gone by.

Now, it is only fair to ask what we have done. Well, first we took the equipment that was in this province and we kept it working from spring until fall every year between taking office to the present time. It is true, the first two years that we were in office we were unable to spend all the money that was voted for highway purposes because of the lack of equipment. However, we kept purchasing equipment as rapidly as we could buy it and the result is that today we have nine earth-moving construction crews of our own; we have two hard-surfacing crews and we have five bridge crews capable of going out and doing work in this province. I find that contractors have added to their equipment, knowing that they were assured of a constant programme of construction in this province. The result is today that we have a lot of good construction equipment in Saskatchewan and it is most fortunate that we did when we were struck with the catastrophe that hit this province last spring.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member a question? Did you have much difficulty in getting equipment in 1944 due to the war being on?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Oh, yes, we had some difficulty for two years. In fact, it is none too plentiful even yet, but at that we continue to build up our crews and from 1945 on we had construction crews for loan in the field doing construction work.

Mr. Tucker: — The war was over then.

Premier Douglas: — There was no difficulty before 1939 was there?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — None at all. In fact, they tell me they used to pester the offices before that.

I might again just remind the hon. gentleman of what I said a moment ago, that the few pieces that they had purchased, I believe in the spring of 1944, some of them, they were not kept by the Department of Highways. There were sent to Northern Areas Branch. The hon. member was not in the House here a few years ago when the hon. Mr. Brockelbank laid on the table some correspondence that I think gave the reason why that was done. It was correspondence to show that the field men of Northern Areas Branches were brought into Regina not to consult with members of their staff, but with Mr. Douglas Munroe who was the Liberals organizer for this province, and I think that will constitute the answer.

Mr. Tucker: — When was that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — We have gone out and we purchased the equipment. I also found, of course, there was a total lack of warehouse facilities in this province to house and to maintain our equipment. As the hon. members know, there has been a dearth of building material in this province throughout the years, but we did manage to buy a hangar at North Battleford which has been reconditioned for the purpose of a highway warehouse; we have been able to lease part of a hangar at Prince Albert; we have purchased a hangar at Yorkton and we are rebuilding a new warehouse in Regina which will take care of the housing and the repair of the equipment in the southern part of Saskatchewan.

An hon. member said the other day that the only two ridings in this province where you could find any evidence of highway construction going on was in the constituencies of Weyburn and Rosetown. Well, if the man has traveled this province at all and if he has any powers of observation, he knows that is not correct. If he will even take the trouble of reading returns which I have tabled in this House from year to year, he will find that in 1946 the constituency of Lumsden had the highest expenditure for highway building of any constituency in the province. In 1947, the constituency of Souris-Estevan had the highest expenditure. That year we practically built a hard-surface road from the international border clean across the whole constituency. Last year, 1948, the highest expenditure was in the constituency of Milestone, and I find that Rosetown last year was 33 on the list. Now I know that to the hon. members across the way that is just not understandable, that in an election year the Minister of Highways should not spend a lot of money in his own riding, but we do not spend it on that basis. I want to say that I only rebuilt part of one highway in my riding in the time I have been here. I should not call it a highway — it was simply a mud trail because you know, Mr. Speaker, the western part of this province traveled through mud and Liberal promises for over 40 years, and not until the C.C.F. government got in power did we have decent highways on the western side of Saskatchewan. Just the other day the other member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), outlined very well the amount of construction work that has been done on the western side of Saskatchewan. That was also mentioned today by my hon. friend from Elrose (Mr. Willis) which is just one part of a road, No. 44 highway, that we have completed from Mantario right through to the junction of highway No. 15. I noticed the other day again that the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) rose in this House and said that his constituency had received generous treatment from the Department of

March 7, 1949

Highways in the construction of new roads. He could not say anything else, Mr. Speaker, because the constituency of Turtleford never had one mile of decent highway until this government took over. Today we are building first-class roads there. I notice that at that particular time the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) said that we needed another Runnymede in Saskatchewan. He fails to remember that we had a Runnymede in Saskatchewan in 1944.

An Hon. Member: — June 15, too.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well now, to be a little more specific, I would like to say that we have carried on in this province a certain amount of investigation work in regard to highways. We realize that we have reached a day when the old methods are obsolete. We realize that you have to, first of all have proper equipment, and we are getting proper equipment here in order to do the work. We also realize that there is a lot to be done — I believe I told this to the House four years ago, but I am going to repeat it again tonight — and that we have reached the state when we have to do a lot more with soils than we have done in the past. Our deposits of gravel are rapidly being depleted, and we also know that there is much you can do with soils. I remember, I think it was the first year we were in office, discussing this with the Dean of Engineering at the University of Saskatchewan, I found they were only giving two classes in soil mechanics in the civil engineering course, and I asked the Dean if he might not be able to extend that. He said he did not have the staff. His advice to me was that we should send some of our more promising young men down to some of the American universities to take up this particular line of work. Well, we had the sorry experience of seeing one or two of our boys do down there and never come back. We do not blame them for staying down there. As the hon. members know, the salaries we are paying here are not as high as they pay across the line, and I saw one or two of our most promising young men go across the line for post-graduate work and take position across the line. I would also like to remind this House that we have increased the salary range of those men, and we have particularly increased the range of the boys who are joining in to give them some inducement to take up work with the Department of Highways, and I am also glad to state again what I said a moment ago, we have a number of them each year joining our staff.

When we took office here, in 1944, I found that our asphalt roads were showing signs of wear, and particularly after I had been in eastern Canada I noticed there was a vast difference between the asphalt roads in the east and those in the west. When I asked my staff why this was they said: "Well, there should be no difference because we are using exactly the same formula here that they used in Eastern Canada," but when we put our chemist to work on this job and he went as far as he could, we then asked the University of Saskatchewan to assist us in this research work. The work that was done at that time brought out the fact that we had in the Lloydminster oil fields some of the best crude oil available for asphalt purposes. I believe it was on the result of those investigations that we carried on; in fact I know it was. We were able to induce one of the smaller firms in this province to rearrange his plant and commence the manufacture of asphalt from Lloydminster crude. Today, I am glad to inform this House that every gallon of asphalt that has been used in Saskatchewan this last two years has been made either in whole or in part from Lloydminster crude.

I want to say further that when we took office I remember almost every week certainly not less than once a month, I had men from the Lloydminster field in my office, pleading with me to do something to get markets for their produce that they might continue to expand drilling operations of that field. I know that the help this government gave those men in respect to asphalt and also in the promise that we could use some of that crude in some institutions here, encouraged the development to the extend . . . you all know the story after that. So that when the hon. members across the way criticize us for hindering development, there is just one case where this department alone gave material assistance in the development of that field at Lloydminster.

Now, what is our record in construction since we took office. I find that we have constructed, since we took office in 1944, 2,250 miles of earth work; graveled 5,534 miles; and black-topped 416. That cannot be duplicated by any other government in a single term at any time in this province. This year, which was the most difficult one, one in which tied up the greater part of our construction crews — some of them up until near the end of June — we were able to build 578.73 miles of earth work, gravel 1,175 and black-top 175 in this province. Yet the hon. gentleman across the way tells us that we are not doing anything. I want to tell you that we are doing what we are doing on the second smallest highway appropriation of any province in Canada. I doubt if there is another province in Canada that can show the mileage that has been done by this province this year. I know that I can show you this: I can show you provinces with much larger appropriations that have not go nearly the results, favourably with anything in Canada or in any of the western states, and we are doing it at a cost per cubic yard that cannot be duplicated anywhere in the North American continent.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I want to use up the rest of my time without answering questions.

I want to say this: the reasons for the low cost in production I believe is this, that we have our own construction crews and in 1947 the government crew working on No. 44 highway placed dirt on that road for slightly over 11 cents a cubic yard. We haven't the figures for this year yet, but I believe that we will move dirt even cheaper on that particular project that we did a year ago. I say that is one of the main reasons, but on the other hand I want to pay tribute to the contractors in this province. They have done a good job by and large, and they have been very keenly on the job, and, I say, we are getting work done cheaper in Saskatchewan than in any other place on the North American continent.

I should say a word about our hard-surfacing programme before I pass on. I find that a lot of people are of the opinion that hard-surfacing is being carried on to provide good roads for the tourist traffic. Well, I would not want in any way to discourage tourist traffic in this province. It is something that we should encourage. But I must point out to this House, as I said a moment ago, our supply of gravel is rapidly diminishing and in order to conserve that supply we are going to have to increase our programme of hard-surfacing

as rapidly as the economy of this province will provide. We have, in the last two years, given Saskatchewan its first hard-surfacing programme, and in spite of all the criticism we have heard from across the House, let me tell you that before that tourist traffic starts coming this year we will have more than half of the road from the international border to the Prince Albert National Park hard-surfaced. In fact we are only lacking 10½ miles from Corinne north and 19 miles from Prince Albert Park south, therefore it is more than half hard-surfaced from the international border, that is by way of Moose Jaw. So that in the course of three years is an accomplishment in itself well worthwhile. In addition to that, we have carried on some experimental work on sandy soils with asphalt. We had some criticism; we had a little difficulty on a few miles here and there when we first started out, but we have now reached the stage where we can go out . . . (part cut out by double recording) . . .

. . . and by making those suggestions they waived the objections to some of these provinces. After Mr. McKinnon had placed before that conference Ottawa's position — by the way he said that in any agreement that was reached, they were prepared to take into consideration the amount of money spent on the proposal of the provinces — they asked us to get together and to select routes, suggest specifications and estimate of costs. Well, I thought, here is where the sticker comes in, but after each province had addressed the meeting I noticed that everyone of them . . . (part cut) . . . and in spite of the fact that we had the largest highway system of any province in Canada, in spite of the fact that the largest highway system of any province in Canada, in spite of the fact that more than half of it is worn out, we had traffic flowing over the highways of Saskatchewan last spring before either of our adjoining provinces.

I want to pay tribute to the men who did this work. That did not just happen. We brought those men in here during the month of March and we discussed the problems that we might face at that time. I remember on one occasion traveling through two particular highway districts in this province, and well after dark those men were still out there and there were hundreds of them still out on the highway draining off the water into the ditches, taking care of a seemingly impossible situation. But the work that those men did saved this situation, and I can assure you had it not been for the equipment this government had seen fit to purchase, there would have been a tragic condition in this province last spring. If this had happened in 1944, when there was nothing but a limited amount of old and obsolete equipment, this province could not have possibly coped with the situation if it had existed then.

Before this government came into office there was very little shown for work that was done. I find that in the four years previous to our taking over — years during which the snowfall was light — the best they could do was 1,500 miles in one season. Now, two years ago, which was the worst winter for drifting that this province every had, I find that we had 4,600 miles open in December, 1947, and 2,900 miles in February, 1948. The present season, we had 5,760 miles open on December 31 and 4,980 open on November 8. So even in the worst years in this province, we have done four times as good as the best the Liberals every hoped to do in the years when there was a light snowfall.

I want to say this in regard to snow removal: with the present condition of our highways it is impossible for us to keep all highways in this province open with our limited economy. We have, at the present time, I believe, purchased all the equipment that our economy will allow us to work for the full

season, and we have proven that the only solution to snow removal in Saskatchewan is the rebuilding of our entire system to the standard of roads that we are now building in Saskatchewan; that is roads on a 100 or 150-foot right-of-way, well above the ground level and with embankments and side ditches properly sloped so that there is no obstruction to the snow, and by so doing you let nature do the most of the snow removing for you. I can take you on any highway that we have built in this province since we have been in office, and there is no difficulty in keeping them open, even last winter, bad as it was. Also, last spring when we were faced with those flood conditions we had no major difficulty on any of the new roads built by this government. I find it would cost at least another \$50 million to bring our present highway system up to that standard, that is for earth construction and gravelling alone without taking into consideration hard-surfacing or administration. The question is how long do the people of Saskatchewan want to wait for these roads because I believe that this government is spending all the money we can possibly spend on highways with a budget of the size that we have introduced at the present time. If we are to go faster than we are doing now, then other means of revenue will have to be found, and there is one source that I want to discuss with you today. We have been hammering away at it for many years. We have maintained that the federal government should be taking some part in the assistance of building highways in Canada. We believe that there should be developed in Canada a system somewhat similar to the one they have in the United States. There, commencing in 1916, the federal government set up what is known as the Highway Federal Assistance and commencing in 1917, with \$5 million per year they have continued until 1946, 1947 and 1948, they were granting \$500 million per year to assist in highway construction.

There are many changes taking place and if I have time I would like to deal with them. I would like to say that the outcome of their experience has been the setting up what is known as a Public Road Administration, a body whose duty it is to deal with the various states in the agreeing of a route and the agreeing as to the amount of money that they ought to give these states. The formula on which they based their grants in the United States is based on three main factors: area, population and miles of road. Most of the grants are on a 50-50 basis, but I find that the present grants are made on the basis, where in some states the population is sparse, they are paying as high as 82.5 percent of the total cost of construction. I mention that fact because at the present time negotiations have started with the federal government, and I want to deal with that a little later on here today, but before I do I would like to mention that during the past summer the three major political parties in this country have held national conventions; all three have mentioned federal aid to highways. The Liberals simply said they were in favour of the construction of a Trans-Canada Highway. The Conservatives went one better and said they were in favour of a hard-surface Trans-Canada Highway, but the C.C.F. I noticed was the only political party of the three who suggested a comprehensive plan of highway assistance from the federal government. They said that they were prepared to assist the provinces in the construction of roads of national and international points; roads to parks; and would include among other things the construction of a Trans-Canada Highway and this would become part of the first term programme of that party.

In December we were called to Ottawa to discuss with the federal government the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway. At the outset I want to say that I was surprised in general with the result of that first conference.

March 7, 1949

When we first met, Mr. McKinnon, Minister of Mines and Resources, laid before us the principles upon which the federal government was prepared to negotiate with the provinces. He said, first of all, that they were not interested in having jurisdiction over this road. When he said that my mind went back to the resolution that was passed at the Liberals convention, here I believe, in 1946 when the hon. member opposite was elected Leader of the Liberal party. At that time in their platform they stated that they were going to turn over to the dominion for development some main highways through Saskatchewan. I would suggest that the Liberal party in Saskatchewan and the Liberals Party at Ottawa get together on this matter because when we went to Ottawa they said that they were not going to take over any highways. They did not want to. They said that they realized that highways and roads were the responsibility of the provinces and the municipalities and I agree with them; I think they are right.

My greatest surprise came then, Mr. Speaker. That was that after we had presented Ottawa with that picture, Ottawa said: "We cannot do anything more just now. We have to have time to consider the information you have given us." And they again asked us to go back home and to supply them with further information. As far as this province was concerned, I saw that no time was lost in getting that down to Ottawa. When I was in Toronto on January 15 I found that two of the provinces had complied with the demand, that is Manitoba and Saskatchewan, but the other provinces all agreed that this be done immediately; they all stated that they were busy compiling information and it was going forward at once. Since that time we have had no further word.

If the Liberals party at Ottawa is sincere in bringing us together to discuss this matter, sincere in asking them to supply this information, and sincere in the statement which they made that they want to see the work start this year and that it should be completed in five years, then there is no time to be lost in calling the provinces together again to finally consummate an agreement if we are to start in 1949. I am beginning to wonder whether the Liberals government at Ottawa is more interesting in building a platform for this coming federal election than in building the Trans-Canada Highway. I hope I am wrong.

Now while I am on this matter I think I should give this House a little summary of what the Trans-Canada Highway is going to mean in dollars and cents. I find that on the estimated cost which we gave that meeting, it amounts to approximately \$266 million to complete the Trans-Canada Highway across Canada. That is broken down as follows: Prince Edward Island \$4 million; Nova Scotia, \$36.5 million, New Brunswick, \$7 million, Ontario, \$103 million — there is more mileage to be constructed in Ontario than in any other province; Quebec, \$27 million, Manitoba, \$17 million; Saskatchewan \$18 million; Alberta, \$13 million; and British Columbia \$40 million. Now that is what the Trans-Canada Highway will mean.

Since we left Ottawa I notice that the Minister of Mines and Resources for Ottawa would likely be prepared to meet the provinces on a 50-50 basis on this project. The other day he said that that would likely be the minimum. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, if we are to take part in the building of a Trans-Canada Highway on the specifications agreed to at that conference, we would be money out of pocket on that basis because 50 percent of the \$18 million would

be \$9 million, but we can build a hard-surface highway all across Saskatchewan, ample to meet the needs of this province, for at the most \$8 million. So if we were to go into a scheme such as this it would not only cost us \$1 million more, but it would mean that the bulk of our revenue would be tied up for the next five years in the building of the Trans-Canada Highway. I say we cannot afford to do that. But I want to say that as far as the four western provinces are concerned, we were all agreed that Ottawa should assume the full cost of the construction of this road. I am hoping that Ottawa will consider this because, as I stated a moment ago . . .

Mr. Tucker: — A real generous offer of yours, of course.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — That is a proper solution . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Were they overwhelmed?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — . . . because there were places across the line where the federal government took part in a programme of national road building that roads up to the Trans-Canada Highway were paid 100 percent by the federal government, and particularly in a province such as ours where you have a sparse population.

Mr. Tucker: — I understood you to say before, 73 percent.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — No, there was one state receiving as high as 80.5. I think that is correct. That is the overall picture in the states, but where you have a designated route called a national highway they sometimes paid the whole 100 percent cost.

I want to assure this House that as far as this province is concerned we are prepared to do our utmost to see that work is started on that highway, and that we will co-operate to the fullest of our extent in having such a project brought under way as soon as possible.

The hon. member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) has mentioned the fact that a contract has been let for the building of the bridge over the South Saskatchewan River, and I am very glad to inform the members of this House that the Bird Construction Company, who has undertaken the work, is one of the best firms in Canada, and the contract for the construction of that bridge, not in four years as was suggested across the way but in two. I am hoping that in the summer of 1950 you will all be present at the opening of the bridge at Saskatchewan Landing.

Mr. Tucker: — What year did you say?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — 1950. I know the hon. member across the way will be glad to hear this news in spite of the fact that on January 8, 1948, while speaking in Swift Current, he threw quite a bit of cold water on it. Then he carried on a newspaper controversy trying to discourage people from subscribing to this bond issue.

An Hon. Member: — Shame.

March 7, 1949

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — In spite of that the people of that country have subscribed a lot of money.

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege. I did not try to discourage people from subscribing to that bond issue. I suggested that this was not the right way to go about financing this proposition.

Mr. Gibbs: — I was there and I heard him.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member withdraw that suggestion. I am not trying to lie out of anything. I am just trying to present the facts.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. gentleman must retract that.

Mr. Gibbs: — You could not understand me, I guess; that is the trouble. Your hearing is good but your understanding is not so good.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — It has become rather common for someone to get up here and read either items of newspaper or Hansard repudiating the hon. gentleman, but I have here a clipping from The Leader-Post, and I also have it from the Star Phoenix, where the hon. gentleman did criticize this scheme, and certainly did not do it any good in the vicinity of Swift Current.

We had other difficulties in having this bridge built. We had a lot of difficulty in trying to get some definite information from Ottawa as to whether or not a dam would be built down here between Elbow and Outlook. Mr. Howe told us that it would only raise the water level at the bridge 18 feet. When I got the information, of course — I do not just go by newspaper clippings — I had my staff get in touch with the P.F.R.A. officials and the report, which we got from them showed that there would be a rise of 53 feet, which, of course, meant that we could not proceed with the present low-level bridge. So I took the matter up with Mr. Howe, and I am not divulging any confidences when I make the statement because Mr. Howe has tabled his correspondence in the House at Ottawa, and a letter which I got back from Mr. Howe showed that the site for the dam had not been picked and he could give me no information as to what the rise in the water level would be at that point. We have been carrying on correspondence ever since. I have interviewed him at Ottawa, but we have never been able to get anything definite from Ottawa as to what would be the exact position of this bridge. In fact some of the members down there tell me to go ahead and build it: "If it is every put up, we will pay for it."

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. gentleman a question on that? Didn't Mr. Howe tell you himself to go ahead and build it, and if they build a damn high enough to flood it hey would pay for it. I understood you to say that yourself.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I have the correspondence with Mr. Howe here. I did not say that Mr. Howe told

me that. This has all been tabled in the House, as the hon. gentleman knows, otherwise I would not give it to you. The first correspondence I have with Mr. Howe was when the statement was made in the House and I wrote him for definite information. Here is what he said: "I am under the impression that final selection of the proposed dam site to control the Saskatchewan River has not yet been made although the choice has been narrowed to a portion of that strip of river between Elbow and Outlook." Now, according to a Saskatoon Star Phoenix release the hon. member across the way made the following statement: "Mr. Tucker said it is up to the Saskatchewan government to co-operate with the federal government in getting construction of the bridge started. He said that Mr. Howe, Minister of Reconstruction, had already assured the government of Saskatchewan that consideration would be given to the sharing of the costs of the Saskatchewan Landing bridge." I saw that in the paper and I wrote Mr. Howe asking for confirmation, and here is Mr. Howe's reply: "I am not aware of any change in the situation affecting the Saskatchewan Landing bridge since we discussed the subject in my office. I am not able to state whether or not the proposed dam on the South Saskatchewan river will affect the plans which you have submitted to the Department of Public Works, since the site of the proposed dam has not yet been chosen." That was on January 31, 1948.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question on that? Didn't you actually say yourself that Mr. Howe . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — No, no, Mr. Speaker. I made no such statement.

Mr. Tucker: — Just let me ask a question because I want to get this cleared up. Didn't you say that Mr. Howe had said go ahead and build the bridge and if we put the dam in and flood it we will pay for the damage done? Didn't you say that he told you that, because I understand that he did tell you that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement but the man who has made the statement is the hon. gentleman across the way, unless the Star Phoenix and the Leader-Post misquoted him.

Mr. Tucker: — You were the man who made that statement not me. I read that you had made it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He said it so many times he believes it himself.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — But to get back to the subject, I want to say that there was some delay in getting this contract let because we are of the opinion that Ottawa should assume some responsibility in the construction of this bridge. If they are not going to build the dam at the site suggested, they should tell us so; and if they are, then they should be prepared to either assume part of the cost of building a high-level bridge, pay part of the added cost in building these piers sufficiently strong to carry a high-level bridge if one is found necessary in the years to come.

March 7, 1949

Mr. Tucker: — Have you asked them to do that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Yes, we have, and they have turned us down.

Premier Douglas: — Repeatedly.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They are not quite sure about the dam yet.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I have talked quite a bit longer than I had intended to as there are a number of things that I want to discuss here and go over as aptly as I can.

The other day the member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) mentioned the fact that rural municipalities could not expect some assistance from year to year. That is true since this government took office, but I can assure you it was not true before this government took office so he is learning fast. I want to point out that in 1943 the rural municipalities — and that was the year before the election — received \$142,199. This year the amount allocated to rural municipalities, and this does not include L.I.D.'s, \$735,966. They went on to tell about the difficulties that the municipalities were having and how taxes were higher in this province; how we were ruining the municipalities, I have here a letter from a gentleman who lived in Saskatchewan but had a quarter-section of land in Saskatchewan and another quarter-section right across the road in the province of Manitoba. He tells me that the land is practically identical, but I find that the quarter-section in Saskatchewan is assessed at \$8,002 and the total tax is \$88.80. The quarter-section in Manitoba is assessed at \$2,000, his taxes there are \$146. Now, where the municipal tax on the Saskatchewan quarter was \$32, on the Manitoba quarter it is \$66. The school tax on the Saskatchewan quarter was \$48, on the Manitoba quarter \$76.

An Hon. Member: — Liberal government.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Liberal government, yes.

Now, if my hon. friends across the way are really perturbed about the taxes the farmers are paying, I would suggest they take a look at the income tax. I find that in 1947 that of the farmers in the province of Quebec there were only 9,902 who paid income tax. But in Saskatchewan we had 54,929 farmers who paid income tax. This just didn't happen in one year. When I go back over the records I find that even in the poor years the province of Saskatchewan has a reputation of more farmers paying income tax than in any other province in Canada. Mr. Speaker, the whole thing smells about as bad as a fish if they sent it up here in 1947. I am sorry that the hon. member for Rosthern is not in his seat because he was sitting in the House of Commons at that time, and to my knowledge he did nothing about this. If he did do anything, it certainly did not have any effect because we today find the farmers in this hard-pressed province, more of them paying income tax than in any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

Then they shed some crocodile tears about the farmers of this province having to take leases from this government for crown lands. I looked over the records for this province from 1901 to the present date, and what do I find? I found that tenancy had increased in Saskatchewan from 1901 to 1940-41 from 3.9 percent to 47 percent, but I find that from 1941 to 1946 there has been a decline in the number of farmers and tenant farmers so that there is a slight upswing

there. A further investigation would reveal the fact that much of this went out throughout the lean years when farmers, through no fault of their own, found that interest costs had accumulated to such an extent that they could not possibly meet their expenses and in many cases were forced to sign Form A agreements which were virtually a release of the land to mortgage companies, and those men became tenants. Now, what did the Liberal government do about this thing? It was mentioned to you the other day one of the things they were able to do was to cancel taxes so that these mortgage companies might again have first claim against the land. Had that not been done the rural municipalities, who by the way suffered a loss because these taxes had been cancelled, could have taken title to this land and could have given the resident farmers a chance to re-buy the land and again to re-establish themselves. But thanks to the Liberal government in office at that time those taxes were cancelled; the mortgage companies again had clear right and were able to go out and report Form A agreements from many of the farmers at that time. So I am sure mortgage companies will be eternally grateful to the Liberal government for all they have done for them, but I think it ill behoves the men across the way to shed crocodile tears because we are giving 22-year leases to men who are taking up crown lands.

I have only one other thing and then I will be through. I noticed that they tried to leave the impression the other day that we were not increasing the vote to the Department of Agriculture. Now I know the Minister of Agriculture will look after this himself, but I just want to mention it in passing. I find that in the Public Accounts for 1947-48, on page 464, the Lands Branch, which he said had just been transferred to the Department of Agriculture, was transferred at that time, and you will find in the Public Accounts at that time the cost of the Lands Branch in the Department of Agriculture. In 1947-48, while we spent \$1,661,000 for agriculture, I noticed the vote today is \$2,518,490 — an increase of over \$800,000. We have used agriculture right in Saskatchewan. We are still looking after them and the vote last spring showed that the farmers of this province realized that and appreciated it, but just as we are looking after agriculture, so, also, are we looking after the industry in Saskatchewan. While the opposition is criticizing us for not starting up new industries in this province — if I had the time I could cite quite a few — I want to remind them that in the period of Canada's greatest industrial expansion, the years before the war, when you had a Liberals government in Ottawa and a Liberal government in Saskatchewan, we had absolutely no industrial development in this province, even though you had widespread industrial development in every other province in Canada. I was amazed the other day when the hon. gentleman asked us why we had not re-opened the mines at Goldfields. Well, did he not realize that those mines shut down while he was the Premier of this province? That was the time they should have been stopped. I know the reason for Goldfields was shut down, and I suppose the other gentlemen here know also that it was because it was not a paying proposition, and the Consolidated Mining and Smelting are a firm that is not in the habit of operating ventures that are not paying. They made a bad guess there and they closed it up. I am hoping, however, with the help that we are giving in this province in developing the north country that Goldfields will again be opened. I want to remind the hon. gentleman one of the things the Department of Highways did, if nothing else, we built that road right through to Lac la Ronge, right to the pre-Cambrian Shield making it possible to get into that area with all types of vehicles.

March 7, 1949

In Conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this government has nothing to be ashamed of in the help we have given people who are interested in development work in this province, and we will continue to do so, and because of those various things I intend to support the motion.

Mr. J.G. Banks (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, before going on with the remarks I would like to make this afternoon, I believe I have to make amends to this House for something that happened about three weeks ago: a broken nut, bolt or spring in this chair disturbed a very good speech that was being given by the member for the Battlefords (Mr. Prince). As a matter of fact, it disturbed everybody. Our good friends, the press, did not overlook it. I want to assure them that I do not feel badly about what they said. I believe that it was probably justified because I may have looked a little bit sleepy that afternoon.

I want to do honour to the Speaker, as all the other members have done, to his elevation to this office for the second time. Being new and making my maiden speech, I can only observe that I like his attitude of fair play; I like the way he will give and take, and I also like his firmness when he closes down. Those are very fine attributes in any man, and I want to assure him that I admire the way he has been carrying on here.

Just let me congratulate the government on its success at the polls last summer. The way it looks to me from all these maiden speeches from this side of the House, they must have had a pretty bad shaking up. When those maiden speeches develop into full-fledged speakers, when they get the information, then they probably better be a little more alarmed. For the time being we new members here are not worried. We won Rosthern; we won Cannington; we won Gravelbourg; we won Arm River; we won Battleford; and we won Saltcoats. You know that brought all of these veterans into the House, and we new members are only going to follow the lead and try and live up to the traditions which they have stood for. I can only say that I am very pleased to be here. I do not want to pretend that I will make much of a speech this time. I believe it was suggested on one occasion here that one of the new members could not make much of a speech, but I am going to do my best. That is all I have been doing since I got old enough to be around, and I always feel that when I have done my best, everybody else feels satisfied.

With respect to the election: I only have one incident stamped on my mind and I would like to tell the House about the incident. This happened on Sunday, June 20. The Leader of the C.C.F. party came to town and held a meeting. Well, we have an unwritten law in our town that no matter what is going on during the rest of the day — tennis, curling bonspiel or whatever you like — when church time comes, everything else stops. It is a good law. It has been that way for years and the people respect it. But on this particular

evening our neighbour from Manitoba, Mr. Zaplitny, had been in my constituency for two weeks, we had 53 Manitoba cars there. Mr. Feeley was there and all were from the west. There wasn't much of a Kamsack audience.

Mr. Kuziak: — All good church men.

Mr. J.G. Banks: — All the people were in church. That is the reason they weren't at the meeting. But in any event they had a new speaker, a little girl of 14 years of age and she got up and told the people how she loved school, how she loved it under the C.C.F. government, how successful she was in school and how easy it was to learn. All of these things were very well written down for her and she read them and that was the outstanding thing outside of the strange cars there. At any even, this thing backfired. The rest of the boys and girls in town did not think school was very much different under the C.C.F., and they gave her a nickname the next day. Do you know what it was? "Little Misrepresentation": is what she was known as after that. Their benevolent school teacher, a good C.C.F.'er, that very afternoon held a vote in the two rooms in the public school. Under those conditions you could naturally expect Little Misrepresentation to get elected. A timid little boy was chosen to present the Liberals, and do you know what the result was? Little Misrepresentation was defeated, badly defeated, and the Liberals won, the little timid lad, and it was under the C.C.F. management, I understand.

You have a very good high school there that has been turning out boys and girls who are all over Canada. As a matter of fact we have had a Rhodes scholarship winner who spent three years in Oxford. These boys and girls between the ages of 14 to 19, having heard of the public school election, thought they would have a Gallup poll, but for some reason the principal of the high school stepped on it and would not allow any of that kind of thing around the high school. He wanted to keep his records clean, I suppose. But in any event they held a Gallup poll and they took all the parties in. The Labour Progressive got three votes and again the C.C.F. candidate hit the bottom. Our boys and girls did not stop there. They made 2,000 posters setting out the vote in the high school and the vote in the public school, and they added: "We understand that Canora is an important town, but it is not big enough for two members." Our friend from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) who is representing that seat, and who you have heard from, had a mate who was running in Kamsack — I'm going to tell you all about that after a while — and he said: "When Canora gets to be as big as Moose Jaw, Regina or Saskatoon then it will be entitled to two members, but in the meantime we are going to send this fellow home, and they did send him home. I do want to say that these posters reached every poll in the constituencies and I believe they had a great effect. No one guided those boys and girls; they did it all themselves. Their ideas and their sense of fair play is what guided them in doing this.

Mr. Kuziak: — The C.C.F. won in Kamsack.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Banks: — I am going to say a few things about the constituency which I represent. It is right along the Manitoba boundary and in mentioning attending these meetings, I want to say that we Liberals had meetings too, we had many meetings . . .

Mr. Erb: — How many conventions did you have?

Mr. Banks: — . . . when this campaign was underway, and during that time I met many people from the dried out areas. I was very much struck with some of the things they said. They had not been having crops, we had. When they spoke of so many bushels to the acre of barley, I would think in the terms of what we got; and the same with the wheat. I came to think we were very favoured people. We were in that part of the constituency where they were having good crops; plenty of grain to sell, plenty of stock to sell and plenty of butter and milk, and I felt that we had a very good location. I have not been one of the fly-by-night kind. I had to wait 32 years to get a Liberals nomination, so I have. Not been one of the fly-by night kind. I have been waiting a long time for it and I have been qualifying, I hope, all of the time for this position. But I am going to tell you — and Mr. Patterson and Mr. Danielson and some of the other older members will remember, they used to send up to our area for vegetables for the dried out areas, and you know what happened: they ask for a carload in our town, and they brought in three carloads. I believe they did that all over that constituency. You know, gentlemen, that was the day, I believe, when that phrase was coined, that biblical phrase, “without money and without price” meant something — they gave it away. There was no trickery attached to it at all, because they gave it away.

I want to say here that the hon. gentleman from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) lives in that area, the finest area you could find. The town of Canora has two good highways passing through it, built by the Liberal government. Now, Mr. Speaker, the statement here that his was a backwoods place was an insult to every voter in Canora constituency. It is not a backward part of the province. It is possibly more favoured, closer to the railroad, has more highways and closer to the city of Yorkton, and I suggest here that this gentleman who has the honour to represent that seat should be ashamed of himself for making the statement he did about his own seat, and his own people. I can possibly explain that. I am able to explain it in this way: it is not that he has not got everything that this province can give him but the constituency has not got that, but he has something else that is lacking. Twenty-five years ago the seat of Canora received its first baptism in socialism. We had a gentleman there by the name of Mr. Zannon. He came from Russia and he was a communist. He taught the young men and girls, and provincially they developed south of that town the Mazeppa Club. They had a lot of fine singers and formed the Mazeppa Choir. He was smart enough to do all of those things and the whole thing was permeated with the teaching of Mr. Zannon. I do not think that Mr. Zannon is there now, but these young people have grown up, and it is the result of these teachings that is the trouble in Canora today. It is not that the country is backward, it is because the spirit is backward. They have lived to ask for alms all of the time. They think that the rich man should help them, instead of helping themselves. Let me tell you today this very spirit has prevented them from advancing in a great many ways. They have not got a curling rink or a skating rink. When they got their Power Commission formed they were in the first ones to offer their power plant for sale so that they could pay interest on the debts on these bonds. They took advantage of every statute that was passed in the province to cut interest, and they are still heavily in debt. On the other side, I want to take you down 30 miles east of Canora. You will find there a \$17,000

skating rink paid for; a curling rink worth \$13,000, and not a dollar owing against it. That was not paid by any taxation; that was put up by the people. They subscribed the money and they paid for it. They have been in operation now for four years. They have a power plant with five units paid for, and its earnings bring in \$18,000 a year.

An Hon. Member: — That's socialism, isn't it?

Mr. Banks: — That is public ownership of things that the Liberal government brought into being. They have the power plant to keep the town running, to keep the wheels turning, and there is not one dollar of debt. The town of Kamsack does not owe one dollar. And you know, Mr. Speaker, during all those years that they were there they were under the control of the Liberal government, except for four years. That accounts for the spirit of Kamsack in contrast with the spirit of Canora, that was so amply demonstrated here a while ago as if they were living in the backwoods.

I have this to say further, and I want to tell you about our own town which we all love and have been living in. We had, as you know, a very, vary bad cyclone there five years ago, August 9, 1944. The buildings were badly smashed, four people were killed, 35 people put in the hospital injured quite severely, and many others who nursed their wounds at home, and so forth. I want to compliment the government on the steps they took at that time. They had just been recently elected to office and two of the Cabinet Ministers came up and helped the organizations. There is no doubt they did very well for us, and more than that, they laid \$50,000 on the line. They asked everybody in Saskatchewan to contribute towards the rebuilding of our town. We are all glad of that. Everybody said that was splendid. They had a committee headed by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan to whom all this money was sent, and it amounted to about \$200,000. They went to work and I believe the last of the repairing was done in the fall of 1945 — that was the year afterwards. There was a gentleman named Mr. Greig who is in the employ of the provincial government and he was the chief potentate. He told the committees what to do, and he said: "This will have to be closed out." There wasn't quite enough money to pay all the claims on Main Street, but most of the claims of private houses were paid. But you know, it was closed out and about 40 percent was paid on Main Street. Gentleman, we did not know or learn what had happened until the summer of 1946. We know now that when that thing was closed out there was just about \$50,000 left in the funds. Mr. Greig saw that amount was left there. We also know now that Chapter 107 of the Statute passed that year appropriated the balance of that fund without stating it to the provincial government. There is no question about that. Now, I am going to ask you what you think of a person who asks you to go into a speculative deal, possibly speculative or not, and he says: "I am investing dollar for dollar with you." That is the way the government did. They said: "We put in \$50,000, now you come along too. They closed that thing out just when there was about \$50,000 in the fund and that was disposed of under Chapter 107 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1946.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question:

Mr. Banks: — After a while. I am not used to these interruptions. I don't want to be thrown off just now.

Now this is the same thing as two men going into a speculative deal, or any other kind of deal, one with the knowledge that if the deal goes bad he is going to get his money back. I just wasn't to say in passing that that seems to be the situation there. The Statute was passed, and we did not know a thing about it. We had a member from Canora but apparently he held his hand up and voted for that Statute applying the balance of this cyclone money to something else. But I want to say this, and I have said it publicly many, many times, that in the city of Yorkton they took all the men off the streets, all the tractors and all the machinery in the town and they brought it into Kamsack and worked there two weeks, and the town of Kamsack never received a bill from them. Possibly the government is entitled to some little approbation about this thing. I do not know if this was like one of those mistakes of the umpire in a hockey or ball game, if they make a mistake when they gave it and they tried to rectify the mistake. Or was it that they went into the venture knowing they were safe because they were going to get it back anyway. That is the attitude of this government. But I want to tell you this much about it. They have been pretty good to us. I want to say that I made a great many trips down here in the summer of 1947, connected with the building of the hospital. I made the acquaintance of Dr. Mott, Dr. Kirk, and I do not think we could get any better treatment anywhere. As a result, this hospital is going to be in operation at the end of the year and the government has contributed \$25,000 towards it. Everybody in my constituency appreciates that, and will be indeed glad to give it credit wherever it may be necessary to give it.

I can also say that with respect to highways, we have done very well. Our constituency is about 45 miles across and we have two complete highways — one entering from the south going into Manitoba, and then about 25 miles north of that is another one; right down the centre of the constituency, running north and south, is another highway and the Department of Highways has just completed that to connect with No. 10 this year. We also have gravel roads. There is a farmers' road a little further west and it is all graveled. You can go 50 miles from one end of that constituency completely to the other end on good roads. I suggest here that that was all done by the farmers themselves. As a matter of fact, we have had three ventures of that kind in the last two years where the people did not wait for the Department of Highways. No, they could not wait. They went to work and they took up subscriptions. Some of them \$100, \$150, and they went to work and they graveled these roads. I want a deal with that a little later, but right now I want to say something about a little speech that I heard last summer on the radio and it was made by Mr. Coldwell. You know it fits in so well with the remarks . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He won't answer any questions.

Mr. Banks: — I think possibly I had better finish up. It is getting on to six o'clock and I want to be finished by then.

Mr. Gibson: — Would the hon. member speak a little louder, we cannot hear more than one-third of what he is saying, over here.

Mr. Banks: — This is a matter which I want to read to you. I do not want to spoil it, and I do not think I could explain it as well as this writer explains it. It is a report on a radio broadcast by Mr. Coldwell which was held just about election time, and I quote:

M.J. Coldwell, C.C.F. Leader, with that familiar air of deep concern, has painted with apparent alarm the increasing corporation profits. Speaking over the C.B.C., the top socialist in Canada was anything but pleased to find that since 1939 profits of the Canadian business had soared up to 50 percent. Since profits soar only when a community prospers, Mr. Coldwell presumably prefers a depression which is the sad state of affairs achieved when profits disappear.

In the hungry thirties there was over 10 million people out of work in the United States. That was in 1938, and it was the same in Canada only on a smaller scale, and for the same reasons. One American steel company had lost \$8 million that year. Wages were only \$20 for every ton of steel produced. The total payroll was \$58 million. That was in 1938. In 1947 these payrolls had jumped from \$58 million to \$219 million. The company was making a profit; a record number of men were being employed, each getting much higher wages as well. The company had used profits to expand and make more jobs. In 1947, wages had jumped to \$28 for every ton of steel produced; nearly half again as much as in 1938. When the company could make profits there were more jobs, better wages. When the company lost money, workers did not get more, they got fired or less money. But Mr. M.J. Coldwell does not like the Canadian companies making profits. In 1947, nearly every American company was making higher profits, and as a result unemployment reached an all-time high of 60 million. Mr. Coldwell, a socialist, doggedly dislikes profits. The C.C.F. Leader is presumably conscious of the fact that during the hungry thirties, while business went broke and people as a result went hungry, socialism got a stiff shot in the arm. Despairing people like drowning men clutched at any straw.

Mr. Coldwell is a rip-roaring socialist. Nothing but his obsession with socialism could explain his disappointment at the signs of a profitable, prosperous Canada.

A more lively part of the C.C.F. Leader's talk was that enriched with poetry. What an English poet knows about economics is something Mr. Coldwell failed to explain, but here are the lines as Mr. Coldwell, inaccurately by the way, quoted them:

“Ill fares this land to every way
When wealth accumulates and men decay.”

Mr. Coldwell may not know it, but in Canada wealth or profit does not accumulate by gets turned back into business to buy more plants, machinery and good, which means employing more people and paying more wages. That is not accumulation; that is increased production and prosperity, which is what Mr. Coldwell is so sorry to see. Neither will men decay; they prosper, and then get the fine profit figures so objectional to the C.C.F. Leader.

March 7, 1949

As I said before, it worked in so well with the speech of the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) that I am certain he will appreciate particularly the poetry that was given here.

Now I want to deal with one subject that I think is important here and that is with respect to the Timber Board. There has not been a great deal said about that yet, but it is a very important subject and in view of the great deal of publicity and propaganda that was put out in 1946, it seems to me that there should be a full discussion of the matter, and I am sorry to see that the Minister of Natural Resources, Hon. Mr. Brockelbank, is not in his seat, but I want to deal with the matter and give you some information which is taken from the reports of provinces from year to year. You will recall some of the things that were said at that time.

We all know that the resources of Saskatchewan were under the control of the dominion government up to 1930, and we all know, too, that the dominion government had leased many berths for the cutting of timber in Saskatchewan, mostly white spruce and jack pine. These leases had been in effect for quite some time. As a matter of fact some areas had been cut over and the trees had grown up again. I am going to read to you from the report of 1940 which deals with this very thing, which became such an important question in 1946. That is the time when this Timber Board was formed. On page 20 of the Year Book for 1940 you will find this.

During the past nine-year period, a total of 314.64 square miles of the most valuable timber and accessible, merchantable white spruce saw timber areas have been logged off and the berths cancelled. Only about one-fifth of the forested land originally disposed of by the dominion government prior to 1930, under the Timber Berth Licence, now remains. Many of those logged over areas have been severely damaged by fire, recent surveys indicate that these acres have been so severely cut over that their residual stand has inadequate stalking, and that regeneration has not been satisfactory over most of those areas. For the working plan on a sustained yield basis, a smaller volume should have been cut in the initial logging operations.

That was a very frank admission given by the government of the day, in 1940, as to that situation. They did not hide anything, and they had secured from these men all of the timber berths except one-quarter. I might say that they had then started the regeneration period, because in the year 1940 you will find that there was over 100,000 of these small cuttings, or whatever they are, planted out over these areas for generation purposes.

Just to give you another idea about this, I want to deal again with a part of this report, and it says here:

As a result of larger crop returns and generally because business conditions prevailed during the last half of the year under review, the purchasing power of the farmers in the urban centres was improved, creating a greater demand for lumber than in previous years. Increased construction of small buildings and government projects for war purposes created an active market for local lumber and other forest products; a definite increase in the number of small portable-type sawmills operating was evident during the winter. The Department of Co-operation with the Department of Labour

undertook a census of sawmills in the province during January, which indicated that more than 400 sawmills of all types were scattered throughout the forest area. (This was again in 1940) The number of Timber Sales disposed of during the year far exceeded any previous year and the volume of timber produced and revenue contracted was greater than any year since the transfer of natural resources to the province.

I have also this information for the House, Mr. Speaker, and these are the cuts four years before this government went into power and four years afterwards: in 1940, 132 million feet; 1941, 136 million feet; 1942, 153 million; 1943, 89 million; 1944 and 1945 are grouped together, 136 million; 1946, 135 million; 1947 30 million feet; 1948, 92 million feet. You can see by that that there was a little more lumber cut in the five years preceding the time when this government went into office, but not very much. This matter of conservation had at that time become recognized. There were forest rangers all over the north country; forest fires were guarded carefully; any many who cut timber in there knew very well that if he didn't use the greatest of care, he was done. This question of come in, cut and get out did not appear to be the case. That was some slogan established by the fire minister, but he created a very woeful picture in the year 1946 over this timber, and he said: "Well, we are done; we are losing it all." "Somebody had destroyed all the timber" is what was said. Now, when you look at those figures, the thing is not so bad, particularly in war years. We had four war years, the first time when they needed lumber as they say here. I want to tell you just how that thing was handled from the year 1940 up. Every farmer was entitled, each year, to cut 3,000 feet of white spruce or jack pine if he had it. He could go in there and he could do that every year, and all he paid the government was \$3 per thousand. Gentleman, there existed the greatest co-operatives that I have ever known at that time. In my constituency, and I have no doubt in Mr. Brockelbank's constituency, the farmers went to the bush to cut the timber down and they all worked together. They needed 7,000 feet for a little four-roomed house, about 11,000 for a big house, and every man in the country was able to get the timber for a granary. The cost of sawing it was \$9 per thousand, and they had a little mobile planer which they moved from place to place. The cost of that lumber was \$9 for sawing, \$9 for planning and \$3 for the government - \$21. They hauled it by themselves. There weren't many trucks in those days. But that system went along and continued up until the year 1946.

Let me tell you about another system they had which was known as the sales permit. Many of those farmers living up in the area of small farms uncleared, maybe just 35 or 40 acres cleared, worked in the bush during the winter. They could get a sales permit and still paid their \$3. But they went to work and with their own efforts took this lumber out and hauled it home mostly. That was a fine thing because it enabled them to store up something in the winter to carry them through the summer by selling this lumber. Now, that was not cutting all the timber or depriving the province of any timber because when a spruce tree reaches a diameter of 22 to 25 inches it is mature, and after that time it starts to deteriorate and the top will come off. That is the time it must be cut, and conservation or no conservation, if it is not cut at that time the lumber is not as good afterwards. We had that system, and I suggest to the Minister of Co-operatives that if he wants a true co-operative. There it is: one which the farmers organized themselves.

March 7, 1949

We hear stories about the ruination of our forest, and the appointment of a Royal Commission. Mr. Frank Aliason of Regina was chairman of that Commission, and I know two of them that were on it: Mr. William Bayliss and a man named Irwin from Toronto. The Commission was all right. Its object was to enquire into the stocks of timber and, if possible, make suggestions as to what was needed in the timber trade to conserve it. One thing they were not asked to find was that the Timber Board was in need to be turned over to some Crown Corporation, which the C.C.F. might name or organize. But with the Timber Board they started out fairly well. The first man named to that Timber board was Mr. Norman Campbell. Now Mr. Campbell is not a Liberal, but he is an experienced lumber man. He is head of the Porcupine Lumber Company at Pelly, is a brother of Mr. M.N. Campbell, many years an associate of Mr. Woodward in the dominion House as C.C.F. member. Well, Mr. Campbell, while operating the Porcupine Lumber Company, gave the government the benefit of his experience. Mr. Campbell never had one charge laid against him for maladministration of the forest, and his choice was a good one, but not a Liberal choice. Here is what happened: in six months Mr. Campbell resigned. Of course he was too good a C.C.F.'er to say why he quit but we know pretty well because he could not get along with Mr. Phelps. I want to tell you that it was a sorry day for the Timber Board when Mr. Campbell did quit.

Then they groped around for a while. The Royal Commission made its findings: 21 paragraphs turned up. But you know, the government of that day were not very brave. There were 47 members in this House with their Crown Corporation laws and they did not have the nerve to say that this was a government measure. And do you know how they got out the propaganda through that: here is section 21 of the report of the Royal Commission and that Royal Commission, as constituted, never wrote section 21. It was not part of the findings of the Royal Commission, but it was inserted afterwards when Mr. Phelps started his Timber Board. He wanted to get control of the natural products of the forest, that is all the timber grown on farm lands. He wanted to be the absolute dictator of it. Well, if you want any evidence about it, two of the Commissioners refused to subscribe section 21, because he wanted this Royal Commission to say that they had advised establishing this Timber Board, and that is exactly what they refused to do. Here is what has been said about it, and it is in the words of one of the commissioners:

Although we have received considerable evidence with respect to the marketing of lumber, and some that had to do with the fishing industry, I considered that not mention of either matter should be made in the report for a variety of reasons, the principle ones being that the Timber Board was still in a formative stage and another Royal Commission had been formed to give further evidence and prepare a report on the various aspects of the fishing industry. The other chief reason has already been referred to above.

When the report was published I know that I was not the only member of the Commission who was definitely interested in Chapter 21. At no time during the length of the Commission can I recall that the members learned that the marketing of forest products and fish products and fur had, in the past, been unsatisfactory from the standpoint of the population in the forest areas, and the sellers have been at the mercy of a buyer's market. What often happens is that we are out of line with actual values.

This statement, no doubt, was true at times, but I cannot recall it being submitted in evidence. We did have considerable adverse criticism directed at the newly-formed Timber Board from all across the north of the province. We did not concur in it for another reason. We believed that a system of centralized marketing based upon recognized co-operative principles is the answer to the marketing problem, and that the appointment of timber boards is a step in the right direction. As a member of the Commission, I fail to find any record of evidence being placed before us to warrant our making such a statement in the report, and the various members of the Commission did not agree that any such sentiment should be expressed therein. It would not have been possible for the Commission to make such a statement in support of the formation of the Timber Board, as regardless of misleading statements made in the press, over the air, and from public platforms, the Timber Board of Saskatchewan is anything but a marketing board based on recognized co-operative principles. It is a state-owned monopoly — a timber contractor that sub-contracts the timber operations at the lowest figure it feels it can get away with, and sells the production of the sub-contractors at the highest possible wholesale price and at a retail figure based upon the Board of Directors of the Crown Corporation. I cannot reconcile such a system of operation with my own ideas of co-operative principles.

As a member of the commission I must emphasize that we were not guided by any political consideration, but I have viewed with interest the steps the government have taken toward the implementation of many of our recommendations. However, I cannot whole-heartedly subscribe to Chapter 21 of the report any more than could all the other members when one considers the implications therein contained. After the report was published and distributed, one of my fellow members, John C.W. Irwin, B.S.F., F.E. wrote to me from Toronto suggesting that a note be inserted in the published book reports, advising that he, at least, did not subscribe to the sentiment expressed in Chapter 21, and that persons who had, at that time, already received copies should be so advised. Failing that, Mr. Irwin stated he would likely find it necessary to disassociate himself with that particular chapter. To those statements I wholly concur. Signed — William Bayliss.

Now that does not make very much difference to the creation of the Timber Board. This government had a right to establish the Timber Board. The only thing that I am calling to the attention of the House is the manner in which the propaganda was put out. I believe we all like the truth when a statement comes from a public man or from the government. We like to rely upon it, and we like to believe it when we read it. Must we look around for further evidence to see if they are telling the truth or not?

I am just going to deal with one further question in this matter, and that is: what will people think of it? What will those farmers where the timber has been removed from their control think of it? Well, the Timber Board proceeded to let contracts for cutting spruce, jack pin. I am not going to speak about the amount they paid them. I am just going to tell you the effects. We, being up against the boundary, make it a little more pertinent. Remember what the Niagara River used to do for the 'niggers' in the States? Well, you know what, that boundary apparently has done just that for those woodcutters adjacent to it. I will tell you how I found out. I had heard that

March 7, 1949

Mr. Daniels, M.L.A. at that time, and a couple of Timber Board men were going around to all these farmers that had permits and measuring their buildings. Well, the reason for that was they wanted to find out if they had used the lumber for building or what they had done with it. In any event; I met one of the higher officials who had flown into Kamsack from Prince Albert. He was a little perturbed, and you know what he said to me? He said: "Do you know that all Crown land in your constituency has been stripped of 7 million feet of spruce?" I told him I did not know that, but he said that was the case. He wanted to know if we weren't getting our contracts in, and I said: "No." When he asked what we were paying I said it was \$31 if we take off the permit. He said: "So you say you cannot find it. That is an awful lot of lumber," and I said: "Are you sure it is that amount?" He said: "Well, our records show that." Now, gentlemen, what would you have done? These men financed that cutting. They had to use their money to cut that timber; they had to pay out their cash for the hired man, for the sawmill, for the planer. I do not need to say any more about that. The Manitoba boundary was too close for Mr. Randall to enforce his Timber Board regulations. The people did not think very much of government contracts.

I now want to say a few words about the Larger School units, and it is about a matter that has disturbed me considerably. First, on the question of equalization: I want to show you one school district just a few miles south of Kamsack, and very good land. They are charging 18 mills in the Larger Kamsack School Unit. With a \$190,000 assessment there, this school district is paying about \$1,600 more to a larger unit than they need for the operation of their own school, and they are not satisfied. They do not know what to do about it. They have been trying to do something all along, but this is caused by reason of the administration . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — May I ask a question?

Mr. Banks: — No, not just now. My time is short and I want to finish up.

What is wrong that this assessment in the school district raises too much money? There are, too, other reasons that are, I think, a little worse.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Name the school district.

Mr. Banks: — I will give you the three: there is Bonny Bank, Spring Valley and Poplar Point.

I want to grant you that there are some school districts that do not raise enough money, but there aren't many. Even with a \$100,000 assessment and the government grant that raises a lot of money, enough to operate the ordinary country school. Now I say these people are not satisfied, and I would like to know, at a later date, what this government intends to do about a matter of this kind. I just cited one, but I guess there are 20 in this Larger Kamsack Unit in this same position. You will probably say, well, where is the money gone? I can tell you where some of it has gone. Any school district that is lucky enough to get a new school gets it paid for, and if they vote themselves out of building that school, this school district is apparently that much ahead and I think it takes about \$8,000 to build a school now, and, undoubtedly, when they build three or four of those, it certainly drains the treasury of the

Larger School Unit. I do not know what the government policy is. Whether they exercise a restraining hand over those people, but, in any event, that is the situation, and I do not think that if these people vote themselves out next year or the year following, it should not be that maybe a dozen school districts that get new schools get them at the expense of the other people.

One thing our district learned during hard times is this: they had to provide for one year ahead. That is, they had to have enough money ahead at the beginning of the year to pay their school expenses for the whole year in advance. They did it through bitter experience and by being threatened by banks. I understand that a lot of money was in the hands of these individual schools when the Larger Unit was proclaimed. I have been told that one district had \$1,800, most of them had around \$1,000, and some of them around \$500. I know of one very poor district that had \$300 in bonds. They were finally hounded to the extent that they had to turn this amount over. I am going to ask this government what they intend to do in the event of that school district being voted out, towards recouping the school district for that money. I will agree that maybe some of them had valuables in addition to running the school. But that is something that a lot of people are going to ask when there is a vote, and I can give notice today that we may not be able to say what is going to happen just now, but in one or two years, when you see taxes amounting up to \$76, \$77 and some of them, \$92 a quarter-section for school taxes alone in areas like that, these people are going to vote it out because it is too expensive. It costs more than it is worth. They prefer the old system just from that standpoint of expense, and that will, at that time, become a very important question. The government will be asked about it; the Minister of Larger School Units Act is strictly trust money, many of the districts have money, and this government has either condoned or secretly approved it. I suggest to you that that has made them a party to this; that they must recoup these school districts, and I do not think this session should finish until the Minister of Education makes a full and complete statement of the policy of the government with respect to that.

I have just one more thing. My good friend, the Minister of Highways, spoke this afternoon, but I have read this statement of revenue and I find the two items which were used for roads, gasoline tax \$6 million, licences \$2.9 million, making a total of \$8.9 million. Do you know what that would amount to, divided into constituencies? It would be \$182,000 each. Now I know that we do not get anything like that. I do not think any constituency does unless it just happens to be on some highway. I want to tell this government that those people who pay 20 to 25 cents on the dollar in taxes for every dollar they spend in gasoline are not going to be satisfied with this treatment. We have an area 30 miles wide and 45 miles long, running clean across the northern end of my constituency, where they are going to demand money for roads. They need \$25,000 a year for five years, and as far as I can see they are entitled to that under the gasoline plan.

Mr. Kuziak: — What did the Liberals do?

Mr. Banks: — I have here in this drawer resolutions from four of the municipalities, asking

March 7, 1949

for a more equitable cut in the gasoline tax. What the Liberals do, my hon. friend, is not going to repair the roads today. That is your job and you cannot pan that off very much longer.

Now, I am pleased to be able to stop at the hour . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — . . . and get out of answering questions.

Hon. C.M. Fines: — I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but during his presentation he made a very serious charge which the Leader of the Government I do not think would allow to go unchallenged; that is in connection with the money collected for the Kamsack Cyclone Fund, the \$50,000. The impression was that this money had been wrongfully spent.

Mr. Banks: — You made that statement, I didn't. I did not intend to imply that. I think I gave your man credit for doing an excellent job, but they cut off all the Main Street property at 40 cents on the dollar and that is true. And the town of Kamsack did not receive the other \$50,000. I do not suggest that there was \$1 wasted of the money that was actually spent, but what I do suggest to you is that the balance of the money was not used for the purpose for which it was subscribed, but was taken by a special Act of parliament and used for some government purpose.

Hon. C.M. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that does not involve only the members of the government, but also the integrity of the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. He was the man who was the Chairman of the committee administering the fund.

Mr. Banks: — Now do not drag the Chief Justice in. He is in the clear.

Hon. C.M. Fines: — After the committee had spent all the money that could be reasonably expended in the rebuilding of the homes of the people who lost them, the balance of the money was unanimously, by the members of the Legislature and the committee, recommended that this money should be paid over to the trustees of the Saskatchewan Agricultural Research Foundation and formed part of the fund administered by them pursuant to the Agricultural Research Foundation Act. I would not want anyone to get away with the impression that there was any wrong usage of any of the money collected for this very worthy cause.

Premier Douglas: — I would like to tell my hon. friend that if he feels at any time that the money which was collected and contributed by the people, or the people of Canada, was not spent for the purpose for which it was contributed, if he will get up and say so in this House, we will give him a Royal Commission and make a thorough investigation, and I would expect, of course, that he would replace his seat at the disposal of that Commission to substantiate any charges he cares to make.

Mr. Banks: — I haven't the faintest intention of placing my seat at the disposal of any Commission that is created by this government. But I want to tell you that

there is that sum that was not used for the rebuilding of Kamsack, and the Chief Justice told Mr. Parker and others in the district that he had to pay it over because it was a special Act of parliament requiring him to do so, and I think that is the case.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that statement is absolutely untrue, and my hon. friend is either making it in ignorance or deliberately.

Mr. Banks: — I got it from Mr. J. Johnson, and he is not a man who makes untrue statements. He attended with Mr. Parker before Mr. Martin came, and Mr. Martin will tell you that tomorrow.

Premier Douglas: — Just the same, the statement is untrue.

Mr. Banks: — It doesn't make it untrue because you say so.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the hon. gentleman withdraw that remark.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Were not the people of Kamsack very well satisfied with the treatment they had received at the hands of this government and from the people of Saskatchewan at large?

Mr. Banks: — The people of Kamsack were delighted. They appreciated it. For a long time they said this government are a fine bunch of fellows. But when they found out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! If the hon. member wants to make a further statement, he will have to make it after 8 o'clock. It now being 6 o'clock, the House will recess until 8 o'clock.

8 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Banks: — I would like to make a statement. Mr. Speaker, before dinner the hon. Premier and the hon. Provincial Treasurer charged that I had made statements respecting the Kamsack Cyclone Fund which suggested improper handling of the fund and which cast reflection upon the integrity of the members of that committee. I do not want my position misrepresented, and nothing could be more unfair than such charges.

I stated that when the fund was started, the government announced a contribution of \$50,000 and called upon the public to supplement this contribution by further gifts. The public's response was magnificent and over \$200,000 was raised, including the government contribution. Much excellent work was done in repairing the damage. Buildings on Main Street were assisted

to the extent of 40 percent of the cost of repair. While there was still approximately \$50,000 in the fund, further assistance was discontinued, and an Act passed by the Legislature directing that the balance of the fund be used for other purposes. This made the practical effect of the policy that the government contribution was not used to assist those who had suffered cyclone damage as the assistance to some of those who suffered damage was limited to 40 percent. In my opinion, the government action was wrong, and the entire amount should have been used for the original purpose. In saying this, I am only expressing an opinion which I hold very firmly, and which is shared by most of the people in Kamsack. In expressing this opinion, however, I am not suggesting any improper administration of the funds by anyone, nor am I casting any reflection upon the members of the committee who served so well. I am simply saying that government policy was wrong.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if I want to get into an argument about it we can carry on in debate later on, but I should make a statement immediately so that there will be no misunderstanding throughout the country. First, the administration of this Kamsack fund was carried on entirely by a committee headed by the Chief Justice. Secondly, when that committee had completed its work, they made a report to the government in which it stated that it had met all the obligations which it thought ought to be met, and it turned the surplus over to be disposed of. The surplus was disposed by an Act brought into this legislature and voted for unanimously by every member of the Legislature, turning that sum of money over to agriculture research at the university, because we had been assured by the committee, headed by the Chief Justice, that all the claims had been met insofar as that committee thought they ought to be met, and that this money therefore could no longer be used in the Kamsack area because the work for which the money had been contributed had been completed. As far as any documentary evidence to substantiate what I have said is concerned, I shall be glad to table it in the course of the next day or two.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — This is the first opportunity I have had, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on your election as the presiding officer of this Assembly, and I wish to add my congratulations to those who have preceded me.

Rising in this Legislature for the first time to take part in the budget debate as the member for the constituency of Souris-Estevan, I realize as previous speakers have pointed out, that with this great honour also goes a corresponding responsibility to be the elected representative in a legislative body which administers the affairs of over 800,000 people.

Now, the province of Saskatchewan is part of the Dominion of Canada and of this great North American continent; and this North American continent in my opinion, and if I can express my opinion, is the last citadel of democracy and free enterprise, and generally what all of us consider to be freedom. We should realize, too, that today the eyes of the entire world are on the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that millions of enslaved and impoverished persons in other parts of the world look to this continent for leadership. We should also realize that it is the free nations today who are making a substantial contribution towards the feeding and clothing of the rest of the world.

It is possibly strange to some people that it is in these free nations, the nations where there is the most freedom, that we have the most washing machines, automobiles, radios and all the things such as most opportunities, and in fact the most of everything that, to some of the people in other parts of the world, is actually out of the reach of even the most fortunate of them. Also here this evening, I wonder if we realize how few places there are left in the world today where the son of an Irish and Austrian immigrant can stand up, as during the previous election, and criticize the government in power and ask people to vote for him. There are very few countries left today where such a person as myself could stand up in the opposition to the government, and possibly criticize it at times, without the certainty of being relegated to a concentration camp, if they were that fortunate.

I do not make any claim to having been born in a log cabin, which my friends across the line have told me was almost the prerequisite to being elected to office over there. Despite the fact that some of us have been smeared as tools of the vested interests and a lot of clap-trap like that, I was born in the town of Estevan, in a rather modest home, I might say; and I do not take any credit to myself that my parents managed to skimp and save a little and worked hard in order to give me a decent break in life. The credit for that all belongs to them; but they came out to this country, as many of the rest of these people did, because they wanted to won their own land. They wanted to get ahead, and possibly because they had the 'guts' to grab hold of that opportunity and they knew that it was here for them if they did, they weren't looking for something for nothing. To be able to stand here tonight as the elected representative of the constituency of Souris-Estevan, I can assure you, makes me feel very humble.

One of the members of this Legislature, while speaking previously, made what I am sure on mature thought he will reconsider — a remark about a portion of the country being God-forsaken. I do not profess to be very religious, but I think that if the hon. gentleman had given mature consideration to that remark he might have realized that possibly one of the greatest reasons for many of our ills today is not so much that we are God-forsaken as, perhaps, that we have forsaken God or some of the principles of religion. I think that even in Canada, and possibly in many parts of Saskatchewan, today there are many evidences of the true Christian spirit, and I would like to refer to an incident illustrative of that. I am sure the Premier will agree with me, and I want it understood from the outset that this is no criticism at all upon the administration of the funds.

On December 24, the day before Christmas, we had a very disastrous fire at the Estevan Airport. Four persons lost their lives and 16 families were made homeless. The fire was of unknown origin and was discovered in the early morning, about seven o'clock. Most of the people got out only in their night attire, and there were many incidents of heroic rescues and a lot of people had been trapped in behind broken windows and under glass and debris generally. This was the day before Christmas, and I am sure that the spirit of Christmas in the province of Saskatchewan was certainly exemplified by the magnificent response from all over the resolution. Relief committees, in the town of Estevan, were immediately mobilized and tasks allocated, and the job of rehabilitating the families was begun within minutes, actually, after the blaze was well under way. Appeals were sent to three of the radio stations in the province, and they

devoted their entire facilities to the broadcasting of the appeal for funds for these stricken families. And, as I said before, the response from Saskatchewan was magnificent; the response from the people of Estevan and surrounding district was unbelievable. Within a few hours after the first shock of this disaster had worn off, the contributions were coming in and arrangements had been made for the housing of all the families, and for their Christmas entertainment, and particularly for the children. They had lost everything, including their Christmas presents. It might be thought, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that this could only happen the day before Christmas. Personally, I think it could happen any day of the year in Canada.

I would like to thank the Premier publicly for his very kind assistance to our committee which was set up to cope with the emergency, and also the people of North Dakota who gave so generously out of their pockets. I would like to bring to the attention of the House the admirable work of the Sisters of St. Joseph and the staff of St. Joseph's Hospital, who did so much to relieve suffering and prevent suffering. The Red Cross, as always, had a very large share in the work. Radio Stations C.K.R.M., C.H.A.B., and C.K.C.K., as I said, devoted their entire day to the appeal for assistance. All the service clubs, the Legion and the Salvation Army gave very generously of their help, and the ordinary citizens responded magnificently. On behalf of the Estevan community, and particularly the poor unfortunates out as the Airport, I wish to thank all those who so unstintingly contributed their services and assistance.

In passing I would like to say that a disastrous fire broke out at Alameda, a small town east of Estevan, and an entire family was made homeless there and the husband actually died later of burns. Another fire took place at Lampman in which several people were made homeless and provision was made out of the Estevan Disaster Fund for these people. I do not know exactly what the amounts were, but assistance was made available to them. I might say we received far more in clothes than, I think, would clothe the whole town of Estevan in the appeal. They were coming in by truck loads.

Out at the Airport today — I do not mean this in any form of criticism; it is just a point that I would like to bring up at the present time — there are 49 families living in apartments. Thirty-four of these apartments are rented out and managed by the Department of Reconstruction, and the rest of the apartments are owned by the town and some by the dominion Department of National Defence. Recently I was sent a letter and some pictures showing that there are conditions there, still existing, which might possibly lead to another fire . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Will he state in which building these fire hazards continue to exist? Is it the buildings controlled by the Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation or by the Department of National Defence?

Mr. McCormack: — I think there is a great fire hazard over the entire airport, Sir, but the building that has the largest number of families is controlled by the Department of Reconstruction. That is the one that I think has 34 apartments in it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Did you say you have picture relating to this building?

Mr. McCormack: — Yes, that is correct.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I would request that those be tabled, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCormack: — I am quite willing to take it up with the Minister of Reconstruction and, as I said at the outset, I do not mean this in any way of criticism at all of the government. I mean this in the sense that there are conditions which still exist there and are bound to exist any place, but there are some dangerous practices still being carried out. I do not say that the Minister of Reconstruction can stay down there and see that everybody does not light a match around the place, but there are a few problems there, and if the Minister will give me his assurance that I may take this up with him, I certainly do not intend to take the time in this House to pursue it any farther, because I am not meaning it in the spirit of criticism. But I would like to point out that a fire in any one of those buildings can mean a very serious situation. There is a 40-bed hospital there, run by the Sisters of St. Joseph. Most of the people in it are aged and bed-ridden and unable to move themselves, and this risk of fire is very great.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the preceding debates, and just to set the minds of some of the gentlemen opposite at rest, I was supported and elected by both the Conservatives and the Liberals in the constituency of Souris-Estevan, and I am not ashamed of it at all. In fact I am rather proud of it. I also received the support of quite a few C.C.F. who apparently had seen the light since the last election, and, generally, all those opposed to socialism. I was nominated by both the Liberal and Progressive-Conservative nominating conventions, and they were both held independently of each other.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — When are you a Liberal and when are you a Conservative?

Mr. McCormack: — I will answer that if the gentleman opposite will tell me when he is a Socialist and when he is a little farther to the left than that.

I wish to thank my Progressive-Conservative friends in the Souris-Estevan constituency for their very generous gesture in placing, perhaps, their love of country a little farther ahead of party politics. At their convention the feeling was expressed that the world was divided into two camps: those who like the sort of country we have here, and those who thought that possibly a little farther east was a better place to live in than this country; and I am very proud indeed to have received their support.

While I am on that point I would like to express my very strong exception to the remarks and jibes of some of the hon. members across the House towards my very good friend, the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald). The member for Moosomin is a young man who served his country very well in the armed forces in the last war, and not only has he an admirable war record but he is well respected in his community. He is not a Socialist or a Communist. In regard to the fact that he and I possibly may disagree on many things at many times, I am only too proud to associate myself with him in his fight against totalitarianism which the socialist government in this province seems to attempt

to force on the people. I think some of the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite are very ill-suited to the dignity of their high office. I am sure that the hon. member for Moosomin will contribute greatly to the deliberations of this Assembly, as did the previous member from that constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the presentation of the budget is something like when we sit down at the end of the year — I was brought up in a store — and take stock; and stock-taking is when, at the end of the year, we figured out whether we were better off or worse off than we had been. I think, quite seriously, that in this first session of the Legislature it would be a good time for a lot of us to take a little stock of what is going on. We might also see where we stand with regard to an asset which does not show up on the balance sheet, but I think it is a very priceless one, and that is our democratic form of government and freedom. Despite the fact that some of the gentlemen opposite seem to think that interest is a very bad thing, I think perhaps that this is an asset we should pass on to people that come after us with a little accrued interest and not fritter it entirely away.

On this continent — you can call our way of life capitalistic if you wish — when we look at what it has produced in the past year alone in the form of material goods, and we take stock of our possessions in contrast to the rest of the world, it is strange to find, really, that we have in Saskatchewan and anywhere in Canada people who believe that a change in this whole system would put something else in its place. It is very strange to find that we have a government which appears very much to be run by imported planners and so-called experts, and a government committed to a policy which, in the ultimate result, would be complete socialization; and the ultimate result, I think, would mean the loss of that asset I was speaking of a little while ago. It is strange to find that there are people who seem to be intent on taking the running of the country out of the hands of the people, whose avowed policy is state-ownership of all the means of production and distribution and who apparently have committed themselves to this policy of letting the Shumiatchers and Cadburys and all the rest of these gentlemen run the country: men whose belief would ultimately, in my opinion, take away our right to live where we want, eat what we like, speak what we like, vote as we like, and all the rest of it.

Premier Douglas: — How about your right to chisel the poor miners?

Mr. McCormack: — I think in many respects having democracy is something like having a motor car, electric lights, etc. It is only when you push the button and the lights will not come on that you realize you have lost something. We have enjoyed our freedom so long in this province that we cannot really imagine what it is like to live in a country where there is no freedom . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Your light has not come on yet.

Mr. McCormack: — If the hon. gentleman has something to say I would be only too pleased to talk it over with him afterwards.

I think it is only when we take stock of what we have and what other people have not got that we begin to realize the privileges we, as Canadians, still enjoy. There are not many places left in the world today where a person can get up and speak without fear of reprisals, without fear of the secret police coming in and taking care of it, or go about your daily business without fear.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — And miners' wives, too, I suppose.

=Mr. McCormack: — I will get around to that yet.

Some other countries were once as free as we were, but they lost their freedom because they weren't vigilant, and the responsibility of each and every one of us in this Legislature is to see that it does not happen here.,

Despite what our socialist friends might tell us, freedom brings prosperity, and it seems to be the free nations who have the highest standard of living. It is the free enterprise nations today which are feeding the world, which are contributing most to the world's recovery. It must seem very strange to people coming from other parts of Europe to this country today, where we have so much freedom, that we should have anybody in this country who wants to change all this. I submit it must seem very strange to them that we have these people who do not think we are living under such a good system. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that at the beginning of this year, not only from within but without, is the freedom of this country, our way of life, seriously endangered, but I think the economic security of this province is being very seriously jeopardized by the policies of the socialist government.

We are situated here almost geographically in the centre of Canada, and in this province all of us depend directly or indirectly upon agriculture for a living. About 85 percent of the wealth comes from the farms of this province. I would like to remind some of the hon. members, when they talk about socializing all industries, eliminating all private trading for profit, that agriculture is a very basic industry. A true socialist must, of necessity, agree it has to be taken over eventually.

In order to provide a more balanced economy in this province we need more industries. Lack of industries is one of the main reasons, in my opinion, why the population is not increasing in the proportion that it should. The Provincial Treasurer, in his budget address the other day, referred to the fact that in the first four years of the C.C.F. government the population in the provinces increased by approximately 9,000 persons. I think anyone would admit that the natural increase in population might take care of this, and when you subtract from that 9,000 all the imported civil servants and planners they have brought in here, the population figures would certainly show a substantial decrease.

The Provincial Treasurer referred to the fact that in the years 1940 to 1944 there was a decrease in population in the province. I am very sure that the Provincial Treasurer did not mean to infer or leave the impression that there was no valid reason for this. I am quite sure he must realize that there were a lot of people employed in war industries out of the province, there were a lot of people, like the member for Moosomin, who were out of the province fighting a battle a little more important than the battle of socialism in

Saskatchewan. I do not think there is any doubt in anybody's mind but that we are losing substantial numbers of our young people. That was referred to in the House today, and I think the situation is serious. We look around all our districts and there are large numbers of young people who are leaving the province because there are not the same possibilities for employment here that there are in other parts of Canada and the United States. We are losing this greatest asset that I think we have, the younger people, and we are in the unhappy position of having to bear the cost of their education and then deliver them to other parts of Canada because we cannot offer them the same opportunities here. I think it is a well-known fact that the young people from the farming communities take second place to none because of their training and their background and their initiative.

I think one of the most serious problems that we have in the province of Saskatchewan is one which any government in office must accept full responsibility for, and that is the stagnation in industrial development there is in the province today. I wonder why we should have to take a back seat in Saskatchewan to all the other provinces, including Manitoba and Alberta, in the development of the industries.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is after 35 years of Liberalism.

Mr. McCormack: — I am not very much interested in what happened prior to 1944. I am interested in what is happening today though, and so you should be too.

Premier Douglas: — We know what's happening today.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. members listen to what the speaker is saying instead of quarrelling across the floor, as they will have the opportunity of speaking later.

Mr. McCormack: — I think the policies of this government in the province of Saskatchewan today are discouraging industrial development and I am quite sure that I have a right to stand up in this House and express that opinion. If I haven't, then there is something wrong with this country and the system.

I do not think anyone is going to invest their savings in a business or any form of industrial enterprise when they are not sure the government might not step in, if it looks like a profitable one, and take over, or if they won't set up something and run in opposition to it. This leads to a feeling of insecurity amongst business people. No one knows when one of the planners isn't going to step in and set up something. Competition is not equal. How can anyone compete on an equal basis with a Crown Corporation which pays no business tax, no income tax, no provincial taxes, no interest, and is financed with the money of the general public of the province of Saskatchewan?

Some of the statements that some of the Ministers in the province have made do not do anything to help the situation. We should be out trying to encourage people to come into the province, and yet there are so many conflicting statements that nobody knows where they are at. The Minister of Education, Hon. Mr. Lloyd, speaking in the House about a week ago, spent almost a half-hour talking about the big corporations, and the theme of his address seemed to be,

“Let’s put the blame on big business”. The Minister of Highways, Hon. J.T. Douglas, today had to take a crack at the big interests. At the same time, they are trying to induce people to come in here and invest some money.

I would like to refer to a few of the statements that have been made by speakers on some of the policies of the government which, I submit, are definitely retarding the development of our industries. We go back tot the Regina Manifesto in 1932.

Mr. Gibson: — I thought you did not want to go back beyond 1944.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I happened to read what happened that year. If I had been old enough maybe it would have been different.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McCormack: —

We believe that these evils can be removed only in a planned and socialized economy in which our natural resources and the principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the people.

I am glad to hear that applause from the other side. Now maybe they will clap on this one:

No C.C.F. government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation a full programme of socialized planning which will lead to the establishment . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. McCormack: — Well, I am glad to hear them clap. The hon. member fro Cumberland (Mr. L. Blanchard) the other night quoted that statement and not even the Premier pounded his desk for it. Then, when being interviewed by the Financial Post, September 23, 1944, the Premier gave the statement that only monopolies were going to be socialized. Apparently they were not going to put into effect the full programme. This is what he said that time:

We intend to go into public ownership, but where it is not desirable to have this public ownership on a provincial basis, we will encourage municipal and co-operative ownership. Where it is better to have private ownership, we will encourage private ownership.

Then a report in The Leader-Post, November 1, 1944, speaking on Second Reading of the Bill to amend the Department of Natural Resources Act, Mr. Danielson said: “why should the government pour public funds into failing enterprises? Why does the government not go to work and take over flour mills and oil refineries? Why not take over the Imperial Oil refinery? We will”, Natural Resources Minister Hon. Mr. Phelps interjected. “These are the people we

March 7, 1949

are trying to encourage to come in here and do a little developing, and they are going to take them over. A pamphlet was put out by the Department of Natural Resources in 1945, and the forward was written by Mr. Phelps. Here is a sentence out of it:

Eventually it is hoped to establish complete social ownership and management of key industries in the development of our resources. It is the intention of the government to effect an orderly change to social ownership in the industrial development of our natural resources.

The Premier, speaking at Winnipeg, April 4, 1945, said: "Socialization in Saskatchewan has not yet begun, the government being too busy with basic legislation during its emergency session and its first regular session this year>' Then, April 3, 1946, the Premier said this in a debate on The Insurance Act: "We will not rest until capitalism has been eradicated from Saskatchewan.

Then on April 1, 1947, there is a little different story that comes out. This is from The Leader-Post, and I quote: "Premier T.C. Douglas told the Legislature Monday that the C.C.F. government had no intention of eliminating private enterprise or private ownership in Saskatchewan."

Premier Douglas: — Does the hon. member not know the difference between free enterprise and eradicating capitalism?

Mr. McCormack: — I am becoming very interested to know just who is a capitalist; what a capitalist is supposed to be. Is it somebody who owns as much land as some of the gentlemen opposite, or somebody with \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$3,000. I would like to know where the dividing line comes. I am sure there are a lot of people in the province of Saskatchewan who would like to know whether they are capitalists or not.

Premier Douglas: — There are a lot of things that you do not know.

Mr. McCormack: — Now, in the Commonwealth, August 7, 1946, in a report of the C.C.F. convention held in Moose Jaw in July, here is a resolution:

Be it therefore resolved that we urge our government to take steps towards the implementation of the C.C.F. programme for the development and distribution of natural gas and oil under public ownership and control for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

Then in The Leader-Post, on July 27:

The provincial government is permitting private enterprise to develop northern oil resources because it does not feel ready to take that step itself, but the government will move at the appropriate time, Natural Resources Minister Hon. J.L. Phelps told the Assembly of the Saskatchewan social party at its annual provincial convention Friday afternoon.

In The Leader Post of April 12, 1947 — the Premier was out in Vancouver then, and this is the Canadian Press report from Vancouver:

The C.C.F. Premier of Saskatchewan said Friday that his government had no immediate plans for starting new socialized industries. Present plans were confined to extension and development of secondary industries now owned and operated by the province.

I have an extract here from a statement which was prepared for the Associated Boards of Trade. Apparently there is something different when you speak to those people, and this is the statement that is attributed to the Premier:

On the other hand, we believe that private enterprise properly run for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan should be supported by our citizens and given every opportunity to serve our province.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. gentleman if he has the date and the place that was supposed to have been said?

An Hon. Member: — Doesn't he remember?

Mr. McCormack: — As I said, it was attributed to the Premier. I got this from a Leader-Post editorial dated June 16, 1947, and the full text of it is this: "Thus in a statement prepared for the Associated Boards of Trade, earlier this year, Premier Douglas said . . . and the quote is in there.

Premier Douglas: — You should extend your reading a little further.

Mr. McCormack: — I had one from the Commonwealth which shows I get around a bit. Here is The Leader-Post, October 31, 1947, and I quote:

At Rosetown on Friday night, Premier T.C. Douglas said: 'As soon as the province gets a pulp mill, sodium sulphate now shipped from Saskatchewan to eastern Canada will be used in the manufacture of paper'.

He also said Saskatchewan would soon start making its own pottery. I haven't any objection to that.

Mr. Bichan, who is the Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Industrial Development, made a statement which was also reported — I am very sorry that I also have to take this from The Leader-Post, but it was reported there on January 17, 1948:

To encourage greater exploration and development, the government is prepared to enter into agreements with exploration companies offering them full protection of operation and the guarantee that dealings with the government will proceed on an accepted business basis. Continuity of activities started by private industry will be assured.

March 7, 1949

On February 16, 1948, Hon. Mr. Phelps said: "The provincial government is interested in oil development and has some intention of going into the oil development field." He also went on to say: "if a pipeline is built to carry natural gas from an Alberta field to Saskatchewan points, it should be a public utility or at least a public carrier." This is the famous pipeline that we hope to get into the province.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend if he disagrees with that statement?

Mr. McCormack: — I would rather see us have the pipeline first and then we will discuss whether we will have it or somebody else will have it. This way we are not getting it.

At the C.C.F. National Convention, that was in Winnipeg on August 19, 1948, and this was published in the Commonwealth, September 8, 1948, and I quote:

For iron and steel, a policy of socialization, etc. For the agricultural implement industry, meat-packing, agricultural fertilizer and chemical industries, a policy of social ownership. Formulate a national fuel policy which will promote public ownership of coal, electricity, gas and oil in co-operation with the provinces. Development of natural resources such as minerals, oils, coal and forests can best be done by Crown companies or some other form of public ownership.

Then by November 1, 1948, we are apparently getting interested again in getting capital into the province and the Premier, while he was in the Old Country, tried to interest British and Swedish capital. I have no objection to him trying to do that. I think we should have all the capital we can get into Saskatchewan to develop our industries. The Premier also went to New York, and this was reported in The Leader-Post on November 15, 1948:

The Premier said he was particularly interested in having outside capital brought in for the development of oil, potash and other minerals. Discussions with the U.S. industrialists would also cover the possibility of developing Saskatchewan's pulp wood and uranium deposits.

On November 29, 1948, the Minister of Agriculture was speaking at Regina People's Forum, and he said:

It is my opinion that railways, packing houses and other concerns which are presently exploiting farmers will have to be socialized and operated for the benefit of agriculture.

I notice there is no reference in there to the oil companies.

The Premier, on January 10, 1948, said: "Our Capitalist system is through. The time has come to move into new waters; to build ourselves a new form of society." And he also said: "The C.C.F. believes the people, through their government, should own and operate the means of production, distribution and exchange whereby they live."

Premier Douglas: — Mr. R. D. Bennet said capitalism was through 15 years ago.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, R. D. Bennett is through too, now.

Premier Douglas: — Will the member for Moosomin agree with that.

Mr. McCormack: — Mr. Speaker, I believe in the encouragement and development of industry in Saskatchewan, and I think seriously that we should encourage investors to come in here and invest their money in the development of our coal, minerals, oil and everything else we have. I think these resources should be used; but I do think we should have some form of control over them to see that they are not wasted. In order to encourage private capital to come into the province and get skilled technical personnel to live here, we have to remove the restrictions which, I submit, are on capital by this government and which so seriously handicap our industrial development. I believe we should put an end to this fear of confiscation and unfair competition from government industries. If we are going to be concerned — which all of us are — with good jobs and good pay, we have to have the investment of private capital in this province in new industries to develop our natural resources. The Premier himself in this House last week said that secondary industries in the province belonged to the co-operative and private enterprise fields, and I think that we should encourage them, and not try to hinder them.

I submit that these are the main reasons why we cannot encourage private capital, or our own people in the province, to invest in the vast natural resources of the province. All other parts of Canada are having an upsurge in the development of many and varied industries. In the growth of these industries will be a greater certainty for full employment, continued employment for the people and a larger market for agriculture products.

We look at the development in the Alberta field, and in the Lloydminster area alone tremendous strides have been taken on the Alberta side of the border compared with what has taken place in the Lloydminster field in Saskatchewan. Who is going to invest extensively here when you read all of these statements that have been made by these people? The former Minister of Natural Resources, Hon. Mr. Phelps, said that if the Saskatchewan wells succeed the government may move in and use the power of expropriation which the Legislature has given. In the north my friends tell me that private lumber operators have almost entirely disappeared, and that the government handles the major share of the fish production. All farmers, business and professional people are sort of sitting back wondering who is going to be next for the chopping block. When we look at the whole picture we find that the development of our mines and industries have lagged considerably behind the neighbouring provinces, and this after only four and one-half years of socialism in Saskatchewan. I submit seriously, -Mr. Speaker, that these irresponsible and possibly irreconcilable statements are one of the direct reasons why people with money to invest are fighting shy of the province. I know I would not like to go down and put a few dollars in a bank if the bank manager was running up and down the street saying one minute they were going to confiscate everything, and the next minute they would give you 20 percent interest, and the next day say they were going to close the bank. Nobody would

March 7, 1949

The political philosophy of the Social Crediters in Alberta to me is as impractical as complete socialism. At least they are not wrecking the economy of their province. They are realistic and business-like, and their province is reaping the benefit. I think that the socialist ostrich in this province should pull its head out of the sand and have a look and see what is going on around in other parts of the country.

I was very pleased to see that in the budget address the hon. Provincial Treasurer had this to say: "Despite the claims of its critics, this government is not concerned with regimenting our economy, but is rather concerned that the affairs of private enterprise be characterized by both justice and a sustained level of prosperity." It is unfortunate that the Provincial Treasurer cannot control some of the people that are running around making these statements that are the direct reason, one of the main reasons anyway, why we are so far behind in industrial development.

Mr. Tucker: — He should write the Premier's speeches.

Mr. McCormack: — The Alberta government announced February 13, 1949, that it had received \$5,198,078 for oil rights on two sections of land. To this must be added all the oil and gas royalties for the previous year collected by the government of Alberta, and according to a report I read in the paper the other day, the figures show there that in the past year that was nearly \$6 million obtained from the sale of oil rights royalties on production and oil and gas fees, rental, and that conservative estimates of the government revenue from oil and gas and the sale of this land for the previous 12 months would be well over \$12 million.

Mr. Erb: — It won't last forever.

Mr. McCormack: — Well, they have it and we haven't. It is a funny thing now that that has been brought up, I think it was the speech from the throne that said that the province of Saskatchewan's oil development comes to nearly \$1 million. Now, in Alberta they are not talking about million dollars; they are talking about 10 to 20 billion barrels of oil. That was in the paper the other day. I submit that the direct responsibility for the industrial development in this province is on the shoulders of this government, and they should come out and state emphatically that they do not believe in the Regina Manifesto of 1932, and they should repudiate all the speakers who are chasing around the country making these nit-wit statements about the complete eradication of capitalism and condemning anybody who looks like a capitalist. I think the gentlemen are long on theory but very short on experience. Unfortunately, the guinea pig is always the one that suffers, and the guinea pig in this case is the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

In the Souris-Estevan constituency one of the keys to our main industries down there is the production of coal, and a large number of people are dependent directly or indirectly on the production of coal for their living. In 1944 the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council — I am not sure whether it was appointed by the Liberals government or the C.C.F. government — made several recommendations regarding power and electrification, and amongst others, that: "A study be undertaken to determine the relative merits of developing electric power from the coal fields of south-eastern Saskatchewan."

To date, in Saskatchewan the production of power has been pretty well confined to steam plants, and, in the Estevan-Bienfait area, there are large deposits of lignite coal. I submit that these are very potential reservoirs for power development, and this could be the basis for rural electrification in south-eastern Saskatchewan. I do not want to give credit to the present government. They have spent about \$500,000 down there quite recently, installing new equipment adapted to the burning of lignite, to increase the power plant's output. However, and I say this in all seriousness and fairness, I think possibly if the \$6 million that has been spent on the box factory, woolen mill, show factory, brick yard, Fish Board, and the tannery had been spent down there to produce power, the government would not have to come in that part of the country and apologize for its lack of rural electrification.

I know for a fact that down in the lignite coal fields, with regard to production if it were not for the policies of the government here at the present time there could be considerably more money brought in to develop the fields. There are some smaller mines down there with a substantial investment of capital in them that could be brought into full operation. Expansion of the field is what is needed to provide for the employment of men who have been thrown out of work recently by the closing of the underground mines which cannot compete with the strip method of mining any longer. Over 180 men, last year alone, were affected by the closing of underground mines, and it is only by new development that there will be jobs available for them.

Some mention was made about the coal industry down there. I think the Premier made suggestion about the 'poor miners'. I would like to draw to his attention that the Saskatchewan Government Industries and the Crown Corporations have nothing to pat themselves on the back for when it comes to wage rates. The brick yard last year, despite the fact that they do not pay any provincial, municipal, income or any other taxes, lost over \$42,000. Now they cannot say that they paid out too much money in wages. The wage rate for a common labourer at the brick yard is 70 cents an hour, and the wage rate at the privately-owned mines for a common labourer is \$1.10 an hour. The highest wages paid by the government for skilled labour at the brick yard is \$1.05 an hour, and a shovel operator at one of the mines gets \$1.63 an hour. If you go to the Power commission, a common labourer at the power plant gets 65 cents an hour, and the highest wage rate paid for skilled engineers is \$215 a month.

The wages paid by the government in these industries are far too low compared with other wages. We have a very, very high cost of living index in Estevan. I believe at one point last year it was the highest in the dominion due to the fact that a lot of the people working in the mines have high incomes, and the people working in these other industries operated by the government are put in the position of having to compete with these people in the purchase of goods.

If the government had been paying decent wages at the brick yard, I would not like to venture what the loss would have been. If they are so interested in ameliorating the working conditions down in the constituency, I could very well suggest that they should start with conditions in the brick yard and the Power commission, and give the employees a better break than they are now getting. I would also like to point out that the brick yard was closed down two days before Christmas. Men were thrown out of work on December 23, and if

March 7, 1949

any private concern did this I can imagine what a great howl would go up from some of the gentlemen on the government benches about the exploiters of labour throwing these poor people out in the cold. In fairness and decency, I submit, that these men might at least have been kept on over the Christmas season until the first of the year, so they could have had their Christmas in peace.

I would like to refer for a few minutes to highways. The constituency of Souris-Estevan is bounded on the south by the United States of America, on the east by Manitoba, on the north by the constituency of the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) and, fortunately, on the west by the Premier's constituency. Despite the fact that we are so close to the American boundary — I am not sure exactly who it was that made the statement in the House about some American soldiers up in North Battleford — we do not lose many nights' sleep worrying about an invasion from this great imperialistic monster, the United States, in our part of the country. I think some of the ill-advised statements that have been made about the United States have caused us a great deal of embarrassment with our North Dakota friends.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That is not the only thing that caused you embarrassment.

Mr. McCormack: — The highway situation in the Souris-Estevan constituency is one of particular concern to all the residents. We were very fortunate in having considerable amount of money spent on black-topping the highway which runs down from Corinne through Weyburn and Estevan and down to North Portal. I think that is a very worthy effort and, as I say, I will give credit any time credit is due.

Mr. Kuziak: — It should have been done 40 years ago.

Mr. McCormack: — I wasn't here 40 years ago. You look like you may have been.

This highway is of particular importance because North Portal is one of the principal ports of entry into Saskatchewan, and a great amount of tourist trade can be encouraged by black-top highways. I would submit, however, that this highway runs only through a very small portion of the constituency, and the people who are not fortunate enough to have highway No. 39 running by them are left almost without any provision being made for decent highway construction whatsoever.

The situation is particularly bad in the winter time. Under the present government's policy all the snow removal equipment and all maintenance equipment is stationed at the district office in Weyburn, and apart from keeping highway No. 39 open in our constituency, no effort whatsoever has been made to clear the roads in any part of the constituency. I think it is very essential that snow removal equipment be stationed in the eastern end of the constituency. The people down there are taxpayers, and some parts gave very substantial C.C.F. majorities at the polls. I think being taxpayers in any event, at Oxbow, Carnduff and those places along there, they should be entitled to the same consideration that some parts of the province get. The policy of the Department of Highways has been to keep the highways open which lead in and out of and not around the city of Weyburn. The highways engineer at Weyburn said the priority

highways are No. 39 north and west. I have a newspaper report here, and can refer to it if necessary. It was a snow removal talk to the Board of Trade, and "Mr. Litzenberger also advised Mr. Burdy", it was told at the meeting, "that certain highways in the area had priority in the matter of snow removal. These were highways No. 39 north-west and south-east of Weyburn, sections of highways No. 18 and 13 from Radville to Weyburn, and highway No. 35 north from Oungre into Weyburn. Opening of any other highways or portions of highways depended entirely on what funds were available after these priority jobs were done", it was said.

I would like to draw the attention of the Department of Highways, the Minister and the government to the fact that there are people in the eastern part of these constituencies — I think the same applies in the constituency of Cannington — who, if there is nothing done to have decent highways and now clearance in the wintertime, will all be channelled into Winnipeg, Brandon and these places, and the money they spend on their purchases will not stay in Saskatchewan.

While I am on this subject, I would like to mention that there is a village very close to Estevan — about nine miles east — and highway No. 39, which has been black-topped, goes within a mile of the village. It is a very progressive village, and I would just like to submit for the consideration of the Minister of Highways that some effort be made to extend that black-top into the village of Bienfait. The tonnage over the highway between Estevan and Bienfait is as great, I think, according to information I have received, as over any other in the province, and for that reason they are certainly entitled to consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a statement that the Premier made with respect to the Royal Commission on Coal and I do submit this in all sincerity: it is of a very vital interest, and I do not want it construed as any criticism of the government or anything like that. I do want to make reference to it because I think it is of paramount importance. The Premier in the House made reference to the government's proposal to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate certain aspects of the coal industry in Saskatchewan as a result of the unfortunate strike that was in the coalfields last fall. It is about two months now since the statement was made, and the Premier, I think, will agree that the only real point of dispute, in the final analysis, between the union that was on strike and the operators, was whether there should be a levy on each ton of coal paid into the Welfare Fund — I think it worked down to that in the final analysis, or whether a contributory pension scheme should be set up. The union, naturally in accordance with its policy, wanted the contribution to the Welfare fund, and the operators wanted the contributory pension fund whereby the men and the company both paid in five percent of the wages.

Recently it was reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix that in the negotiations in the Alberta field, an arrangement had been made whereby the Welfare Funds had gone up from five cents a ton to 15 cents a ton. It is very unfortunate — I am not criticizing at all — that there will be a similar increase requested this fall, and in view of the fact that possibly there may be a repetition of the strike conditions which brought so much hardship to these people and their families in the past year; in view of this fact that, in my opinion, possible the price of coal has reached the state where it cannot go any

March 7, 1949

higher without the markets being seriously restricted, and in view of the fact that if they get this oil pipeline into Regina we do not know what the result might be with regard to the Estevan field, and there are a lot of people employed there, I think the government should set up this Royal Commission with all possible speed — an ounce of prevention is always worth a pound of cure. If I may suggest, I think the Commission should be composed of men who know something about the coal industry and men who are impartial and unbiased and not particularly concerned with white-washing any particular individuals or sides that had anything to do with the dispute. Their findings and deliberations should be based on what is the fair thing for the working men in that district. I would respectfully suggest to this Assembly and to the Premier that possibly that Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal or a judge appointed by the Chief Justice of the King's Bench should be asked to appoint somebody, a judge preferably, to preside over the commission to insure its impartiality.

I am not going to take up the time of the House any longer, Mr. Speaker. I am sure if I am incorrect the hon. Premier will correct me in this: listening to the debates in recent weeks, I was almost brought to the conclusion that the Holy Bible had been written, edited and published exclusively for the use of some of the gentlemen opposite, and the C.C.F. party generally. While I said I do not profess to be an authority on the Christian teachings, when I heard some of the gentlemen opposite saying that socialism is an exemplification of the teachings of Christ, I was wondering possibly if they did not overlook the passage that I remember from Sunday School days. It is from the Gospel of St. Matthew, Chapter 19, verse 20, and there it relates about the rich young man — I think the Premier might illuminate on this; it is probably referred to some place else — I think he was a rich young lawyer which maybe makes it all the more apropos. Apparently this rich young man came to Christ, and he was told, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give it to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven, and come and follow me." By my standards, many of the C.C.F. members opposite are comparatively wealthy, and also by the standards of a lot of other people of Saskatchewan; and if they are true apostles of socialism, following their argument to its logical conclusion, I suggest that they show a better example than they are now. I would be very willing to take my changes on pooling my assets with some of the landed gentry that sit across the floor of the House. Unfortunately, I do not think they will agree to it, because socialists seem to want to apply their standards to everybody but themselves.

I shall oppose the motion.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.