

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Eleventh Legislature**

**Monday, March 14, 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 now leave the Chair.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, on Friday, before the House adjourned, I was just expressing my appreciation to the various members for their kind remarks in reply to the budget address, and I do appreciate them very much. I don't take it as any great credit or honour to myself, but rather to the government for, after all, the budget document is simply the financial proposals, not of the Provincial Treasurer, but of the government as a whole.

I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with all the things that have been said on the other side; for example, the statement of the hon. gentleman who referred to me as being an "orthodox capitalist financier, introducing an orthodox capitalist budget". I am not sure whether I can take it as a compliment or not. I think it was probably meant that way, but I certainly cannot agree with his description. Strange to say, the same gentleman, before he sat down, said that even though it was an orthodox capitalist budget, he was not going to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I am disappointed in the lack of criticism. During the debate, a number of members devoted a good deal of time on what was supposed to be criticism of the budget, and yet there was only one person who made any real criticism of the budget at all. I personally feel somewhat slighted as I put a great deal of time and energy into the preparations of this document. We started last September and worked at it constantly until it was tabled in the House the other day. It took a great deal of time; but I wonder, after having listened to all the various members, if it really was worthwhile. Is it really worthwhile to prepare a somewhat lengthy document, outlining the financial position of the province, and then find opposition on members talk about everything except what is contained in the budget address:

There has been no constructive criticism, and there has been just one theme-song all through the week, and that is: "The budget is too large, and we must reduce it." I apologize, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) as he did suggest we should take the education tax off farm fuels. I want to thank him for that very constructive suggestion. Six months ago he was out on the platform suggesting we should wipe the education tax off everything; but now he has got it down to where he would be quite satisfied, and would be more inclined to support this budget, if we took it off just farm fuels. On the other hand, the chief contribution to the debate of his seat-mate, the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) was that he would reduce the "frills"; he would wipe out the Budget bureau, the Planning Board,

and would cut in two the amount expended on the Public Service Commission and the Bureau of Publications. If he couldn't cut those in two, he would be willing to resign his seat. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not a very big stake for him to have to put up when it is about three-quarters gone already. I might say in passing that what we would save by the suggestions made by the hon. member for Cannington would just about equal what it would cost if we carried out what was suggested by the hon. member for Arm River. Those two just about balance out.

One of the things that has stood out in this debate is the lack of constructive criticism. The same old speeches we had in the election campaign were given over and over again here in this House, last week. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people throughout this province are getting awfully tired and fed-up on words. It is actions they want. The people throughout the province are getting tired of listening to long speeches. In this debate we had five speeches from the opposition members, each of which was over one hour, to say nothing of those in the previous debate. People are getting fed-up on arguments going on back and forward between members of the House as to who won the election. The people in the country know perfectly well who won the election. That was settled 'way back in June, and there are nor more brains in this Assembly than there are scattered throughout the province. The people are quite capable of reading the result of the elections for themselves.

I think, too, the people are getting fed-up with all this talk about communism and about the failure of the government in business. They are getting fed-up about all these false rumours of people leaving the province, about driving business out of the province, of taking farms away, or usurping the authority of the Legislature, and of the terrible roads in Saskatchewan. The people can see the roads. If the roads are bad, my hon. friends don't need to say anything about it, and if the roads are good the people in the country can appreciate it. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are wasting a lot of words in this House telling the people of Saskatchewan things they know a great deal more about than we do.

The people are also getting tired of all such talk as we heard the other day from the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr), to the effect that if a C.C.F. government were elected, it would be the last election. Such utter nonsense. We have listened to that kind of statement for so long the people are getting tired of it. People are getting fed-up on all this talk of how the Liberals could provide cheaper hospitalization in Saskatchewan, when they know that out in British Columbia they are charging, not \$10 but \$15, plus a three percent sales tax.

They are getting fed-up on all this talk of communist propaganda in the schools. I am going to sincerely suggest to the hon. members in the opposition that they do this House and the people of Saskatchewan the courtesy of preparing a new speech; these are becoming shop-worn. We have heard them so often I think the people are getting fed-up.

What is it we expect of an opposition? First of all, constructive criticism; secondly, alternative policies, clearly and forcefully expressed; thirdly, intelligent questions to keep the government on its toes, and intelligent questioning of all monies spent or to be spent. One of the things that has been very noticeable in this debate is the lack of discussion by opposition members of any alternative suggestions.

The former Leader of the Opposition, the member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson), said that I introduced a political note into this debate, the first time a Provincial Treasurer had ever done so in a budget address. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that was done deliberately, carefully, and after much thought. I introduced into that budget something that might be construed as political and something which I knew I might be severely censured for by my hon. friends opposite, but I did so because I wanted to get on the records of this House a statement from them of what they intended to do. I pointed out in my address that if we worked out the taxes proposed by the members of the opposition, and if we introduced the various services or some of the new services they proposed, there would be a deficit of \$35 million. Mr. Speaker, not one single member in the opposition challenged that statement; and yet I have no doubt they will go out of this House, out on the public platforms and deny it. This is the place, in this Assembly, where there should be a constructive, alternative policy proposed. We were entitled to that courtesy. We did not get it.

There is altogether too much talk on the other side about cutting taxes and, at the same time, reducing expenditures. I have no doubt that a great many of the hon. gentlemen attended the convention that was supposed to have been held the other evening. Mr. Reid, who was the guest speaker on that occasion, said:

We have been accused of bribery by spending, but there is nothing worse than bribery by promises that cannot be fulfilled and must be forgotten after an election . . . You hear speeches in the country and the House of Commons, advocating greater expenditures for a variety of things, including social services. At the end of these speeches, these people advocate a reduction in taxes. Anyone who has experience in administration at any level of government knows that it just cannot be done. You can see proof of this in your own civic government.

These are very wise words from the hon. gentleman, and yet the members of his party in this province have been guilty of going throughout the length and breadth of this province and building up the hopes of the people that they can have their taxes reduced, and at the same time they can spend these enormous millions of dollars.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is the way you got elected in the first place.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I want to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he had ten days to get up on his feet and tell us how he was going to do it. Instead of that, he wants to sit in his seat this afternoon and yell across the way. He had his opportunity and failed to take it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Go and lecture your own people.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like now to deal with some of the statements made by the various members. First, I should like to start with the former Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson). I would like to congratulate

him on his speech. I thought it was very good, but, after all, why should it not be a good speech as we have heard it now for the fourth time. After you have given a speech that often, it either should be good, or you should quit giving it.

His criticisms, very general, were the same. I can take you back two years ago to the published speeches of the hon. gentleman, in which practically the same thing was said in practically the same way. I would like, first of all, to answer his statement about the government spending money without the vote of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a dollar spent without the vote of this Legislature. He referred, for example, to two Acts. The first was the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Fund, under which he says money can be expended without this Legislature knowing the first thing about it, and without any reference to the representatives of the people, and that it is entirely within the control of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Then he went on about the Industrial Development Fund, which says:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may borrow on the credit of the province up to the sum of \$2 million, and when that money has been so borrowed the Industrial Development Fund has, subject to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the authority to spend that money to pay expenses.

In both those cases the government came before the Legislature. We said to the Legislature: "We want \$5 million for the purpose of reconstruction and rehabilitation in this province." We came to the Legislature and said: "We want \$2 million for industrial development within this province." The Legislature voted that money for us. Therefore, how can we spend money without a vote of the Legislature when we have already that vote?

I would like to remind my hon. friend that other provinces, such as the neighbouring province of Manitoba, where they have a Liberal-Conservative Administration, and British Columbia, where they have a Liberal-Conservative Administration, when money is voted in this way in the ordinary estimates, the vote does not lapse at the end of the year. I think possibly that is one thing we should correct in our whole system of financing. When we undertake to provide a certain amount of money for capital expenditure, it is not always convenient to spend the money during that year, and yet we have to come back, year after year, and have that money re-voted. That is one of the reasons our proposed expenditures for capital development has been higher than the amounts actually spent. In these other provinces the vote does not lapse at the end of the fiscal year. So I think it is too bad that my hon. friends should try to give the impression to this House, and to the people of Saskatchewan, that the government is spending money that has not been voted by the Legislature when already the Legislature has voted that money and has given us the authority to spend it at any time we see fit.

The hon. gentleman referred to what is good business practice. He stated that individuals engaged in business try to conduct their operations on what might be called a business basis. That is, in prosperous times, they endeavour, first, to retire debts, if they have them; second, to increase their assets; third, to lay aside reserves for the future. He then suggested the government should do the same thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have qualified pretty well there as being operators of good business practices. We

have reduced the debt by some \$70 million – it is true a portion of it was my hon. friends' reduction in the early part of 1944, but from the end of the fiscal year, 1944, to the end of December, 1948, the public debt has been reduced by \$70 million, which is a very substantial reduction, considering that it is the first time in the history of the province there has ever been any substantial reduction in the public debt.

The second good business practice was to increase the assets. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand Public Accounts for 1943-44; I also have the Public Accounts for 1947-48, and it is more interesting to notice the increase in the assets. For example, in 1943-44, "Public Buildings and Public Improvements" was \$56 million; in 1947-48, this is up to \$65 million, an increase of \$9 million during that period of time. "Sinking Funds" have gone up from \$24 million to \$42 million, an increase of \$18 million during the same time. "Cash in Banks and Investments", 1943-44, \$10 million; 1947-48, \$15 million, an increase of \$5 million in round figures. There, Mr. Speaker, taking three times alone, we have increased the assets by \$32 million. Lay aside reserves? Yes. When I took over the "Sinking Fund" there was \$24 million in it in 1943-44; today there is \$42 million, an increase of \$18 million. If that isn't setting aside reserves, I don't know what is.

We were told, also, during the discussion by the former Leader of the Opposition, that actually we have not reduced the debt at all, and that there was an actual increase of \$4 million in the debt this year. I want to say again that while the gross debt is up by \$4 million, the sinking funds have gone up by \$5 million, and therefore your debt is reduced by \$1 million. If it would satisfy my hon. friend, I could arrange tomorrow to have that \$4 million wiped out. It is held in debentures, issued to our own Sinking Fund, which will mature on March 31, 1949. There is a total of some \$7,250,000 in that category. Then, the next year, there was some \$6.4 million in that category, a total of over \$13 million of debt which is owing to our selves. It has gone, on the one hand, to build up the gross debt but, on the other hand, it has also gone to build up the Sinking Fund and, therefore, your net debt is not affected thereby. If this had been some new member of the House I could forgive him for making statements like that' but I cannot forgive a man who has been the Provincial Treasurer throughout these years, a man who understands and knows where that debt is, and who gives the impression, by making the definite statement, that the debt has not been reduced but is actually up \$4 million when he knows the statement is not true at all.

Then he points to the increase in interest of some \$600,000. Again, Mr. Speaker, who gets that interest? That interest is coming back to ourselves. On this \$13 million we have in the Sinking Fund, the entire amount of the interest comes right back to ourselves. I think my hon. friend should have known that. I point out, too, that a great deal of the debt that has been incurred is self-liquidating. Power, for example: in 1944, the total indebtedness was \$7.7 million; in 1948 it was \$18.7 million – an increase of \$11 million in the Power debt which is completely self-liquidating.

My hon. friend went on to point out that each department shows an increase in expenditures. Yes, that is practically true: two departments I think had a reduction. But, Mr. Speaker, inflation is something which affects all departments. No one can escape it. When it hits a country it hits every

**March 14, 1949**

individual in it. And so, not because of any policy of this government, but because of policies of the government at Ottawa, this inflationary policy has been allowed to go forward with the result we have to pay more for everything we buy. Whether it be labour, or supplies for the various institutions, it costs us more today than it did one year ago, because of the increase in the cost of living, and the decrease in the value of the dollar.

I would like to point out that an increased budget is not something which is prevalent in Saskatchewan only. It is true in every province of Canada and every state of the Union. I am not going to quote them all. I could – I have them a yard long if my hon. friends would like to have them. Let us take some of our neighbours. In 1943-44, British Columbia's expenditure was \$30.35 million, this year it is \$92 million, an increase of 204 percent; Alberta, 1943-44, \$21,654,000, this year \$66,659,000, an increase of 208 percent; Manitoba, \$18,315,000 and now it is \$36,213,000, an increase of 97 percent; Saskatchewan, in 1943-44, \$29,799,000, this year \$56,500,000, an increase of 89 percent. In the other western provinces, 204 percent, 208 percent, and 97 percent; yet in Saskatchewan, our increase during the same period of time is only 89 percent. So this is not something which affects Saskatchewan alone; it is something which affects people in all parts of the Dominion.

I was interested in what the former Leader of the Opposition said about the frills. He said: "We have an Economic Advisory and Planning Board that is costing us \$55,000; a Research Council – strange to say we have never heard anything about it; the Bureau of Publications jumped up from \$34,000 to \$120,000." I would like to say just a little about these frills for a few moments, Mr. Speaker.

The Economic Advisory and Planning Board: It is quite true the previous administration did not have one, but, after all, if you are not doing anything, why do you need to make any plans? Today, throughout the whole democratic world, planning boards are recognized as a very essential part of government. After all, we were spending large sums of money, and \$55,000 to be spent on the future economic development of the province may prove to save millions. I would like to tell my hon. friends some of the things the Planning Board is studying at the present time: land tenure, land use, farm credit, power rates, federal highway aid, provincial revenues, consumer service, government statistics, rural electrification, natural gas, physical planning and superannuation. There, Mr. Speaker, is a list of 12 subjects the Planning Board is giving some thought to at the present time.

The Planning Board is made up, partly of members of the government and partly of outsiders. One of the ways we study these is through setting up working committees on each of these subjects, to do research work and present any recommendations to the government. One thing I would like to emphasize is that the Planning Board has absolutely no executive authority whatever. They made no decisions. All they do is to advise the government.

The next thing is the Research Council. My hon. friend has never heard of it. Well, he should have been watching his votes a little closer last year because this was included, and there was considerable discussion. We told the House the set-up. This Research Council consists of a number of people who are experts in various fields. The university is represented on it. We have no big research laboratories here so what we usually do is get the university to do the work.

Might I take a moment to just mention some of the subjects which will be studies this year, on which research will be done. First of all, Briquetting, drying and the solvent extraction of lignite. I don't know what will come of it; perhaps nothing, On the other hand, it may ultimately mean a big industry in the south-east part of the province, possibly a government industry and possibly a private industry. This information will be available for private industry some day. Secondly, Lloydminster asphalt airblowing, chemical nature of lignite, research on Saskatchewan clays, study of water hardness, utilization of volcanic ash, poultry nutrition, hereditary factors in egg quality, housing research, cellulose, fertilizers, animal nutrition and genetics. These are subjects with which, obviously, the members of the government are not competent to deal. They require trained chemists and scientists; and so this money, for the most par, will be spent in payment of fees, for services rendered, to the university or the Research Council: \$32,000 for that, which my hon. friends refer to as a frill. I would say there is one thing wrong with this: it is not nearly large enough. If there is any place we should be spending more money, it is in the field of research.

Then we come to the matter of the Bureau of Publications. The hon. gentleman suggests he could operate this with one-half the vote. Well, I notice in Manitoba, for example that last year they had \$131,040 for their Bureau of Publicity and Travel. This year they have jumped it up to \$204,140, an increase of some \$70,000, while we in Saskatchewan are going to try to get along with what we had last year, \$120,000.

Then my hon. friend refers to the Civil Service Commission as a frill; that the expenditure is up 800 percent from what it was in 1944-45. Well, what was the situation in 1944-45? We had one man, Mr. Turner, and three girls in the office. They received applications for jobs, and they interviewed those who came to the office. They kept records of any appointments made by the various departments. Now, one thing I would like to emphasize is that except for very minor positions, the appointments were made by the department, not by the Public Service Commission.

What is the situation today? Today we have a classification system, the purpose of which is to analyze the duties and responsibilities of all positions in the service so that similar positions may be grouped together in various classes. Then there is a "pay plan", which recognizes and ensures the principle that people doing similar types of work receive similar pay.

When we made the survey we found some most interesting things. We found cases where two people were doing exactly the same work, one would be getting \$110 a month, and the other would be getting \$190 or \$200 a month for doing exactly the same job. That is all cut out. I am very interested when the hon. gentleman suggests this is a frill, one of the things he would do without. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Civil Service Association will be very interested to know that this is one of the things his party feels they could get along without. They will be very interested in knowing that.

There is some criticism of the number of civil servants. In June, 1944, without counting Power and Telephones, there were 3,099; today there are 4,735, an increase of 1,636. Two years ago I had the privilege of visiting a naval base out of Seattle. In that naval base there were a number of large

**March 14, 1949**

warships – it was after the war was over. The man with whom I was, pointed to one large ship. He said: “You see this big ship? During wartime there were 2,000 people on it, today there is one man on it.” It was going places; it was fighting a battle and it took 2,000 men to operate it; but when it was lying at anchor it did not need anybody on it. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the same. When you have a government doing nothing you do not need many people to operate it. In our mental institutes in 1944 there were 720 employees; today there are 1,190 – 720 to 1,190; of course, that includes all the mental institution. I understand some of the hon. gentleman visited the institution in Weyburn last week. I am sure, after going through it, they would not want to put themselves in the position of the employees who worked there up to 1944-45, who had to work 12 hours a day, six days a week, in some instances seven days a week, as they had only every other Sunday off. I am sure, too, they wouldn’t want to see a situation where there was one attendant in some of those large wards. Yet my hon. friend suggested the other day that we should get rid of all these people who have been appointed by this government. The hon. Leader of the Opposition verified that when speaking last summer, during the campaign.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I did no such thing.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Oh yes you did.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I certainly did not. On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing. I never suggested we could get along with the same number of civil servants as we had in 1944. I say I never suggested any such thing, and the hon. member is stating something that is not correct. I ask that he accept my word on that.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I will accept the hon. gentleman’s word because I have no alternative; but I am going to suggest to him that when statements of such importance as that are published in the Regina Leader-Post, which purported to quote him, and they are not correct, he should issue a denial at the time.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I deny such a statement was quoted in the Leader Post of anything I said. I challenge the hon. member to produce it. He is not accepting my word.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I will...

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member who is speaking did accept your statement. He is now referring to an article in The Leader Post.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He is trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was quoted in The Leader-Post as having said that, and that I did not deny it. I say I challenge him to produce it.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I shall do so before I am finished. I will send out for it.



Mr. Speaker, may I again point out that in the Department of Agriculture there were 162 employees, today there are 252; Natural Resources, up from 185 to 252; Health Department, up from 124 to 263. What would my hon. friends have us do? Go back to the days when we had probably 10 public health nurses in the province? Or in the Department of Social Welfare, go back to the position we found in 1943-44 when there was not a single trained social welfare worker employed by the government? The hon. gentlemen criticize the increase in staff of the civil servants, and yet they have not the backbone to get up and say where they would cut the number of servants. They have not the backbone to get up and tell us that they would go back to the 72-hour week; or discharge these public health nurses, or fire all these trained social welfare workers. And yet my hon. friends would fire all these C.C.F. appointees.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is a different matter altogether.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, he admits . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I did not admit it at all, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member cannot put words in my mouth. I did not say I would fire all the civil servants taken on. I repeat, I said I would fire all the C.C.F. workers.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — No, I did not say . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — “All C.C.F. appointees”, and that means all people who have been appointed since this government came to office. I want to say here and now . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Appointees are . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — There is a lot of talk about political appointments. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are political appointments. We have two types of appointments: those made by the Public Service Commission and those made by Order in Council through the Cabinet, which consist of very, very few. I want to tell my hon. friends that we have no intention of appointing people to responsible positions — Deputy Ministers, heads of board, heads of commissions, responsible positions of that kind — who are going to sabotage us and cut our throats. We have not intention of doing that at all.

On the other hand, in the case of employees appointed by the Public Service Commission, the matter of politics never enters into it. If there is any one criticism I have had more than any other, it is that there have been too many people belonging to the Liberal party appointed to these positions.

I would like to point out that the reason for the increase in civil servants is the increased activity. There is no increase in the number of civil servants where the amount of work is the same. On the contrary, there is a very

great reduction where we are carrying on routine work such as in my own department. For example, in the Taxation Branch, there were 142 in 1943-44, today there are 132; There were 61 in the Treasury, today there are 53; in Municipal Affairs, 55 in 1943-44, today there are 53; in the Attorney General's Office there were 34, today there are 28; the Land Titles, notwithstanding a 50 percent increase in work, there were 136, today there are 141; Court House, there were 97, today there are 86. It is only where there are more activities being carried on that it was necessary for us to engage additional employees, or where we found employees were working an extremely long number of hours and we had to reduce them to comply with modern hours of work.

**Mr. Deshaye:** — May I ask the hon. Minister a question? Did I understand you to say the number of employees in the Land Titles was reduced?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — No, I did not say that. I said the work has gone up 50 percent, and the increase is from 136 to 141. Those are the figures.

**Mr. Deshaye:** — That is a very small increase, and I was wondering why there should be a substantial increase in Land Titles fees when there is that small increase in employees.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, the question of Land Titles' fees has nothing to do with the number of employees.

The other day the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson) referred to the number of inspectors found running around. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he must have got mixed up with some of the federal inspectors like Unemployment Insurance inspectors, family allowance inspectors, radio inspectors, income tax inspectors, P.R.R.A. inspectors and so on and so forth.

There was some talk here the other day about the 20 or 30 people who have been prosecuted under the Hospitalization Act, but there were 606 prosecutions in the province of Saskatchewan for radio licences. There were 63 prosecutions in Saskatchewan of people who had not paid their income tax.

Another frill that was attacked by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) was the Budget Bureau, which is operating on a budget of \$27,000. He may not know it, but I would like to tell him that a Budget Bureau is today to be found in practically every modern government organization on this continent. I am very proud of what we have done with such a very small staff. We have already won one international award — the first year we were in operation. The hon. gentleman suggests that we should leave the preparing of the budget to the Treasury. I would like him to know the Budget Bureau is part of the Treasury. It is attached to the Treasury. I have here a report from the Select Standing Committee on Estimates in Great Britain. It is a very interesting document, Mr. Speaker. It point out — I might say that the Budget Bureau over in England is referred to as "Organization and Methods" — "O. and M." In Ottawa they are considering setting up such an organization, and have been making some enquiries as to what we are doing here. This is a very interesting report:

The ideas behind 'O. and M.' are not new. Some were put forward by the Macdonnel Commission 33 years ago. It was not until 1942 that the Treasury 'O. and M.' Division was created.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the preparation of the budget is only part of the work of the budget bureau. The other is to deal with the organization and methods in the government's executive machinery. They go into different departments, when asked by the different departments, to try and find ways and means of increasing the efficiency of operation and the mechanical operation of those departments. We have been able to make some very substantial savings. I can tell my hon. friend that they have already made sufficient saving in methods of operation that their salaries will be paid not only for this year, but for the next 20 years.

Again, I would like to refer you to this Committee report from England, to show you the type of thing they do. For example:

During the last year over 50 assignments have been undertaken by the Treasury Division at the request of Departments . . . . The reorganization of the system of issuing passports by using 1,600 Labour Exchanges spread all over the country, instead of concentrating the work in London, Liverpool and Glasgow. This, while providing a more convenient service for the public, enables a passport to be obtained in 48 hours and, as the same time, has resulted in a reduction of Passport Office staff from 1,100 to 700, without causing an increase of staff in the Labour Exchanges.

Reducing the staff by 400 people. I could go on and give you dozens of examples along the same line to show you the value of such an organization – and for a mere 20-odd thousand dollars.

The hon. gentleman referred to the matter of debt reduction. Again it is the same explanation he gave a year ago. At that time I attempted to answer him, but evidently it did not sink in. The same old speech, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the debt had been reduced was because of monies repaid by the farmers on farm loans, because of monies repaid by the Wheat Pool, because of money returned by the Telephones and money returned by Power. I would again remind him that during the years his government was in office they were collecting these identical amounts, and yet, did he reduce the debt? No. In addition, this government has spent over \$25 million on capital account. He talks about the money being paid by Power and Telephones, but it is not one-quarter of what we have given to them. Notwithstanding that fact, we have still been able to reduce the debt.

General statements have been made to the effect that the C.C.F. and socialism will result in communism. I have no criticism of anybody who sincerely believe Arm River (Mr. Danielson) went on to criticize the League for Industrial Democracy, and referred to it as a communist organization. Such a reference as that shows a complete lack of understanding, and a tendency to brand any organization with which he disagrees as communist. The honorary president of this organization is John Dewey, a well-beloved educationalist of the United States, a man on whom one cannot cast any aspersion, a man

who has devoted his life to the cause of building up democracy in education, a man who is opposed to everything with any dictatorial tendencies. This grand old man, who will be celebrating his 90th birthday this year, has been connected with this opposition and was one of the prime founders of it. The vice-president is Mr. M.J. Coldwell, and I want to say that anybody who accuses him of communism had better do it outside of this Chamber. One of the directors is Mr. Gordon King, who at present time is engaged by the C.B.C. In view of the statements made by the hon. Prime Minister, I am sure that if there was any communist blood in him, he would not be engaged by the C.B.C. at this time.

The regrettable thing is that this is not confined to the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) alone; that same attitude is noticeable in the remarks of other hon. gentlemen. Take the hon. member for the Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) the other day, when referring to the U.F.C. The Leader-Post reported him as saying: "The U.F.C. was purely and simply a communist organization, organised by the Internationale." I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you, as one of the founders of the U.F.C., will not appreciate too much those remarks of the hon. gentleman; nor will hundreds of others appreciate them very much. The same gentleman said: "In 1929 the Wheat Pool held wheat back from the market because of communist influence, thereby losing the British market and causing the ruin of western Canadian farmers. Later the board of directors changed." I am sure 75 or 80,000 members of the Wheat Pool will be very interested in that remark from the hon. member for Saltcoats, that their leaders were people of communist influence. I am sure the United Farmers and the members of the Wheat Pool will not appreciate very much that remark made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to recommend to each of the members opposite, particularly the members for Arm River and Saltcoats – yes, and even their Leader, it will be good for him – that they invest \$1.25 in the last issue of Fortune magazine. In this issue there is an article written by Eric Johnston, and all members know that Eric Johnston is no socialist. He was former president of the United States' Chamber of Commerce, and now is president of the Motion Picture Association of America, so we do not need to tar him with being a communist because he utters these statements. The article is called "How America can avoid Socialism". He said:

If we ever get socialism here in America it will be, in large measure, the fault of the American businessmen. When British voters kicked out the Conservatives and put in the socialists three and a half years ago, they were not choosing between free enterprise and socialism. They didn't have any such choice. Free enterprise, as we know it, didn't exist in Britain. The voters had a choice between monopoly and cartelization versus nationalisation.

And then there is another little bit which is very good:

As a businessman, I am very proud of the growing social-mindedness of business, but I am thoroughly conscious, also, that business is still doing penance for its opposition to social-economic reforms. We didn't find much of industry in the cheering section when one piece of social legislation after another dropped into the hoppers of Congress and the State Legislatures. We in business were against workmen's compensation; we were against minimum wage legislation; against insurance of bank

deposits, social security, parity prices, legalized collective bargaining. Social legislation, we insisted, would lead to socialism.

I think that sums up only too well how we are going to avoid communism in this country; that is, by removing those things that will cause communism: removing insecurity; providing our people with jobs; providing our people with housing; providing them with a full dinner-pail. Those are the things that will keep communism out of Saskatchewan. That is why I pray to God that never again will we have a Liberal government in this province that will allow those conditions of insecurity, unemployment and poverty to exist; because that is the sort of thing that brings about communism.

It is also stated, over and over again in this House, that we have lost money in our Crown Corporations. I want to say that these statements have been made not only in the House but outside the House. I have here a copy of the Kamsack Times for March 3rd, signed by John G. Banks, M.L.A., in which he says:

Underneath the bravado of the government there is a definite uneasiness. The much-lauded Crown Corporations have not been doing well. The government is unable to hide this fact further from the people. Instead there is talk about 'problem children'; the Fish Board, the woollen mill, the government tannery have already been closed.

The Fish Board, the woollen mill, the government tannery have already been closed.

The sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin, with an investment of \$3 million, is closed for want of orders, and will not, in the opinion of those who know, be opened again. The bus lines are in distress, and the brick factory at Estevan, after an expenditure of \$150,000 to winterize, has been closed, and is a white elephant that will be shortly be shelved. The people of Saskatchewan should be informed that over \$6 million invested in the enterprises carried on by the government is lost, except for a little salvage on the sale of them; that as operating business or businesses they are a failure and cannot be operated at a profit under public ownership. Those great traits of leadership and misrepresentation possessed by the government leaders cannot keep that fact buried any longer.

That is signed by John G. Banks, M.L.A., in a letter to the editor of the Kamsack Times. This gentleman owes us an apology to this House for such statements that are utterly ridiculous. He refers, for example, to the Fish Board, as already being closed; to the woollen mill being closed; the tannery, it is true, is closed at the moment, the only one of the three that is. The woollen mill is doing a tremendous business, operating at full capacity with a full staff, and disposing of the products as rapidly as they have been able to turn them out. That is the situation there, and yet he has the audacity to deliberately falsify the situation and make such a statement as that.

Then he goes on: "The sodium sulphate plant is closed for want of orders and, in the opinion of those who know, will not be opened again."

Another utterly ridiculous statement. The sodium sulphate plant is going at full capacity with one or two carloads of sodium sulphate being shipped out every day. There is not a chance in the world of that industry being closed; and yet here he is saying it is closed and not going to be opened again. He refers to a \$2 million investment, which is twice as much as the actual fact.

Then too, “the bus lines are in distress”. Well, Mr. Speaker, the bus lines, are from being in distress, are operating, insofar as the roads allow them to, very satisfactorily. We never intended to make money on theses, and they are paying their own way.

Then he says: “The brick factory, after an expenditure of \$150,000 to winterize, has been closed, and is a white elephant that will shortly be shelved”. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that brick factory looks today as though it is going to be open for a long time to come. There are sufficient orders on hand to keep it going for two years. Never since we started have the prospects for that particular industry been as rosy as they are at the present time. That is the kind of stuff these gentlemen peddle around the country. If they are going to put that in the paper while the House is in session, what will they say when they get out to the backwoods, in the school houses? I think this hon. gentleman owes an apology to the House and if he has one decent spark of humanity in him he will get up and give it at once.

It has also been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the larger school policy has resulted in reduced enrolment, and that the voters would turn it out. That is what the hon. gentleman for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) said the other day. What are the facts about enrolment? Let us look at facts and figures. In 1941 to 1944, there was a decrease of 816 enrolled in Grade XI; from 1944 to 1948 there was an increase of 236 enrolled in Grade XI. In Grade XII, in 1941 to 1944, there was a decrease of 1,077, and yet from 1944 to 1948 there was actually an increase of 368. That does not look as though enrolment was going down in the high school grades.

What about total rural enrolment for all grades? In 1941-1942, we had 111,026; 1944-1945, 93,000, a reduction in the last three years of Liberal administration of 17,979, or 1.6 percent. In 1947-48 this has gone down to 81,841, a reduction of 12,000 or 1.3 percent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in the last three years of Liberal administration there was a 5,700 greater reduction in the number of youngsters in our rural schools than there were in the first three years of C.C.F. administration.

What about closed schools? In 1941-41, there were 397 and after three years of Liberal administration there were 713; 316 closed in that three-year period. What about the last three years? 870 were closed in 1947-48. Actually a total of 157 schools were closed in the three years of C.C.F. administration, but 316 under the Liberals or twice as many schools were closed in the three years the Liberals were in office.

I wonder if the hon. gentleman for Humboldt really meant what he said the other day when he said: “If a vote were taken at this time it – the larger unit – would be defeated.” What does the Minister of Education in Manitoba say about the larger unit; a Liberal member, Hon. Rhodes Smith, the brightest man they have in the government, what does he say about it? This is what he says:

The large school has been the source of many arguments in this province. We, in the department believe the large school area has definite advantages over the small school districts operating as a completely separate unit. These advantages are more apparent in the high school level. My own opinion in this regard is based partly upon the studies made by and briefs submitted to the Legislative Committee on Education some four or five years ago, the great majority of which support the large area, apparently on the grounds that every brief submitted also strongly supported the large area. Partly, also, on the more practical ground that in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, where the large area has been introduced and has been operating for some years, there seems to be no disposition to revert to the old independent small district.

That is what the Minister of Education for Manitoba said. Of course, my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) may know more about it than the Minister of Education of Manitoba.

Take a look at something else then. Here I have, in the issue of The School Trustee for January of 1949, an article by Mr. L.A. Dowling of Engelfeld, on the larger unit. It says: "Humboldt, a Larger Unit in action." I wish I had time to read the whole article, Mr. Speaker. He points out in this how conditions have improved; how there is a new spirit abroad, a spirit of hope and optimism and geniality; and he goes on to talk about the improvement in sanitary conditions in the schools; for teachers – the application of a schedule, professional books and pamphlets that are provided, and the helping teacher engaged to assist those persons starting out in life; how they have a circulation library there, which has proved to be very popular, and how they are building up a professional library for teachers. Then, too, about the great improvement in buildings; how 14 percent of all classrooms have either been replaced or remodelled since 1946.

Reading this article, by someone who knows something about the larger unit in Humboldt, would not give much indication that there is very much danger. I am going to suggest to these hon. gentlemen that instead of criticisms like this, let us get behind this thing. We all recognize the larger unit to be something which is in the best interests of education. Let us make it work. I had a letter today from a gentleman, commenting on these radio broadcasts. He said: "I wish you had told the people in the House how one of the larger units in my district has been a failure. I enquired what kind of trustees they had and they were all Liberals. They are doing everything they can to sabotage it. In the next district where they have all C.C.F. trustees, the district is going ahead."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest to these gentlemen that they forget their politics. Politics is all right with adults, but when you start using politics to destroy something for the benefit of the children, then I am sure my hon. friend for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) agrees that it should not be done. I would say that the attitude of the Liberal party, while they have not the courage to come out and say they are against the larger unit, is that they would destroy it, and they are seeking to destroy it today. I am confident that the people of this province will be able to see the advantages and, notwithstanding all the political propaganda, will reject any suggestions that we should change our method of school administration.

It has been said here, very frequently, that we are spending a lot more money on education. Well, we are, and thank God for that. It is time we were spending more money on education. No longer are teachers working for four, five or six hundred dollars a year. Today they are getting decent salaries. This inflation has hit education just as it has hit everything else. I would like to point out that in 1927 five percent of the net farm income was used to pay the schools in the rural municipalities; in 1930, seven percent; in 1947, only three percent. Recently a 20 cent per bushel bonus for wheat marketed from 1945 to 1948 was distributed which will amount to around \$115 million. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the amount of money spent in rural schools in Saskatchewan over the last four years, that additional payment will be sufficient to cover all the school taxes for 15 years.

We talk a lot about the increase in school taxes. I have not heard these gentlemen talk about the increase in the price of farm fuels. In 1945, using 100 as an index for 1939, the price of farm fuel was 105.6; for 1946, it jumped to 110; for 1947 to 117; for 1948 to 133: an increase of 27.9 percent. We spent on farm fuel, oil and grease in 1945, 17 million. The increase in the cost of farm fuel is approximately \$5 million, but the increase in school taxes, in the same period, was only \$2 million – less than half as much. Yet we do not hear much talk about the increase in farm fuels.

I am sorry the hon. gentleman for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) is not here. I was leaving some of this until he came back, but he has evidently gone for the day. He said that the north had voted against compulsion. Well, I do not know. I often think back to those years prior to 1944, and think of the compulsion there was at that time, and I think of the freedoms there were. Yes, there was freedom all right. There was freedom for the children of that great north country to go without an education. The trappers of the north were free to the extent that they had little choice in selling of their furs other than selling them to the trader, the unscrupulous trader who took a very large share of the profits. Likewise, the people of the north had little or no choice as to where they bought their supplies. They had absolutely no control whatever of the prices they had to pay for them. The hon. gentleman spoke of the closing of Canoe Lake. Well, this lake was ‘frozen’ insofar as frozen fishing was concerned, by the normal regulations. It was closed for fresh fishing by special permission. After two and one-half months of fishing, with 26 fishermen, the catch amounted to only 1,000 lbs. per fisherman for the two and one-half months. This is a clear indication that the fish in the lake be been depleted, and it has been recommended that the lake should be closed for at least three years in order to get the fish supply built up again so that we can go ahead with commercial fishing in that particular lake.

May I point out that the situation in Saskatchewan with regard to fishing is apparently a great deal better than it is in Manitoba. Our fishermen in Saskatchewan have very little fish left on their hands. I would like you to compare this situation with the one in Manitoba, pictured in the Winnipeg Tribune of March 8th. Here we have: “Lake fishermen face ruin.” I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is very interested in this. A wire was sent: “Manitoba fishermen face disaster. Cannot dispose of winter’s catch at any price”. They sent a delegation to the provincial government asking for financial assistance. “Majority of winter catch, according to fishermen, has been turned over to packers who are keeping it in storage at the fishermen’s expense until a price



is set. They can't get credit at the stores; they can't get money for their fish: they owe the company for advances. 'We are broke', they say. One of the men estimated his winter operations had cost \$1,768: 'I have 40,000 lbs of fish, which was an exceptionally good catch. If I get five cents, I will break even.' They are looking for new jobs." A very heart-rending story, much worse than anything that has been given in this House about the conditions in our Saskatchewan fishing. The only difference is, Mr. Speaker, that these statements were made in Manitoba with a view to doing something to try to help the fishermen, while statements are made in Saskatchewan with a view to embarrassing the people who try to do something to help the fishermen.

The Saskatchewan Fish Board has taken the matter up with the dominion, through the Federal Fisheries Support Board, and at last they have taken action, but it is not going to help us much. The price which they are going to pay, F.O.B. Winnipeg, is so low that when transportation and other costs are deducted there will be nothing left for the fishermen on the lakes of northern Saskatchewan. It is becoming evident that the Saskatchewan Fish Board, although it lost money, has served the fishermen of Saskatchewan very, very well. When the figures are all added up and the truth is known, it will probably be found that a great deal more has been spent to look after the situation in Manitoba than we will lose on our Fish Board here in Saskatchewan.

There has been a great deal of talk, too, during the debate, about the lack of mineral development in Saskatchewan. It is always a great thing, if you do not do anything yourself, to shout so loud you will take the attention off that lack of doing anything. That is about the situation here. The records show that in 1932, when we had a Conservative government, a few students were sent out with field officers of the department. There is only one report, of some investigation on oil seepage, on record. Only one report throughout all these years. In 1933 the government did give some assistance to drilling. In 1934 some assistance was given to a dominion survey party; but from that time right through until the present government came into office nothing was done to try to help the mining industry of Saskatchewan.

Yet today we find we are getting for the people of Saskatchewan something out of the mineral development. The previous administration gave practically everything to the companies that drilled it. For instance, \$205,000 was the largest amount of royalties taken by the previous government from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company; today we are getting about \$1.5 million.

Compare that with what was done in 1948. We sent three geological parties out to work in the pre-Cambrian area. Their reports will be published and will be available to prospectors and others interested in mining development. The one geologist is located at Flin Flon; another party worked on the plains, and there are more university students out than have ever been out before.

All this talk of driving business out. Here we have the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company putting up a new \$6 million plant at Flin Flon. More claims were staked in 1948 than in any previous year in the history of Saskatchewan. Several companies took out mining concessions and, by so doing, are committed to spend nearly \$500,000 on exploration and development. Since 1944 the total mineral development of this province has increased by over

**March 14, 1949**

50 percent. The same is true in oil exploration: real progress has been made. I was very interested in the chart shown the other day by the Minister of Natural Resources. This shows the natural gas permits in 1943-44, and you will notice it is just Imperial Oil and a very few other companies. But at the present time you can see the whole western part of the province is staked out, not by one company but by dozens of smaller companies. It is a very interesting chart which shows quite clearly that the department is doing something to get development going here in Saskatchewan.

In 1944 the total value of oil produced was about \$1,000, while today it is about \$1,250,000. In uranium, greater progress has been made in Saskatchewan than in any other province in Canada. If my hon. friends doubt that let them read the Quebec Miner for January 7, 1949, which says: "Saskatchewan is advertising itself as the uranium province, and rightly so. During 1948 more discoveries of uranium were made in the northern part of Saskatchewan than anywhere else in the Dominion."

**Mr. Tucker:** — Are you taking credit for that too, that uranium is in the province?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Certainly, we are going to take credit for assisting these people in exploration work.

**Mr. Tucker:** — God put it there, not you.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — The exploration parties were organized by our department, and were the ones who discovered it, not the ones organized by the Dominion at all, as my hon. friend is suggesting.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It was there when the Liberals were in. He thinks we put it there.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Your minister is taking credit for it being there.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I have spoken altogether too long. I have criticized others for speaking at some length, and I have done even worse myself.

There has been a great deal said by speakers discussing the budget about its size, and about the very considerable sums of money which are being spent by the government to carry out its programme. Emphasis has been on the budget only in monetary terms. That is absolutely necessary; yet I believe emphasis should not be placed so much on the dollars and cents involved in the budget as upon what we are going to achieve as a result. After all, a budget is simply a monetary interpretation of a designed policy, and a discussion of budget in money terms alone is meaningless unless it is coupled with an understanding of the policies it is designed to achieve.

I would like to emphasize that there is no inherent virtue to be found in a large budget, and not criticism can be levelled against a large budget as such. Similarly, there is no particular vice in a small budget or, for that

matter, is there any special virtue in a small budget. It is no irrefutable quality of efficiency in a budget that it is small, for there can be waste and unwise management in the very smallest expenditures; nor is it a sign of efficiency simply because a budget is large.

Criticism of the opposition that the budget is too large – and remember that has been the refrain for the last four years – is about as meaningful as that there are too many children receiving an education in our schools; or that there are too many automobiles owned by the people of the province; or that Canada, with 12 million people, is overcrowded. What the Liberal party and its members have never been able to recognize is that changing times demand changes in the needs of our people, and the changing needs require extended services and additional care. To rail and rant against the size of a budget is to criticize the needs of the people, or at least to ignore them, and that is something this government will never do.

We should view the budget not only in monetary terms but also in human terms and their satisfaction. That is the test this government will always apply to its budgets, because it is a government committed to a principle that human beings are more valuable than goods and chattels; that man's health is more important than money, and that the nation's welfare is rooted not in its banks and its industries and corporations, but in its men, women and children who build the future. It is the needs of our people which have received first priority in this budget, and it will be with the object of continued improvement in the health, well-being and happiness of our people as a whole that our succeeding budgets will be presented by this government.

It is not of first-rate significance that we are spending \$570,000 on cancer treatment, or \$1.4 million on hospitalization, or \$12 million in welfare work. That is not the important thing. What is of importance is that a humanitarian approach is now being taken to meet the ordinary, everyday problems of John Jones and Mary Smith, the former on his quarter-section of land and the latter in her office, because in our view the principal purpose of government is to help to make life just a little more liveable, a little happier and a little fuller than in the days of laissez-faire to which the Liberals would have us return. Interpreted in these terms, the budget moves some distance in fulfilling the government's objective, and the people's as a whole.

Ten years ago, this country was shocked in September when we heard of a great war. At that time the leader of the government at Ottawa called upon all the people of Canada to rise up to fight against the forces of aggression. People responded to that call. It made no difference what their politics were, whether they were C.C.F., Liberal or Conservative or Social Credit; they all responded to the call – and, according to the votes, more C.C.F. than any other party. Be that as it may, the records are there to speak for themselves. What I am trying to point out is: we rallied to that call of the dominion government. When it came to putting up money for Victory Bonds, people of all shades of political opinion responded; when it came to doing war work of any kind, people of all shades of political opinion responded.

Today in Saskatchewan another war is being waged, a war against insecurity, and it is a war that is not made up only on one battlefield; it is a war that is extending over many different fronts. The battle is being fought

on many fronts and we are going to have to win many battles before we finally win that war. What are some of those battles we are fighting today? We are fighting a battle to try to get our economy diversified; we are trying to get our oils and mines developed. It is a battle to try to develop irrigation in this province; to try to get the agriculture industry stabilized; a battle to try to increase production; a battle to try to fight off the grasshopper menace; a battle to try to overcome these drought conditions due to which this province at the present moment is facing a very grave situation; to try to overcome fluctuating prices.

Mr. Speaker, this is important, far more important than the fortunes of any political party. I want to appeal today to the members opposite to join with us in this battle, and just as people of all shade of political opinion responded to their call to battle in 1939, so in 1949 I am going to urge that they get behind us to try to build a bigger and better Saskatchewan. Let us have an end to all this talk about people leaving the province in hordes. Let us have an end to all this talk about government confiscating industry. Let us have an end to all this talk about taxing industry out of business. Let us have an end to all this talk about dictatorship, communism and all that stuff. Let us get together and try and see if, instead of doing those things which are keeping business out of the province, which are keeping the people from coming in here and helping us to develop it; instead of hindering this development, let us try to see if we cannot work together to build up the province. Now, I am sure if the hon. gentlemen would do that – forget their politics, forget the fortunes of their political party for the time being, and think of the good of Saskatchewan – it will be a better province for all of us.

I now have the clipping referred to earlier, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was outlining the platform at Ituna, and he concludes that he would bring about the ‘saving of between \$4 million and \$5 million by dismissal of C.C.F. hirelings and their retinue from the civil service and restoring it to its previous members.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I said. I claim the right to explain what I said. The hon. member said that I would dismiss all the people the C.C.F. had hired. I said I would dismiss the C.C.F. appointees of this government; in other words, the C.C.F. hirelings. That is not all the people appointed by the C.C.F. What I said was correct, and the hon. member should withdraw what he said against me.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member how he could go back to the former figure without firing all the people hired by the C.C.F.?

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. gentleman has just confirmed what I said.

**Premier Douglas:** — You can’t wiggle out of that one.

**Mr. Tucker:** — There is no greater wiggler in Saskatchewan than the hon. Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following division:

**YEAS — 28**

Douglas (Weyburn)  
Wellbelove  
Benson  
McIntosh  
Brockelbank  
Fines  
Corman  
Lloyd  
Brown  
Gibson

Murray  
Thair  
Darling  
Howe  
Douglas (Rosetown)  
Williams  
Gibbs  
Heming

Dewhurst  
Stone  
Erb  
Kusiak  
Denike  
Swallow  
Willis  
Buchanan  
Walker  
Larsen

**NAYS — 19**

Tucker  
Marion  
Loptson  
Prince  
Culliton  
Patterson  
Danielson

Dundas  
Woods  
Trippe  
Egnatoff  
Korchinski

Loehr  
Banks  
McDonald  
Deshaye  
McCormack  
Blanchard  
Lofts

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