

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
17th Day

Friday, March 10, 1950.

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):

On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction in the report of what I said, yesterday, in support of expanding P.F.R.A. I am not accusing anyone of false motives; it is just a mistake. They mentioned that I was somewhat alarmed at the recent tendency to broaden the application of P.F.R.A., and it should be P.F.A.A. I should mention, too, that I did not indicate that I was opposed to any broadening of P.F.A.A., but that we should not go too far in broadening P.F.A.A. into the field of crop insurance, that the alternative was to increase the benefits under the P.F.R.A. to overcome our basic problem.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Wednesday, March 8, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)

Mr. E.M. Culliton (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, as this is the first occasion that I have taken part in a debate in this House during the present Session, I would like to join with the previous members in expressing my regret at the passing of Mr. Paul Prince and Mr. Alvin Murray. I think we all agree that they were two members who brought to this Legislature dignity and understanding; they were men who were fair in debate, and they were men who made a real contribution to the welfare of Saskatchewan and to the constituencies which they represented. We can ill afford to lose, in the public life of the province of Saskatchewan, men of the calibre of Mr. Prince and Mr. Murray. Naturally, I was much more closely associated with Mr. Prince and had an intimate friendship with him over a number of years, and in his passing I lost a close personal friend.

I, too, want to welcome to this House, along with the other members, the new member for The Battlefords, the new member for Cannington, and the new member for Gull Lake. I am sure they will find the surroundings congenial, and will, in the time that they are here, make a contribution to the welfare of the province. I also want to congratulate the member for Gull Lake on being a member of the Executive Council. It is a real honour to be a member of this Legislature and even a greater honour to be a member of the Executive Council; but such an honour carries with it responsibility and a great deal of work. I do not think that the new Minister will find his position particularly difficult as he is no stranger to parliamentary procedure.

March 10, 1950

He was a member of the House of Commons at Ottawa, and, as a matter of fact, is not a particular stranger to these buildings. I think, if I am correct in this, that the hon. member was an employee of the Government before he received this appointment.

When I recall that fact, I can't help but think of the change that has taken place in the attitude of our hon. friends opposite since 1934. At that time they were known as a Farm-Labour Movement; they wouldn't be called a "Party". They were not going to be guilty of the sins that had been committed by the old Tories and the old Liberals. They would have nothing to do with patronage. They would not hire any ex-members. Well, that was not a difficult position in 1934 – they did not have any ex-members at that time. Strangely, fifteen years of experience has somewhat changed their attitude and I am going to say I think this Government had done fairly well; they have a considerable number of ex-members. They have Mr. Burton, former C.C.F. member; they have Mr. McKay, former C.C.F. member for Weyburn; they have Mr. Young and several others. Now I am going to say to my hon. friends opposite that I am not critical of that, and I find no objection to a Government employing men who were former members of the Legislature and members of the House of Commons; men who have devoted their time to public service and, in spite of what many people think and many people say, they usually render that service at a personal financial sacrifice. Having had that experience in public service, they should be best fitted to carry out the function of civil servants or public servants in a government.

When I say those things, of course, there are certain conditions: one is that they fill a job that is essential; secondly, that they are qualified for the job, and that there is no political work in connection with the job. Now the position occupied by the Minister of Public Health – I do not know exactly what you would call it, but for lack of a better term I would say he was the 'professor of politeness' in the Government of Saskatchewan. He was employed to teach the civil servants courtesy and politeness. Now, in my experience, I have always found the civil servants to be fairly courteous and fairly polite, but I am not going to disagree with the Government. If they thought that work was essential, then by all means they should have had a man to carry out that particular function. I became a little suspicious, however, when I found out that the man in that particular position was not only interested in the civil servants, but he was interested in which constituency each came from. When I learned that, I thought maybe he had taken a leaf out of the book of the Minister of Highways; that we were going to have courtesy expended in this province on the same basis as the highway expenditures – a high degree of courtesy in Rosetown and Weyburn and very little down in the constituency of Gravelbourg. I hope that, now we have a new man to replace him, in the person of Mr. Castleden, the former C.C.F. member for Yorkton, Mr. Castleden will be advised that if we are going to have this courtesy and politeness, let us by all means have it equally all over the province of Saskatchewan.

While I am here I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the very able, concise and clear presentation of the budget which he delivered Wednesday. I also want to thank him for his thoughtfulness and his courtesy in sending over to me a copy of his speech immediately after he had delivered the same. I am not sure, however, when I get through, this afternoon, that he will be convinced I read the speech; I am sure that he will be convinced that I did not understand it. Usually the Provincial Treasurer is very happy in delivering his budget speech – but on Wednesday, as he approached the end,

I do not think he had the same conviction and the same happiness that he had on the five previous occasions that he has done this job in this House.

I feel a little strange, on this particular occasion, as this is the first time that I have had the job of leading off this debate as financial critic for the Opposition. I am going to have one advantage, however, both over the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition; I do not think anyone will be able to say that they have heard this speech on six or seven previous occasions and I do hope that no one on the Government side will be unkind enough to say, "Well, at least we heard Mr. Patterson deliver the same speech on ten or twelve previous occasions."

The reason why it is a new experience for me is that this task has always been performed by Mr. Patterson. When I was elected in 1935, Mr. Patterson was the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Provincial Treasurer, and in all the time that I was in the House it was his responsibility and his work to deal with Treasury matters. I am sure it was a matter of regret not only to the people of this House, but to all the people of Saskatchewan, when a man who had devoted twenty-eight years to public service found it necessary to leave Saskatchewan and enter a new field of service in another place. We have had able Premiers of the province of Saskatchewan down through the years, and all of the Premiers, including the present Premier, have had their weaknesses and they have had their strengths. They have had various problems with which to deal, but I think I can say, without any reflection or any disparagement of anyone else, that there was no Premier who had the same difficulties and the same problems as Mr. Patterson had during his term of office, and that we in this House and throughout the province of Saskatchewan, owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

Now, in discussing the budget, I am convinced that one should confine one's self principally to the discussion of provincial matters. However, in discussing those matters, it is essential that we have a proper appreciation of the international situation, particularly in respect to trade and monetary matters, and particularly insofar as those problems may affect the economic and domestic life of the province of Saskatchewan. It is especially important that we should take an unbiased view of the international situation in the light of the many loose statements that have been made in this Legislature during the past two weeks.

There is no doubt that there is a very difficult international situation today – one that affects monetary exchanges, one that affects the exchange of goods, and one that may well affect the province of Saskatchewan, but I must say the international situation is largely of an economic origin. As the result of the war we have had great disparity between the productive capacity of the North American continent and the countries of Europe, including Great Britain, and there will be no solution to that international problem until the countries of Western Europe and Great Britain approach something like the productive efficiency of Canada and the United States. It is the sheerest nonsense to suggest that we can overcome those problems merely by the appointment of boards, the imposition of regulations and by further restrictions. It is also the sheerest nonsense to suggest that any one country is to blame for that situation, and particularly to say that that country is Canada. Anyone who wants to look at the record will agree, I think that both Canada and the United States have made a real honest effort to try and alleviate that situation. When you criticize the attitude of the Dominion of Canada, I want you to remember that, since 1939 over a period of ten years, the Dominion of Canada has given to Great Britain in the way of loans, credits and tariffs over seven and a half billion dollars.

March 10, 1950

That money has been given and that assistance granted regardless of the political complexion of the Government of that country. There is no country in the world that has made the same contribution, on a per capita basis, as has been made by the Dominion of Canada. The international situation will not be solved by criticism. It will only be solved by a true spirit of co-operation and understanding between the nations of the world.

Now, when we look back at the record of this Government, and its slogans and its policies, I think it is fair when I say that, according to C.C.F. propaganda, and according to C.C.F. slogans, the watchword of the Party and the Government has been "Security". Frankly, I do not think that my hon. friends opposite have any particular monopoly on the term "Security." All of us in this House can at least get on common ground in trying to attain that particular objective. But if the Government is sincere in trying to attain security, then the first duty and responsibility of the Government is to establish sound and sane financial and domestic policies within the province that will give stability to economic and domestic matters within this province, not only to establish those policies so that you discharge your obligations from day to day, but to establish policies that will guarantee the discharge of those obligations in the future.

When we say we must have that stability and that security within our Provincial operations, we do not want to forget one important part; that is, that we cannot have that security and stability on a Provincial level unless we have it on a municipal level as well, because the basic foundation of free government within this province, of sound government within this province, the establishment of secure and sound municipal administration. So that leaves to us this simple question: Has this Government, since it came into power in 1944, and as indicated by the budget that was introduced only Wednesday last, pursued policies that will give that financial security and stability to the Province and to the municipal governments in this province, and to assure and guarantee to the people of this province that this Government will be able to meet its obligations from day to day, and to guarantee that those obligations will be met in the future?

To me, the record of the Government gives an easy answer. If we look over the record of this Government from 1945 to the present time, I think we can safely say that, during that entire period, there has been no thought of the future, there has been nothing learned from the history of the past. The whole policy of this Government has been to spend as much as possible from day to day and to let tomorrow take care of itself. The standard of Government expenditure established in this province today, is already beyond the capacity of the people to pay. If we were to experience in this province two or three years of crop failure, or if we were to return even to more normal conditions, one of two things must inevitably happen. Either the social structure would crash, or there would be a drastic curtailment of Government services.

The Provincial Treasurer has recognized this fact. He says we are entering a period of declining revenues. And I am going to say to the Provincial Treasurer, let us be realistic in this particular province, because every citizen in Saskatchewan knows that no government, whether on the municipal or provincial level, can render services beyond the capacity of the

people to pay. That particular principle has apparently carried no weight with the Government not only with the policies it has pursued since 1945, but in the budget that was delivered in the House on Wednesday last.

Now you may properly ask: Does the record of this Government justify those conclusions? The only way we can decide whether or not the record of this Government justifies these conclusions is by analysis and comparison of the record of this Government with the policies pursued by the Liberal administration that preceded this Government. And if we want a fair basis of comparison, I think it is only reasonable to take a four-year period – take the four years from 1941-42 to the year 1944-45. Those are four years for which the Liberal Government must accept responsibility. Then we have the four years from 1945-46 to 1948-49, which are four years for which the present Government must accept full responsibility.

When you analyze and compare these records, you learn some startling facts. The first fact that is significant is that there was never any government in the history of this province that has enjoyed the tremendous revenues over a four-year period such as have been enjoyed by the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan. When we go into the field of taxation, when we take the total revenue from taxation in the four-year periods those for which the Liberal Government must accept responsibility and those for which the C.C.F. Government must accept responsibility – we find that the total amount received by the Liberal Government for education tax, gasoline tax, motor licenses and all other forms of taxation was \$42,000,000.00. The total amount received by this Government over its four-year period from the same sources of taxation was \$56,000,000.00, or \$14,000,000.00 more than was received by the Liberal Government during a similar period. When we come to liquor profits, we find the same thing. During that four-year period of Liberal administration, the total liquor profits were \$12,000,000.00; during four years of C.C.F. administration, those liquor profits were \$30,000,000.00, an increase of \$18,000,000.00 from liquor profits alone.

Then we come to one thing that is really startling. All during the Session and in-between Session, we hear the constant condemnation of the Federal Government: request that they assume further responsibility in Saskatchewan; that they make further contributions. One would assume from what the members of the Government are saying that the Dominion Government has made no contribution to the financial welfare of the Province of Saskatchewan. As recently as Wednesday last, the Provincial Treasurer, when speaking, said: “Tremendous public pressure has wrung from Ottawa certain token actions.” But what does the record disclose? During four years of Liberal administration, from 1941-42 to 1944-45, the total amount received from the Dominion Government by way of agreement, subsidy and payment in respect to old age pensions, was \$37 million. The total amount received by this Government over that same period of time was \$62 million – \$25 million more. If we allow for certain taxes that have been collected by the Liberal Government which are no longer in effect, then I am on safe ground when I say that the Dominion Government has paid to the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan, over a four-year period, \$20 million more than was paid to the Liberal Government in a comparable length of time – a total of \$62 million. Surely even the Provincial Treasurer will agree that that is more than “token action” by the Dominion Government.

The matter is even more disturbing than that, however. The total revenue that this Government has received over that four-year period, if you want an over-all figure; the total revenue received from all sources, taken into revenue account, was \$187,000,000, and the total amount received by the Liberal Government during its four-year period was \$124,000,000. In other

March 10, 1950

words, this Government has received in revenue and on revenue account during that four-year period \$63 million more than was received by the Liberal Government.

That is not the only disturbing thought. When you look back at that four-year period of Liberal administration although the revenues were \$63 million less, the surplus in that period was \$7 million. During the four years for which this Government must accept responsibility, with \$63 million more in revenue, the surplus was only \$3 million – and that does not tell the whole tale. During the four years of Liberal administration, only \$1 million was taken from liquor profits into revenue account, and that was taken in the year 1941-42. In the subsequent three years, not one single dollar of liquor profits were taken into revenue account. On the other hand, this Government in order to balance its budget, has had to take \$18 million out of liquor profits into revenue account. Had this Government pursued the same course as the Liberal Government did over the last three years for which it is responsible, this Government would not show a surplus of \$3 million, but would show a deficit on revenue account of \$15 million.

Now, I say to my hon. friends opposite: with these tremendous revenues, surely some provision should have been made for the future. We know that we will have changing conditions, and any sound Government should know that it was its obligation not only to deal with the day-to-day problems but to establish such polities as would guarantee that they would be carried out from year to year. There should have been some provision made for changing conditions; but no, this Government's policy has only been one thing and that is to spend and spend and spend and spend. I am sure that, had Mr. Patterson been directing the Treasury of this Province, and even if we were to go into difficult times resulting from a year or two of crop failures, there would have been a surplus of thirty-five or forty million dollars to try and meet those difficult situations. But if there was ever any other evidence required of the failure of this Government to make provisions for the future, then that evidence was given to us, last Wednesday. In spite of the fact that, during four years, this Government had a total revenue of \$187,000,000, in spite of the fact that it had a total liquor profit of \$30,000,000, in spite of the fact the total taxes have been \$45,000,000, this Government had, in order to finance its day-to-day obligation, to increase the Education Tax from 2 per cent to 3 per cent. Surely if, under these buoyant and record revenues, the greatest in the history of the province, this Government could not meet its day-to-day obligation without increasing taxation, I shudder to think what will happen in this province if we get a year or two of crop failure.

The thing that surprised me when they announced the increase in Education Tax from 2 per cent to 3 per cent was that the Provincial Treasurer or the Government were able to get the members on that side of the House to agree. I think that many of these members must feel rather uneasy today. I am sure they are not going to relish going back to their constituents and telling them, "I am the man who put that 3 per cent into effect; I think it is all right." As a matter of fact many of them are going to have some difficulty in reconciling their position today, with the position they took in 1944. Not only are they going to have difficulty in reconciling their own position today, with the stand they took in 1944, but they are going to have some difficulty in reconciling this position with what the Government said, several years ago, that it would remove this Education Tax if other funds became available.

Now, with sixty-three million dollars additional taxation and money from the Dominion Government available, there is not very much of an argument to suggest that the funds were not available to take the place of the Education Tax.

I realize that it was a very unpleasant task for the Provincial Treasurer, last Wednesday, to have to announce this increase in taxation. When he announced this particular increase in taxation, he made two statements. He said: "This tax has been criticized more than any other Provincial tax; that this criticism has usually been political and not based on sound reason." Then he went on to say: "There is no doubt that certain persons would be prepared to sacrifice badly needed health and education services in order that they may gain whatever political advantage they can be their advocacy of removing the tax which they introduced many years ago." Well, I say to my friend the Provincial Treasurer that, when he made that statement or those two statements, he was not aware of the history of the Education Tax, because, had he been aware of the history of that tax, he would not have directed those remarks at us, but would have directed those remarks at the gentleman who sit behind him and beside him.

What is the history of the Education Tax? I say to my hon. friends opposite and I recommend to you, go and get the Journals of 1937 and in those Journals read the speeches of the Mr. Patterson and of the late Mr. Williams. This tax was introduced by a Liberal Government in 1937. We were going through most difficult times in 1937. We had had eight years of crop failure. There was a general world-wide economic depression. Government revenues were at a minimum. We were faced with the necessity, if we were going to maintain educational services in this province of raising additional revenues; it was essential that some new source and some certain source of revenue be found. After very careful consideration and after a great deal of thought, we decided to impose the 2 per cent Education Tax. Now, the Government of the day did that in a courageous and fearless way, and they did it in spite of the opposition of the five members of the C.C.F. Party who sat in the House at that time. If you go back to page 157 of the journals of 1937 you will find that every C.C.F. member in the House voted against that Bill on third reading. We knew, when we imposed that tax in 1937, that we had to face the people in 1938, that we had to go out and justify to the people of this province that the imposition of that tax was necessary, that it was essential if we were to carry on the services in the province of Saskatchewan. We went through an election in 1938 and, during that election, there was nothing but constant criticism and opposition to the Education Tax from every member and every candidate of the C.C.F. Party. We went out and we explained that tax, and the people accepted our explanation, they voted confidence in us and returned a Liberal Government in 1938. But even that successful election of 1938 did not faze our friends in the C.C.F. Party; they kept up their constant criticism of the Education Tax from 1938 to 1944.

I know that my hon. friends opposite, members of the Government, say they never promised to abolish the Education Tax. I am going to say to them, however, that the great majority of the people in this province were convinced and believed that the Education Tax would be abolished when the C.C.F. got in, in 1944. Surely, we as Liberals, could not possibly have been responsible for that situation because we were in the position, both in 1937 and again in 1944, of going out and defending this particular tax, so that the only people who could have made the people of Saskatchewan believe them

March 10, 1950

that the Education Tax would be abolished by the Government, are my friends in the C.C.F. Party. I can readily understand that because, if you go back and read the statements they made at that time, any intelligent person could only conclude that that was the policy of the Government. The 'Leader-Post' on Wednesday, saved me considerable time. It published a short summary of some of the statements, and here is one made by Mr. Coldwell, Leader of the C.C.F. Party. He said this, in July, 1944, six days before the Provincial election:

"The C.C.F. will abolish the Education Tax as rapidly as new sources of revenue are found. I repeat it is the worst form of taxation and the sales tax is an abomination."

I can understand why, when Mr. Coldwell was asked, yesterday, whether he had any comment on the Education Tax he was mum, he had nothing to say. But I do ask the members who sit on the other side of the House whether any intelligent person could construe from that statement anything other than a promise to remove that tax.

Now, I do not usually quote the Attorney General; he and I get along very well. I like the Attorney General personally but I just cannot resist, on this occasion, giving to you the statement that he made. This statement was recorded, June 15, 1944:

"Just one word about the Education Tax. The C.C.F. is the only party that will abolish it. We have always been against it in principle, and are pledge to work as fast as possible for its removal."

Now, when anyone heard that broadcast in 1944, when anyone heard that statement by the Attorney General, who is a responsible member of this Government surely there was only one conclusion – that the C.C.F. Party were going to abolish that tax.

Then, I come to my amiable friend from Swift Current (Mr. H. Gibbs). He described the tax very well. He said, at a C.C.F. convention:

"It was not good enough to say that we will take it off when other revenue becomes available. All our good legislation will be forgotten if we still have that stinking tax regardless of what Mr. Brockelbank or other Cabinet Ministers say.

All I can say to my good friend from the city of Swift Current, knowing his ability to convince people, is that he will be able to go back and tell the people of Swift Current that this tax smells a lot better at 3 per cent than it did at 2 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Provincial Treasurer suggest that we on this side of the House were responsible for making a political football of the Education Tax, no man could be on a weaker foundation. And I can sympathize with the Provincial Treasurer. I am sure that if there is one thing that he wishes he could do, that would be to change the course which the C.C.F. Party pursued right from 1937 down to 1944. They are the people

who made a political football out of the tax that might otherwise have been accepted without a great deal of criticism by all the people of the province of Saskatchewan. In spite of those facts, they now want to make this new tax a little more palatable by giving it a new name and by making certain minor exemptions. The truth of the situation is that there has been no substantial change made in the Act, since 1937, other than the removal of the Education Tax from meals. There have been some minor exemptions; but again, this year, when new exemptions were added, the farmer is the 'forgotten man'. There was only one thing from which he was seeking removal of the Education Tax on and that was farm fuels and greases. But nothing whatever was done to relieve him from that one form of taxation which bears more heavily on him than any other application of the Education Tax. No, I say to my hon. friends opposite, no amount of camouflage will bury the stark bare fact that the only thing this Government has done is to increase the Education Tax from 2 per cent to 3 per cent. There has been an increase of 50 per cent. This Government instead of abolishing the tax as most people believed in 1944, now finds it necessary to increase that tax from 2 per cent to 3 per cent.

When we make these criticisms of our friends in this Government and when we deal with these large and exorbitant expenditures, we always meet this stock answer from the Government: "That is alright. You did not spend as much money, but you never did anything." That is the usual retort we get from our friends opposite, and when they make that explanation, if there is one Department that they refer to specifically it is the Department of Public Health. They not only say that today. There is nothing new about that particular criticism; they made that same criticism in 1944. They put out a pamphlet: "Let there be no Blackout of Health." In that pamphlet and in the propaganda since that time, they have tried to establish that, in 1944 when the C.C.F. Government was elected, there was no health programme in the province of Saskatchewan. They were elected in 1944, and after they were elected they must have had grave doubts about the correctness of this particular pamphlet, because they sent down to the United States and brought up Dr. Sigerist, a very able man, a very efficient man, a professor at John Hopkins University, a professor of medicine, to make a survey of health conditions in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, if he were brought up here to substantiate what my friends said in 1944, there must have been greatly disappointed with his findings, because he made the survey, and after he had completed the survey he made a report to the C.C.F. Government. In that report he said this in respect to the health services as they were found in this province when this Government took office in 1944:

"The public health services of the Province are highly developed and are carried on very efficiently."

That is not Liberal propaganda. That is Dr. Sigerist, a man brought in by the C.C.F. Government to make a survey of health conditions in the province. He not only gave a report to the Government of Saskatchewan as a result of his survey, but he made certain public addresses in Saskatchewan. He spoke in the city of Regina on September 26, 1944, and he is reported as follows:

"The province has a fine health record, said Dr. Sigerist who was Dean of Medicine at John Hopkins University."

March 10, 1950

He made another speech in the city of Saskatoon, and it is reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix – referring again to Dr. Sigerist, the man brought in by this Government:

“He praised the present facilities and standards of health in Saskatchewan, stating that the province already had a superb record and a splendid setup which has been built up in years of gradual work. It was now only a question of extending those facilities.”

And when we look at the record, we can come only to these conclusions: that Dr. Sigerist in his investigation made a full and very complete and a very fair report, and that this Government, in dealing with questions of public health, are not giving credit to the province administration. It was the Liberal administration that established the Department of Public Health and laid the foundation for all health services in the province of Saskatchewan.

If there is one thing for which this Government takes great credit unto itself it is for the establishment of poliomyelitis clinics. These are clinics established in this province for those afflicted with infantile paralysis. They can go there and obtain treatment at Government expense; hospitalization at Government expense – wonderful work that must be encouraged. Yet even Mr. Coldwell apparently did not know the history of these clinics. Speaking in the city of Regina in the Provincial election of 1948, speaking in the Armouries, he said: “If for no other reason you should re-elect the C.C.F. Government because they established these poliomyelitis clinics in the province of Saskatchewan.” Now what are the facts? In my hand I hold the Annual Report of the Department of Public Health for the year 1943 – (this is signed by the Premier himself, the Hon. T. C. Douglas, when he was Minister of Public Health) tabled in 1944. And what did this say? Surely I think members on the opposite side will agree with me that, when you have a report signed by your own Premier when he was Minister of Public Health, that report must set out the facts, and it says this:

“Anticipating the possibility of a large number of cases and in view of the fact that the Kenney treatment was being used with success, the Department sent two of the public health nurses to Chicago, early in the spring, to learn the Kenney technique, and also the Director of the Communicable Disease Division to Minneapolis to take a short course in Kenney treatment.”

And all this was made available to the clinic of St. Paul’s hospital at Saskatoon, where the Kenney treatment was made available to polio cases at the expense of the Government. Organizational charges were paid by the Government, so were the clinic cases. All this Government has done (and I give them full credit for it) is to carry on a policy that had already been established by the Liberal Government.

When we come to the question of cancer it is the same thing. We have in this province, as I have said before, one of the finest cancer setups on the American continent, one of which every citizen in the province of

Saskatchewan can be proud and one which every citizen in Saskatchewan can support. There again, the facts are with you. The Cancer Commission was established, in the first instance, by a Tory Government; in 1944, on the 15th day of May under a Liberal administration, provision was made for free treatment, free hospitalization and free surgery. Oh, but you say, "You made that provision on the 15th of May, but you did not pay out any money!" That is true, and there is a very simple explanation for it – the Act became effective on the 15th day of May, 1944; there was an election on the 15th day of June, 1944, and we were defeated. We did not have any opportunity to do so. All this Government had to do was to continue to carry on the policy that had been established by the Liberal Government.

It is not necessary to deal with the question of tuberculosis, because the tuberculosis programme we have in this province, established by a Liberal Government in co-operation with municipalities, is the finest in the world. But then this Government says: "There is one thing we have done that you did not do. We have given over a million dollars in hospital grants." That is true and I give this Government full credit for having given a million dollars for hospital grants; but when they say the Liberal Government did nothing, that is not true. During the years that we were in power, in trying to establish a sound public health programme in this province, the two basic requirements for a sound public health programme were the construction and establishment of the two mental hospitals and of the sanatoria. We did not spend a million dollars for hospitals. No. We spent millions of dollars, many millions of dollars, with a great deal less revenue than you have today, founding the sanatoria, building the sanatoria and building the mental hospitals. There would have been no sound programme in this province if that had not been done by the Liberal Government, and the reason that we did not give grants to other hospitals, during that time, for other types of construction is again very simply answered: we did not have the money to give grants to hospitals and to do this construction as well.

Then we come to hospitalization. This Government has established a province-wide hospital scheme, and it is a meritorious scheme. I am in accord with the principle of that scheme. Any scheme that will assure the great majority of the people of this province hospitalization deserves the endorsement and the support of all the people in the province of Saskatchewan. I am not going to say that there are not certain changes which could be made and certain economies affected; but it is a good scheme. But there again, when friends in the C.C.F. say the Liberal Party have done nothing for hospitalization that is not true. Even before this scheme came into effect, as far back as 1941, there were 94 municipalities in this province, 20 per cent of the entire population, that had hospital schemes of their own; 20 per cent of the people had hospital schemes of their own, under their own organization. It had been our policy to encourage development of municipal organization, and we had been fairly successful when 20 per cent of the people were covered.

Then we come to another branch. This Government, in its desire (and I find no fault with that either) to render medical service to all the people of Saskatchewan, have established health units. There is only one unit in which full medical services are rendered. That is out in Swift Current. There are many merits to this organization, but it has one fundamental weakness in its entire setup, and that is that the cost of maintaining the scheme is not properly based. The main cost of maintaining that health unit at Swift Current is placed on land and farm taxes and, if you have succession of crop failures in that area, there is only one thing that could happen, and

March 10, 1950

that is that the scheme would fall under its own weight. And if this policy of health units is to be continued, if it is going to be placed on a sound and permanent basis it can only be done if a much greater part of the cost is carried by the Provincial Government.

When you look over and whole field of public health services, I think you will agree with me that when Dr. Sigerist's report shows that we had a superb record in this province, he was making an accurate and truthful statement. No member of the Liberal Party needs to make any apology for the record of the Liberal Government in the field of health prior to 1944. Certainly, this Government has extended the service and established one or two more services; they are paying out more money. We did not do that, first, because we did not have the money and, secondly, because we believed, as I am sure the Provincial Treasurer believes today, and as every citizen of Saskatchewan believes, that you cannot establish a standard of social services and social structure beyond the capacity of the people to pay, and that you can only have a standard of social structure and social services that can be guaranteed, maintained and carried on both in good times and in bad.

I say this Government has really failed in not giving assistance to rural municipalities. I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of the province-wide hospital scheme, and the assumption by the Government of hospitalization and medical aid for old age pensioners and mothers' allowance cases are of some indirect benefit to the municipality; but this Government has pursued no policy that has assured to the municipalities, year after year, some stability and some security in municipal finance.

There is great disagreement between the members on the other side of the House and ourselves as to the disposition of the \$1,200,000 in the public revenue suspense account. We, who are on this side of the House, along with the members of the Saskatchewan Municipal Association, understood and believed that that money was to be paid back to the municipalities. The present Government did not agree with us. They said they would retain the \$1,200,000, and that it would be paid back to the municipalities, not on the basis on which it was collected, but as an equalization grant. I say to my friends opposite that the payment of this equalization grant or the payment year after year of one type of municipal road grant or another, does not give to the municipality the stability to which it is entitled, but merely leaves the municipality in a state of suspense. You can only give real stability to the municipality by way of either direct grants to the municipality, or by the assumption by this Government of a greater part of the cost of education.

It is not only its failure to give this stability and security to the municipalities that worries me, but the reflection of that failure of the Government in increased farm taxes throughout Saskatchewan. Whenever we say that since this Government took power, through the policies it has inaugurated, through its failure to deal with municipalities properly, there has been a substantial increase in taxes, we are met with a constant denial. Well, surely the members of the Government and the members of the C.C.F. Party will not deny the figures from their own Department! I went to the Department of Municipal Affairs to find out what the average tax rate in the province of Saskatchewan was in 1944, and what the average tax rate was in 1948. This is what I found out: in 1944, the average tax rate in this province, only for school and municipal purposes, was 17.9 mills; in 1948 – and there has been a further increase in 1944 – the average tax rate in this province for school and municipal purposes was 27.7, an increase of ten mills, or an overall

increase in farm taxes of 60 per cent. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this increase in taxes does not include either telephone tax or health region taxes. One of the hon. members opposite, got up, the other day, and talked about a tax of \$22 a quarter as the average in Saskatchewan. All I can say to the hon. member is that I would like to have him come down to my constituency and go into the rural municipalities, Nos. 103, 104, 105, 134 and 135 and try and convince them that the tax rate is \$22 a quarter.

Years of experience I think have established one thing, and it is a very very serious matter, and that is that we have now reached the point where land taxes can no longer be increased in a large section of this province. The land tax is already an unbearable burden, and if there is one responsibility on any government – either the Government opposite or when we form the Government – it is to pursue a policy that will stabilize and reduce farm taxes. Under the policies pursued by this Government during the last five years and as we indicated in the budget delivered here, Wednesday, there is no indication that this Government has taken any substantial steps either to reduce or to stabilize these taxes. We may expect a return to somewhat normal conditions; we may expect (as we have already) sections of the province to have a crop failure, and there is no part of the province which, over a period of years, can carry the tax burden that is being carried today. All I can say to the farmers of Saskatchewan is that when we look at the record of this Government and at the budget that we have today, we can only expect that there will be gradual and continual increase in that taxation.

When we look over the whole picture we come to the conclusion that this Government, in its overall picture, has now established a standard of expenditure and service that cannot be maintained by this province. I am going to repeat to the Provincial Treasurer (and it is a sound statement) that the people of Saskatchewan are practical people. They have learned a lesson since 1944. They realize that there is nothing free under a C.C.F. Government or any other type of government; that when you set services, those services must be paid for and they must be paid for in taxation; and that no Government should make as its sole purpose the attainment of social services. A government has a greater responsibility than that: That is, to attain services within the capacity of the people to pay and at the same time to maintain a sound and expanding economy in the province of Saskatchewan. There is nothing that will destroy that sound and expanding economy quicker than excessive taxation. The Provincial Treasurer admitted on Wednesday, that we have reached a very dangerous position in the province of Saskatchewan. He admitted, when he increased the Education Tax to 3 per cent, that even under the present buoyant revenues, this Government cannot meet its day-to-day commitments in respect to social services without finding other fields of revenue. He said, the other day, that we were facing a period of declining revenue. Well, you have only to read the budget: if we are facing a period of declining revenue (and he may be right), then this Government is going to be in very serious difficulties. As I said at the beginning, they are going to be faced with one alternative or the other – either the social structure will collapse or there will be a great curtailment of Government services.

There is only one thing that will save this Government from those particular difficulties, and that is the assumption by the Dominion Government of a greater part of the cost of the services in the province of Saskatchewan. Now my friends in the Government are not the only people who have realized that, over the years, with changing conditions, there must be some re-allotment of responsibilities between the Province and the Dominion.

March 10, 1950

A Provincial Government can do, as this Government has done, get itself into a very difficult financial position in trying to meet its obligations. We saw that situation as a Liberal Government, a good many years ago. When I hear my friends opposite speak, dealing with this question of Dominion-Provincial relations, you would think the Liberal Party was opposed to a solution to this particular problem.

The solution of the Dominion-Provincial problem is of paramount importance to the people of Saskatchewan and we, of the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan were one of the first – if not the first – to ask the Dominion Government at Ottawa to make a full investigation into the matter of Dominion-Provincial affairs, with a view to amending the constitution and to reassessing the burdens. The Federal Government paid attention to our recommendations. It appointed the Rowell-Sirois Commission. That Commission made a very full investigation and the Liberal Government of the day submitted its brief, and I say, with all deference, that the brief submitted by the Liberal Government of that day was the finest explanation of provincial problems ever presented by any Government. That is the brief upon which this Government, and properly so, has based its recommendations to the Dominion Government and to the Railway Commission. The Commission went all over Canada and it made its findings, and the formula it recommended was a very simple one. It was simply this: that every part of Canada was entitled to a certain minimum standard of education, health and social services and that, if any particular province was not in a position to maintain that minimum standard, then assistance would be granted from the Federal Treasury. That was a recognition of the facts, and a conference was called. I think I am the only member of this House today, who had the honour and the privilege of being one of the representatives of Saskatchewan at that conference. That conference broke up, not because of the attitude of the Liberal Government at Ottawa. That conference broke up for the reason that the Provinces of Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia would not agree to sit down and to discuss the report of the Commission on the basis on which it was tabled. The conference was a short one and we all came back. During the war, agreements were made with particular Provinces based somewhat on those recommendations – not entirely but along that line.

Then we came to 1945 when another Dominion-Provincial conference was called, and at that conference the Dominion Government made certain specific proposals particularly with respect to public health and social services. Those proposals, again, were based on the fundamental principals of the Sirois Commission, and when the Dominion Government called that conference, they stated to all the Provinces that were there, that there has to be substantial agreement before the proposals could be implemented. The hon. Premier and the members of the Government who were there know that two provinces, Ontario and Quebec, failed to agree on the proposals. They would have nothing to do with them. Those Provinces represent 60 per cent of the people of Canada and I do not think any reasonable person will ask, with a constitution such as we have, that a Government would be entitled, with 60 per cent of the people opposed, to disregard that constitution and to deal with problems over which it had no constitutional right. I think any reasonable person will agree also, that if we are going to change the constitution, then we want equality among all the Provinces in Canada. We cannot have a constitution where there is inequality among the ten provinces of Canada. We can only change the constitution where there is mutual understanding and co-operation.

I say to the members of this Government: a new conference has been called for 1950, at which the principles enunciated in the Rowell-Sirois

report will again be discussed and the proposals made in 1945. If the representatives of this Government go to that conference and go with a real spirit of compromise and co-operation, understanding and actual trust, then they will go down to that conference with our whole-hearted support and endorsement, and we wish them every success. We are as anxious as they are that we find a solution to this problem; but I am going to suggest to them that this constant criticism of Ottawa, this request that Ottawa make the Province of Saskatchewan a Dominion 'ward', that it take over all the responsibilities for which this Government is responsible; I do not think that attitude will gain them much support from the Provinces of Canada. From what I have seen of what the other provinces are doing, I do not see constant requests from the other nine Provinces for the Dominion Government to assume provincial responsibilities. When this Government goes to that conference, we went to see that they are successful. We want to assist them, because we want to find a final solution to this particular problem.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is very evident from what I have said, that it is not my intention to support this particular motion. The budget delivered on Wednesday last is merely a continuance of the unrealistic and impractical administration of this Government. In that budget there has been an unwarranted and unnecessary increase in taxation. The amount to be expended this year, in spite of the Provincial Treasurer's statement that we are facing declining revenues, is the greatest in the history of the province. There must be added to that budget, as far as the people are concerned, the moneys collected for hospital tax and the automobile insurance. There is nothing in the budget to assist rural municipalities. As in the past, the farm people who make up the greater part of the total population, have received no consideration. Farmers of this province, under C.C.F. administration can only look forward to continuing increasing taxation. The Government has failed in these matters, and has failed to follow its own advice to municipalities that provision should be made in years of buoyant revenue for difficult times that may lie ahead.

Mr. Allan L.S. Brown (Bengough): — The hon. member for Gravelbourg told us that at least we would be hearing a speech which we had not heard before in this Legislature. While it is possible that we may not entirely agree with that, at least we can agree to this extent — that he did deliver it in a clear and concise manner, and I feel that the hon. member is to be congratulated in his efforts to criticize the budget, which was his job.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be rather presumptuous on my part to undertake to make any drastic comments on the speech which was just delivered in this House, but I do feel that I possibly may have one or two matters to make some comment on. The hon. member and I, at least to the extent that our constituencies are close together, are neighbours, and I have, on several occasions, had the very pleasant experience of visiting the constituency which he represents. That was particularly true, previous to his entry in the House, that I made some of my visits into his constituency when that constituency was represented by Dr. Houze. Now he may suggest that, if I had remained out of his constituency, we may have had Dr. Houze here rather than the present member. Also on the basis that the profession which he represents and the profession which I represent, we have something in common, so that I may have some justification in making some comment — the profession which I represent grows the bull and the profession which he represents throws it.

March 10, 1950

Without appearing to be presumptuous to make any comments on his remarks, I will attempt to confine the remarks which I make here, this afternoon, to expressing my opinion on some of the remarks which he made. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that he criticized the budget which was delivered here, last Wednesday, on three or four main points. He suggested that we were not giving sufficient assistance to municipalities in an endeavour to stabilize local governing economy; and secondly, that, during the period of multiple revenues – which it is true we have enjoyed here in Saskatchewan, also in Canada as well – we are making no provision for the future; thirdly, he did as we all expected him to do – he took his fling at the increase in the Hospitalization and Education Tax from two to three per cent; and, fourthly, that we are simply carrying out the policies which were inaugurated by the former Liberal administration, and finally he suggests that every time we get in difficulty our only solution is to go to Ottawa and ask for great assistance from that body.

Now, I will attempt to make my remarks along the lines I suggested, which I feel that he attempted to bring to this House in his criticism. He suggests that we have made no effort to stabilize municipal economy, and I think we must take into consideration that we have done considerable in that respect by assuming as Provincial responsibility a great many responsibilities that they formerly placed on rural and urban municipalities. He has suggested that possibly we are, to a degree at least, responsible for the increase in the taxation of these local governing bodies, and I believe that he used the figure of 1944, the average rate in rural areas, as being 17.9; the average rate in 1948, being 27.7. He suggested that we must assume a large share of the responsibility for this increase in taxation. I can assure him that, if we had not assumed the responsibility which was formerly the responsibility of the municipality, such as providing hospitalization for their ratepayers and people living within their boundaries if we had not taken off the hands of the municipalities the responsibilities which they had for the caring of indigents, and in many cases caring for the sickness and the providing of health services for the old age pensioners, that increase of taxation would have been considerably more than an increase of ten mills as he has suggested that it has been during the four-year period which he was reviewing. I would suggest that any increase in taxation is certainly not the fault of this Government. It has been due to an increased cost of services, and there was a justifiable need for some of these increased costs of services, particularly if they applied to the education field. I suggest that a large amount of that increase is due to the decontrol policy which was allowed to develop, following the war., by the Liberal Government at Ottawa, a Government of the same political stripe as is the Opposition at this time.

I can further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have undertaken, through the medium of legislative framework, an attempt to stabilize the economy of local governing bodies. I can point to our inauguration of the Larger Unit of Administration Act for increasing the areas which are to be responsible for the education of the children of this province, and in that way we have created a body by which it will be possible to carry on educational facilities without placing an undue burden upon areas of the province, particularly when those areas could (as they were previously) be confined to the local school districts, unfortunate enough to suffer crop failure or any other causes which might affect a local community of a four-by-six area or an area of that size but which would not affect the areas covered by the larger unit of administration.

Then he suggested that we are living in times of multiple revenues and that we are asking no provisions for the future. It is true that this Government has had multiple revenues in the past few years, and I suggest that they are due, to a large degree, to the policies followed by this Government, and we could make reference to one or two items. For instance, in the Department of Municipal Affairs, since the period of 1940 to 1941, I believe, comparing that year with the present year, the amount of revenues which this Government is getting from that source has increased by over 300 per cent, and when you increase revenues from that source from the Department of Natural Resources, naturally the Government has more money to spend on the services which it is undertaking to provide.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this Government is not making any provisions for the future, he had better level his criticism at the Federal Government, for I feel that we have made considerable provision for the future through the medium of the legislation which we have inaugurated and by the administration by this Government of the legislation which we have.

It has been, in my opinion, to the credit of this Government that they have been able to take advantage of the revenues which have been at their disposal to make them work effectively in the interests of the people. We have increased the services which have been, and are being, supplied to the people of Saskatchewan, which cannot be equally said of the Dominion Government which has had equally bountiful revenues at its disposal and has not increased the services to the extent that we have a right to expect that it would, and that it is very well able to do. For instance, reference could be made to the commitments which were made back in 1945 by the Liberal Party, when it went to the country that year to be re-elected and was re-elected to form the Government from 1945 to 1949. They suggested at that time that they would drastically increase and undertake to provide a comprehensive health service throughout the Dominion of Canada. Well, in spite of the fact that they have had the revenues with which they could do it, they have definitely failed in that respect, and have not followed the lead which Saskatchewan has taken inaugurating the 'Welfare State' here in Canada.

Reference was made to the increase of the Educational and Hospitalization Tax, and I suggest that we get used to using that term, for, as pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer, the revenues which will be obtained from the increase in this tax will be used for the hospitalization. I would point out to him that we were faced with several alternatives in this respect, as was pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer, that we had a deficit in our hospitalization scheme and that this deficit must be made up from some source. While I can agree that, in my opinion, a sales tax is not the exact type of tax which we would hope to be able to inaugurate, and it is not a tax which we would have had to inaugurate if the Federal Government had lived up to the commitments which it made in 1945 and upon the basis of which commitments we first started out this hospitalization scheme on the basis of a personal tax, there would certainly have been no necessity for this increase of one per cent if the Federal Government had lived up to this commitment. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, when we have removed the regressive features of this tax, as we have by removing it from meals, groceries and foodstuffs which we are required to buy for maintenance of life, that, within the bounds of a provincial jurisdiction, a sales tax is the most equitable form of taxation that we can place upon the people of the province. By opposing this increase in

March 10, 1950

taxation, if he is suggesting that we should eliminate our hospitalization scheme, I am satisfied that he will obtain very little support from the people of Saskatchewan, for the people of Saskatchewan have seen, and have been able to take advantage of, the benefits which have been derived from the inauguration of this scheme. I am satisfied that, if he has to make that choice, he will be on our side and support this tax rather than see it curtail the services which have been, and are being, provided for the people of Saskatchewan.

He quoted some of our authentic sources in connection with this tax, and he quoted the Leader of the C.C.F. Party (M. J. Coldwell) to the extent that he suggested that this tax would be abolished as new sources of revenue are found. I can suggest that that statement is as true today as it was then; and that as soon as we are in a position (and that time will come when we have elected a Government to Ottawa with the same philosophy as we have), there will be new sources of revenue at our disposal which will make it possible for us to remove this tax to which my hon. friend takes such great exception.

My hon. friend suggested that we are simply carrying out the policies started by the Liberals, and he referred, in particular, to the health programme which is at present in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, if we are carrying out the policies started by the Liberals, I think it is a safe and general statement to make that these policies were strictly on paper, and strictly in the Liberal 'platform' and were not in operation in the province of Saskatchewan. That I think is true as a general statement. It is true that I think there is a lot of credit coming to the people in the province of Saskatchewan even under a Liberal regime for what they were able to do in providing themselves with health services – possibly in spite of the Liberal Government. I was not going to say that. We have in Saskatchewan a hospitalization scheme which is serving possibly 25 per cent of the people, he suggested. At the same time he suggested that, in connection with the health unit, this Government had placed a great deal of responsibility on the local people of that area; yet, on the other hand, he was supporting a scheme which placed the entire burden on the local burden of any one community. We must be consistent in this, Mr. Speaker, either we are in favour of throwing it all back on the local governing bodies (and I presume that is the suggestion which is made) or we must undertake to find new sources of revenue which can be spaced over a greater number of people, and undertake to provide increased services through the medium of the Provincial Government. I can suggest that that is the policy that we believe in on this side of the House. We believe that any individual, whether he may have in areas which are not able through local taxation to provide those health services, is entitled to those services just as well as ones living in this wonderful area around Regina, which possibly is well able to take care of itself.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg also suggested that, when we get into difficulties, we go to Ottawa asking for assistance, and I resume the reference might be that we have on numerous occasions in this Legislature resolutions asking Ottawa to undertake certain measures which we feel are of benefit to the people of Saskatchewan and to the people of Canada. Well, I suggest that that is a right and proper procedure to take. If we must work with any governing body, whether it be on the municipal level or on the Federal level, we must be prepared to work and co-operate with them, and it is our duty to see that a proper co-ordination takes place between each province, because it is only in that way that we can obtain the most effective and efficient use of the wealth that is at our disposal. And when we go to Ottawa

or submit for recommendations there, we do it in the interests of the people, of all the people of Canada and with no selfish view in mind.

I think that is particularly true in the attitude which this Government took at the Dominion-Provincial Conference, which was held and which it was suggested will be held again. While it is true that at that conference there was disagreement, there was agreement on the basis of certain fields of taxation with certain Provinces, and I think it is only fair and honest to say our Government was right and honest in their contention that those provinces which had entered into this taxation agreement should be entitled to the benefits which the Federal Government suggested would be made to the Provinces. I make particular reference in this regard to the proposals which were made in connection with health services, and the proposals which were made in connection with providing for old age pensions to the people of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggested that it might be presumptuous on my part to make any comment on what the hon. member said, and I can assure you it would certainly be presumptuous on my part to suggest that I could continue to the length that he did. So, I will bring my remarks to a close with the final statement that I am going to support the budget, for I feel that, in that way, we have a direct relationship to the Speech from the Throne. In the Speech from the Throne we are indicating to the Legislature the framework on which we propose to build the type of economy and social welfare state in Saskatchewan which we wish, and in the budget we are making provision for the appropriation of the funds necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Speech from the Throne so that we may in our time have a type of social economy based upon human rights and social justice.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time that I have taken part in debate, this Session, I would like to take the opportunity of joining with the other members who have congratulated the new members of the House, and of expressing my own regret at the passing of Mr. Prince and Mr. Murray. The members I think have all been congratulated up to the moment, Mr. Speaker, and it is perhaps not necessary to congratulate them many times more. I would just like to say that not only do I congratulate the Minister of Public Health, I want particularly to congratulate the people of his constituency who were so wise to select him, first of all, as a candidate and, secondly, to see that he came here to Regina to represent them in the business of Government. I also want to take the opportunity, to begin with, of congratulating the Provincial Treasurer. Those of us who have had the privilege of being in the House since 1944, have become accustomed to hearing the Provincial Treasurer present an excellent budget in an excellent manner. My only thought is that I have never heard him in better form, have never heard him do a better job than he did on Wednesday of this week, and we pass our congratulations on to him.

I would join, too, in the congratulations that have already been extended to the hon. member for Gravelbourg. His address was pleasant and it was forceful, even though it was rather partial in its treatment, perhaps. I thought that he may have overlooked some of the things which do place a burden on the people of Saskatchewan in an economic sense. I had thought, listening to him, that the only thing that was bothering the people of Saskatchewan economically was that they had to pay certain taxes to municipalities, school districts and the Provincial Government.

March 10, 1950

I was reminded, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact of some of the stories that I heard, last summer, after a certain circus had visited Saskatchewan. The circus charged, as all circuses do, a certain amount to get in the front, whatever it happened to be, and then when you got in you paid more before you could see it. If you bought anything you paid twice as much as you would have had to pay had you bought it outside, and in addition to that there were a number of pickpockets. Now, the people who complained, Mr. Speaker, were not entirely concerned about the high cost of admission, but the second charges and the paying of double for things they had to buy and the pickpockets really made them mad. It seemed to me, when the hon. member was speaking about the provincial economy, he talked about the initial charge but he forgot all about the second charges, the double charges and the pickpockets straying around.

Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.