

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session – Eleventh Legislature
18th Day

Monday, March, 13, 1950

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

On the Orders of the Day

CONDOLENCES

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — I would like to express a few words of regret at the passing of two men, who, while they may not be so well known in the provincial field, have been closely associated with community activities, particularly as school trustees, for a number of years. One of them, Mr. Paul Margo, of Cutknife, had been Chairman of the Unit Board at Wilkie since the Unit was organized. The other, Mr. Weir, of Leney, was a member of the Unit Board of the Saskatoon west Unit. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Margo took a heart attack and passed away while he was speaking at a Home and School meeting during Education Week on behalf of the Unit. Mr. Weir passed away while attending a meeting of the Unit Board.

I know that the members of the Legislature, particularly the hon. member from Meadow Lake and the hon. member from Moose Jaw, who were both chairmen of Unit Boards themselves, would like to join with us in passing our regrets to the families of these men.

Melville Hockey Victory

Mr. V. P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Melville Millionaires on once again, for the third successive year, being the champions of the Senior B Hockey League of Saskatchewan. When Melville entered the playoffs they beat the Swift Current Indians three games in a row, and thereafter they beat Yorkton Legionnaires three to one. They met Prince Albert — the northern champions, but Prince Albert, on Saturday, defaulted, making Melville the provincial champions. They are now waiting to meet Manitoba and then, if they take Manitoba, they will proceed to the West Coast as they have done in the last two years. I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Melville Millionaires.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Friday, March 10, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, although I am sure that it is not necessary for me to do it, I do want to take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to the very colourful attire of my fellow-Ministers,

March 13, 1950

this afternoon. The shirts which they sport are home-produced made in our woollen mill at Moose Jaw. I also assure the members of the Opposition that, while they may have that kind of shirts on, they have all left their shooting-irons at the door, so we can go on as usual.

When the member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton), was speaking Friday it seems to me that he made criticisms which can be summed up very briefly. He suggested, first of all, (as we expected, and he did not disappoint us), that the Government was spending too much money. At the same time he suggested that we were not spending enough money in support of municipalities. His suggestion was that we spend more and save more. He made no suggestions as to any way in which these savings might be effected. I noticed, however, that he did not make any suggestions with regard to extra services. I presume the strategy is that those suggestions will come from other members of the Opposition – they will do the asking for more roads and more grants for education and more bridges, probably, and better health services and so on.

It seemed to me that the sentiments of the member for Gravelbourg were pretty well summed up in a little booklet which arrived at my desk, the other day. In order that we may be able to get the differences between the two groups properly established, I would just like to read a few quotations from this little booklet, which do not have reference to Saskatchewan, but which might have been said by the hon. member, speaking on Friday. This booklet says:

"There is, of course much to be done to repair all the damage already done to our system by the advocates of Socialistic measures. We must put an end to the orgy of spending that is rapidly bankrupting the nation. Amongst the most critical conditions that menace us are fantastic commitments for spending. We must stop planning for Socialism and begin planning to make our free system of private enterprise operate. The Government has taken measures to prevent people from accumulating savings which make expansion possible. It has taxed away his savings. Our system is an appalling mess with public debt, confiscatory practices which draw the very blood from its very veins."

That sums up, pretty well I think, the sentiments expressed in the budget debate, on Friday. Those criticisms, as I say, were not expressed against the Saskatchewan Government, but they were expressed by that old friend of the hon. member from Redberry, Mr. John Flynn, in criticizing the democratic government in the United States, and they were circulated in this province by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. I think it is worthwhile to get our position straight, because the voice that came from the Opposition benches, on Friday, criticizing this Government made the same kind of noises that the reactionary voices in the United States made in criticizing President Truman's government, and they are the same kind of noises distributed in the province by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. It is worth noting that those people are, at least the spiritual allies of the members of the Opposition.

The member from Gravelbourg pointed out (and rightly so, I think) that there was need in a consideration of a Budget Address for some consideration as to the position of international trading. He pointed out (and again rightly, I think) that our problems could only be properly solved when productivity and consequently purchasing power of many of the European nations was adequately restored. In the light of that, however, he left, I gathered, that it was wrong for us to criticize the Federal Government for its abdication of its responsibility in the field of marketing farm products. He pooh-poohed the whole idea of Federal Marketing Boards. It seems to me that the question immediately arises: isn't it true that we can make a greater contribution to the reconstruction of these nations, and consequently to our own welfare and security, if marketing boards, by marketing boards interested not in fleecing the producer or the consumer, but marketing boards interested in getting a fair deal, and with the full support of the Dominion Government? One needs only to recall one remark of the late mayor of New York and the late chief of UNNRA, Le Guardia, speaking to one of the international conferences of the United Nations when he said that the people in these countries will never be properly fed until the doors of every gambling food exchange in the world are closed. That would include the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, the spiritual allies of the members in the Opposition. And that infers marketing by national marketing boards such as have been suggested by this side of the House. If proper assistance is to be given to these people for their own sake and for our sake, if the Saskatchewan farmer is to get a square deal, it can only be done if the authority that controls fiscal policy in this country – tariffs and so on – also resumes the responsibility for marketing. That authority is the Federal Government and the Federal Government alone. Marketing and importing must go hand and hand. They are far too important to be left to the whim of those people who would market or who would import solely to make a profit. They must be planned by the Federal Government, properly advised by responsible producer groups, and properly sensitive to the welfare of people at home and abroad.

While it is true, as the hon. member said, that we cannot overlook the international trade situation, it is equally true (and he did not say) that we cannot overlook any national situation or condition which places a heavy load on the people of the province whose budget we are considering. Listening to the hon. member from Gravelbourg, one would have to conclude that the only financial worries of the people of Saskatchewan arose from paying municipal taxes, school taxes and Provincial Government taxes. Surely, Mr. Speaker, he must have spoken with his tongue in his cheek! Surely, he overlooked, as I suggested the other night, the hidden charges, the secondary charges, the protected charges, and the financial pickpockets over which this Government and municipal governments have no control! He overlooked the charges, the increased costs, arising from increased freight charges, arising in part at least out of the Federal Government's unwillingness or reluctance to rationalize freight rates in this province some ten million dollars extra, this year. Surely, he forgot the cost of the Federal Government's tariff policy to the people of this province, a charge which, on the basis even of 1931 figures, would constitute a loss to the people of this province of approximately twenty-four million dollars. How much more in 1950, I don't know.

Certainly he forgot the Federal Government Income Tax paid in Saskatchewan, from Saskatchewan people, of nearly twenty-four million dollars in 1947, nearly five million dollars of which was paid by Saskatchewan farmers. And certainly in his criticism of a one per cent increase in Saskatchewan on

March 13, 1950

some goods, he forgot all about an 8 per cent tax which, by the time the consumer paid, was at least 10 per cent on more goods, a tax of the same kind imposed by the Federal Government made up out of his own pocket. He could have said, and I think consistency would have required that he say it, when criticizing us for a one per cent increase on some things – he could have said: "I disagree violently with the Federal policy of my party in continuing the imposition of a tax of 8 per cent." He could have said: "I criticize the Provincial Government for one per cent, and, therefore, I dissociate myself from my Federal brethren because they continue taxation of the same kind more than twice as great; a tax that will take out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan, this year, not three million dollars but closer to thirty million dollars". He could have added: "I criticize my Federal brethren because, a few years ago, they had the opportunity to take this tax off, but instead they chose to take off the excess profits tax, two taxes producing about the same amount of money." They could have taken off the one which would have decreased living costs and production costs for every Saskatchewan citizen. They chose instead to take off the one which did nothing but add to the profits of a number of corporations. And the people, these people, who chose to increase profits rather than to reduce living and production costs are not, Mr. Speaker, just the spiritual brethren of the members opposite they are real full-blooded blood-brethren.

If the security of Saskatchewan people is, as was intimated, threatened by taxation levels, we cannot overlook, in considering the provincial budget picture, the importance of these Federal policies in the provincial field. Let us just look at them again: increased freight rates, some additional ten million dollars this year; losses through tariffs, something like twenty-four million dollars; Federal income tax, another twenty-four million dollars; Federal hidden sales tax, about thirty million dollars – making a total for those four items alone of eighty-eight million dollars. It raises the question: Who is it that is really picking the pockets of Saskatchewan people; who is it that is really responsible for high agricultural production costs?

Let us examine, too, some of the other drains down which Saskatchewan's purchasing power goes. Someone in this House has mentioned that the selling price of one type of a Case tractor has in recent years increased by over \$1300. If a farmer with land assessed at \$10,000 purchased one of these tractors, the increase in the cost alone would cost him an amount equal to an amount of 130 mills of taxation. Spread it over ten years if you like, to pay increase in costs alone on the one type of equipment would cost him 13 mills a year to meet that cost. If 10 mills of taxation increase for municipal or school purposes is a heavy burden on the people of Saskatchewan, what about increases of that kind?

Let us look at the whole picture insofar as it pertains to farm machinery and farm repairs. In the year 1948, the wholesale manual of farm implements and repairs sold in Saskatchewan was approximately fifty-five million dollars. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the index of farm equipment costs in 1946 was 128.6, and in 1948 it was 173.1. That represents in that period of two years an increase of over 44 per cent. In other words, the farm machinery and the repairs purchased in 1948 in Saskatchewan could have been purchased at 1946 prices for seventeen million dollars less. That saving would have paid all, not just the farm, but all of our school taxes, and left two and a half million dollars over.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Who is it that is taking money out of the pockets of Saskatchewan people? Who is it that is destroying or threatening his security? And the further question follows: What Liberals have ever in this House or any other House protested against it? The Leader of the Opposition sat on the Government benches in Ottawa for many years – Is there any record of his protest against it? NO! And all of this, Mr. Speaker, could have been avoided, this increased costs, if the blood brethren of the members opposite, who form the Government at Ottawa, had wanted to, but they preferred . .

Mr. W. A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — I was asked a question, I suppose a rhetorical one, Mr. Speaker, but I will answer it. If my hon. friend will look at the record of Hansard, he will find many protests by me against the Matters he has mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I recall other protests the hon. Member made. I recall when the first recommendation for increase in freight rates was mooted in the press, the hon. Leader of the Opposition then sang, too: "Oh, you don't need to worry, the people of Saskatchewan don't need to worry about this. The Federal Liberal Government will see that the West gets a square deal". It got it in terms of a 16 per cent increase. That kind of protest does not move me very much.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this could have been prevented if the blood-brethren of the members of the Opposition, who form the Government at Ottawa had wanted to prevent it. They preferred, I gather, instead to see the Massey-Harris Company increase its profit during those two years by seven million dollars, and the Cockshutt Company to increase its profit during those years by nearly two million dollars. During that period remember, the Federal Government was steadily taking off the excess profits tax.

We get the same kind of a picture if we examine the index price for oil, gas and grease, in Western Canada. During the years 1946-1948, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows an increase of 23 per cent in the cost of these commodities. In other words, the 1948 supply of gas, oil and grease purchased by Saskatchewan farmers could have been bought at 1946 prices for six million dollars less than the farmers actually had to pay for them. Six million dollars, Mr. Speaker, represents at least 6 mills of rural taxation in this province; and a most moderate price control leaving these companies with their profits at the 1946 level, would have saved Saskatchewan farmers in their purchase of farm machinery, repairs, gas, oil and grease some twenty-three million dollars. With that savings they could have paid the extra one per cent tax, they could have doubled their school taxes if they wanted to, and still have five million dollars left.

Items of that kind cannot be left out of a discussion of a provincial economy. That was why I said, the other night and repeat again, that the hon. member left out some extremely important factors in discussion of the economic factors weighing on the people of Saskatchewan. It seems we must conclude that the right to unlimited profits at the expense of individuals, and at the expense of local governments, is guaranteed by the Liberal Party. Provincial Liberals cannot escape the blame; they acquiesce. The little Liberals here make big Liberal in Ottawa, and that is the fruit we get. It is not a question, Mr. Speaker, of whether or not we are going to have controls.

March 13, 1950

It has never been a question of whether or not we are going to have controls. It is simply a question of who is going to do the controlling! Either the controls remain in the hands of the companies that are in a position to control it, or as we suggest, they are placed in the hands of responsible elected members of the Dominion of Canada Parliament. These companies, companies that have, since this province was settled, preyed on the people of this province, are the very creatures and the very heart of the system which the Liberal Party seeks to perpetuate.

May I, Mr. Speaker, just mention for one other reason one aspect of the national picture? I mention it because the hon. member for Gravelbourg was good enough, may I say, to quote my Federal leader with regard to provincial affairs. I think it only fair then that I quote his Provincial leader with regard to some affairs which are both Federal and Provincial. I say we cannot overlook these things in the provincial picture. Quotation of the Leader of the Opposition from the 'Star-Phoenix', of Saturday, April 2, 1948: "Turning to the South Saskatchewan dam scheme" – I presume he turned to the south – he promised:

"If the people of this province give endorsement to my stand and elect a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, we will be sure to get it, otherwise the outlook is not so sure."

Then he went on to say that with himself as Premier, Saskatchewan would benefit from Federal legislation, inferring we did not now. Talk about political promises, Mr. Speaker, or talk about political bribery, talk about two hundred thousand or eight hundred thousand dollars! The Leader of the Opposition really doesn't play for peanuts.

Members of the House, on both sides, I am sure, will welcome the increased estimates this year, particularly insofar as they pertain to school grants, in the Department of Education. That increase is something in addition to one million dollars. And just to give us a picture of the relationship between school grants and school taxes received by school districts in the province over a period of years, I want to give these few statistics: In 1943 that relationship, that is the percentage of school grants to school taxes received by school boards was 24 per cent; in 1944, it was 23 per cent; in 1945, it was 29 per cent; in 1946, it was 33 per cent; in 1947, it was 39 per cent; in 1948, it was 41 per cent and in 1949, approximately 41 per cent. The latter figure is an estimate of course. In 1950, the percentage of school grants to school taxes will undoubtedly be larger. You will note the steady improvement since 1944.

In 1943-1944, the last complete year of Liberal Government in this province, the amount of money made available to school district school boards for spending was \$2,765,000, giving the figure in round figures. In 1950-1951, that amount will be \$7,335,000. That includes grants to school districts, the assistance in paying the bills of the Northern schools, and the assistance by way of capital grants. From two and three-quarter million in 1943-1944 to seven and one-quarter million in 1950-1951. That, Mr. Speaker, represents an increase of \$4 1/2 million. May I emphasize that I am not speaking about the total differences between the budgets for the Department; I am speaking about the differences between the total amount of money made available by the Department of Education for expenditure by school boards. An increase

of 4 1/2 million dollars, an increase of 160 per cent of \$2.60 available to school boards as compared to \$1.00 in the last year of a Liberal Government. Leaving out the capital expenditures of some \$800,000 this year, the increase is still 140 per cent – \$2.40 for every \$1.00 provided by the previous Government. And yet the hon. member from Gravelbourg stands in his place on Friday last and says, "no assistance to municipalities".

May I say a word about the distribution of the one million dollars additional grants. I do not wish to deal with it in too much detail today, Mr. Speaker; that will come when the legislation is brought down. There has been some pressure to increase the basic rate of grant of \$1.50 a day, but it is felt by the Government that, instead of increasing the basic rate, we should distribute this money on an equalization basis. There is one exception to that. Many of the cities and the towns in the province are now receiving less than \$1.50 a day as a basic grant for elementary rooms; these will all be increased to \$1.50 a day. That is an increase from \$1.30 a day for some and from \$1.40 a day for some. This will mean then that the basic grant for all schools in the province will be \$1.50. Under the previous Government, in 1944, Mr. Speaker, the cities of Saskatoon and Regina, for example, received an equalization grant based on 8 mills times the difference between the assessment per classroom and \$100,000 with a maximum equalization grant of \$600. May I say that while that is what they get now, that is double the amount that they got in equalization grants under the previous Government. Our proposal is to include in this group of schools all of the districts up to an assessment of \$105,000 with a maximum equalization grant of \$960. The increase in the maximum equalization grant for this type of school is \$360. Town districts under the previous Government received no equalization grant whatever and their basic rates range from \$1.00 a day to \$1.50 a day. In 1946-1947, Mr. Speaker, we made equalization grants available to town schools on the same basis as to rural and village schools except that we established a maximum equalization grant of \$200 per room. At the same time we increased the per-day rate for these districts. Our proposal is to bring, first of all, the basic rate up to \$1.50, the equalization grant to be calculated on the same basis as for rural and village schools except that the maximum will be \$360 per room.

Perhaps we can make it more clearer by examining what has happened in one rural district and in one town. These are hypothetical cases, but could be true. Take a rural district with an assessment of \$50,000 operating one room. Before 1944, that district received a basic grant of \$300 and an equalization grant of \$200, a total of \$500. In 1949, that district received \$300 basic and \$400 equalization, a total of \$700. In 1950, our proposal is that this district receives \$300 basic and \$660 equalization, or a total of \$960. That is an increase of \$260 as compared with last year. It is an increase of \$460 as compared with 1944, or an increase of almost 100 per cent for that particular district. Yet the hon. member from Gravelbourg says, "no assistance given to municipalities"! If that district were operating on the level of expenditure of 1944, that grant would carry 50 per cent of the cost.

March 13, 1950

Turning to the town district, I suggest we take one with an assessment of about \$75,000 per classroom operating 8 elementary rooms and 5 high school rooms. I happen to know a town about like this, Mr. Speaker. In 1949, this town school would receive on behalf of elementary rooms \$2,240, in behalf of high school rooms \$3,500, as an equalization grant \$2,600, a total of \$8,340. In 1950, it will receive \$2,400 for the elementary rooms, \$3,500 for the high school rooms (there is no change there), and \$4,680 as an equalization grant, or a total of \$10,580. That represent an increase of over \$2,000, or an increase of approximately 20 per cent. Let us see what was the position in 1944. For elementary rooms, they received \$1,760; for high school rooms, they received \$3,500; there was no equalization grant, and so they received \$5,260. The increase from 1944 to 1950 is an increase of just over 100 per cent, an increase of over \$5,000 – an increase that to the people of that town is worth 5 1/2 mills. That is not enough assistance granted, but an increase of assistance of 100 per cent in five years is a great help. Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, we could have put that \$5,000 and any other \$5,000 along side of it in the bank and, according to the hon. member from Gravelbourg, we would then have had "security". I regret that we are not announcing an equalization grant for cities. They are the only group now left out, but that problem is being studied. I may say, Mr. Speaker, it is not the money, it is the principle in this case, and we hope to be able to present some suggestions a year from now. In the meantime, the increase in the basic grant will be of assistance to the cities.

Approximately 4/5 of the province is in units. The equalization grant for units is at present determined on this basis: it is the difference between the operating costs based on \$800 per elementary room and \$2,100 per high school room and the revenue produced by the regular grants plus the revenue from taxation of 10 mills on rural property and 14 mills on urban property. Our proposal is that we use the same formula that adjusts some of the figures, and the equalization grant will then be calculated on the difference between the operating cost on a basis of \$2,100 per elementary rooms, \$2,200 per high school room, the revenue produced by the regular grants plus taxation at the rate of 11 mills on rural assessments and 15 mills on urban assessments. We increase the grant by increasing the programme cost and by increasing the mill rate which we use for purposes of computing the equalization grant. Those figures have no meaning except in so far as they are used for computing the equalization grant. We increase in that way the equalization grant more to the lower assessed units than to the higher assessed units. In very general terms then, Mr. Speaker, a unit with an average assessment per classroom of \$50,000 will gain approximately \$250 per elementary classroom and \$50 per high school room. The maximum gain for any unit will equal approximately 6 mills of taxation for that unit.

There is one other point to be mentioned. That is, to some of the units which do not presently come within an equalization formula we pay a minimum equalization grant of \$5,000; and we propose to increase that to \$10,000.

I should like to pay just a bit of a tribute to the people of Saskatchewan for their effort in supporting education on a comparative basis. I use figures for 1946, and my authority for these figures is the 'Canada Year Book' and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In that year, the people of Saskatchewan, school boards and Government combined, spent on education per a pupil of average attendance \$114. That amount equals the

amount spent by Alberta. It compares with \$115 – (\$1.00 more) in British Columbia, and it excels that of Manitoba, which is only \$100. The comparison is all the more favourable when we find that the average income per pupil so counted in the three provinces, excluding corporation income, is as follows:

Saskatchewan	\$3,884.00
Alberta	4,161.00
B. Columbia	7,314.00
Manitoba	4,985.00

The inclusion of corporation income would, of course, make the disparity even greater. In other words, Mr. Speaker, for every \$34 of personal income in Saskatchewan, \$1.00 is spent by the school districts and the Government of education. That compares with \$1.00 out of \$50 in Manitoba; \$1.00 out of \$36 in Alberta; \$1.00 out of \$63 in British Columbia. That, I think, is a commendable record. It is also, Mr. Speaker, the argument for Federal aid to education, and I make no apology to the members of the Opposition, or to the Federal Government in Ottawa, when I say that before the children of Saskatchewan and the children of many other provinces are going to get a square deal in education, there must be recognition of the problem by the Federal Government and financial assistance accordingly.

It must be admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the teacher situation in the province remains serious. That has never been denied by myself. There are some encouraging aspects, however. Last year, that is 1948-1949, we put into the teaching profession, or into the schools, about 400 short-term students and about two hundred supervisors. In other words, we put in about 600 new, or partly-trained, people – that is partly-trained or not trained. This year, we have introduced no new short-term students; we are using about 400 supervisors. In other words, there is a comparison of about 600 in this group as against 400, or a gain of about 200 in that regard. May I say that a reasonably capable supervisor with more assistance from the superintendent, with assistance from the helping teacher in those units which have helping teachers, and with the assistance, partly or completely, of the correspondence school, will do a better job than many an inadequately trained student. It still doesn't make for a teacher in a school.

There are other gains also. Last summer, 850 of our students, formerly teaching, advanced their certificates by attending Normal School. Eight hundred of these completed their Normal School training. It is encouraging to note that more and more teachers are obtaining degrees, high school certificates and superior certificates. In 1944, 12.8 per cent of all teachers, including temporary and permit teachers, had a certificate better than a first-class certificate. In 1948, that 12.8 per cent with certificates better than first-class has increased to 20.8 per cent. The increased rate of pay, improved salary schedules, improved living and working conditions, improved superannuation will continue to bring improvement. It might be mentioned that we are, this year, spending \$52,000 to assist Normal School students in paying for their Normal School courses.

One of the reasons why school boards have had a difficult task in recent years is because of the need which has been with us for a tremendous building and repair programme. It is worthwhile nothing that, since 1945, excluding cities, the school building and repair programme in this

March 13, 1950

province has amounted to approximately thirteen and one-quarter million dollars. The war, the depression, years of inadequate governmental assistance, small districts unable to finance, all have added to this need. Had the buildings and the equipment been in a shape in 1944 comparable to their present shape, we probably could have put one-half that money in the bank and had some of the security which the hon. member from Gravelbourg talked about.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is equally true that the increased asset of better buildings, and consequently, healthier, happier children, is also a blow struck for security. If prices had been properly controlled, many more buildings could have been obtained for the same money – or more money in the bank. The amount of money that I have mentioned represents in round figures over 900 new classrooms, over 370 new teacherages, over 400 new stables, plus repairs and repairs and repairs. That, I think, is a remarkable bit of achievement in a period of about five years. In the Units, which make up a part of the picture of which I have been talking, we have about 800 new classrooms, over 300 new teacherages, about 400 new stables, and they have spent about three and one-half million dollars for repairs – about \$12,000,000 worth of work, Mr. Speaker, which, with the exception of approximately \$600,000 is all paid for. Had, as was done for years in this province under a Liberal Government, debentures been issued in order to take care of this, there might have been some more money in the bank but there would have been a lot of debentures hanging around the necks of Saskatchewan people, which, by the time they were paid off, would have amounted to twice the original cost.

May I make one or two general statements about Units – to say that, in Saskatchewan, in this House or outside of this House, there ought not to be any political argument about it. I say that, Mr. Speaker, for two reasons: One, because every political party in Western Canada, including the one to which the members opposite belong, have someplace in Western Canada endorsed the principle of the Units and put it into operation; every single political party has done so. Secondly, because no political party in Saskatchewan dares to openly declare opposition to the Unit idea. I must draw the attention of the members of the Opposition to this fact, that not one Liberal member in this House has as yet stood on his hind legs and said one solitary single good thing about the Units – not one in this House! I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are some members in the Opposition, who, individually, agree wholeheartedly with the Unit policy. There are many over there who have stood up and condemned the Units, and I hope that some of the people whom I know agree with it will some day stand up and say what they, as individuals, think about it.

May I illustrate the effect of the Unit programme and of our equalization grant programme and of our capital grant programme by reference to what has happened in three Units. I want to talk first of all about the Hudson Bay Unit. It is the Unit which has the lowest assessment of any Unit in the entire province, and the highest average attendance per classroom. This Unit has, since 1945, built eighteen single new rooms, two two-rooms schools, one four-room school, one six-room school and one eight-room school – in five years forty new rooms by a Unit operating less than ninety rooms; a building and repair programme of one-quarter of a million dollars. In one of those districts, a district which now enjoys the use of eight new classrooms, they would have to pay, to pay the teacher's salary alone, one hundred mills of taxation – and the hon. member from Gravelbourg says we have done nothing

to help municipalities! That Unit has purchased 1800 new desks; three-quarters of the youngsters now sit at new desks. They make available 50 cents a day in that Unit to high school students who have to leave home in order to attend high school. There are no high school fees within the Unit. That \$100 a year possible, plus the fact that they do not have to pay fees, is worth to a man with a farm assessed at \$5,000 twenty-six mills of taxation over a possible period of each of four years. People in that area, five years ago, would not have believed such a programme possible, and, Mr. Speaker, it would not have been possible without the larger Unit, or with a different Government.

There will be some question about taxation. Well, the average rural rate in that area, before the Unit, was twenty-one mills, and the average rate since the Unit was established is seventeen mills; the present rate is nineteen mills. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is an area in which municipal, including school costs, have actually gone down since the election of this Government.

I take a second Unit: The larger Unit of Radville. They point out something which the hon. member from Gravelbourg missed in talking about increased tax mill rates, the other day, and it is that, from 1928 to 1948, the assessments of the school districts in that area dropped from \$12,000,000 to \$8,000,000, and, during the same period 1928 to 1948, the levy for school purposes increased by only four thousand dollars – less than half a mill on the present assessment. In 1928, Mr. Speaker, we had a Liberal Government and had had it for a long while. In that Unit, teachers' salaries, since the 1943 level, have almost doubled. Whereas they spent, in 1944, \$500 on school libraries, in 1948 they spent over \$2,000 for that purpose. They, too, are up against the difficulty of high costs. Fuel costs, in 1944, were \$5,000 and in 1949, \$9,000. Janitor services in 1944, were \$500; and in 1949, they were \$1,100. Repairs, in 1943, \$2,000, and in 1949, \$22,000. New buildings and equipment in 1943, \$2,500; and in 1948, \$32,000; 1949, \$26,000. And then the picture with regard to debt. A reduction of debenture principal, over the period during which the Unit has operated, \$19,000. School loan indebtedness – reduced over \$26,000 – wiped out. Notes against school districts – reduced \$7,5000 – wiped out. Overdue debenture coupons of \$3,300 – wiped out. Miscellaneous debts of \$1,450, wiped out.

They have liquidated a total of accumulated and overdue debts of \$38,000. What an inheritance, Mr. Speaker, that was! What a contribution that load of debt must have been to the stability of the municipalities in that area! Let us not forget this: had it not been necessary to take care of that inheritance of debt and that inheritance of years of neglect with regard to buildings and repairs, what advances there might have been in education had that money been able to be put in more positive ways.

I turn now to a third Unit, that of a Unit which is more highly assessed – the Kindersley Larger Unit. I want to make some comparisons with the conditions in that area in 1944 before the larger Unit, and also with the conditions in the superintendency of Rosetown, which was organized into a Unit just this year. First of all, let us look at the position of teachers' certificates. In 1944, 80 per cent of the teachers in that area had a certificate of a less than permanent nature; in 1949, only 29 per cent – in other words an improvement of 51 per cent. In Rosetown (a non-unit) for the same year, 59 per cent of their teachers had a less than permanent certificate; they were 30 per cent worse off than their neighbour Unit –

March 13, 1950

Kindersley. In 1944, only 16 per cent of the Kindersley teachers had a permanent first certificate – in 1949, 43 per cent or 27 per cent better; in Rosetown, 20 per cent or 23 per cent worse. In 1944, in Kindersley, only 2 per cent of the teachers had a superior or junior high school certificate; in 1949 14 per cent with a superior or junior high school certificate; in Rosetown, in the same period, 12 per cent or 2 per cent worse. In 1944, only 2 per cent in the Kindersley area with a high school certificate; in 1949, 14 per cent or 12 per cent more. In Rosetown in the same period, 9 per cent or 5 per cent worse. Years of average experience in 1944, the teachers in the Kindersley area had 2½ years of the average; in 1949, they had nine years of average experience, and the Rosetown area had five years. Salary averages – \$945 in Kindersley, in 1944; \$1,730 in 1949, almost twice as much. And in Rosetown \$1,730 – the same average salary. May I point this out? That whereas Rosetown was paying the same amount of salary on the average, they were employing people whose certificates, as a group, were much lower than those employed in the Kindersley Unit. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons why the people of Rosetown voted so overwhelmingly in favour of the larger Unit type of organization.

Now for a look at some of the cost relationships in Kindersley . .

Mr. Tucker: — Will you permit a question on that? Have you got the figures on the number of schools closed for lack of teachers in those two superintendencies?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, Mr. Speaker, I have not, but I do know this, that the percentage in Rosetown will compare pretty well with any other in the area. The hon. member, I think, is inferring that the larger Unit has been the cause of closing a lot of schools. He is quite wrong. This has happened in the Kindersley Unit: some schools have been closed this year as a result of an almost unanimous vote of the ratepayers of a number of those schools and as a result of placing at their conveniences a modern satisfactory school bus to take the children to school. That cannot be done unless you have the larger Unit type of organization.

To turn now to a picture of cost relationship between 1944 and 1949. Administration costs: 1944, 5 per cent; 1949, 3½ per cent. Some of the people who go around crying havoc and ruin because of high administration costs need to note those figures: 5 per cent in 1944, and 3.5 per cent in 1949. Instruction: about the same in both years, 49 per cent. Auxiliary services: 14 per cent in 1944; 8 per cent in 1949. Capital outlay and repair: 6 per cent in 1944; 22 per cent in 1949. Debt charges: 6½ per cent in 1944, 2½ per cent in 1949. Perhaps the most outstanding figure of all, Mr. Speaker, in that group, is that the average yearly expenditure for capital and repair by the Unit has been 800 per cent of the expenditure in 1944 – \$8.00 for every \$1.00 in 1944. They have in that area a composite school which is a model for any area in the province; a dormitory to which rural high school students may come and live at reasonable cost under supervised conditions. They have modern school buses that they make use of.

Let us see what the effect of that has been in equalling educational opportunities. In 1944, for every one hundred students in grade eight in the rural part of the Unit, there were only five in grade twelve. In 1944, for every one hundred in grade eight in the entire unit, there were only thirteen in grade twelve; but in 1949, for every one hundred students in grade eight, there were seventy-seven in grade twelve. In 1944 five out of every hundred; in 1949, 77 out of every hundred. The proportion

of rural grade eight students in grade twelve is now as high as the proportion of urban grade eight students in grade twelve in that Unit. The percentage of students dropping out was decreased from 95 per cent between eight and twelve in 1944, to 23 per cent in 1949, an improvement of 72 per cent in five years. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that sort of thing builds real honest-to-goodness security.

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. member permit a question? Has he got similar figures in regard to the superintendency of Rosetown?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, Mr. Speaker, I have not; but I have given pretty conclusive reasons as to why one would not expect the same sort of thing: no assistance to high school students; no composite high schools; no method of conveyance – work it out for yourself. I think it is indeed worthwhile noticing the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition.

I have, Mr. Speaker, referred to three Units. One of them is a low-assessed Unit with a high equalization grant; one of them is a medium-assessed Unit with a medium equalization grant; and one of them a high-assessed Unit with no equalization grant. The other Units, Mr. Speaker, can give the same kind of a picture, and again I submit that there is more security in that than there is in many millions of dollars in the bank. I submit that that is a record of achievement, for five years, never before equalled in the history of this province.

The hon. member from Gravelbourg laboured at some length, the other day, to persuade us of the remarkable job which the Liberal Government had done in the field of public health. He quoted Dr. Segerist – at least he quoted some of the press reports regarding Dr. Segerist. May I say that certainly no one expects a man of the stature of Dr. Segerist to make a report or to make speeches full of scathing denunciations. The important part of Dr. Segerist's report lies in what he recommended to be done. That is where we find the picture of what was not done before. I think we need to read from that. Since he agrees so wholeheartedly with Dr. Segerist as an expert, Mr. Speaker, I want to read one of the first recommendations of Dr. Segerist which was this:

"The insecurity inherent in the geography and the economy of the province" (that was in 1944)
"therefore makes it the more urgent to establish a system of socialized medical services on a provincial scale."

I hope the hon. member will go along with that recommendation as he has with the others. It is important to note what Dr. Segerist said was yet to be done, and I want only to mention them. He said: "More health centres"; "travelling dental clinics"; "mental hygiene clinics"; "need for more hospitals and need for" (note the word) "free hospitalization" which, according to the Hegarty report would cost the province three million dollars. Free hospitalization costing the province three million dollars! We know, Mr. Speaker, that hospitalization is costing more than three times that today. He said, and I quote: "Cancer patients still have to pay for the cost of operations." I know that the hon. member from Gravelbourg said the other day . .

Mr. Danielson: — Would the hon. Minister give us the date of that report?

March 13, 1950

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The date of that report is October 4, 1944.

Mr. Danielson: — Was there free cancer at that time?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that Dr. Segerist was writing on October 4, 1944, on the basis of information which he had gathered some time before this. I don't know how much we had paid by that time, Mr. Speaker. I know how much they paid though — not a cent! The hon. member for Gravelbourg said, "Oh, yes, this was on the statue books" — and so were a number of other Acts on the statue books, and nothing happened about them. He said they were in there in 1944. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, it was because of that that they put the election off for another year making a complete term of six years. I don't know.

Dr. Segerist recommended an expansion in the size of clinics; he recommended provision of free treatment for V.D.; better sanitation service; better health education; better nutrition. All this and more, he said, needed doing. From that we can judge whether the job that was being done was so complete.

My hon. friend from Bengough (Mr. Brown), pointed out, the other day, one of the slight errors in logic which the hon. member from Gravelbourg made. He had praised, and I think rightly so, the efforts of the municipalities in setting up Union Hospital districts and in organizing in order to employ municipal doctors. That is admittedly good and something of which anybody in Saskatchewan should well be proud; but he forgot to mention that the cost was almost entirely carried by the municipalities. Then he proceeded to criticize our programme in the Swift Current Health Region, in which two-thirds of some of the cost is carried by the Government, in which 50 per cent of some other services is carried by the Government, and, of course, a lesser amount for others. Evidently a programme, under the Liberal Government, in which the municipalities carried nearly all of the cost was all right, but under a C.C.F. Government, where they carry only part of it, that, I gather, is bad.

The hon. member admitted that the hospitalization programme is good, and undoubtedly he would have to admit that. He said: "You know, Mr. Speaker, there could be many economies and savings". Probably so, but why not let us in on the secret of some of them? And the answer, I think, probably is because he does not know just what economies and savings might be made. If he does, I am sure that the Government of British Columbia would be most anxious to hire him as a consultant when this Session is over. In British Columbia, under a Liberal-Conservative Government, the fees for single persons are \$21 as compared with our \$10; the fee for the married group \$33 per family as compared with our \$30; where they have had a sales tax of 3 per cent for some years on more kinds of goods than ours, and where they have infinitely greater other resources to support such a programme.

It should be noted that the increased revenue from Education and Hospitalization Tax is about equal to the deficit of the Hospitalization tax. I want to ask this question: does this constitute any charge on the Saskatchewan people which would not be there if there were no C.C.F. Government, and consequently, no hospitalization plan? Does it constitute a charge which would not be there if we did not have a hospitalization plan? Or does it merely imply that, by means of the personal payment and the one per cent tax, all of the people of Saskatchewan will pay the annual hospitalization cost

which, otherwise, the unfortunate few who have to go to hospital would pay themselves? That is what it means, a little added money; it is simply a matter of putting into effect a policy of sharing costs. Is not it better, infinitely better, that all of the people of the province do share rather than have the sick carry practically all the load themselves, or have it carried by municipalities, as was the case under the Liberal Government almost entirely? Isn't it good, Mr. Speaker, that a person who spends \$4,000 a year on taxable goods should pay \$40 towards hospital costs, whereas the person who pays \$400 will pay only \$4 more? Isn't that fair and equitable? The men whose income will allow him to spend \$4,000 a year on taxable goods will contribute \$40 more; the man whose income will allow him to spend only \$400 a year, will contribute only \$4 more. After all, isn't the principle pretty much the same as the principle of something which the hon. members opposite are very proud, namely, the principle of P.F.A.A., where all the farmers contribute to the fund and the unfortunate ones in any one year get something back and the deficit is made up out of the central funds of the Dominion of Canada, funds which may come from an 8 per cent sales tax?

Now, it is true that, in one respect, costs under the plan may be greater than if they were carried individually, and that is true for one very good reason: More people go to the hospital, or put it another way – people who couldn't otherwise afford to go because they would not have the money to go, can now go. In 1946, before the plan was in operation, there was 118,800 hospital admissions. In 1948, that had increased to 145,378. It had increased by 22 per cent. If the Provincial Government had not met, each year, the deficit on the hospital plan out of our revenues, we could have put six or seven million dollars in the bank. I suppose we would have bought security at that price! Many people of the province would have had a lot less in the bank, and many people in the province would have been a lot less healthy. I simply want to ask: do the dollars in the bank give more security, or are people actually more important, as we happen to believe?

The hon. member had something to say about exemptions, and he suggested that the exemptions had not been taken off foodstuffs. All I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that he should go on a diet and eat only those things which were tax-exempt in 1944. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition and myself ought to go on that diet – I don't know; but he should try it because the tax has been taken off a considerable number of food-stuffs.

Let us have a look for a while at the picture regarding rural taxation. Comparison was made of average mill rates for 1944 and 1948. May I suggest, first of all, that you cannot compare, in any absolute way, mill rates from one year to another and get a fair picture, because you overlook several things. For example, the hon. member overlooked the drop in assessment from 1944 to 1948, and it was a drop of ten million dollars – ten mills of taxation in 1948 produces a million dollars less than it did in 1944. He overlooked the collection of arrears in 1944 and previous years, overlooked the fact that many areas were using those arrears in order to take care of some part of their current budget. The mill rate did not indicate spending to that extent. Actually the taxes collected by rural municipalities, in 1944, was \$23.8 million and, in 1948, \$20.6 million. Actual tax collections were \$3,000,000 less in 1948 than in 1944, and I agree that you cannot use those figures and get absolute comparison either. He overlooked the relationship between farm prices and taxation. The average price received by a farmer for his wheat, in 1944, was 1.25 bushel; in 1948, it was 1.55 a bushel. To pay

March 13, 1950

\$100 worth of taxes in 1944, it took 80 bushels of wheat; to pay \$100 worth of taxes, in 1948, it took only 64 bushels of wheat; that is, it would have done had it not been for those increased costs which we talked about before, and over which this House has no control.

Rural municipal taxes, in 1944, took only about 6 per cent of our net agricultural incomes; in 1948, they took about 5 per cent. He might have gone back and made some other comparisons, Mr. Speaker, which I propose to do. It might have been mentioned that in the period from 1922 to 1929, a long period of Liberal reign in the province, the school tax per capita was \$13.19 and that, in 1946, the middle period of the C.C.F. term which he referred to, the school tax per capital was \$12.40. Now, if \$12.40 was an impossible load in 1946, what kind of a load was \$13.19 in 1922-29? He might have pointed out that in 1926, in the middle of a long period of Liberal Government, the total tax levied by rural municipalities was \$18,000,000, and that twenty years later, in the middle of C.C.F. period that he referred to, the amount levied was \$17,400,000, \$600,000 less. And if \$17.4 million was too much in 1946, what was \$18 million in 1926?

Again, with regard to some areas which have experienced some decrease in school taxation, he might have looked at the figures in the Gravelbourg School Unit and seen there some of the areas in which school taxation, at least, is down compared to previous years. The Gravelbourg Unit may not be in the hon. member's constituency, Mr. Speaker; the Unit is larger than the constituency; but they are in the Unit. May I just read for the sake of the House some of these examples: Pinto View, 7 mills down; the rural portion of Lafleche, 5½ mills down; Divide, 3 mills down; Spiral, 12 mills down; Meyronne, 5 mills down; Ferland, 4 mills down; Southside, 3 mills down; Pebble Hill, 3 mills down; Survivance, 5 mills down; Glentworth rural, 14 mills down; McCord, 4½ mills down; Brockworth, 5 mills down. As a matter of fact, in that Unit, nearly 40 of the districts, in spite of much higher total expenditures, had a mill rate, in 1948 either lower or no higher than the mill rate for the district before the Unit was organized.

With regard to this matter of taxation, may I say that in Saskatchewan, today, every person who insures his home or his business, every person who insures his automobile, nearly every person who goes to the hospital, every person who has treatment of cancer, every person whose children receive high school assistance from a larger Unit, every person in an area in which work is being done by the Department of Agriculture, are all better able to pay municipal taxes because of the policies of this Government. They are more secure. The municipality is more secure; the Province is more secure. He even argued, Mr. Speaker, that the cancellation of the 1938 seed grain debt had increased the burden on the municipalities. I do not think it would be possible for anybody buy a lawyer to come to that kind of a conclusion, yet I haven't any doubt that he is a very successful lawyer, but as a mathematician I would doubt his ability very much. If this increased the burden on the municipalities, why did the Association of Rural Municipalities year after year ask the Liberal Government to do something about it? How can the welfare of the municipality be separated from the welfare of the people in the municipality? It is just like saying, Mr. Speaker, that if you kill the goalie on a hockey team, you haven't hurt the hockey team because you haven't killed the whole team. It is the members of the team that are important. If a ratepayer has other large obligations, then his tax-paying ability is decreased by that much.

The hon. member had reference to some municipalities in his own constituency, I don't know whether I got them all or not; 103, 104, 105, 134 and 135. The assessment of those municipalities, in 1945, was \$13,463,000; the cancellations to the people of that area, as a result of the policy of this Government during 1945-6-7-8-9, a period of five years, was \$799,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, that amount of money on that amount of assessment is equal to the amount that would be raised if there has been taxation to the extent of 55 mills, or an average of 11 mills for each of those five years. It is true that did not perhaps take it off the municipality directly, but it did improve the tax-paying conditions of that municipality by that extent.

I would like to have reference to this matter of Provincial assistance by referring to my own constituency. I haven't, Mr. Speaker, ever had the chance of rising in this House to say that a curling team has won a provincial championship, or that our hockey team has won a provincial championship yet; but this much I do say to the members – if, come next summer, any of them think they have a ball team, I will willingly get the ball team from Delisle to play against them and bet on the outcome.

With regard to Provincial assistance to the constituency of Biggar, to the municipalities entirely or partly within that constituency. In 1941, municipal road grants from the Government, nothing; in 1942, \$1,500; in 1943, \$500; in 1944 (election year it goes up) – \$1,931. Now look at the difference: 1945, almost \$6,000; 1946, over \$6,000; 1947, \$14,000; 1948, \$15,500; 1949, \$13,520. Will the members of the Opposition say that that kind of increase assistance is of no value to a municipality? With regard to the matter of which I was speaking a minute ago . . . (interruption)

Mr. Woods (Kinistino): — Would the minister state that all municipalities in the province got the same treatment?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, during those years they will compare very well.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Kinistino is extra good.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Dealing further with this matter of relief debt, which again we lifted from the shoulders of the people and consequently from the municipalities, here is what it meant to the municipalities in my constituency:

43 mills, or more than 8 mills a year;
48 mills, or more than 9 mills a year;
29 mills, or more than 5 mills a year;
80 mills, or more than 16 mills a year;
19 mills, or more than 4 mills a year;
54 mills, or more than 11 mills a year;
81 mills, or more than 16 mills a year;
39 mills, or about 8 mills a year;
30 mills, or almost 6 mills a year –

an average cancellation worth to those areas about 47 mills.

Mr. Tucker: — Are you referring to cancellations by the Dominion Government or by this Government? I understood the hon. member said this Government.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I am referring to the cancellations effected as the result

March 13, 1950

of policies of this Government which have come into effect since 1944. The improved assistance has equalled an amount which would be produced by an average tax rate of sixteen mills. The people, then, have benefitted, through the result of these two measures, to the extent of sixty-three mills (some of them more than that, some of them less), of taxation on more than twelve mills a year for each of the five years. To this must be added, Mr. Speaker, a portion of the 1938 seed grain debt which our friends opposite collected when they sat over here and which we paid back after we got over here.

There was some comparison, too, of the income of the Provincial Government during two periods: 1941-42 to 1944-45 inclusive and 1945-46 to 1948-49 inclusive. They may be comparable periods insofar as time is concerned certainly they are not comparable insofar as costs are concerned. However, it is admitted, and the hon. member showed very well, that the income during the last group of four years has been greater. Because the extra income which he pointed out was not in the bank, he said we were not building security. His concept of security, I take it, and that of the Liberal Party, is determined by the amount of money that happens to be in a bank someplace. In dealing with security, he dealt only with dollars and forgot entirely about people and works, and I suggest that, again, is one of the basic differences between the two groups in this House. He said, in effect, if you have forty or fifty or sixty millions of dollars in the bank, then regardless of the ability of people to take advantage of hospital services, regardless of a health programme, regardless of teachers' salaries, regardless of agricultural and natural resources development, then you have security if you just have the money in the bank. We, Mr. Speaker, disagree.

He illustrated his increased revenue by dealing with three sources – the money from taxation, the money from the Federal Government, and the money obtained from liquor profits. Now let us have a look at the increased revenue which he calculated from each of those sources, and the increased expenditure during this period from some Departments of the Government. Comparing the two four-year periods, he said we received from taxation \$14,000,000 more than the previous Government. Granted, Mr. Speaker; and in the same period the Department of Highways spent \$17,000,000 more than the preceding Government in their two years: \$14,000,000 more taxation, but one Department spends that and \$3,000,000 more in that period! Now, we could have put the money in the bank. We could have done that and left our highway system with less than 100 miles built to standard, as was the case in 1944, and left that to deteriorate, left the rural municipalities almost entirely to their own resources. Would that have added to the security of Saskatchewan? Do you build security by allowing assets to deteriorate?

He said, secondly, that from Ottawa we got \$20,000,000 more by comparison. That included old age payments – which we don't get but merely pass on. It might be noted that because of Ottawa's haste in taking off price ceilings, they increased the cost to the people of the province by at least eight times that much during the same period; but, nevertheless, we got \$20,000,000 more from Ottawa. We spent, during the two periods, Mr. Speaker, \$20,000,000 more for the health of Saskatchewan people, not including hospitalization. Do you not build security when you promote better health? Would the people whose lives have been saved because of the air ambulance service, been more secure if they were dead, and we had a few hundred thousand dollars in the bank? Is that the kind of security the Liberal Party is speaking for? Would the people who come from the mental hospitals able to take their places in society, be more secure if they had remained in the mental hospital and we had several million dollars in the bank? Those are questions which the hon.

members have to answer.

He pointed out that from liquor profits we had taken \$17,000,000 more than the preceding Government in those two four-year terms. We did. And on Social Welfare, one Department alone, we spent \$13,500,000 more than did the previous Government. Do uncared for children or a greater gaol population, plus money in the bank to the credit of the province, spell security? That is the implication that I draw from the address of the hon. member. I think the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, must clarify for the people of the province just where they stand in this struggle of people versus money. The increases of expenditures in the three Departments I have named – those three alone – more than account for the increased revenues which the hon. member was able to dig up. We should add that the increase of additional millions of dollars in power and telephone lines have added security; the spending of more money in one year by the development and conservation Branch of the Department of Agriculture than the previous Government spent for the entire Department of Agriculture has added to the security of the people of this province. Greater assistance to the Co-operative movement has added to the security of this province. The work of the Natural Resources Department in development and in conservation has added to the security of this province. The growth of the Trade Union movement has added security. All of these could have been neglected and we could have had money in the bank; it would not necessarily mean security. The Liberal Party, I take it, Mr. Speaker, would sit and watch the water pile up until the dam burst and then try and repair it. We prefer to do what we can to prevent it from breaking.

I want to look at the figures in one other way. The hon. member, speaking for the Opposition, said that we had received in revenue and on revenue account \$63,000,000 more during that four-year period than they had during the preceding four-year period: That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is correct. Now, let us see some things that might have happened to that \$63,000,000. The net debt, in 1944, in this province was \$214,000,000. We have since that time made a capital expenditure of \$47,000,000. The net debt, then, might have been expected to be \$214,000,000 plus \$47,000,000 or \$261,000,000. But the net debt in 1949 was only \$148,000,000. In other words, there was a reduction of \$113,000,000. The Dominion cancellation and the money paid over because of the Natural Resources Agreement amounted to \$44,000,000. Now, if you take the reduction of \$113,000,000 and \$44,000,000 from that, you get \$69,000,000 of reduction of debt which had been paid out of revenue. The hon. member spoke about \$63,000,000 more in revenue and a revenue account, but we have reduced the debt by \$69,000,000.

Mr. Tucker: — What about the Wheat Pool repayments?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That's part of the money.

Mr. Culliton: — Does the Minister state, on his responsibility as Minister, that you have reduced the debt by \$69,000,000 out of revenue.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I will give the figures against so you can figure it out. The net debt in 1949 was \$148,000,000, so in that area of figuring, there is a reduction of \$113,000,000. The Dominion cancellations and the money paid because of the Natural Resources Agreement, \$44,000,000, and you get a figure of \$69,000,000.

Mr. Culliton: — I may have misunderstood you, and I don't want to; but I understood

March 13, 1950

you to say specifically that you had reduced the debt \$69,000,000 out of revenue. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Out of the revenues of the province.

Mr. Culliton: — Out of Revenue account?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Not out of revenue account because of the capital expenditures in there, some of which came out of capital account. That explains that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I go on to one other statement which the hon. member made. He pointed out that if we got a series of crop failures in the province then there will be no alternative – or there will be an alternative: either the entire social structure will crack, or there will be a drastic curtailment of Government services. Well, we have learned this much from history, Mr. Speaker, and it is that if that happens in this province, as it has happened under a Liberal Government, we don't get any alternative – both happen at once right away. His argument that because of the situation we should not spend any more money reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of the argument that the chairman of my school board used to use when we went to him to talk about increased salaries. The old gentleman, who was a pretty fine gentleman, said: "I was on this Board when we had to cut salaries before; and I am not going to raise them now and be in the position of cutting them again".

In 1937, the Provincial Government of the day submitted what was termed by the hon. member (and I agree with him heartily), an excellent picture of the problems of the province and the possible solutions thereto, to the Rowell-Sirois Commission, and I want to have reference to that. I note it is signed, not by T. C. Douglas, but by T. C. Davis, with a foreward by the Hon. W. J. Patterson, I want, as I read some of the recommendations there, to mention again that the hon. members have criticized us for asking Ottawa for assistance in one way and another. Let us see what the Liberal Government of 1937 asked Ottawa to do in order to make it possible to balance its budget in an average year. They said, first of all: "that a portion of the public debt, attributable to the payment of direct relief should be regarded as a national responsibility and assumed by the Dominion of Canada." They also said: "that the customs tariff should be completely removed from all the instruments of production and drastically reduced on all necessities of life". They said: "that the provision of transportation facilities should be considered from a national point of view and the freight rates examined with a view to getting relief for the primary producers in Western Canada." This one is worth underlining, Mr. Speaker: "that the Government of Canada shall construct and maintain a trans-Canada highway of a permanent type as well as permanent highways from Canada – United States border to the several National Parks in Canada". "That the entire responsibility of old age pension payments shall be assumed by the Dominion of Canada". "That the burden of direct relief shall be definitely assumed by the Dominion of Canada as a social service of national concern". "That consideration be given to the enactment of a national scheme of health insurance". "That the unconditional subsidy presently payable should be increased on the basis of fiscal need of the province as indicated by the material which appears in this submission".

Pretty good asking! Running over those again: the public debt attributable to direct relief – all to be assumed by the Dominion of Canada; customs tariff from instruments of production drastically reduced – about

\$20,000,000 perhaps there, for the people of Saskatchewan; freight rate structures which were unfair then, and more unfair since – ten or fifteen million dollars there for the people of Saskatchewan; trans-Canada highway – our share is going to be ten million dollars. If the Dominion Government will do as the Liberal Government asked in 1937, we would have ten million dollars there – we would not have to increase the tax, we could decrease the taxes and build some more roads; and if they took the other suggestion to build from the national boundary up to Waskesiu, there is another ten or fifteen million dollars we would not have to worry about. Take the entire responsibility, they said, of old age pension – over three million dollars there alone. That would have taken care of our hospital deficit – we would not have had any particular increase in tax. Direct relief costs, they wanted the Federal Government to take the whole share. Well that would have saved the municipalities and the Province about two million dollars. National Health Insurance – sixty per cent of our hospitalization costs alone would have been some six million dollars. If they would do that, we could take off the tax and put the personal payment into a few other things. Then, in addition (that wasn't all) they said, 'subsidies based on fiscal needs': they said these are some of the things that we think enter into determining this – education costs, the development of cheap power, geological survey complete inventory of land resources, land classification: All of that, Mr. Speaker, in order to balance a budget on what they called an average year in the light of 1937 levels of social thought. If the Dominion Government would do, completely, just one, or shall we say two, or perhaps three of any of those things asked in 1937, we would not have any 1 per cent tax, we could have a lot of services, we could have money in the bank. If we get the condition which the hon. member was talking about – several years of crop failure, particularly if that is accompanied by dropping prices – then not only this province but every other province will have to curtail social services. That is the sort of thing which cannot be met by any single individual province, but only if action is taken on a Federal basis. If a Liberal Government were sitting in these benches today, they would have to make the same requests that we are making or else repudiate the requests they made in 1937.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the record of the Government shows a great deal of assistance to municipalities, because the record of the Government shows greatly increased assistance to, and opportunities for, individuals, because the budget shows a continuing consideration for the welfare and needs of Saskatchewan people and because on that consideration real security lies, I support the Motion.

Mr. L. E. Blanchard (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the newly-elected members of the Legislature. The hon. member for Cannington, who has already spoken in the House, seems to be quite capable of taking care of himself in any company, and I feel quite confident that our hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Maher) will give a very good account of himself in this House, this Session. Also the member for Gull Lake, who has spoken in the House here. He has given a very good account of himself; he speaks like a veteran.

I also want to refer to the address on the Speech from the Throne made by the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley. I noticed he used the words "programme, policy, rumour" and the word "dignity". Now, just for the moment I want to pass over those words, but I want to come back to those a little later on.

March 13, 1950

I have something here that is uppermost in mind which I would like to talk about for a moment or two. Perhaps someone will remember that a year ago in Rupert's Land constituency which lies in the northern part of the province of Manitoba, a small child was mauled considerably by some dog and the child died from the effects of that mauling. Mr. Hamilton, who is M.L.A. for that constituency tried to get legislation passed in the House, last year, but apparently for some reason or other he was not able to do so. Now, we have had the same thing happen in Flin Flon just this past four weeks. A child who was six years old was sent to get an armful of wood from the woodpile at supper time; two husky dogs jumped on this lad, and mauled him so badly that he died from the effects of that mauling. The outcome of that is that the town of Flin Flon, (where I live is an adjacent sub-division or adjacent property – it's an addition to the town of Flin Flon), the town of Flin Flon is passing by-laws and regulations governing these dogs. We in the Saskatchewan side, being an unorganized territory, it is impossible for us to make any legislation of that kind. Legislation of that kind to take care of dogs would have to be passed in this House covering this unorganized territory.

I have in my hands here the Bill that has been passed in the Legislature in Manitoba at this Session, and I want to point out to you that this by-law at Flin Flon said that no dog of this type, the husky type of dog, sleigh dogs, would be allowed to be housed within one-half mile of the city limits of the town of Flin Flon. We, living close by there, are adjacent to it, and the Flin Flon dogs of this type are coming into the Saskatchewan area, and they are allowed to run loose. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely we value the lives of our Saskatchewan children just as much as they do in Manitoba; but being an unorganized territory we are absolutely helpless to do anything for it ourselves as far as passing legislation goes. I hope that in this Session of the Legislature that this Government will see fit to pass legislation somewhat similar to the one that has been passed this Session at the Manitoba House. So much for the dogs.

We have another situation up there that is quite serious. I have mentioned already that we are adjacent to the town of Flin Flon. I believe that south and west from the town of Flin Flon there is a highway called the Beaver Lake Road, and sometime when we have the completion of the No. 35 highway from Flin Flon to Nipawin that will be called No. 35 highway. Not 300 yards inside the Saskatchewan boundary, there is a very bad spot. There is a very bad sloping rock there and some years ago, I think it was back in 1937, some building and vising were done and there is a very narrow roadway there at the present time. Three years ago, during the winter months a father was hauling a small child on a sleigh through this narrow defile of rock and he was overtaken by a Caterpillar tractor. He undertook to pull the child up to the side of the road, which he did; but it had quite a slope, and this child rolled off and, right in front of the father's eyes, rolled under the Caterpillar tractor. Now, Mr. Speaker, the same thing can happen again. While the opening of the Flin Flon highway or the Manitoba highway in June (that is the official opening; in fact they are using the road at the present time), we are going to have a congestion of traffic in this bottleneck. Now, I am not asking the Government to build a Nipawin highway or any other kind, but there is three miles of this road that leads from Flin Flon into Saskatchewan, and at the present time we have a population on the Saskatchewan side of close to two thousand people. The traffic there is very heavy. Our Mr. Leslie, two years ago put through a preliminary survey whereby this road would be straightened out and be made much less dangerous. Not more than a quarter-mile from the town of Flin Flon, on the Saskatchewan side, there is a very sharp turn in the

road. There is a huge rock that obstructs the view, and immediately making the clearing you go downhill and underneath the overhead railway tracks. It is a very dangerous curve. The proposed new road would extend approximately three-quarters of a mile out towards Phantom Lake. Phantom Lake is a very popular summer resort. There is not another lake like it, for scenic value or as a playground for children, in Saskatchewan. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company has financed that project and they made a wonderful job of it. This road leading from the town of Flin Flon through Saskatchewan is naturally a Saskatchewan road. Very little work has been done on it. It is in the very poor condition it got into when the traffic in the summer months is heavy. I am only asking for this Government to see their way clear to build three miles of highway for us that is very badly needed. I am sure that we would welcome at this particular time, and I'll take the privilege of inviting all the members on both sides of the House to come up to Flin Flon on June 24th at the opening of the Manitoba highway. I assure you that you will be treated royally regardless of your politics or any other affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that this Government will see fit to do something for us about this three miles of road that we are asking for. We are not asking for them to widen the road to Beaver Lake. Traffic is heavy on that road, but it is not really dangerous. It is this first three miles which really we do need.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to drop the topic of roads for a moment, and talk about stores for a little while. I see by the paper here, in several different cases, where the Saskatchewan Government are putting up stores in outlying districts. Surprising as it may seem, I might say that I am in favour of that in some of these outlying districts where at the present time there are no stores. Buy a year ago this Government saw fit for some reason or another to put up a store in the Indian village opposite Denare Beach on Beaver Lake. There were already three stores in operation there. One of these stores had been there for a period of more than twenty years. They did business with the trappers, the fishermen, and also the prospectors for a period of twenty years. When the Government was asked why they put this store up in the Indian village, they said it was because there was a period of time in the spring and the fall of the year – in the fall in the freeze up – that it was impossible to get across the bay for this short distance, and the same thing in the spring when they have their spring break-up. Well now, the Indians have done that for over a period of years and I want to point out to this Government that they have done themselves a great harm by opening this store at Beaver Lake. As I have said, there are three stores there, but I am speaking particularly of one man. He has been there for a period of more than twenty-five years. He is an oldtimer. He knows all the people for miles and miles around. He calls all the Indians and half-breeds by their first names. We have a population of 12,000 in Flin Flon, and I dare say he knows most of them by their first names. Now, when this Government or any other Government tries to run a man like that out of business, a man that is so well thought of as that man has been for over a period of years, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they are doing themselves a lot of harm. I understand that they are opening up stores at Cumberland House. What are they trying to do? Are they trying to run Hudson's Bay trading posts out of business? They are doing this all over the north country. It looks as if they are trying to drive the pioneers of the north out. Why? What's the idea? I notice that one word in the Socialist vocabulary is "exploiting". Sometimes I think

March 13, 1950

they work it to death. I have been through the north considerably, and I have got to know considerable about the Hudson's Bay stores, and I must say that I never ever have been exploited by any of the Hudson's Bay stores or trading posts through the north country. Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for the store business.

I would like to take you up to Reindeer Lake. Flin Flon is 500 miles north of us here. Reindeer Lake is another 130 miles north of Flin Flon. Just before the election in 1948, the C.C.F. Government sent men up into the Reindeer Lake with a bunch of contracts. These contracts apparently were quite to the liking of the fishermen because, apparently, the fishermen very readily signed them. Later on, I met some of these fishermen in the town of Flin Flon, and they told me that they were happy about the arrangement that they had with the Saskatchewan Government regarding fish.

This Government in the meantime had acquired a Canso flying boat which is the answer to all the difficulties of the north in so far as transporting the fish goes. The men told me that they were getting a very attractive figure for their fish and they were picked up daily at Reindeer Lake. I realized the fact that they were well satisfied, and I did not bother talking fish or anything else to them. I just passed the time of the day in a funny sort of manner and let it go at that. However, Mr. Speaker, after election time, when the ballots were counted up and the C.C.F. found out they had lost the Cumberland seat, things started to work out a little bit different. It was not long until the fishing season, towards the end of the season, possibly ten days before the season closed, the Government broke faith with those fishermen on Reindeer Lake, Mr. Speaker. That Canso flying boat was pulled off the service. The fishermen were left with fish on their hands. They had not been able to get their winter supplies in. That does not help any Government either, Mr. Speaker, breaking faith with a bunch of fishermen 600 miles north of nowhere. Just ten days before I came down here, 12 of these fisherman came down to Flin Flon. Who did they hunt up this trip? They didn't laugh in my face and tell me they had a wonderful contract with the C.C.F. Government. They came to me and said, "Lorne, can you help us out? We are in trouble". I said, "Well, I don't know. What are your troubles?" I spent three days with them. We got down to brass tacks and finally we got some progress. Now the fishermen are back on the job again and are quite happy, and according to an item they had published in the paper, they say that their troubles are over and the fishing project is in responsible hands. So much for the fishing.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley said something about a rumour. A rumour, well now you know what a rumour is. Maybe you do, maybe you don't. It can be anything. It can be a myth can't it? But the rumour that he mentioned was in regards to rats. We have had birds and bees in the House and I think one of the hon. members across the House introduced a bedbug the other day. I don't know why I can't have the privilege of introducing a rat pelt or two. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter in my hands written in Cree. It is a little too much for me; I could not quite make it out. However, a friend of mine understood it quite well, and he has been kind enough to translate this letter along with several others. If you don't mind, Mr. Speaker I would like to read just a part of it here. This letter is about one matter. Now there is some wording in it that is a little bit crude, a little bit difficult to read, but still the meaning is there. He goes on to say:

"The one matter, and that is a wish of those of us who live in the Cumberland House in Birch River mainly that we want to regain the old way of living that the Indians had. That is for this that I write you in advance so that that man who we elected may be told what it is that we want done for us, and I do not mean C.C.F. So you shall read this letter. Indeed and truly, this is for sure what the people want. And you can tell him also of your own mind. This we hate – that our furs be sold for us instead of making our own bargain with the dealers. And also this we hate – that we may not kill the animals, practically nothing we are allowed to kill to eat. Many an Indian is hungry for there is not enough food to be had for him to eat, and there is not enough work to go around. So if you understand this letter will you please set this matter forward in as much as in your power, so that our desire may come to pass in truth. This is the truth I am telling you. That is why I write you in advance to discuss it. I am not of jellery. (Now, I don't know just exactly what he means by that phrase). It is of them that I am chiefly concerned. You can just let me know if you get this letter. Now one other thing, we had a tremendous rain here during elections, but all the same we walked over and deposited our names to help that man to who we look now (and he's got in brackets here 'not C.C.F.'). Here we acted like grown men. Now let him act the man for us in this matter of our desires."

Now, this is only one of many letters, Mr. Speaker. I will try to run over some of these presently. Now here is another letter that is written by an Indian. As I have said, it is a little difficult to get some of this over the way it should be, but I will do my best. This letter is written on July 10th:

"Dear Sir: I write today. I do this on behalf of all municipality areas (and also he speaks on behalf of all his band). Since you visited here in our settlement before the election, we all suffer with hunger. We don't know how we are going to live. Most of us have to wait another month before we can get anything to live on. Fur Markets stated some of our furs would not be sold until August 10th"

This is written on July 10th, some months away before they can get any money to buy food with: —

"For example, will sell 36 of my muskrat pelts and one beaver on August 10th and still I don't know when they will sell my other 70 muskrat pelts and 7 beavers. This is only one person's worry. Never before we suffer such burdens, like we have here today and this year. Some of us are fishing on five cents a lb. on white fish, trout and pickerel.

March 13, 1950

(just let that soak in a minute boys) five cents a lb. white fish, trout and pickerel and nothing for jack."

He goes on to say:

"In a few days there will be a meeting of the men (that is the Indians down there). We will gather and have our meeting here with Chief Linklater and all his band and all the Metis trappers, and we will let you know how many of us don't want the Fur Marketing Service. We don't want it. We'll tell you".

Trappers, nearly 25 are here with him at the time he is writing this letter, you see am satisfied with the Liberals, but we will hang on until the next provincial election".

I would like to ask the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley whether he can say that is a rumour. Is that a rumour? I have a letter here dated July 20th. This letter here is very difficult to read so I got my wife to go over it slowly and type it out. I daresay my wife spent some time deciphering the letter. This came from Lac la Ronge on July 20, 1949.

"We, the undersigned trappers stationed at Lac la Ronge are very dissatisfied and disappointed with the manner the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Service handles and markets our beaver pelts, muskrats and beaver pelts, and above all in the matter of paying us for our furs. We want no part in it to sell any or all our furs that we trap. That is our living and has been as long as Saskatchewan has been known as a province. This also applies to the Fish Board. We are willing to face privately, but will not face and hand over our catches to the Saskatchewan Fish Marketing Services."

Now, while this letter was written from Lac la Ronge, it really could refer to the trappers at Montreal Lake, and here is a list of the trappers' names. Now if any members across the House would like to verify any of these statements or letters or the names on there, they are quite free to do so. I have this petition here, and it contains 85 names.

Here is another one along the same line, and this also is a typewritten copy with the names below and there are 64 names on that page, another 50 on that page, another 31 here. Now, I think that is not a rumour. Now here is another one from Lac la Ronge written on August 4, 1949.

"Do your best to get some settlement from Mr. Brockelbank. I have seen trappers who make up the population of the north in the honours given by the Saskatchewan Government. Never were they so hard up as they are since the C.C.F. Government came into power."

And it goes on to say with regard to roads:

"We are taxed to the maximum and beyond all reason and the only road improvement has been for their own benefit, and there are several highways where there has not been one day's work done and the roads are a disgrace. You cannot drive a car over them; nothing but a truck can pass over that portion of the road."

Here is another one, written on August 28th, and this is also in the form of a petition. It has twenty-eight names: This is the letter of Chief Linklater, and he thought possibly it might be delayed in the mail and he was anxious that I should get this letter, so he got his dog-team and travelled sixty-five miles in weather 40 below zero to see that I got the letter in time to bring it to the House. Time is getting on, and this letter is along the same lines as the others.

Premier Douglas: — If I may ask a question, I was just wondering if any of these names on these petitions, or any of the petitions themselves, had been submitted to the Minister or to the Fur Marketing Service. I notice that since they are dated last August, they are quite old. Had they been submitted to the responsible Minister or to any of the Government agencies, or are they petitions to the hon. member himself?

Mr. Blanchard: — No. In July I went out among the various parts of my constituency and the boys came to me and outlined the situation and told me of the seriousness of the situation and these petitions started to come in. I did write to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources and he answered the letter by return mail and reminded me that meetings would be held through the entire north country. I understood from the context of the letter that there would be trappers there and they would be able to choose for themselves whether they wanted compulsory marketing or whether they wanted to sell on the open market. Now, I understand one meeting like that was held at Prince Albert and that approximately 125 trappers attended that meeting and the vote there was 75 for and 50 against; but I understand the Government and trappers are still meeting in the north — is that correct?

Premier Douglas: — The vote was much higher than that for proceeding with the marketing scheme. I also believe that these men were not just picked as trappers. They were representatives of councils; they were representatives from each district, each conservation block or from an area, so that they were really representative of many more than that. I believe some further meetings are being held.

Mr. Blanchard: — Well, these men that signed these petitions are men that have regulation trapping blocks, if that is what you mean. I daresay that I can tell you I know a lot of these men, I have put in considerable time with them and I know them personally.

I have a letter here written on February 8, 1950:

"I am very pleased at getting your letter, also that Battlefords by-election results came out right. Very well. We hope you will do all you can to get some commercial fishing stopped on Lac la Ronge. If they insist upon increasing

March 13, 1950

we will soon have very little left for the tourists, and they want fish."

Two years ago when I was visiting Cumberland, there were four American fishermen in there and they were prepared to spend a bit of money to catch a few fish. They hired a boat and they had to row twenty-five miles to get into a place called Hunter's Bay to catch a few fish. After fishing for two or three days, they found out that luck was against them; but the guide seemed to be a good sort of a chap and he told them, "I know where you can get some fish. Over on the lake here, there are some commercial fishermen and you can get some trout over there". Well, I saw the trout – sixty-five of them; and they averaged from six to sixteen pounds apiece. They were in the lockers up there at Lac la Ronge; they were frozen. I did not notice at the moment, but one of the men up there called my attention to it. He says, "Do you see the gill marks on the nets?" Now that is not what the tourist wants. He goes up there to fish. He doesn't want to have buy the fish. He wants the sport of catching them. But if they continue fishing in Lac la Ronge as they are now, the lake is going to be depleted in a very short time. I have heard several men complaining about the fishing at Lac la Ronge, and I think that there are more tourists than ever travelling through that country. It is a lovely spot there; but I must say that we have a very nice spot on the east side of the province too.

I have a letter written on January 24, 1950, and it goes on speaking about the conservation of fur. It says:

"It is very necessary to remember a factor which seems to have been forgotten – that of fur. Mink (he says) now are at the top; fox is coming back into demand – long-haired fur. In spite of the quota system and the amount of muskrat seen after the close of the trapping season, the muskrats will be short this spring. I question if the fall trapping was advisable."

So the quota system has not overcome the natural cycle. After all, if we want to know things about fish, furs and so on, we still have to go to Indians for it – the pioneers of the north. If we want real inside information that is our source of supply. According to the Indians beavers are plentiful, but from 1940 to 1947 there was only one trapping season and it goes on to say that a dam was built at the north end of Montreal Lake. It raised the water level, and dark things were floating around in the water. I fail to see the conservation.

Then it goes on to talk about the Indians:

"We were, prior to the advent of a C.C.F., given free licences. Now they pay for them.

I was given to understand that there was some agreement with the Indians that dates way back to Queen Victoria's time, but this Government, for some reason or other, seemed to do away with that and they are making the Indians pay for their licences. This man goes on to ask:

"being minors by law, is it legal for deductions

on sales of furs, which is income, to collect from Indians on the sale of their furs?"

Now that was too much for me. I could not answer that one. The fur buyers usually have three grades for muskrats, but the Saskatchewan Fur Market has eleven grades and he wants to know how they get their eleven grades. He goes on to say that, before the advent of the C.C.F. Government, they only had one field man fifty miles away and he came up twice a month; now there is a man seven miles away and another permanent man at the north end of Montreal Lake, and he goes on to ask "Who is going to pay for all this?" Then he ends up by wanting to know whether the 17 per cent deduction goes to pay these men's salaries.

I have an interesting bill here, Mr. Speaker. There is a fellow from Pelican Narrows delivers two beaver pelts to the field officer for which he gets an advance payment of \$6.00 per pelt. The pelts were sent to the Fur Marketing Board here at Regina. He is charged a levy fee of 25 cents, express of 20 cents, a sales commission of 53 cents, and down at the bottom here, commission on sales \$1.05 but, for some reason or other, after the fur pelts get here they find out they are only worth \$5.25 each, and they are \$10.50. There are charges here of 25 cents, 20 cents, 53 cents and \$1.05 against it, so the poor Indian, who thinks he is going to get another \$12.00 for these pelts, instead finds out that he owes the Government \$3.53. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only one.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Did he try to get an explanation of this from the Fur Marketing Service? I am asking you if you have taken this up with the Fur Marketing Service to try to get an explanation and get the facts verified?

Mr. Blanchard: — I see you don't like that stuff, boys.

Premier Douglas: — I would appreciate knowing with whom it was taken up. My hon. friend can say it and still be courteous; he does not have to be bad-mannered merely because he has not got a case.

Mr. Blanchard: — I did mention the fact here, or I guess I didn't either — I intended to. After the deferred election up there in 1948, our hon. Premier had occasion to have an article published in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' saying that the people of the north required further education. I am sure the Premier will quite likely remember that, and I think he used that on one other occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. Premier that the people of the north area have, through some way or other, acquired further education. During the Federal election, we were able to elect a Liberal member over a C.C.F. member to hold a seat in Ottawa. He was also able to have co-operative farm established near Sturgis, also a school and dormitory for the students, but that apparently did not do him any good. He was beaten by a very comfortable majority, and I would like to point out to you, too, Mr. Speaker, that our Liberal candidate never got as far north as Hudson Bay Junction. Now that speaks pretty well for the education of the north, doesn't it? Now then, on the Manitoba side, we were also able to elect a Liberal member. Then, in November, at the time of the provincial election, a C.C.F. member (for some reason or other he was ostracized publicly from the C.C.F. Party) decided to run on an Independent ticket. They then nominated a straight

March 13, 1950

C.C.F. candidate. The C.C.F. candidate lost his deposit and the Independent candidate came very nearly losing his. Our Liberal candidate up there – a young man only 32 years old – won out by a majority of over 2,370 votes. So much for the further educating of the people of the north.

Now I would like to call your attention to some interesting figures that I read in this book here. I am getting back to that word 'exploiting'.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I would like to ask a question at this point. Did I understand the hon. member from Cumberland to state that the correspondence and the petitions that he has been quoting from would be available for the Minister for study and consideration?

Mr. Blanchard: — It is. It would be a pleasure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to this little book from the Natural Resources Department. There are some very interesting figures here. On page 80, at the bottom of the page on Table No. 18 at the bottom of the column on the right hand side, is a figure there of \$1,424,400. At the top of that it is headed 'Royalty Revenue from Mineral Products' and it goes on to tell you what they are; gold, petroleum, natural gas, quartz, alkali, etc. Now then, if you look at the centre column under the heading 'Quartz' and read the figures there – \$1,286,638.62. Now, if our hon. Minister were here I would get him to check these figures and see if they are right or not. The way I have it figured is that it is an old royalty covering the whole of the province of Saskatchewan for coal, petroleum, Quartz and alkali. The total royalty is only \$137,762.38 – I don't want to leave the cents off. Now, I am just wondering whether the members in this House realize just how much is being contributed to this from the constituency which I represent. The amount is a million and a quarter dollars of revenue that this Government is getting from my constituency, let alone what they get for the fish and the furs, lumber, insurance on automobiles and trucks. They get over \$5,000,00 alone for taxi cabs; they have to carry a licence and insurance with both provinces. The same way they get another \$1300 for the buses, and I could not tell you how much for privately-owned trucks and tractors and so on.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal for just a moment on their "exploiting" which the Government seem to make so much about. I want to take you back up to Flin Flon again. Three years ago there was a gentleman called us up there to a little settlement at Creighton and, if I am not mistaken, I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs was there at the same time. He tried to talk us into opening up a co-op store. Well, we thought pretty well of it. We did a bit of corresponding, and we thought it would be nice to have a store of our own. Just across the border on the Manitoba side, as soon as they heard what we wanted to do, they told us to hold off a few days to see what they could do. They thought it might be better if we had one good store, then have a couple of small ones. Inside of a very few days they got their feet under it; they appointed their committees, and the committees were sent out to sell shares in that business and inside of two weeks they had \$75,000 collected to start a co-op store. The real manager of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, a man by the name of Channing (you are all familiar with the name, I suppose), when he heard of what was going on and that \$75,000 had been collected in two weeks to start a co-op store, said "I want to meet these boys". It was arranged, and he said, "Boys, I understand you have \$75,000. What are you going to do with it?" "We are going to buy out the store over

on main street", he was told. "How much is the store?", he asked then, and the answer given was \$40,000. "Too much money," he said. "It will only leave you \$35,000 to stock your store. Hold off for ten days to two weeks to hear from me".

The boys did this, and they had another meeting within ten days' time. Mr. Channing started in to lay the cards on the table. He said, "Boys, I can buy a lot around the corner of Main and 4th Avenue. I'll tear the old buildings down, and I'll build you a complete modern store, fireproof, modern in every detail. This building will cost us \$100,000." Well the boys thought that was a lot of money, as they only had \$75,000. Mr. Channing said, "Here is what I am prepared to do. If you want to go through with this and it means holding off for a year, we will put the store up for you. You use your \$75,000 to stock, and we will rent it to you for \$1.00 a year". Is that "exploiting"?

Now then, Mr. Speaker, just this last year, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company contributed to the town of Flin Flon the sum of \$660,000, being 55 per cent of the total cost of installation of sewer and water – \$660,000. Now that is real money in anybody's language, and that is not "exploiting". I wouldn't say it was, anyway. Now then, in addition to that, just this year, and I will quote from our local paper up there – I just cut this small clipping out:

"Of the more than half a million dollars expenditure here in 1950, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited will contribute 55 per cent made up of \$156,626.05 towards the school budget, and another \$101,001.54 towards the town budget."

That is a quarter of a million there. That is not "exploiting". We have one Company like that up there; just one. There is room for two, and possibly three, more. The one there has been there for years and it will still be there for many years to come unless something is done about developing it. This Government makes such a big to-do about going up prospecting, locating, new finds; we get them every day. It looks to me as if every time they come into the House here they go to draw a red herring for us to trail. This year, they found asbestos right out in their backyard; last year, they found uranium out there. Next year, I suppose it will be marble. We know it is there, it has been there for years. We know it and the old prospectors up there know it; but every time just before the House opens for some reason or other there is a write-up in the paper. I don't know who is responsible for it, but it is in the paper anyway – "a new find". I don't know whether it has been lost for twenty years or more or twenty-five years, but still it's "a new find". I don't know who is responsible for it.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell a few more things that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting people have done for the town of Flin Flon. We had some trouble, during the war years, and we have had some trouble since, finding suitable accommodation for single men. Up there they are working shift-work – one crew goes on at eight o'clock in the morning, another at four in the afternoon; and they are followed by another group going on at twelve and work till eight in the morning, and that is the way it goes three hundred and sixty-five days of the year. We only have two holidays during the entire year, and that is Christmas and the first of July; at all other times

March 13, 1950

there is a 'skeleton' crew on the job. They cannot shut down. They have to keep going, therefore they only have two holidays during the year, and even then it is not a complete shutdown. The Company put up three large dormitories each one capable of housing one hundred single employees. Adjacent to that building they put up a large cafeteria, modern in every way, and this cafeteria is kept open twenty-four hours a day. The men can go in and get their lunch packed and take it underground, or go and eat there any time they wish, and I must say that the place is not like some of the old mining camps or old logging camps – it is spick and span for cleanliness. The cafeteria would do credit compared to any of the places that I have been in since coming to Regina. Now, again, that is not "exploiting."

We have a hospital plan up there. The Company has a hospital. The operating room leaves nothing to be desired. The lighting fixtures in there are the best it is possible to arrange. The X-ray requirements and equipment is equal to the best in the Dominion of Canada; iron lungs and all. We have seven doctors up there, and it costs up \$5.95 a month to keep an outfit like that going up there. We don't think it is so much; we think it is all right because we get complete coverage. We get everything, ambulance and everything else; and, as far as air ambulance is concerned, if it is a case of bringing anybody in from my district, the Company does that and nobody ever hears anything about it; there is never any charge made, nobody hears a word of it. There is no great big hullabaloo about it; it is just done.

There is another little write-up here that I would like to read to you. Time is getting on – I had no idea I was so long-winded. Mr. Speaker, this is a little clipping I took out of one of the local papers up there called the 'Flin Flon Daily Miner'. We have two local papers up there, and that is more than you can boast about in Regina. It goes on to say here:

"Flin Flon has high average income; According to a story appearing in the January 7th issue of the Montreal 'Standard', Flin Flon, Manitoba, and Oshawa, Ontario, closely follow Quebec City as having the highest average income in Canada. The report states that Quebec City taxpayers have an average income of \$2,585, closely followed by Oshawa with \$2,552 and Flin Flon with an average wage of \$2,546.

Not bad for our neck of the woods, Mr. Speaker!

Here is another thing I would like to call your attention to. I only have a few words on it but it means a lot to us up there. It may mean a lot to you people down here only you don't realize it. But in case there should be conflict between our countries and Russia, we of the north up there are lying in a very vulnerable spot and you know that that type of manufacturing is of vital importance and I want to call your attention to this: some day, these same fishermen and trappers and prospectors up in our country may be a very valuable asset to this Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that this Government is collecting large sums of money from furs, fish, lumber, car licence insurance, and over one million and a quarter dollars in royalties from the Cumberland constituency, and giving us so little in return, I can see no need for the increased tax. Therefore, I cannot support the budget.

Mr. Lofts: — Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn the Debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 18 – An Act to amend The Jury Act

Hon. J. W. Corman (Attorney General): — I have to catch a 'plane, so I couldn't speak more than ten minutes if I wanted to, this afternoon. This is a Bill amending The Jury Act. The first amendment proposed for your consideration is to raise the age limit for jurors from sixty to sixty-five. I had a lot of smart things here to say about men of sixty still being in possession of most of their faculties. Probably the arguments of most of you would be for others – I might have a littler personal interest in that; but many of you I think will agree that when the age limit of sixty was put in there, life expectancy was fifteen or twenty years less than it is now. I submit that for your consideration.

The Bill also qualifies women for jury service. It makes service by the fair-sex optional and not compulsory. Now, I have a lot of historical data here that would be interesting, I know; probably more interesting not read. I may say that in Canada – Alberta and British Columbia both provide for optional service by women on juries. I may say that in Great Britain women are liable for jury service, but the exemptions allowed make it possible in practice for women to serve or not serve. The same thing is true in New Zealand – the women are made eligible but they are not compelled to serve; they must first notify the sheriff that they are willing to serve. The same thing is true in South Africa. Now in the States of the Union, there are still fifteen states where women are barred from jury service, and not considered qualified in fifteen states. In seventeen states they must serve on the same terms as men, but in actual practice, service, even in those states, is optional because of the exemptions allowed.

As to the qualifications of women for jury service, I think there will be general agreement in this House that they are equally capable of jury service with men. The only decision the Government had to make in recommending this Bill was whether service would be made compulsory or optional. We have decided that, while the time may come in Saskatchewan when women should serve on full terms with men, service by women on juries in Saskatchewan should be made optional, and that is what is contained in the Bill. I think, as I can't talk for half-an-hour that I will stop right now. I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.