

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session – Eleventh Legislature
19th Day

Tuesday, March, 14, 1950

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Monday, March 13, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)

Mr. W. T. Lofts (Meadow Lake): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the speakers on the other side of the House and on this side of the House for the wonderful speeches they have made. I do not wish to criticize the Government too much for what they have done or have not done. I think it is my duty to express my views and I would do that if I were on the Government side of the House or the side which I am on.

I have lived in the constituency I represent for the last forty-three years, and I have seen the ups and downs of it and I might say that, up there, there has been a great improvement in that long time. When I first came into the district we did not have any roads whatsoever, and I must say that there are parts in my constituency where there are still no roads. I will deal with the roads first.

Most of my constituency is under the L.I.D. branch and very little in the R.M's., so it is somewhat different to most constituencies. Most of my constituency has just been opened up in the last twenty years. I would like to take the east part of my constituency first, where the train service is very poor and there are no completed highways. In this same district, which takes in a number of towns and hamlets, such as Fairgood, Lundred, Bellevue, Lusted, Robin Hood, etc., these districts are mixed farming districts. For instance, in the district I have just spoken of, I would say that, in 1949, there was about 3,000 head of cattle and a larger number of hogs trucked out of Prince Albert, North Battleford and Saskatoon. Most of this stock is picked up miles off No. 4 and No. 40 highways. This means that the truckers have to travel over roads almost impossible for travelling at times. These settlers have looked forward, for years, to having highway No. 55 completed so as to give them at least one good outlet. A few years back I was with a delegation at Regina, which consisted of twenty-five members and which came all the way from Prince Albert and Turtleford to ask the Government if it was at all possible to have No. 55 completed without delay. There is a very long gap that is still uncompleted which runs through the most important part of this district. Spiritwood and Lloville and all points in that part, which takes in a large district, are very badly in need of a road running out to connect up with No. 40 and No. 5 highway in order to give them a more direct route out. When the Liberals were in power six miles of this road was built south of Spiritwood. I cannot help but give the people of this district credit for what they have done. They have built a most up-to-date hospital, which they have financed and built mostly themselves, and that same district formed two snow clubs and have purchased two

March 14, 1950

rotary snow-plows to keep the road open which is their only means of reaching their market centres to shop, and to enable them to get to hospital in case of sickness.

We have heard a great deal from the other side of the House about the wonderful social services provided by the C.C.F. Government. I can grant they have made some improvement in social services. Every Government that has been in office in this province has made some improvement in social services; but no other Government had any more than half the money to spend that the present Government has. Most of the former Governments had only half of the \$60,000,000 that this Government is now spending. I want to ask the Government if more of this money could be spent in providing the very necessary social service for the people of my constituency. A large number of these people are a long way from dentists. The C.C.F. Party used to tell us that this dental care is a special necessity for children; and what we need in my part of the country is travelling dental clinics that will visit the schools and provide dental care needed by the children. What I have said about teeth may be said equally well about eyes.

These are the things the C.C.F. promised to do before being elected, but in my part of the province I notice very little, if any, change. When the Liberal Government had about \$30,000,000 a year to spend, there may have been an excuse for neglecting these necessary services. Now that the Government is spending about \$60,000,000 a year, we expect to see much more in worthwhile results. The \$100,000 a year that the Government spends for the experts who advised the Government to establish these 'problem' industries would provide real health services for my constituency, and taking in other districts would ultimately provide health services for every constituency in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk of the district of Rabbit Lake which has been settled for the last thirty-five years. They have a hospital and doctor. They have no market road whatsoever, and the closest market is North Battleford, a distance of forty-six miles over country roads, and in wet weather it is almost impossible to get there. Mr. Speaker, I think these people have good reason to complain.

I will now deal with the town and district of Meadow Lake. The town has a population of about 3,000. In the year, 1949, they shipped about four million bushels of grain and somewhere around three thousand head of livestock which comes in for miles over the most terrible roads. I must not forget to give to the present Government credit for the good work they have done on No. 4 highway; they made a real good job of it – if they will just keep up the good work and build up a good road to Makwa and Goodfellow and the inland points. We have a railroad to the east, a distance of about seventy miles and no other road connecting the two towns together. A number of miles of this road were built years back, and about four miles in 1949. By opening a road, it would save miles of travel to reach Meadow Lake.

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I was associated with the lumber industry in the north. I saw development under which a large number of small operators used portable sawmills. None of these men made very much money or profit. They made a modest living for themselves and their crews, they cut a lot of small stands that otherwise might have been left to deteriorate. They supplied us with lumber at very reasonable prices. That

hardy breed of lumbermen has almost completely disappeared under the C.C.F. lumber policy. They have been driven out of Saskatchewan. It is too bad for them, and not very good for the rest of us. They were the people who opened up the north country. They are a type of people we cannot afford to lose.

While I am on this question of lumber, I would like to remind the Government that there is a very fine stand of timber north of Flotten Lake, about ten miles from No. 4 highway. I suggest that a road be built into that stand so that it may be cut before it burns or is otherwise wasted.

I want to compliment the Government on a charge they made in their policy of the Timber Board. Under the general regulations all timber cut must be sold through the Timber Board at a price set by that Board. Under the recent change the lumberman cutting railroad ties may sell the rough stuff produced in sawing ties such as sides wherever he wishes. Previously he sold it and also his ties through the C.C.F. Timber Board. He must still sell these ties through that Board, but when he sells the sides of lumber off the ties he is once again a free man. This is a small concession, but it is something. Under the full programme of socialized planning promised in the 'Regina Manifesto' we should probably be very thankful for any small liberties we may enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, before the Saskatchewan Timber Board took over all the timber in the north, trucks came from all over Saskatchewan as far south as the United States' border to buy lumber. Since then there have been very few trucks come to buy lumber, because the Timber Board prices are too high. There is too much difference in the price that the operator gets and the price that the Timber Board sells it for. I still think that if the Government should charge the necessary royalties and let the operator sell lumber to whomever he wants, it would be better all around.

I would like to say a few words about the Saskatchewan Telephones in my constituency. There is only one line, which has to take care of Meadow Lake, Glaslyn, Fairholme, Robin Hood, Medstead, Glenbush, Rabbit Lake and Cochin, and all calls have to go through on the same line, and Cochin being a very good summer resort, and all calls having to go through Cochin, sometimes we have to wait as long as three or four hours to get a call through to North Battleford. In the busy season it makes it very inconvenient. I think the Government should do something about it. In his budget speech, the Provincial Treasurer told us of the huge profits made by this Telephone Corporation. I hope some way may be found under which a very small part of this province may be used to string a few extra wires in the north country so that the busy farmers do not have to sit for hours while they wait for telephone calls.

I would like now to take a little time to deal with the farmers who live a few miles from Turtle Lake and other lakes. In the winter, quite a number of them would like to take out a domestic licence to catch a few fish for themselves and their families. If they live more than nine miles from the lake, the Government will not grant them a licence. I do not think it is fair that farmers who have lived and paid taxes for years in the lake vicinity, are not able to catch a few fish for themselves. It so happens that a family which lives nine and a half miles from the lake likes fish and needs fish just as much as a family which lives eight and a

March 14, 1950

half miles from the lake, is not allowed to fish. There is just one way to handle this situation, and that is to sell any person who wants it a domestic licence. That was the policy which was followed until the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, another matter even more serious is the constant depletion of our nearby lakes of fish. Cold Lake, as you all know, has been made a ghost town through a policy similar to this in connection with fishing; there is neither sporting or commercial fishing, and I will give you the facts. Up until September 8, 1949, during the whole angling season of that year, there were four lake trout taken out of Cold Lake by anglers, and I also wish to inform you that all nearby lakes of this country are being depleted on the same scale through a fish policy which will be the ruination of all fishing in all lakes on account of this summer netting in excess amounts. There should be a much larger appropriation made available to have these lakes in the north stocked with fish which may thrive in these waters, and save for the future generations those fish so essential to the people who use and require the fish from these lakes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the Government has raised the Education Tax from two to three per cent, it has only taken it off fertilizer and attachments and has not taken it off tractor parts which are so necessary for every farm tractor in Saskatchewan. They have raised the Education Tax on a \$2,400 car or truck from \$48 to \$72, and speaking for the people of my constituency they were promised in 1944, if they elected a C.C.F. Government, that the Education Tax would be taken off, and now in 1950 the Government has raised the Education Tax to three per cent, you will just know what the people think who want to buy a car or truck, or a dealer who has to collect that \$72 when it was promised, in 1944, that if the C.C.F. was elected, there would be no tax.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the budget.

Mr. Speaker: – There is an old standing rule that speeches cannot be read verbatim. I have been very lenient in not taking notice of long, extended notes and things of that kind, but I think we should not establish a precedent in this House where a member reads a whole speech so flagrantly. I think we have got to discontinue that practice.

Mr. B. L. Korchinski (Redberry): – Mr. Speaker, I assure you I am not going to read my speech. I stand up here, today, to take part in this budget debate, and before I enter any criticisms I have with regard to the budget I would like to present a few requests of my people from the Redberry constituency. When I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, I am performing my duty as their representative. I am not speaking as an individual here, for myself; but I am speaking in the name of thousands of people whom I represent, people who belong to various political parties – Liberal, C.C.F., Conservative and others. I am not here to ask favours or charity, but to ask justice.

Some of the requests that I have present are in connection with the highways. We have two highways running through the constituency of Redberry. Both highways run east and west; but it so happens that our main trade centre is Saskatoon, and our trade flows south and north, and there is a crying need for some improvement in this respect. Highway No. 5 is the highway that connects Edmonton through North Battleford to Saskatoon. From Radisson this highway to Battleford is in terrible condition. There is very

heavy traffic on this highway, and yet it still remains in a very horrible condition. I think that something should be done to improve this highway – it should be rebuilt from Radisson on to North Battleford, and I believe that it should be hard surfaced. I have heard members get up here and tell us how much hard surface they have in their constituencies. I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is not one inch of hard surface highway in our constituency and I think it is time that something should be done to this highway from Radisson. One day this highway is going to be the trans-Canada highway – no matter what happens now. I believe that this highway should be put in very good condition.

Then there is the matter of highway No. 40, connection from No. 40 to No. 12, and I believe that the member for Shellbrook will support me in this request. There is a crying need for the link from No. 40 highway from Blaine Lake across the North Saskatchewan river to No. 12. This link would serve a very large area north of the North Saskatchewan river. It would take in people from Big River, Spiritwood, Shellbrook, Parkside, Leask, Glaslyn and Blaine Lake, and would give them a short cut to Saskatoon. Now this is the situation. The distance from Blain Lake to Saskatoon, if this line was constructed, would be fifty-six miles. Today, the people have to go to North Battleford to get to Saskatoon – a distance of one hundred and seventy miles; on a round trip they have to make two hundred and twenty-eight miles. This means about \$5.50 to every motorist that makes a trip to Saskatoon. I don't think it is just, to ask these people to do this continually and I believe that there should be a link constructed without delay. Then there is the matter of a link from No. 40 to No. 5 travelling south. There should be a connection constructed somewhere between Speers and Krydor to No. 5 highway in the south. This link would serve people of Krydor, Hafford, Speers, Richard, Keatley, Alticane, Mayfair, Whitkow, Redfield and Mullingar, and all those points there. This is what the situation is today. If anyone wishes to go to Saskatoon from this point they have to back-track to North Battleford. If this link was constructed, the difference from Hafford to Saskatoon would be 70 miles; now it is 145 miles. On a round trip a motorist has to make 150 miles extra, which would cost in the neighbourhood of \$3.75 for gasoline alone. And I may say that the last of these two connections is to the disadvantage of the city of Saskatoon. I hope that the members for that city will take this under notice. Our people like to go to Saskatoon and trade there, but since they have to make these extra long trips they cannot make their visits as frequent as they would like. And so what happens? Most of the things that they could get in Saskatoon they have to order through mail from Eaton's in Winnipeg, and so a lot of our trade goes to Winnipeg instead of Saskatoon.

Besides these two roads, there is a crying need for highways for the north country. Mayfair, Mullingar, Whitkow, Alticane, and those places have no highways. They are thickly settled districts. There are many people there, many farmers, and yet they are about 30 miles away from the highway. Take Whitkow as an example. This place, a fairly large little community, is about 30 miles away from any highway. They have one train a month. Did you ever hear of such a thing? One train a month! On the second Friday of every month they get a train. There are no commercial roads from that place to anyplace. There are very few 'phones in there. And so you can see what those people have to go through. In case of sickness or emergency quite often there are cases where they have to drive 30 miles by team to take that emergency to the hospital. The Air Ambulance is not there, because as I said, there are very few 'phones in there, and how are you going to contact

March 14, 1950

the air ambulance? There is a bad need of market roads in the whole constituency. Take the area north of Hafford. People for some 26 miles have to come down to Hafford on very poor roads. And then the area south of the Redberry Lake, the Great Deer area, they certainly need some good roads in there. I believe that this Government should make bigger grants to the municipalities so that these municipalities could construct these market roads.

When I am asking for these roads, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, I am not asking for any favours, I am asking for justice to be done. I hope that the Minister of Highways, who is supposed to be a just man, will consider this request. Our motorists in the constituency pay the same licence fees as any others. They also pay the gasoline tax. For every ten gallons of gasoline bought in that area, there is \$1.00 of gasoline tax that goes to the Government. So these roads that they are asking for now have been paid long ago, and I hope that the Minister will see fit that they should be immediately constructed. Since his Department is asking for a large appropriation, I hope that he will see his way clear to start work there this summer.

Another general need in our part of the country is electric power. There are many villages that are without this power. If you start down the line and follow down to Richard, Speers, Hafford and Krydor and the large communities you have no power connection. And as you go down the line to Keatley, Alticane, Mayfair and Mullingar, Redfield and Whitkow, there is no power connection in there. At Hafford there is a hospital and they are obliged to operate their own generating plant to supply this hospital with electricity. That whole area is very thickly settled with farmers, and I believe that the Power Commission would find very good business there in rural electrification. So much, Mr. Speaker, for my clients.

I would like to deal for a few minutes with the budget. We were told by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fines), that the income of the people of this province, is declining, and yet we notice that the taxes are going up. Last year, our budget was \$49 million; this year it is \$55 million, an increase of \$6 million. It is a very queer type of financing, Mr. Speaker: The less the people earn the more the hon. Minister proposes to collect from them. I think that just runs true to the Socialist schemes. Lenin and those who proposed Socialism, said that "capitalism may be induced to commit suicide by over-taxation"; and I think that is what the Minister had in mind when he drew up his budget. The less people get the more tax they have to pay, so that finally the capitalist system that we have will commit suicide. This type of budgeting and the type of the Socialist legislation that we have grafted on this province in ruining our province.

Look at the law books of Saskatchewan. Each year, especially under the C.C.F., they are growing thicker and thicker with regulations, amendments, orders-in-council, and the socialists are happy about the growth of the laws. Don't be so happy! These laws are the new law and new Act that you pass tied somebody's hands; the labourer, the farmer, the merchant, the professional man, and the various services are all tied in a knot. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are enough laws in this province now to put all the citizens in this province behind bars, including the Government. One day I think somebody should get up in this House and propose that we pass a law to prohibit passing any more laws.

The type of budget that we have here presented to us is pressing

hard on the farmer. And what is the result? The result is the ruining of the farmer of Saskatchewan. Farmers are vacating their farms; they are moving away from the farms; they are moving to the cities; they are moving out of the province. Here are some very interesting statistics on your population trend in Saskatchewan. In 1941, there were some 600,000 people living on the farms in Saskatchewan and 295,000 in the cities and urban centres, making altogether 895,000 population in Saskatchewan. This gives you a percentage of 67 for the rural population and 32 for the cities. What do we have today? By the way, I was surprised how these men on the other side were claiming that the population was increasing. I cannot find statistics to prove it. Today, in 1950, according to the latest information I could get in the Library, we have 500,000 in rural areas and approximately 360,000 in the cities and towns and villages, making a total of 860,000. The percentage basis is 60 for rural areas and about 40 for the cities. The farms lost 100,000 in population in this space of time, the cities gained 75,000, and there is a total loss over all the population of 35,000. I heard somebody claiming that our population was increasing. There is a loss of 35,000 population of Saskatchewan in this period. We have the cities' population increasing by 7 per cent in this space of time. I think that the labourer should take a good look at this trend; and the labour bosses, to the union heads who glory in uniting themselves with the C.C.F. and forcing the common labourer to toe the C.C.F. line. They should take a look at these statistics. The policies of this Government are driving the farmers into the cities, and what will be the net result of this? The C.C.F. is destroying rural Saskatchewan and the labour bosses are helping along. So the labourer is helping the C.C.F. Government to kill the goose that laid the golden egg; because we should not forget that there is no other reason for cities in Saskatchewan to exist. The cities of Saskatchewan exist for the service of the farmers. Our economy is a farm economy, and all the people in the cities serve the farmer. Without the farmers there is no reason to have the cities. And so you destroy your farmers by letting them remain in your cities.

Now why did the farmers move away from the farms? Quite a portion of them moved away in the last few years. Why did they move away? Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons, but one of the main reasons is that the Government of Saskatchewan has failed to keep pace with the advancing Machine Age. The members across the way are happy and laughing; but what we have in Saskatchewan is a horse-and-buggy Government in the form of the fast cars, tractors and combines. You cannot expect the age of speed to live in the presence of widening cow paths and washboard roads. What happened in the past six years? There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that our people, our farmers have had prosperous years. There was prosperity in spite of the fact that the C.C.F. friends attacked the Federal Government. It was due chiefly to the policies of this Federal Government that our people during these past years enjoyed that prosperity. Farmers had money, and so what did they do? They advanced in farm machinery, in tractors, in cars, in trucks. What do we see now? This is the trend today: a farmer leaves his farm to work his land; he is ten, twelve, fifteen miles away from town. In the winter he is snowbound all the time, he would often believe that it is not safe for him to stay on the farm so he moves into the village. He buys himself or builds himself a home in the village and for the winter he moves to the village.

Why should he be expected to stay on the land; but if you cannot use your car more than six months a year because you are snowbound for

March 14, 1950

six months or more of the year, how do you expect the farmer to stay on the farms? What is the solution for this? I know of one solution, and I think that the main solution is to keep the roads open for the farmers. I am not saying that plan never entered the minds of this Government. They are too busy with their Socialist planning boards; they are too busy advancing new ways of collecting taxes.

I would like to give you an example what common people can do for themselves if they are given a chance – and I will take Speers, one of our little communities, as an example. This little community is a mile away from No. 40 highway, and as soon as the first heavy storm comes, the road to Speers is blocked. And do you know what the people used to do the last two years? They used to round up all the men and all the boys and all the people who were free, and they would go out with shovels and spades and open up that one mile. There was a snow-plow sitting down in North Battleford not doing anything. They asked them to come out and open that mile; that was not worthwhile, they would sooner sit on their fannies in poolrooms and in beer parlours, and we have to dig through the snow with shovels. Now, that has happened for the last two years. But this year necessity is the mother of invention. An enterprising individual thought of buying a snow-plow, and he is doing a wonderful job. There are some 25 or 30 cars in this community. We chipped in \$3.00 apiece. He charges us \$6.00 an hour to keep our roads open, and he does a wonderful job, and I venture to say that one man removes more snow off the road than the snow-plow from Battleford to North Battleford. He is kept busy, and he kept the roads open for many farmers, and that shows that it is possible. It is possible to keep those road open, and in the future in this province, whether this Government likes it or not, there will be plows in the municipalities that will keep the roads open for all the farmers who have cars, so that these farmers can farm their land and can be happy in their homes.

I have a suggestion to make in this respect, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that, instead of having the snow-plows sitting idle in the cities (because storms don't occur every day and that is the only time they have work), they should get out and open these main market roads. You say that that would cost extra money. I say that this will be paid by people using cars and paying extra gasoline tax. They would pay for this plow working on the side roads. I don't see any sense in these men getting paid and sitting around doing nothing while the farmers with shovels, and spades and little tractors, try to open up the roads. So the lack of roads, lack of year-round roads is what is driving our farmers off the land.

There is another thing, perhaps more fundamental, that works against rural people. That is the educational system that we have in this province, the philosophy of education. If you started from the primary grades up, what do you find. There is nothing there about farmers or very little. There is no attempt made to bring to the children the good of the farm. The whole education seems to be turning to the city. And if you go down into any common school today, into any common average high school, and ask the boys and girls what they are studying for, they will tell you that they are studying for doctors, for lawyers, for nurses, but there are very few there that are proposing to study for farmers. The love of the soil and the love of freedom in this land is not brought about to the children of this province. There is very little that they are told about the farm. The pictures in our books, the stories, all seem to be about the cities, about the bright lights, about

the streetcars, about the wonderful things that they have in the cities. There is nothing there about the dust and the gas and about the people stepping on each others toes in those cities. There is nothing about that in those books; only the good sides of the cities are presented. There is nothing to show the children of this province that it would be much better for them to live on the farm and be free. I think that there should be a careful study made of this whole trend in our education, as young people with this type of education are attracted by the city. They are attracted by the lights and like moths they fly and burn their wings on these city lights, and it is usually too late for them to go back to the farm.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the three cent tax. I don't think that I should pass up this wonderful opportunity to say something about it. There is no way that the C.C.F. can explain or justify their notion in this case. Prior to 1944, they very strongly condemned this Education Tax, and they promised to do away with it, and this was one of the things that put them into office. But once in office, Mr. Speaker, their attitude to this tax began to change; they grew more sympathetic. They are people with open minds. The tax which they called a "stinking tax", "abominable tax" and so on, now has become a good tax, a necessary tax, a just tax. Why not, it put them into office! As the years went by, the C.C.F. found praise for this Education Tax and, finally, they said to themselves, "Why not increase it? It's so good." Note, Mr. Speaker, how cunning and deceptive these Socialists are. To make this tax more palatable to the people of this province and to protect their soft under-bellies – what did they do? They disguised it in fine, flowery words. Now it is the Education and Hospitalization Tax. Notice the word "hospitalization" – a fine dress for a very unpleasant creature. Through years of propaganda, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists of this province have created in the public mind fear of their health, so that one would think, today, that any time we could all land in the hospitals of Saskatchewan. Health and hospitalization: those are words tender and close to the human heart. So who would dare to criticize health tax or hospitalization tax? Who would refuse to contribute? But what is the difference, Mr. Speaker? It still does not please the people of this province. Why not call it a 'disease' tax? Why call it a 'hospitalization' tax? A disease tax may have the better meaning because the people are robbed of their money and they have not the wherewithal to carry on, or it may be used to control diseases in this province. And when they tell us that this Education Tax was such a horrible thing when the Liberals had it, so they took out the regressive feature from this tax, they have taken out the fertilizers and grasshopper bait, forage crops and so on, especially grasshopper bait. Won't the grasshoppers be happy that they will be able to get their bait tax free?

Of course, they had a good word for the children of this province. I am quoting now from the Budget Address.

"Consideration has been given to remove the tax on children's clothing, but it has been found impossible."

Won't the children of this province, the little tykes, be happy to hear that their shining sun, the Finance Minister, "Three-cent Fines" was thinking of removing the tax. Such paternal love and solicitude, such warm hearts for the children of this province! But note, Mr. Speaker, what actually happened. Instead of taking the tax off children's clothes, he now

March 14, 1950

proposes to take the clothes off children's backs with this tax. What a financial genius!

Mr. Speaker, you will permit me to draw to your attention a few statistics at this point. The other day, we had some talk about this, and I think you will be interested, and I know a hundred thousand veterans in this province would like to hear these statistics which have no bearing in the present, but which may have some bearing in the future. The U.S.S.R., today, spends 25 per cent of their budget on armaments – it comes out to \$16 billion, the United States, the capitalist-Imperialists' are spending 6 per cent of their national income. Russia today has 9,000 combat planes, the United States has 2,000. Russia has 8,000 transfer planes, the United States has 5,000. Russia has 7,000 production per year, the United States has 1,000. Army: Russia has 2,600,000 under arms, the United States has 600,000. Russia has 125 divisions under arms; the United States has 9 divisions. Russia has thirty armoured divisions; the United States has one. Russia has 277 submarines, United States has 74.

Mr. Speaker: – Is the hon. member getting his information from notes, because he is wandering a long, long way from the budget. I think that the hon. member will agree that a great deal of latitude is given in this debate, but I do not think we should give that much of a latitude.

Mr. Korchinski: – I was trying to give some statistics in view of the fact of the things that are continually being said in this House. Who has the peaceful intentions in this case? Who is the man, who in the face of all these facts, these terrible facts, stands up in this House and gives rise to censure and pussyfoots around the whole problem. Who is the person who attacks capitalism, who attacks the American theatres – and I say "God Save America"; who never exposes or condemns Russia, who sanctions Communism, a man who makes declarations of faith in this Legislature. Who is that man? I say that that kind of a person is a fellow-comrade, is a fifth-columnist, is a Communist and is the worst type of quisling in existence.

Mr. Speaker: – The hon. member must retract that statement.

Mr. Korchinski: – At your pleasure, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that statement. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in this House the other day I was subjected to a sneak attack. The Minister of Social Welfare called me names.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think I need hardly draw to your attention that this is contrary to the rules of debate to refer to another debate which has taken place at the same session.

Mr. Korchinski: – Mr. Speaker, I am not quoting. I am just saying that my courage has been in question, and if the Minister of Social Welfare doubts my courage I will be willing to accommodate him any time or any place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have something to say about the speech, yesterday. I am not going to weary the members of the Government's side with any more talk. We had the Minister of Education, yesterday, defending his colleague the Finance Minister. His speech was very highly amusing. He

waded through mobs of figures and quotations. He made comparisons. Buy I say to that hon. gentleman that his comparisons were out of place. He was comparing Federal financing with Provincial financing; it is the same as comparing the Rural Municipalities with his Provincial financing. The two things are not in the same field. I believe that my hon. friends have made an excellent comparison between the performance of the Liberal Government and the C.C.F. Government in the same field, in this House. As soon as they have nothing to say, they attack Ottawa, they attack the capitalists. They want to tell us that the Massey-Harris, the Cockshutt, and the Railway companies are the pickpockets. They considered the increase in the railway freight rates as pickpocketing. But they forgot to draw to the attention of labour that a lot of these increases are labour wages. Well, is not Mr. Minister a pickpocket, too? Are all these men selling machinery pickpockets because they sell Massey-Harris Machinery? If you wish to compare governments, why don't you compare the Federal Government of this country with the Federal Government of the United States or of Great Britain. If you were talking about income taxes, why don't you talk about income tax in Great Britain and income tax here? His comparisons reminded me of a fable where a village blacksmith was shoeing a horse and a frog was watching him, and after the blacksmith got through with the horse, the frog stuck up his leg "I want to be shoed too."

The hon. gentleman talked about Mr. Flynn. He got into quite a tizzy about the book "The Road Ahead", and in no time he had arts and the Grain Exchange all tied up in a knot with Mr. Flynn; but he forgot to include Mrs. Bothwell, the librarian of this Legislative Library, because today they are promoting the reading of this book of Mr. Flynn's. This is the book I have in my hand. It is from the Legislative Library, and so why not include that with the Grain Exchange? This is a good book. You are not able to refute his arguments, so the best thing you can do is deny them and smear them up. That is the usual Socialist technique. The Minister was quite worried that we had blood-brothers in Ottawa. I am proud to be a political blood-brother to the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent. He is a fine statesmen and a perfect gentleman. You have no one that can compare to him; you cannot get near him. I say you are jealous.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose you can conclude that I am not going to support the budget.

March 14, 1950

Mr. J. G. Egnatoff (Melfort): – As this is the first time I am participating in a debate at the present Session, I would like to express my personal regrets at the passing away of Alvin Murray and Paul Price. Although I did not know Alvin Murray well, I have no reason to doubt that he was sincere, just as sincere as I am in my desire to serve the people of this province. After the passing away of these two honourable gentlemen, I could not help but think time and time again of the words of the poet who said:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints in the sands of time."

No doubt both of these honourable gentlemen have left their footprints in the progress of this province.

I would also like to pay a word of tribute to Mr. Patterson who is no longer in this Legislature. I feel it an honour and a privilege to have been associated with that hon. gentleman, and if the words 'honourable gentleman' were ever applicable to anyone, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will agree that they are indeed applicable to Mr. 'Billy' Patterson, whose name will go down in history as a great statesmen of this province.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my sincere congratulations, strange as it may seem, to the new member for Gull Lake and also to the members for Cannington and The Battlefords. In spite of the bit of crossfire – I was almost going to say spitfire – that goes across the floor of this House, I believe that all of these new gentlemen will find the surroundings reasonably congenial and I trust that they will all serve faithfully in the promotion of the welfare of the people of this province. To them I would just like to say this. If at some future date, some historian of provincial affairs picked up a book – perhaps memoirs – he might find these dates and words in the memoirs:

1937 – Imposition of the Education Tax by a Liberal Government, the purpose of which was to finance education – violently opposed by the C.C.F.

1938 – Clouds of Socialism were hovering over Saskatchewan. The Liberals re-elected in spite of the C.C.F. opposition to the Education Tax.

1944 – Clouds of Socialism enveloped this province.

1948 – Political storms; Socialistic clouds continued to hang over the province; some clouds, however, were gone with the wind and the sunshine of Liberalism was again beginning to peer through.

1949 – Political thunderstorms from coast to coast. What about the weather in Saskatchewan? Liberal sunshine dehydrated the C.C.F. seats. Clouds of Socialism had disappeared except in one place and that was over the banks of the Wascana.

1949-50 – Three by-elections in the province. Socialism was drought-stricken. Gull Lake. The provincial Department of Agriculture announced a reclamation programme, an irrigation programme, which turned out to be quite an irritation programme. Here was the solution. A certain T. C. Douglas carried a watering can and from the spout poured forth the promise of a Cabinet appointment. The result – plain to see; one of the quickest provincial political mushrooms sprang up over the heads of men who were equally worthy of Cabinet positions on the right side of you, Mr. Speaker.

Cannington by-election. This time it was an airplane spray. Gold, silver dollars; eight hundred thousand dollars were sprayed all over the constituency. The result – Cannington today is represented by a Liberal. The enticements were too wet, Mr. Speaker.

The Battlefords. New techniques had to be developed. What this time? The Government called into play its big spray equipment and they painted all over the constituency of The Battlefords, two hundred thousand dollars worth of work. The result, Mr. Speaker? – We are happy on this side of the House to have with us Jim Maher, the new member for The Battlefords, who I believe will make a very worthwhile contribution to the deliberations of this Assembly.

March 14, 1950

Much has been said about the international situation, I would just like to say this to members on both sides of this House. We should realize that both the United States of America and Canada have made a very great contribution to the reconstruction of the war-devastated United Kingdom and Western Europe. Canada alone, Mr. Speaker, in grants, credits and outright gifts, contributed about seven and a half billion dollars to the economic recovery of the United Kingdom. I would like to say, too, Mr. Speaker, that in these critical times of international tension, there is a very serious need for an attitude of firmness in dealing with the U.S.S.R. When I say this, Mr. Speaker, I am merely expressing an opinion which I formed during my service overseas when I was attached to the United Kingdom War Office. At that time I felt that the Western Powers should have adopted a very firm attitude towards the U.S.S.R. They should have said to the Soviet Union: "We have no desire to eradicate Communism from within the boundaries of your country. At the same time we will not tolerate the encroachment of Communism upon other nations where it is not wanted". We should have been prepared to back that firm stand with force – with an international police force.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting for me to note on what sections of this House we find our good neighbour to the south being criticized. It is on your right, time and time again, that we have the United States accused of imperialistic designs. It must give a great deal of consolation to the Soviet Union to know that there are men holding responsible positions in this country and in this province who are trying to drive a wedge of ill-will between the United States and Canada.

In view of the fact that, after all, in this Assembly we can do very little about the international situation and about the national situation, it was most encouraging to find the excellent manner in which the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E. M. Culliton) really got down to provincial affairs. It was also encouraging to find my colleague, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard), present in the Budget Debate the problems with which the people of the far north are confronted, problems which the C.C.F. Government has not attacked courageously and in fairness and in a spirit of justice so far as the people of the north are concerned.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg criticized the financial policy of the C.C.F. Government. Every member in this House, including the Provincial Treasurer and the Hon. Minister of Education, will agree that the hon. member for Gravelbourg made a charge which cannot be denied satisfactorily, namely, that the Government is doing nothing in the budget to assist rural municipalities, and that the C.C.F. Government continues to give no consideration to the farm people who make up the great part of Saskatchewan's population.

I enjoyed the Budget Address, Mr. Speaker. I have had the pleasure and privilege of listening to two Budget Addresses brought down by the Provincial Treasurer – not brought down, but up! He has "brought up" six budgets; I have perused all of his Budget Addresses – they are fine and make good reading. Not being a financial critic, Mr. Speaker, I propose to submit a report on one pupil, namely, Clarence M. Fines – Grade VI. I have

placed him in Grade VI because this is his sixth budget. This is the report:

"Main vocational interest – pronounced interest in operating public funds.
Language (spelling, composition) – A.
Delivery of Budget Address – seemed embarrassed.
Mathematics – good at figures.
Interest on Advances to Crown Corporations – nil.

- (1) Ø Financing social services by operation Crown Corporations, F.
- (2) Ø Municipal taxation, F. (complete failure in relieving municipal taxation)
- (3) Interest in Education, F. (continued failure to have the Provincial Government assume its responsibility for financing education)

Why such a report, Mr. Speaker? I propose to deal very briefly with each of the three "F's" that I have given to the Provincial Treasurer.

Now, first of all, one of the reasons why the C.C.F. Government proposed to go into business was that it felt that that would give them a source of revenue for financing social services. The Minister of Education stated, yesterday, that the hon. member for Gravelbourg and the Liberals, were more concerned about money than they are about people and social services. He seemed to imply that we would rather see people die than provide air ambulance service. There is just one thing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely false; it is an absolutely unsound implication to make. On the Minister of Education's part, that is sheer tommy-rot. Surely the hon. members opposite know that they have no monopoly on truth. They have no monopoly on the desire to extend social services to the people.

They claim to be champions of social services – so do we. There we stand on common ground; but there is this fundamental difference – we believe that educational health, medical, dental and hospitalization services, old age pensions, mothers' allowances and various other social services can be improved and extended only as we increase the production of our wealth. In other words, we on this side of the House believe that, to extend social services, it is necessary to have a sound economic base. The C.C.F., on the other hand, believe first of all in extending the social services and then trying to provide an economic base to support them.

The Premier of this province has stated that during the first four years of his administration in Saskatchewan, the idea was to extend social services that, during the coming years the policy of the C.C.F. Government will be to provide that solid and sound economic base which would be used to support the social services which had already been extended. There is just one thing wrong with that approach, Mr. Speaker. The hon. members on the other side are placing the cart before the horse. As a matter of fact, I suppose there is nothing wrong with placing a cart before the horse, the only trouble is you just don't go anywhere.

March 14, 1950

No doubt the hon. members on your right were sincere in their faith in the Government going into business. Here are some of the things they said, Mr. Speaker – this is how they were going to raise money to finance social services:

"The C.C.F. can obtain money from the wholesale distribution of petroleum products; raising of revenues by Government engaging in revenue-producing business; sponsoring the development of natural resources by public or co-operative ownership; the establishment of secondary industries such as grain alcohol and protein feed cake, wheat starch, wheat syrup, synthetic rubber, plastics, glycol anti-freeze and linseed oil."

Even the Premier, before he became Premier, had this to say – and this is a report in the Regina 'Leader-Post' of an address which he made in Gravelbourg in 1944:

T. C. Douglas, C.C.F. leader, declared in an election campaign speech here, Thursday night, that the C.C.F. if given power in the June 15th vote, would shift the basis of taxation from land and consumption to profits of mortgage companies, which he declared went out of the province. Mr. Douglas said forty million dollars went out of the province on the average each year, and taxation of this would provide one of the sources of financing the C.C.F. social programme."

Here is another statement made by J. H. Brockelbank, who is now Minister of Natural Resources:

"A provincial government," said Mr. Brockelbank, "can take a greater part in the distribution of goods and so save for the people of this province profits which are now lost to us. This can mean more and better social services for the people."

Here is a statement by another C.C.F. leader:

"We propose to take over the large corporations, the banks, large companies and the large insurance companies. The savings and profits realized by the large corporations would, under government ownership, go into the public treasury and would not be withdrawn from circulation. The profits could be used to improve the position of the people and provide them with a better life."

Sounds very familiar, no doubt, to the hon. members on the opposite side of this House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how have the Crown Corporations made out? Have they been sufficiently successful to pay for these many and varied social services? According to the Provincial Treasurer, the Crown Corporations showed net earnings to March 31, 1949, of \$3,270,000. Now, let us have a look at the report of the Government Finance Office referred to by the hon. member. What do we find? Some of these Crown Corporations have been referred to as 'problem children'. Let us have a look at them. Problem child No. 1, the foster parent of which is the Minister of Education – Saskatchewan Wool Products: deficit for the year ending December 31, 1948, \$147,000; during the year ending December 31, 1949, deficit of nearly \$78,000. No wonder the Provincial Treasurer had to increase the Education Tax!

Saskatchewan Leather Products – Problem child No. 2 – foster parents, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Public Health – and frankly, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Public Health and the Minister of Education know about boots and wool and tanning hides, I don't know.

The next problem child, and again the same foster parents – Saskatchewan Tannery: loss for the people of Saskatchewan in the year ending December 31, 1948, \$63,000; and during the year ending December 31, 1949, a further loss of \$9,800. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer had to increase the Education Tax?

Clay Products: a deficit December 31, 1948, of \$28,000. Saskatchewan Lake and Forest Products, Mr. Speaker – a deficit to the end of October, 1948, of \$27,000. Saskatchewan Box Factory – for the year ending December 31, 1948, a deficit of nearly \$11,000; and the same Box Factory showed a deficit during the year ending December 31, 1949, of another \$400.

Saskatchewan Fish Board, another problem child, showed a loss of \$198,000 for the year ending December 31, 1948. For the year ending December 31, 1949, it showed a further loss of \$163,000.

Mr. Speaker, for the year ending December 31, 1948, the Crown Corporations that I have enumerated have lost more than half a million dollars, and if you would add to that loss at the end of 1948 the further losses sustained during 1949, the total deficit amounts to \$816,000. \$816,000 of the people's money poured down the Socialistic drain.

It is significant to note that these losses do not include any interest charges on the money advanced to these corporations. If we were to include interest charges, the Provincial Treasurer would be the first to admit that the total losses sustained by these problem children amount to away over one million dollars – that is, on the corporations that are operating at a loss. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. Government had to raise the Education Tax.

Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that some of the corporations are showing a profit; but the two main profit-bearing corporations are the Saskatchewan Telephones and the Power Corporation, and both of these are utilities and any profits that are accrued as a result of their operation should be plowed under to extend further telephonic and power services. Therefore, if we are going to examine the Crown Corporations fairly, we should not consider

March 14, 1950

the profits of those two utility corporations.

Now, if we use the reasoning that the hon. Minister of Agriculture used in this House when he claimed that any time anybody makes a profit, somebody suffers a loss – you will recall the object lesson we had in this House, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture dropped his pencil to demonstrate the law of gravity and assured us that, just as surely as the law of gravity is good, so is his economic law that whenever anybody makes a profit, somebody must suffer a loss – here is the conclusion we must reach. The Government Printing Corporation makes a profit because of the business which it derives from the Saskatchewan Government. Therefore, if the Printing Corporation shows a profit, the Saskatchewan Government shows a loss, and we must inevitably cancel any profits that are claimed for that particular corporation, because what you are doing is taking money (if you have any) from the right pocket and putting it into your left.

Mr. Speaker, the Fur Marketing Service, if it is going to operate, I believe should operate as a producers' marketing service, and I cannot help but feel that it is only just and fair that any profits which are earned as the result of the operations of the Fur Marketing Service should be given back to the producers, that is the trappers. It doesn't matter what type of mental approach you have to this – if there is going to be any degree of fairness and justice, the profits accruing from the operations of the Fur Marketing Service should be given back to the primary producers – in that case, the trappers. So we cannot really take the profits of that corporation into account.

Now, if we subtract the profits of these two corporations and the profits of the Power and Telephone corporations, what is the net profit? One and one-third million dollars; we have reduced it to that. But we are not through yet. If we are going to examine this realistically, if we are going to examine this without the motive of trying to show the people of Saskatchewan that we are making money by going into business, then we should charge interest. The Provincial Treasurer should charge interest on the money that is being advanced to these corporations. Now, he may argue differently on the floor of this House but I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that if you got him off into a quiet corner by himself he would admit that that is the only fair way to operate a business.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – We should charge an amusement tax on this speech.

Mr. Egnatoff: – At least I wouldn't charge any education tax on it, Mr. Speaker. Now, if you take interest into consideration, what happens to the profits of the other so-called profit-making corporations? Mr. Speaker, the million dollar baby, that sodium sulphate plant, that million dollar baby which the member for Morse cherishes so dearly, would operate at a loss. If you charged interest on advances made to the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation, in spite of the successful operation of the lunch counters, even that one would operate at a loss. The same applies to the Saskatchewan Government Airways.

If we actually analyze this thing realistically, what is the conclusion that we must come to? There are only two Crown Corporations,

exclusive of the utility corporations, which show a profit, and these are the Timber Board and the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. Now, Mr. Speaker, you see, the reason why I found it necessary to rate an 'F' when it came to the Provincial Treasurer's ability to finance social services through operating various businesses.

I would like to deal, for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, with the Provincial Treasurer's failure to make provisions in his budget to relieve rural municipalities from the increasing burdens of taxation. I think it is only right to state that the \$500 grant to rural municipalities could never have been considered fair under any circumstances. Let us consider for a moment the amount of money taken out of the municipalities by way of gasoline tax, motor licences, education tax, and public revenue tax. The average rural municipality of nine townships must contribute at least \$30,000. Most municipalities have approximately five hundred miles of roads besides having to look after numerous bridges, and with the exception of the \$500 grant, perhaps a bridge built, and, for the past three years, a grant of \$1200 received from a certain trust fund, all moneys raised are by means of a property tax. Property taxes have reached their saturation point. Whether or not the general economy of the province can stand higher taxation, the fact does remain that for all practical purposes, whenever the people of a given area feel that they are taxed to the limit, then I say that for all practical purposes of taxation, property taxation has reached a saturation point. If there is even a slight recession, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that many of the services now carried on by the municipalities would have to revert to a caretaker basis.

During the period 1945 to 1948, the assessment on rural and urban municipalities by the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis league increased as follows:

in the rurals from \$241,000 in 1945 to \$574,000 in 1948;
in the urbans from \$160,000 in 1945 to \$382,000 in 1948.

During this period, Mr. Speaker, government grants to the League increased from \$287,000 in 1945, to only \$292,000 in 1948. It simply means that San. levy in the municipality of Connaught was increased by 400 per cent. The cost of operating schools in that municipality increased by 150 to 175 per cent since 1938, with no increase whatsoever in the school grant for that given area. Municipal government has increased by 100 per cent since 1938, and the municipal governments have no new sources of revenue.

I would urge the Government to give this problem very serious consideration. Municipal men suggest that the grant should be increased to at least \$2,000, and, where a municipality has more than 15 bridges thirty-feet in length or more, then that municipality should receive an extra grant on a percentage basis to help it build those bridges.

Then, too, with regard to municipal finance, some municipal men feel that the municipality should be advised, not later than the first day of April in each year, of the grant that they may expect, because that would facilitate their solution of their own financial problems. The present system of having municipal delegations come down to Regina to try to use various methods of getting increased municipal grants is deplorable. Municipal grants

March 14, 1950

and services rendered to municipalities by the Provincial Government should be taken out of politics because, after all, municipal governments are comprised of men of all political persuasions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer again to a particular municipality to show what has happened by way of increased taxation. In the R.M. of Connaught, in 1938, the total of all taxes levied and collected by the municipality was \$58,800.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: – Have you the number of that municipality?

Mr. Egnatoff: – It's the R.M. of Connaught. I haven't the number; but I will 'phone the number to you tomorrow, if you would like to check it. The total taxes levied and collected, in 1938, in that rural municipality were \$58,800 in round figures. In the year 1949, the total of all the taxes collected in that municipality was \$133,000, an increase of 100 per cent and, regardless of the amount of talking that the Minister of Education or anyone else on the Government side can do, they will not convince the people of that municipality that their taxes have not gone up as a direct result of the policies of the hon. members who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why I deemed it necessary to rate the Provincial Treasurer with another 'F' – another failure, and that was the failure of the Government to assume its proper share of the financial responsibility for education.

What were some of the promises made? Here is what the hon. members on the other side of the House were promising the people: "What will the C.C.F. do," Here is the answer:

"Provincial responsibility. A C.C.F. government will recognize the fact that providing educational opportunity for all children is the responsibility of the province, and will so reorganize school administration and finance as to increase expenditure on education, improve the school plant and equipment and raise the teachers' salaries. The British North America Act which is Canada's Constitution, makes education a provincial, not a municipal or local responsibility. All along the line the provincial government has been evading its duties. They have made grants to schools, outlined courses of study, it has provided for inspection of schools, but it has left the main burden of maintaining school services upon the municipalities and the local school boards. The main burden does not belong there."

(That's what they said in 1944.)

"A C.C.F. Government will accept the responsibility laid on it by our Constitution and take steps to provide adequate schooling for all children irrespective of the part of the province they happen to live in."

And that same promise, Mr. Speaker, was made by the most responsible member of the Government, by the gentleman who is now Premier. This is what he said:

"The first thing which a C.C.F. government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the Provincial Government. There has been a tendency on the part of the Provincial Government to pass this buck to the municipalities and local school boards for maintaining our educational facilities. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the Provincial Government and it cannot be passed on to any other body."

I believe that the C.C.F. made those promises in good faith. I am sure that the present Minister of Education felt that, when he joined the C.C.F. Party, he saw in it an opportunity of improving educational services in this province. But what has happened? School grants have increased. That is absolutely correct; but while grants have increased school taxes have increased by greater amounts. Let's have a look at school grants. "School finance and school grants" – This is taken from the Annual Report, the latest annual report, of the Department of Education. Reading from page 14 in this report we find these words:

"Proceeds of school taxes in the province increased by two million dollars over 1947 and provincial grants increased by \$1,000,000."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful co-operative commonwealth that the Minister of Education is trying to establish. He says, "We will assume the responsibility for financing education", and then asks the school districts through property taxation to increase their contribution to education by two million, whereas his Government contributes an increase of only one million. Now try and justify that!

Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a table of property levies in urban municipalities and in rural municipalities. I have here the property tax levies for school and municipal purposes, the total levy, taxes collected, and the school levies expressed as a percentage of the total levies, in urban and rural municipalities from 1922 down to 1942, that is over a period of twenty years. We find that the school levies stayed at approximately 40 per cent of the total urban municipal levies. The percentage increased in 1943-44-45-46-47. The urban municipalities now find it necessary to contribute 50 per cent of their tax levies for school purposes. A similar analysis reveals the following about rural municipal school tax levies: We find that, from 1922 to about 1944, the percentage of your municipal levies which was collected for school purposes ranged from the high thirties to the low thirties. You would find the percentages running from 38 down to about 32 and up again. Under the present C.C.F. administration which claims that it has done so much for education, the rural municipalities' school taxes amount to 42 per cent of the total municipal levy – that is over the province as a whole.

March 14, 1950

Mr. Minister of Education and Mr. Provincial Treasurer, in my humble opinion, and deep down in your hearts, surely you realize that you are not assuming the proper share of the financial responsibility for education!

Again I would like to take some statistics, as the Minister of Education reported to a great many. I think the only way you can really judge whether or not the Provincial Government values education more than previous administrations did, is in terms of the portion of the total provincial expenditures on revenue account which are devoted to education. And the Minister of Education must realize, I am sure, that that is the only reasonable and fair comparison for anyone to make, if you are going to judge whether or not a particular administration is assuming a greater share of its responsibility, and is placing a greater value on that particular service, than previous administrations did. Here is what we find: In four years prior to the C.C.F. Government, the percentage of the school grants as compared with the total expenditure of the government on revenue account over that four year period was 9.92 per cent. That's very low, isn't it? During the four years of C.C.F. administration, here is what we find: The school grants during this period constituted 9.83 per cent of the total expenditure on revenue account. And then the Minister of Education has the effrontery to get up in this House and try to pretend that he is doing such wonderful things for education! If you want to take specific years, go back to 1924-25 and you find that 15.78 per cent of provincial expenditures on revenue account went to school grants. According to the proposed budget, school grants will amount to approximately 10.5 per cent of the total provincial expenditures on revenue account. Now I ask the Minister of Education, is that fair?

Well, Mr. Speaker, you see the reason why I had to reprimand the Provincial Treasurer for his failure to increase school grants sufficiently to make it of some material difference to the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather strange house to be in, and it seems to be a rather strange house for this reason. In an ordinary home where you have large families such as the family from which I had the privilege of coming, each member had his responsibilities. Some of the girls had to attend to certain house duties. I had to go from office to office selling eskimo pies. Whether or not the person in the family carried out his responsibilities was accountable directly by the person in charge of those duties. So if my sister did not get the dishes done in time, I didn't have to try to justify her before my mother; and if I lost some money or spent a little extra money which I should have turned in from the sale of eskimo pies I was accountable for that, not my brother, not any one of my three brothers or four sisters.

Now, I said that this House is indeed a strange house to be in. A peculiar family we have. The Minister of Agriculture flies to Ottawa and stays there for the entire course of his discussions. The Minister of Public Health, instead of giving a report on the affairs of his Department, defends the actions of the provincial Minister of Agriculture. Now, who is the Minister of Education? In my opinion he should be the man in charge of the extension of educational facilities throughout this province and he should

talk about his Department. Instead what did he do? Well, let's make an analysis of the Minister's address.

I have said before and I will say again, Mr. Speaker, that I don't doubt the sincerity and good intentions with which the Minister of Education entered public life. On the surface it must have appeared to his colleagues that he made a terrific blast, yesterday. No doubt the hon. members opposite were proud of his wonderful address. His voice is very pleasant to listen to. It is audible. Now, you must admit, Mr. Speaker, that that address was very typically C.C.F. He spent a great deal of time trying to paint the Liberals as pickpockets. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have never picked anybody's pockets but my own. He was most vehement in his criticism of the Ottawa Government. As a matter of fact although the hon. members opposite may think that he gave a wonderfully logical address, if they would analyze it honestly, they would find that it was a rationalisation for the shortcomings of his administration. Just like the little fellow who comes into a principal's office and instead of trying to explain his own particular misdemeanour he immediately refers to supposed misdemeanours of other people. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, is that not precisely what the Minister of Education did, yesterday? Why did he spend so much of his time talking about Ottawa? Could it be that deep within him he was actually ashamed for his failure to solve many of the educational problems facing the people of this province?

I heard a story that I must relate here, because I think it is very appropriate. A young man and his wife took their young son for a holiday to the mountains. The father wanted to give his young son the experience of hearing an echo, so he pointed to the mountain and said, "Now, son, say 'hello' to Mr. Echo", and the son said "hello", and there was an echo "hello". The youngster was frightened. He said, "I hate you", and the echo came back, "I hate you". At that time the youngster broke down and said, "Father, Mr. Echo hates me". The father took the little son and said, "Now, son, you look over there and say, 'I love you', and the son looked at the mountain and said, "I love you", and the echo came back, "I love you".

Mr. Speaker, I don't, as I have said on previous occasions, doubt the sincerity of the hon. members who sit on your right, and I trust that they will accord the same relationship towards the members on this side of the House.

I would like to suggest here, Mr. Speaker, that the various Cabinet Ministers in charge of various departments in the C.C.F. Government have pickpocketed the Department of Education. They have taken funds, which should have been spent by increasing school grants, for the purpose of the work of their own particular departments. Surely, the Minister of Education himself must at time feel let down because his Department of Education still remains the Cinderella of the various government departments. Surely, the Minister of Education must find it difficult to reconcile the actions of his Government with his own conscience!

A great deal has been said by the Minister of Education with regard to Federal aid. To listen to him talk about Federal aid you would think that there has never been any Federal aid for education. Without going into

March 14, 1950

detail on an explanation of the various Acts that have been passed by the Federal Government, I would like to enumerate them. Back in 1913, an Agricultural Instruction Act was passed which allocated ten million dollars expendable over a period of ten years. In 1919, the Technical Education Act provided for the expenditure of ten million dollars expendable over a period of ten years. The Vocation Education Act of 1931 provided for the expenditure of \$750,000 per year for a period of 15 years. The Youth Training Act of 1939 provided for the expenditure of a million and a half dollars each year for a period of three years. The Youth Training Programme has now operated for a period of 12 years, and under this co-operative plan, assistance was and is being given to nurses in training, to medical students, to students in dentistry, engineering, agriculture, and in arts and science. Federal expenditures on education in Saskatchewan are to be found in the form of youth training expenditures, vocational training assistance, audio-visual education, student aid, physical fitness, and university D.V.A. grants. When the Minister of Education talks about Federal aid, I would suggest that he should talk about the extension of Federal aid for education rather than talk about Federal aid for education as if there had never been any aid for education from the Federal Government.

The Minister of Education referred in his address, yesterday, to the fact that the people of Saskatchewan were spending approximately \$1 out of every \$34 of personal income for educational facilities. He pointed out that that was a better record than any other western province. The question, in my opinion, is not how much are we spending, but are we receiving value for our money? Mind you, I do not think that we are spending nearly enough money on education, and our expenditures in that field will have to be increased very substantially; but are we getting value for our money?

This brings up the whole question of teacher supply, a question which the Minister of Education merely brushed over, yesterday. He spent very little time on one of the most vital problems which his Department must solve and which to date he and his Department and his Government have failed to solve, Mr. Speaker. The Minister said that the teacher situation in Saskatchewan is still serious, but he looked for continuing improvement.

Now, what are the facts with regard to teacher supply in this province, Mr. Speaker? According to the Annual Report of his own Department for the year 1948-49, a table showing certificates issued reveals the following startling situation: 12 D's, and 24 D's and letters of authority; that is, people who have had 12 weeks of normal school training, people who have had 24 weeks of normal school training, and people to whom the Minister of Education has given a letter of authority to take charge of schools. In 1944, there were 776 of these certificates granted in the province; in 1945-46, taking those two period together, there were 839 of these certificates granted in the province; in 1946-47, the figure jumped to 861; in 1947-48, the figure jumped to 1,026; and in 1948-49, some 1,299 of these certificates were granted throughout the province. Now is that a record of which the Minister of Education is proud? Is that what he calls 'continued progress'?

Mr. Speaker, the girls and boys of this province deserve qualified and adequately trained teachers. I will grant you that some of these people may be rendering valuable service and some of them are doing good work. It

is only fair here to state that the number of people who are entering the College of Education at the University of Saskatchewan is increasing, and the College of Education is indeed to be commended for the type of teacher training programme that it is carrying on.

Reference was made by the Minister of Education to so-called study supervisors: "Sitters" is what they are commonly called. Mr. Speaker, that is a most unwise nomenclature; "study supervisors" sounds very much like superintendent. And here is the situation that I found in the country when I visited a farm home. I asked the lady of the house if they had a teacher in their school and she said, "yes". I said that's very fortunate because they have had difficulty in obtaining teachers there. She said, "Yes, we feel very happy about it. We haven't a normalite; we haven't one of those T'S; we have a man whose qualifications are much higher." Well, I thought that was wonderful and when we left my friend informed me that the person in charge of that school was a study supervisor; but, because the Department of Education gave them that dignified title of study supervisor, there are many people in the province who feel that their qualifications are even higher than the qualifications of people who went to Normal School for one year. That is a disgraceful situation. Mr. Minister of Education – are you proud of that situation?

Today, Mr. Speaker, there are more than 400 of these study supervisors. In reply to questions asked by members from this side of the House, it was stated that the number of study supervisors on October 1, 1949, was 335; the number of study supervisors on Jan. 31, 1950, was 418. An increase from 335 to 418 study supervisors – and the Minister of Education tries to tell the House that the teacher supply situation is continuing to improve. Do you call that improvement, Mr. Minister of Education?

Study the number of study helps that are sent throughout the province by the Saskatchewan Government Correspondence School – and I want to say here that those correspondence courses are, in my opinion, very well prepared, and they are far better than no instruction at all. We have always had a considerable number of correspondence courses for students at the secondary school level, but the number of children in the elementary school grades who have to make use of correspondence courses was, in the past, relatively small, ranging around 400. As of December 31, 1948-49, there were more than 3,000 boys and girls in this province, who had to depend for their elementary education on those correspondence courses. At December 31, in the school year 1949-50, the number had increased to 6,400. It simply means that there are over 6,000 girls and boys in this province who are being denied, as a result of policies pursued by the C.C.F. Government, of the guidance which only an adequately trained teacher can give.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make another reference to the Annual Report of the Department of Education. We find, on page 62, the number of teachers with second class or higher professional certificates who taught in 1947-48 and 1948-49. I am not going to read all the figures. I would like to direct your attention to the fact that there are over 1,200 teachers who have temporary certificates – 1,200 out of 7,000. It simply means that

March 14, 1950

the turnover of teachers is far too great and the policies of the Department of Education should now be directed, not to training more and more teachers, not to training great numbers year after year, spending public money, but to retaining teachers in the profession. In the long run it would be far more economical to retain the teachers whom you have already trained in the profession, and that is the policy, I submit, that the Department of Education should pursue. This is a problem which they should face courageously. This is the problem, Mr. Speaker, to which the Minister of Education should be attending, rather than tinkering around with boots and wool, and hides.

Now here are five suggestions. One of the hon. members asked earlier: what do you suggest? Well, here are my suggestions:

First: Higher salaries for teachers. That is one of the major factors that will help to keep them in the profession. I daresay that that was one of the factors which helped the Minister of Education to get into politics, rather than remain in the teaching profession. Where is that provincial salary scale that you people talked about back in 1938 and 1944? When elected to office, the Minister of Education and the C.C.F. Government were going to institute a provincial scale of salaries for teachers. Well, I suppose we will have to wait until the Liberals are elected to office.

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): – Three hundred dollars a year.

Mr. Egnatoff: – \$300 a year says the hon. member for Morse. Mr. Speaker, he is looking back again; he is looking back to those very difficult years. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a bird – it is called a worrybird, Mr. Speaker. This worrybird flies backwards and it constantly flies backwards because it is always anxious to find out where it has been and it doesn't give a hang where it is going. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that every time we hear a burst on the other side of the House – "What about the 'thirties?" . . . "What about the bad old days?" – they are nothing but worrybirds. As a matter of fact, I think that is a very sound comparison. So my suggestion to the Government to improve the teacher supply situation is, first of all, to provide a province-wide scale of salaries, but that scale of salaries will only be high enough when the Provincial Government actually assumes its responsibility in financing education. The people throughout the province are willing to pay higher salaries but the government of Saskatchewan is not increasing its school grants sufficiently.

Suggestion Number Two: There must be adequate training. You cannot hope to train a teacher in one year although you have been trying to train them in much less than one year.

Suggestion Number Three: Careful selection. Right now, Mr. Speaker, anyone who cannot get into any other walk of life can apply for admission to the Normal School and get in. They sometimes talk about various selective instruments that they have; but the strange part of it is that there are very few if any students who fail the Normal School course once they are admitted.

Suggestion Number Four: I would urge the Minister of Education to take an aggressive stand with regard to the clearance of slum teacherages in this province.

Suggestion Number Five: I would suggest to the Government that they make the retirement pension sufficiently sound and sufficiently attractive for men and women to remain in the profession as a result of security that they may foresee for their older age.

I submit to this House that the girls and boys of Saskatchewan are entitled to well trained, carefully selected and skilled teachers. The children must have good teachers, Mr. Speaker, if they are to grow in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the Education Tax. The hon. members opposite know that they will be hearing a good deal about this. I am not going to refer to the commitments that have been already referred to by the hon. member for Gravelbourg, such as the statements made by the hon. member for Swift Current of the Hon. Attorney General, but I would like to quote from a press conference reported in the Free Press on June 17, 1944, a statement made by the gentleman who is now Premier. Mr. Douglas said his party believed that the present Education Tax levied on most purchases in Saskatchewan, can be eliminated when new sources of revenue are developed, but this could not be done immediately. Now, if that statement does not lend the people to believe that it was the definite policy of the C.C.F. to eliminate the Education Tax, I do not know what statement is.

The Provincial Treasurer in defending the increases in that Education Tax, made the statement to the effect that this tax would fall more heavily upon those who have more money than it would upon those who have less money. He also said it would fall most heavily on corporations. Unfortunately, there is a limit to what most people buy. There is a limit to the normal expenditures of most people, and this tax will fall more heavily upon those who are less able to pay than upon those who are more able to pay. So, if you are going to justify the increase in this tax, then, for goodness sakes!, simply say, "Our Crown Corporations have failed; we have too many civil servants; we need more money, and so we will up the tax." Let us be honest. Let's not try to say that it is going to fall much more heavily on those who are more able to pay than it is upon those who are less able to pay.

I would like to say that, at the present time, that increase in the tax is unwarranted. The Government in the present budget could affect savings which would make it possible for you to get ten, or eleven or twelve million dollars for education and to take care of the deficit with regard to the hospitalization scheme without increasing taxation. It is just as simple as that, Mr. Speaker. Since this Government went into office they have increased the civil servants by more than 2,500 people. I would suggest that approximately 1,000 of those are not necessary, and there is a saving for you already of nearly three million dollars. Get rid of some of those C.C.F. political healers! Get rid of some of them! Let them get out into the country and start reorganizing and revitalizing your organization instead of living off the fat of the land.

Another saving: The Bureau of Publications, which might better be termed the C.C.F. Propaganda Bureau. The budget or the estimate for that

March 14, 1950

particular item could be reduced by a hundred thousand dollars without taking away from the effect of that organization. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the Bureau of Publications should have, as its main job, the selling of Saskatchewan to American and Canadian tourists. We have lakes in the Northern part of this province which cannot be equalled anywhere. As an example, there is no finer trout-fishing lake on this continent than Lac La Ronge and, in my opinion, the Bureau of Publications would be wise to advertise Lac La Ronge, to advertise Lakes in the Northeastern part of the province to attract American tourists who will pay us a lot more per pound of fish by angling than we will ever get by selling fish on the market.

Then too, I think the Government should dispose of some of its 'problem children,' at the earliest possible date. Strangle them, if you wish! Some of them would be better dead than alive. I would certainly get rid of the ones that are losing money for you. I have already pointed out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that those Crown Corporations which are operating at a deficit, have, in effect, lost for the people of Saskatchewan, more than one million dollars. Now there is a million-dollar increase for your school grants, Mr. Minister of Education! That is an additional million in addition to the three million I have already found for you.

The Economic Advisory and Planning Board: Now, Mr. Speaker, if a farmer hired me to do some work on his farm and I was not producing the goods, as very likely I would not on a farm, because I know nothing of it, the chances are that he would soon get rid of me and he would get somebody to do the job who can do it, or else he would reduce his operations. I want to suggest to the Government that it is high time they got rid of their Advisory Planning Board. That is a waste of public money, because they are merely advising you on Crown Corporations which are constantly losing money. Get rid of them. You might do better yourselves. So I am submitting, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been possible to increase school grants by all of three million dollars instead of the one million dollars, without increasing the over-all revenue expenditures.

I would appeal to the Government to take vigorous action in the developing of our Northern part of the Province. We cannot push frontiers south. We cannot expand either west or east. The only frontiers that we can push back are the frontiers of the Northland. I think, hon. members will agree with me when I say that North Battleford may be regarded as the 'Hub' or the 'springboard' for the North-West; Prince Albert may be regarded as the 'key' or the 'gateway' to the North or the 'hub' of the North, particularly the North-central part of the province. I think Melfort, Tisdale, Nipawin, as being towns which may very well serve as the hub or the gateway to the Northeast. Therefore, I would urge the Government to take vigorous action in developing that part of the province.

I am going to conclude, although I would like to have said something about larger units for the benefit of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has told us that, among his capital expenditures, there would be money allocated for a mental training school. That is a very worth-while project. I am going to suggest to the

Government that, within the next two or three years, before they are swept right out of office, they give consideration to the setting up of a training school for C.C.F. workers. I would like to suggest the number of instructors for that school, Mr. Speaker: Professor Bentley, who would be in charge of the Department dealing with the art of defending the Minister of Agriculture, and the Department dealing with the art and science and the technique of obtaining Cabinet appointments, and the art of promoting courtesy particularly among Cabinet Ministers; Professor Sturdy will be the head of the department in charge of Lower Slobovian studies, and the Department in charge of parliamentary procedure; Professor Fines – who, incidentally, should have hung out the shingle "Cash More Fines". Give the money and I will spend it " – Professor Fines is in charge of the department dealing with the art and science of changing your party's stand on the Education Tax – I'm sure he could make a very valuable contribution there; Professor Lloyd, the art of manufacturing boots, at a loss, woollen goods at a loss, and the science of camouflage; Professor J. T. Douglas, in charge of the department dealing with the low ways to build highways; Professor T. C. Douglas, in charge of mourning exercises, because you must have mourning exercises – mourning, Mr. Speaker, spelled with a "u" because there will be a great deal of mourning after the next election; Professor Kuziak, in charge of the department dealing with the science of sticking your neck out to guarantee the chopping off of the head, together with the department dealing with how to win friends and influence people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt that no reasonable member could possibly support the motion that you do now leave the chair.

Hon. J. T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): – Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I feel that I should join with the other members who have preceded me in expressing my regrets on the loss of two members during the past year: Mr. Alvin Murray and Mr. Paul Prince. True, I only had the opportunity of meeting Mr. Prince in the year 1944, and at that time I came to know him very well. Mr. Alvin Murray was a man with whom I have had a great deal of work throughout the years; a man who was associated with the farmer movement and co-operative movement and with the C.C.F. organization, and as the Chairman of the Caucus Committee on Highways I found him a very valuable assistant; a man whose services I know are greatly missed in this Legislature. I also want, at the same time, to welcome to this House the new members, and I know that they too will make their contributions. Particularly would I like to welcome my desk-mate here, (Hon. Mr. Bentley), who has already proven that he has the ability to do a very good job.

When I am on this matter of complimenting people, I should also like to compliment the Provincial Treasurer for again doing an exceptionally good job in bringing down the budget. This has come to be an almost commonplace occurrence, and we would all be greatly disappointed, including the Opposition, if he were to do anything else; but he certainly did not disappoint us this year and did not disappoint the people of Saskatchewan in the budget which he brought down.

I should also at this time compliment the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton), on the very fine job he did in attempting to

March 14, 1950

criticize the budget. I know it is a pretty difficult task, pretty hard to pick holes in that budget, and I am afraid he did not find very many holes to pick. But there is one thing that he did a very good job in, Mr. Speaker. In fact he did an excellent job in debunking the statements that have been made previous to the last two elections, Federal and Provincial, and also during the by-elections – Statements made by his Leader and I am afraid, some of the statements made by himself.

Previous to those elections, we had a great many promises made, and I have them here, although I am not going to read them all. But we had promises for larger grants to municipalities, more money for roads, more money for hospitals, and I could go all the way down the line. I think the Provincial Treasurer had it figured out here, just how much money this would mean. I meant to bring it up here, but forgot to do it. However, you know it was a tremendous amount of money. Then the other day, the member for Gravelbourg read us quite a lecture for spending too much money, and he came back to it again and again. First he said the standard of government expenditures established in this province, today, is already beyond the capacity of the people to pay, and, again, you cannot establish a standard of social services and a social structure beyond the capacity of the people to pay, and again, this Government in its over-all picture has now established a standard of expenditure in services that cannot be maintained for this province. Well, I believe that under Liberal administration that may be correct, but we have proven in this province, Mr. Speaker, that we can keep up with expenditures, and not only have we made the heavy expenditures but we have reduced the public debt.

After listening to the member for Gravelbourg – and again, I say, I enjoyed his speech and I want to compliment him for the very high standard he set, a standard I was hoping might be continued by members on the other side of the House. But there was one thing that struck me as he spoke, and that was that rather than being a criticism of the budget, it was more or less a confession – a confession that the many statements which had been made by the Liberals during the campaign that I just mentioned, were made by the Liberals with their tongues in their cheeks, because you cannot do as he suggested be done – lower taxes, and at the same time raise expenditures. He told us that we could not hope in this province to continue the expenditures that had been started by this Government. Well now, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the speeches this afternoon, I felt that possibly that high standard of speaking had not been maintained, and I was rather sorry to hear the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), get up (and again we have some of his old speech) and make reference again to that book "Their Road Ahead". Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that book is an insult to any man's intelligence who would read it, and I am surprised that any hon. member would stand up in this House and recommend it to anyone. Well, of course, we have all types of books here for the people, because we have to have something to entertain people once in awhile.

In the few minutes that I am going to take here, tonight, I want to reply to some of the statements made here, this afternoon, and I notice that the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts), complained about the roads in his constituency and about the lack of assistance to municipalities. I want to agree with him, Mr. Speaker: he has a lot of bad roads up there, but I want to tell you that the highways which this Government is responsible

for, have been kept in good shape. We have rebuilt part of those highways, and on the roads that we have rebuilt we have done a good job and we are continuing with the construction of roads through that area.

Referring to the grants to municipalities in this constituency, I had them sent up here. I have here, first, the expenditures in the Meadow Lake Constituency for the last six years the Liberals were in office, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, they are much better in Meadow Lake than they were in either Redberry or Melfort; but in Meadow Lake, they amounted to \$18,982. Now, let us compare that with what we spent in the six years that we have been paying grants. We have paid \$62,787, more than three times as much in the same time. Now, it is interesting to note this, Mr. Speaker, because of the bearing it has on what the member from Melfort said. Since we took office, every municipality in every year received grants in the constituency of Meadow Lake, and not for political reasons. As a matter of fact, I will tell you, right now, that we have for the first time in this province adopted the system of making municipal grants whereby politics are left entirely out of the picture. Let me tell the hon. member that the grants are worked out on a formula which take into consideration, first, the mill rate in the municipality; secondly, the number of farm families in that municipality; thirdly, the number of miles of roads which the Provincial Government maintains in that municipality; the soil index of that municipality; the degree of stoniness, and the amount of bush coverage. That is the formula we use and there is nothing there that takes into consideration the political affiliation of that municipality. Let me assure you of that.

Now, while I am dealing with grants, I might as well deal with the other two constituencies, and I have here the constituency of Redberry. I find that, for instance, in the year 1941-42, not a single municipality in that constituency got a grant, not a single one; and the total amount paid in that constituency was \$12,887.44 under the Liberals. Under the C.C.F. \$59,263 was paid. In Melfort the Liberals, in the last six years they were in office, paid \$3,337.13 against \$61,257.35 under the C.C.F.; and, according to the member, that is money wasted. Now, that is the difference in the methods adopted by the C.C.F. and by the Liberals.

I just have one or two things left before I adjourn the debate.

There is one thing I want to do here. I want to compliment the member for Melfort in doing a very good job in one respect. I noticed there was one gentleman sitting up in the galleries the last half-hour sound asleep on the hard benches, and it takes a pretty good speech to put a man to sleep on the benches up there. I also wanted to mention here just a word about taxation. I think it was the member for Meadow Lake who mentioned the one per cent increase of tax on cars would be \$17.00; I think it would be a little more than that – around \$20.00; but I want to remind him that the Federal tax on a Ford car amounts to \$247.88. Well now, I think that is about all the data that I took down with reference to the speeches made this afternoon, and as it is getting near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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