

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
21st Day

Thursday, March 16, 1950

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 15, 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. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to speak in this debate on the eve of the Anniversary of the Patron Saint of that country from which so many of us in this House are descended. I am grateful to all the members for the kindness and consideration which I have received since I arrived here, and as a new member I appreciate the friendly spirit I have experienced from both sides of this House.

It was with a feeling of sadness that I entered these buildings on my arrival to replace the late Mr. Prince, whose untimely passing shocked us all. I know you will agree with me when I say that both The Battlefords and the province lost a man who had the interest of the affairs of this province at heart throughout his short life, and he contributed much to the welfare and progress of this western country of ours. I, personally, not only lost a friend with whom I was associated politically, but a personal friend whose counsel and advice I respected to the utmost. I fully realize the responsibilities that I have accepted in replacing him, and I sincerely hope that I will be able to carry on, in part, the work that he was doing throughout the length and breadth of this province of ours. As a personal friend I want to extend my most sincere thanks for the wonderful tributes that were paid to him from both sides of this House.

I am very proud of the constituency which I have the honour to represent — The Battlefords. It is located in the northwest section of this province and is an ideal mixed-farming country, and, from this viewpoint, it is very hard to beat. We have had our drouth problems; but the contribution of this constituency in the production of livestock, dairy products and grain has always been very great. Like the Minister of Highways, we too have had outstanding advance in the field of production, and I just want to tell you the accomplishments of one of our farmers in the growing of crested wheat grass. Mr. Mack Guilot, who lives in the northeast corner of our constituency, is a registered grower of crested wheat grass. He entered his seed in the Royal Winter Fair at Toronto, on which he won first prize; also at the Provincial Seed Fair at the University of Saskatchewan, where he also won first prize; and finally, he placed it in the Hay and Grain show at Chicago and there he was also successful in winning first prize. I am sure this makes him a seed grainer grower of international repute. Other farmers in our district have also distinguished themselves in the raising of

March 16, 1950

livestock by participating in the Royal Winter Fair at Toronto.

The centre of our constituency contains what I believe to be one of the small, most modern cities in our province. The citizens of North Battleford are proud of their city. It is a clean, well-kept and a fully modern community, and I think that we can all be proud of it. I believe there are more paved roads within the confines of the city of North Battleford than any other city in the province. It is the focal point of the northwest portion of the province, and has developed into one of the largest distributing centres in that area. It is the distributing centre for an area bounded on the west by the Alberta boundary and on the north — as far north as you want to go, even up into the seat of my good friend from Athabasca.

We are also proud of the scenic development in our constituency of Battleford. Immediately south of the city lies the North Saskatchewan river, and it has been said that the view from the heights there equals, or is as great, as any that we see in the Canadian Rockies. As you look across the river, with the Saskatchewan river with its many islands, to the historic town of Battleford, on the left you see the old North West Mounted Police barracks, which as you know has now been converted into a museum of which we are all very proud. In the distance you can see the old parliament buildings of the North West Territories. On the river bank on the north side, you see the Saskatchewan hospital. We are very proud of this hospital and in summer it presents one of the most beautiful sights throughout the province with its unexcelled flower gardens and other scenery. Unfortunately, due to water shortage, the grounds have been allowed to deteriorate and I sincerely hope that the Government will very soon overcome this and bring it back to the beauty spot that it has been in the district.

While I am talking about the city of North Battleford and the town of Battleford I want to make reference to several matters. One is the Eventide Home. This Home was established a few years ago by the Salvation Army, and I had the privilege of visiting it during the last few months, and I want to say that special tribute should be paid to the Salvation Army for the wonderful home they are providing for the elderly men and pioneers of this province.

While I am on the question of North Battleford and Battleford, I would also like to refer just briefly to the employees of the Saskatchewan hospital. I believe that these employees contribute much to the welfare of our province. They, as a group, participate in a work that is not too desirable, but I want to say that, with the results I have seen in the recovery of mental health in this particular institution, it is a tribute to all of them and if any concessions are to be made in the way of civil service I think that the employees of these institutions throughout our province should enjoy a very high priority.

I want to turn now to the northern part of our constituency. We are fortunate in having two of the most picturesque lakes in the northwest in this area. Here we have all the facilities for camping and fishing, and also swimming. These lakes provide facilities for a large area outside

our constituency. We have visitors from many parts of the province; we have them from the seat of the Minister of Highways, we have them from the seat of the Minister of Education, and as far south as Elrose and Saskatoon. I would just like to point out that this resort is unique in one respect — in the fact that it gives economical camping facilities to working people and people of lower income. We are very proud of this, and in July and August the number of people that participate and enjoy this is very great, and I would strongly urge that the Department of Natural Resources take note of this and do something to improve the facilities out there during July and August. Again I say, this is the workingman's playground and it deserves the interest of this Government.

It is not my intention to belabour you with the events of the by-election again, but I just want to convey a few of my thoughts on it. As I was probably as active a participant in it as anybody, I think that I am entitled to this right. The hon. Premier referred, in one of his addresses in the city of North Battleford, to the hardships that he endured in winter elections previously. I want to assure him that we were all put to considerable inconvenience during the by-election. This, however, did not concern me particularly, and I don't think it should concern him, because, after all, we are in politics by our own choice, and for that reason I don't think that this was much of a consideration. The thing that bothered me, I think more than anything else, was the fact that so many people were unable to get out to vote, particularly the elder folks of the constituency and the married people (that is, the wives of farmers), and I just want to pay tribute to those that did bear the rigors of winter and the terrible roads to get out to vote, and I want to say that it certainly shows that the people of the rural areas, in my constituency at least, appreciate the privilege of voting in this democracy of ours.

I also want to make reference to one other matter, and that was the prediction that the hon. Premier made while he was in North Battleford. He stated that some of the curtailment of the Canadian National Railway would be of a permanent nature, and I just want to inform him that the city of North Battleford is now enjoying a normal daily train service which lack was caused entirely by the coal shortage in the United States.

During the by-election the Government, through its candidate, made certain promises to the electors of the Battlefords; I think they amounted to in the neighbourhood of \$200,000, and they appeared to originate from quite a number of the Departments in the Government. I feel that if they were of as much import before the by-election, they are just as important today, and should be acted upon, and I am very pleased to say that one of them has already been started, or has been promised; that is the power line extension to the village of Meota. I want to congratulate the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for arranging to have this done. I think that this is one of the most essential projects of this year's power extensions, and I hope that this will be just a start in the extension of power throughout this area of the province, and that it won't be long until it is extended up into the constituency of my friend from Turtleford and up along No. 4 highway through the constituency of my friend from Meadow Lake. I hope that this extension of power is a sample of what we can expect from other Departments of

March 16, 1950

the Government.

During the election it was stated that the blacktop road would be extended along No. 4 highway to Cochin and along No. 26 to Meota. These two, in my opinion and I believe in the opinion of most people, are very vital not only to my constituency but to the number of people that participate in the camping facilities in Meota and Jackfish. They are also the main roads leading to the northwest portion of the province, and I would just like to say that after hearing the Minister of Highways, yesterday, I feel confident that this particular extension of hard surface will be made, because I do believe that he explained the real need for hard surface roads, and I believe these extensions certainly are of the type where the amount of traffic involved is too heavy for the present gravel roads. I hope that as soon as weather permits we will see the hard-surfacing contractors located at the thirteen-mile corner of No. 4 highway to continue with these two extensions. I would like to say, too, that there has been some highway work done in The Battlefords constituency, and this thirteen miles has been a real asset. I want to say to the Minister of Highways that I can assure him of my support and co-operation for any work that he proposes to do in my constituency.

While I am talking on roads I would also like to mention a couple of other small projects. One is the re-grading and gravelling of No. 29 highway from Fairyland School to Battleford. This highway has become neglected because the road to Wilkie has become materially changed by going down to No. 4 and cutting access to No. 29. I would like to say that the reason this highway needs replacing is the fact that, at the present time, it is very difficult for the people in that area to get into Battleford to shop. It is a good farming area of a rolling type of land and is prone to suffer, like all roads do in this province, the damage of snow. It is practically impossible, unless this road is repaired, for the farmers of that area to get into Battleford.

Another promise that was made — I don't want to belabour you too long with these promises — I have a couple more left, however; but this one was rather a strange one and it was that if the by-election was won by the Government candidate certain extensions would be made to the Telephone Department in the city of North Battleford. It struck me rather strangely, because I never thought that the Department of Telephones or extensions was influenced from a political standpoint, but I just want to say that, due to the expansion of the city of North Battleford in the last few years, the extension of telephones to people living in houses there is very essential. We have railway employees, Saskatchewan hospital employees, who in my opinion are entitled to telephone facilities as a matter of right.

Another promise which I think is my last one, was the erection of a Bus Depot in North Battleford. I was rather amazed at this as surely the Minister of this Department knows that the city of North Battleford sold the Government this property in 1947. At that time I had the privilege of serving on the City Council, and participated in the arrangements made, and there was a great rush to get this property so the Bus Depot could be built immediately — it was going to be built in 1947. To day, as we all know, there has been no bus depot built. The only thing that has

happened is that the city has not been able to sell this property to anybody else, and there has been no revenue from it whatsoever, and I believe that, with the size of the city of North Battleford and the number of patrons that use these bus facilities, and the number of buses that are in and out of North Battleford daily, North Battleford deserves better facilities than they have at the present time.

I want to say a few words, today, about the Budget that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) brought down. First, I would like to congratulate him on the able and forceful manner in which he delivered it. I also want to congratulate my fellow colleague from Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) in the able way in which he presented the criticism of it. I realize, in my short tenure in this House, that I am hardly able to set myself up as a critic; but I would like to give you my observations of it. Like my colleague from Gravelbourg, I agree with the principle that the basic foundation of a stable province is sound municipal government. I am convinced that the weakness in the Provincial Treasurer's budget was the lack of notice of this important factor. I have had considerable municipal experience, and one of the greatest problems that municipalities are facing, today, is the great increase that councils are required to levy to meet rising expenditures. I think that the time has come when senior governments must take notice of the fact that municipal taxes, whether they are on the farm, in the village, the town or the city, cannot be raised much higher. They are getting to a stage where they are confiscatory in nature. I was surprised that, outside of school grants, there is no more provision in the budget for this important factor.

I would like to quote you a few figures — I don't want to bore you with them; but in the rural municipality of North Battleford, No. 437, the mill rate has just doubled. In other words, on every quarter-section in that municipality, regardless of statistics that have been presented by the other side of the House the taxes have been doubled. I am not going to say much more about rural municipalities because there are many of my colleagues on this side of the House more competent to discuss these than I am; but I would like to say a few words about municipal finance with which I am a little more familiar, and that is in the cities of this province.

I have been rather surprised that this has never come to the fore before. When I look across the House I see a great number of members over there who have had experience in city affairs, including the ex-mayor of Regina (Hon. Mr. Williams) and other members who have spent some time on city councils. After all, this Government put itself up to be not only the friend of farmers, but also the friend of labour, and, in my opinion, they have not done one thing as far as the workingman who owns his home is concerned, with regard to taxation.

In the city of North Battleford, in 1944, we had to levy \$150,000; in 1949, this was raised to \$288,000, practically twice as much. Now, I realize that some of these expenditures were made necessary and probably there was no way of a Government being able to assist; but I feel that the shoe was a little bit on the other foot. For example, in the city of North Battleford, the T.B. levy which is paid by the municipalities, was raised from \$2500 to \$7000. With regard to school taxes, I am pleased that

March 16, 1950

the Minister of Education has put something in the budget for the increased cost of schools. During the period from 1944 to 1949, it was necessary for the ratepayers of the city of North Battleford to increase their levies for public school purposes alone to the extent of \$55,000, while, on the other hand, the total increase in grants was only a mere \$2,500. In other words, for every dollar of Government grant increase for that period, 1944 to 1949, it was necessary for the ratepayers of the city of North Battleford to levy for an additional \$20.

So that you will not think I am spending too much time on North Battleford, I looked around the province and I obtained a little information elsewhere. I understand that the mill rate in the city of Regina, in 1944, was approximately 49 mills. I think that, last year, it was around 60, and I see by the press that they are anticipating a levy of between 60 and 65 mills. I see by the morning paper, today, that the school costs in the city of Regina have risen from \$570,000 to \$945,000.

I would also like to quote a few figures in the hon. Premier's seat. In 1944, the levy was around \$200,000; in 1948, it was up to nearly \$300,000, with a mill rate of 45 mills. Since then, the 1949 mill rate was increased to 50 mills and I understand the 1950 mill rate is anticipated at 55. There again, the T.B. levy was increased from \$2,400 to \$5,600. I would suggest that, at the present time, taxes in cities and towns throughout this province are getting entirely out of line, and that senior governments are going to have to take notice of this fact, or before long we are going to find a lot of workers in the position that they will not be able to pay their taxes.

I would just like to refer to another line of taxes which I consider of the hidden type, and that is the question of the Government purchasing properties in cities and then the cities finding them absolutely tax free. I respect the right in the case of an institution such as the mental hospital or the parliament buildings — something that has no revenue. Probably in such cases your Provincial Government should not have to pay taxes, because after all, any of these organizations that are in a community, I think they do contribute to the welfare of that community. What I do object to are Government projects going into communities in which the Government purports to go into business, whether it be Liquor stores or Crown Corporations. I am of the firm belief that governments, in these so-called profit industries, should contribute something to the welfare of that municipality.

I would like to give you one example, and I give the Government considerable credit for this. The Minister of Social Welfare mentioned the question of the suites that were converted from airport buildings in North Battleford. Now, as I say, I give them credit. They came in at a time when housing was a difficult problem, and they did provide seventy-seven suites in the city, but that was all they provided. They made no attempt whatsoever to assist the city in any of the problems that were found immediately after. They city had to provide fire protection — I think they were paid for it, if there was a fire, and fortunately there hasn't been one; and it was the responsibility of the school boards to participate to the extent of either charging the students fees or accepting the responsibility of the education of them.

Now, I have prepared a few figures on this, and, as I say, I believe the project was a good one; but I do believe that the Government should have contributed something to the municipalities towards the share that they took in this particular project. In the city of North Battleford there are seventy-seven suites, but I think that this is probably comparative with any other community that had it, and I understand the reconversion and cost of these suites was approximately \$65,000. Now I heard it said that these suites were not making any money, but I find that the rents in these suites are comparable to any rents payable in North Battleford on taxable property — they run from \$34 to \$41 a month. Now if you take an average over a 12-month period, the project in North Battleford brings into the Government in the neighbourhood of \$35,000. I will assume it costs \$15,000 to operate that project there, which, in my opinion, is very high. Surely to goodness the Government can contribute something to the services that the municipality is providing in the way of fire protection, police protection, schooling and even keeping a road open to the airport in the winter!

I feel that the worst feature of this budget is the fact that there is no provision in it for municipal taxation, for the alleviating of the high cost of municipal taxation, and I am very concerned that nothing has been done. However, I realize that the answer to my question will probably be, “Where is the Government going to find the money?” I suppose that might be partially answered in the addition or change of the Education Tax to the E. & H. Tax, I think they call it — in the increasing of it to three per cent. I don't think that this is the solution to it. I believe that the time has come when the Government of this province will have to give a lot of study to the economy of administration and costs — unnecessary costs — in the operation of this province. I believe this is one economy that could be reduced materially, and I want to say, also, that I think it is time the Government forget about their Socialistic industries. I was one, in 1944, who felt that, if this Government could succeed in some of its Socialistic projects it was worth a try; but what is the picture today? It has changed considerably: Socialism has been a failure. Why doesn't this Government forget about it, and encourage industry, encourage the development of our natural resources and build up this province to the place where it can be one of the outstanding provinces in this Dominion of ours?

I would just like to refer you to a clipping I took out of the ‘Star-Phoenix’ of the last day or so. I don't know who E.J. Marshall is, but I presume as he is Saskatchewan Forest boss he must certainly have something to do with the timber policy of this Government. He suggests that the time has come when pulp mills and other industries should be attracted into the north. Can you see any industry going into the north under the present policies of this Government with regard to timber? Can you see capital coming into this province with the present fiscal policy of this Government? I can't see it. This Government should forget about these Socialistic industries and encourage private industry and encourage tourists to bring money in here. That is the only way this province will progress. I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposing the budget.

March 16, 1950

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, rising in this Legislature to take part in this Budget Debate, I would first like to pay tribute to some of the men who have passed on since we last met here. I did not know Mr. Murray intimately, but I understand from members on both sides of the House that he enjoyed the highest esteem of his fellow members. In the passing of Mr. Paul Prince we lost a very outstanding citizen in the province of Saskatchewan, and all of us on this side of the House realize that we lost a very close personal friend. One former member, Mr. Norman McLeod, formerly of Estevan, passed away last year at a comparatively young age. Mr. McLeod was a leading figure in community and political affairs in the Estevan district ever since I can remember, and his loss is going to be seriously felt by the community. My deepest sympathy is extended to the wives and children and close relatives of these people who gave so unselfishly in public life of themselves.

I would like to add my congratulations to the new members who are in this Legislature, and particularly the member who just spoke, the hon. member from The Battlefords. The new members from Cannington and The Battlefords, I think, are to be congratulated on their successes in the by-elections which we recently had. I think that those who have heard the member from Cannington and the member from The Battlefords who has just taken his seat, will agree with me that they will be valuable additions to this House.

I was particularly interested in the success of the member from Cannington. His constituency borders mine for nearly one hundred miles. In the Souris-Estevan seat we are all rather envious of the \$800,000 worth of roads that he is going to get up there. These roads were promised by a Mr. McCullough, a former member of the Dominion House and, on at least one occasion, an aspirant to this House. I hope really that Mr. McCullough's defeat in the by-election is not going to lessen his right to act as a spokesman for the Minister of Highways. In fact during the Cannington by-election it was strongly rumoured by C.C.F. workers (and they certainly didn't do anything to squelch the rumour) that he was to become the Minister of Highways if elected. In fact for a few months there were so many Cabinet Ministers being verbally shuffled around on the hustings, I thought I was going to see a lot of strange faces, or new ones at least, on the other side of the House. Possibly by the time 1952 or probably it's 1953 now, rolls around that might be the case.

I would also like to congratulate the new Minister of Public Health, the Member from Gull Lake, (Hon. T.J. Bentley) not only on his election but on his appointment as Minister of Public Health. When I heard him speak in the House here, some time ago, I thought that he had probably taken over the Minister of Agriculture's portfolio as well, and from the tenor of his remarks I feel that he is much better qualified in his present position than he would be as the director of soft words and fishy handshakes for the C.C.F. Party.

The recent election results in New Zealand, Australia and Great Britain, and I must not overlook the election, last year, in the Dominion of Canada, I think, show that Canada along with these other countries has turned its back on Socialism. The defeat of the C.C.F. candidates in Saskatchewan shows that the Saskatchewan farmer and the businessman and the worker are getting wise to the perils of Socialism, and apparently they would rather go on with the expanding phases of social security under the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent than try out costly Socialistic experiments under the Winchs and the Coldwells.

Now, in a more serious vein Mr. Speaker, a matter has been brought to my attention which is the matter of radio broadcasting of the proceedings in the House. There is no question but that the citizens of the province are entitled to hear what is going on and to hear what their elected representatives are doing. I do submit, however that these broadcasts, which show mainly the debates of the House, do not give a true picture to the people in the country of the work that has to be done by members on both sides of the House in various committees. Many people, I might say, have asked me if we do nothing but come up here and crack jokes and heckle each other. Now, it may be presumptuous of me to say so being one of the youngest members in the House, but I seriously think that just because the radio is on there is no reason for everybody to try and become a Jimmy Durante or try and outdo him. It's probably bad enough that we should be likened to Fibber McGee at times. Seriously, I would say that I don't think any of us, particularly in these troubled times, should say or do anything which is going to bring into disrespect throughout the country cherished institutions such as this Legislature.

Because my next remarks follow, I don't mean that they should necessarily be connected with what I have just said previously. But I do say that many of the remarks and jibes levelled at my hon. friend the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), I think probably are not of keeping with the dignity of this House. We all realize that in debates, heated debates particularly, there are apt to be things said which probably many people would rather not have said. However, the hon. member was referred to as a "hybrid" and "wet behind the ears". Now, I would like to point out that he was a very gallant fighter pilot during the recent war. He was shot down three times in action, and on one time into the English Channel. Now, he may have been wet behind the ears and some other places at that time; but it's probably unfortunate that there aren't more men of his calibre who have shown his courage and manliness, taking part in public affairs.

I was very impressed, a couple of years ago with the fanfare that attended the passing of a Bill called An Act to protect Certain Civil Rights, The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act.

March 16, 1950

And there was some reference in this House, recently, respecting a gentleman, who, possibly through no fault of his own, hasn't got one of these smooth cultured and cultivated accents. Lots of us have different accents, Mr. Speaker, whether it be Irish, English, Scotch, or of some Central European extraction, and the Bill of Rights, one section of it, says this:

“No person shall publish . . . through any radio broadcasting station . . . any representation tending or likely to tend to deprive, abridge or otherwise restrict, because of the race, creed, religion, colour or ethnic or national origin of any person . . . the enjoyment by any such person . . . of any right to which he is entitled under the law.”

Now, I agree with that, and I don't think that it is very fitting, Sir, with all due respect, that because a person has an accent, they should be referred to as a refugee or something from 'Lower Slobovia'.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy: — My reference to the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) as a fugitive from 'Lower Slobovia' arose because of his referring to Russia on many, many occasions in this House, and it had absolutely nothing to do with the fact that the member was of a certain national origin. I am the last man in this House to discriminate in as far as race, colour, creed, or national origin is concerned, and the member from Souris-Estevan should know that.

Mr. McCormack: — I am pleased to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite sure that the hon. member, now that he has made that explanation, would not like to insinuate that because anybody had an accent of any kind he should not be allowed to be a member of this House. I am very pleased to know that.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I intend to refer particularly to my own constituency, and I think you will find that I will, for the most part, stay within the boundaries of that constituency and certainly within the boundaries of the province of Saskatchewan. The constituency of Souris-Estevan is in the extreme southeast corner of the province, and is bounded on the south by the State of North Dakota, U.S.A., and on the east by the province of Manitoba. On behalf of my constituents from whom I hear occasionally, I would like to make a few references to the highway situation in the constituency. The Minister of Highways made a very good speech, yesterday, and I would like to draw his attention to a few of the things that I have been asked to bring up in this House.

The constituency has one main highway running from east to west, being No. 18, and three north and south tag ends of highways. These highways, I might say, are all in need of rebuilding. There was some work done from Oxbow east in the past year or so, and, unfortunately, it didn't amount to a great deal despite the fact that there was a considerable amount of money spent on it.

I would suggest to the Minister of Highways that he give some serious consideration to his statement, yesterday, that highway construction crews operated by the Government could do the work cheaper than highway construction companies. A return which was tabled in this House, recently, respecting the road from Oxbow to the Manitoba boundary on No. 18, shows that a total of 43 miles was improved ("improved" was the word that the Return used) at a cost of nearly \$92,000 in the year 1948.

Now, what was done to this road — and these are the figures from the Return? Three miles were constructed, three miles were gravelled, 10 miles were reconstructed, and 27 miles regravelled. Now, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the main portion of the work done there (and I have been over it myself) was the three miles that were reconstructed and the three miles that were gravelled. The other work did not amount to a very big proportion of the total work done there.

It is difficult really to see why these miles should cost so much money. The road runs over ordinary level prairie. I would suggest to the Minister that perhaps if he went down and talked to some of the residents around there about the activities of one of these efficient and inexpensive Government construction crews, he might be able to find the solution as to why the cost is so exorbitant.

We also have Highway No. 39 — the Premier and I have Highway No. 39 — which runs from North Portal through Weyburn and up to Regina. We have a great deal of it and, needless to say, this road, or the major portion of it, was constructed prior to the provincial election in 1948. I do think it is unfortunate — and most people who have travelled it will agree it is unfortunate — that the road from Weyburn to North Portal was not reconstructed as the road from Weyburn to Regina was; and I do think that the policy of laying blacktop on the old road will result in a lot of headaches for the Highway Department in the not too distant future. This highway is of particular importance because North Portal, on the American border, is one of the principal ports of entry into Saskatchewan, and a very great amount of tourist trade can only be induced into the province by all-hard surface all-weather highways. Unfortunately, however, this highway only serves a very small portion of the constituency, and those who are not fortunate enough to have Highway No. 39 running near them are left without any decent roads on which to travel. While we need main roads I do believe that our main market roads, our bridges, our secondary highways should not be entirely disregarded.

While I am on this subject I would like to refer to the fact that Highway No. 39 runs within one mile of a very thriving and prosperous village, the village of Bienfait. I would again strongly recommend that this one mile be completed into the village of Bienfait if for no other reason than that, in the winter time, a lot of the men who work in the mines live there, and it is not possible at all times for them to get to work to the mines which are south of there, and there is a great resulting loss in coal production and in wages for these men on numerous occasions in the winter.

I don't want to overlook, while I am at it, the portion of highway which runs from Torquay down to Marianthal on the American border, and also Highway No. 47 running from Estevan south to the American border.

March 16, 1950

Both of these highways need a considerable amount of work done on them. I believe they both need rebuilding and, of course, in connection with all these highways there is the problem of snow removal in the winter time. That is one of the reasons why I am sorry that the road from Weyburn south to North Portal was not rebuilt and a high grade put in there.

I might say that there are five customs and immigration ports on the southern boundaries of my constituency and, despite the fact that many of our good neighbours from the south are being continually denounced as war-mongers and fascists and imperialistic capitalists and one thing and another, we are only too glad to have them come into Saskatchewan and send their capitalistic dollars with us. Most of the people in my constituency — I think it also applies in the southern portions of the Weyburn constituency and the other constituencies which run along the border — have relatives and close friends residing in North Dakota. Much of our social and sporting life is enjoyed in company with our good American neighbours. A lot of them are farmers and wealthy ranchers, much the same as the Minister of Agriculture. I am quite sure he could associate with them without much danger of being set upon. Many of them are business and working men and professional men and teachers, and ardent golfers, like our friend the Minister of Social Welfare, and I am very sure that he and I could visit one of their clubs and find a great deal in common with them not only on the links but in the clubhouse.

I feel in this House, and particularly while radio broadcasts are being made, Mr. Speaker, that those who purpose to speak for the Government should forget a lot of this anti-American nonsense and not let their fanaticism run away with their reason. I cannot agree with the C.C.F. Federal Leader who has said that he thought Canada should be a thousand miles away from the United States. I don't know just what direction he wants to shove us in. Nor can I agree with some of the gentlemen opposite when they take cracks at our good neighbour to the south. I was rather surprised actually to find out that when we heard about the exercise 'Sweet Briar', no measures for the defence of the province had been taken by the Minister of Agriculture. I think we are very fortunate, indeed, Sir, to have this generous and good 'big brother' to the south of us, and I really hope that some of these ill-advised utterances will cease.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy: — What has that to do with the Budget Speech?

Mr. McCormack: — The Minister of Social Welfare asked me what this had to do with the Budget Speech. Well, if for no other reason than pure selfishness, we should encourage American tourists to our province. Visitors to Canada in 1949 spent more money than they ever have before, and figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics show that American tourists — not necessarily all American, but tourists — left about \$288,000,00 in Canada, last year, and these were mostly received, I think, from Americans. Everyone profits in increased international good will as well as money from this tourist trade. I would like to quote a little article which appeared in the 'Saskatoon Star-Phoenix' which, I think, sets it out more concisely than I can:

“Our problem now is to devise ways and means to persuade these visitors to return and to bring their friends. Better roads, better tourist accommodations and better tourist literature. These are effective means to encourage tourists to visit this country, and the courtesy and friendliness which we display towards our guests in the simplest and perhaps the most effectual of all.”

Mr. Speaker, a trip to Souris-Estevan would not be complete without a visit to the coal mines, and I would earnestly urge all members, including members on the other side of the House, to come down and pay us a visit. You will see there the finest and the most up-to-date mining equipment on this continent, and I would like the members of this House to remember that 1,800,000 tons of coal were produced from the Estevan-Bienfait coalfields, last year — quite an asset to the industrial development of the province.

One reason why I think that a lot of the members should come down is that I think there is a great misconception as to how the coal is still being mined down there. All the coal at the present time, or 98.6 per cent of it to be exact, is being mined by the open pit or the strip method; that is, the overburden is taken off maybe anywhere from 10 to 45 feet, and then there is a seam of coal which will vary probably from five to 12 feet underneath, and this coal is either lashed or stripped out and loaded into cars and put over the tipples.

One reason that this coal production is so important is that it is the key to our main source of electrical power production in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time, and a large number of people down there, approximately four hundred, are directly connected with the mining industry, and practically the whole of the community is indirectly dependent on the mines for its living. Yorkton city is now connected to the Power Corporation's plant, and I do not think it is unlikely that, some day, a very large proportion of the electrical energy produced in the province of Saskatchewan, will be produced in Estevan. I would like to assure the Government and the Power Corporation, and any private enterprisers that may be listening in, that they will have my whole-hearted support in any steps they take towards this goal.

I would also recommend to the members that they read the Coal Commission report which was tabled in the House recently. I might say I have not had an opportunity to digest it fully but, from superficial reading, it appears to contain many reasonable deductions and I would also recommend it to the serious consideration of the Minister of Labour, because I think some of the information he might get from the Coal Commission report would be a more accurate source of information than some that he has had with respect to the mines down there. I seriously hope that, at a later date, we may have an opportunity of discussing the Coal Commission report and its recommendations more fully.

In passing, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Labour a comparison of some of the wage rates paid by Crown Corporations with those paid by private industry in my constituency. Wages which are paid by the Government which professes to be such an ardent friend of labour make an interesting comparison when they are compared to private industry wages.

March 16, 1950

The Government Brick Plan in Estevan — wages range from 92 cents per hour for what might be termed common labour to a high of \$1.17 for a shovel or a dragline operator. At the Sodium Sulphate Plant, which is an operation which might be similar to this type of strip mining in many respects, wages range from 93 cents per hour for labour to \$1.15 per hour for a shovel operator. Now, if you go up North a little farther to the Box Factory, wages run from 84 cents per hour to a high of \$1.10 per hour for carpenter foremen. In the Power Corporation, 80 cents an hour is paid for labour and a senior operating engineer, who is one of the highest paid men in the plant, gets only \$260.00 a month.

I might say that in the Estevan Field, due to the high mechanization of the mines and the great amount of electrical energy that is used in the production of coal, there are men working in the mines and men who are working for the Power Corporation who do practically the same thing. I would like to refer to a Union which the Minister of Labour has at times, or at least if he has not directly a lot of his officials have referred to as a 'company union', that is the Saskatchewan Coal Miners' Union. They get \$1.16 an hour for common labour. That is 24 cents per hour more than common labour in the brick-yard, 23 cents per hour more than at the Sodium Sulphate Plant, 32 cents per hour more than at the Government Box Factory, and 36 cents per hour more than at the Power Corporation, almost half as much again. Surely, at least in the Power Corporation and the Sodium Sulphate Plant, where such tremendous profits are reported to have been made, the wages of the men there could be placed on a comparable basis with those engaged in private industry.

In addition, the Saskatchewan Coal Miners' Union have a five per cent contributory pension plan whereby they put five per cent of their wages into a fund, and the company matches it with an extra five per cent. I have gone through these union agreements which are tabled in a Return which issued from the Provincial Secretary's Office on January 18, 1950, set out these wage rates I have referred to. The Return is signed by the Hon. C.C. Williams who is also the Minister of Labour as well as the Provincial Secretary, so he should be familiar with these agreements. In none of these union agreements with the possible exception of provisions made under the Telephone Corporation and the Power Corporation, are there any superannuation benefits or provisions provided. The rest of the wages other than common labour in the mines are correspondingly higher. A dragline or a shovel operator, getting \$1.15 per hour at Chaplin, would get \$1.69 at the Taylorton Mines or a difference of 54 cents per hour more, and he would get 52 cents per hour more at the Taylorton Mine than at the Government Brick Plant. I said in this House, last year, and I intend to say it again — I think that, in the Estevan field, the wages paid by the Government corporations and industries are far too low when they are compared with the wages paid by private industry. I do not mean to say that the wages paid to the men at the mines is too high. With increased production due to increased efficiency in operation, and due to large investments of capital to eliminate a lot of the costs of production, wages, we hope, will continue to increase, and I hope these wages will continue despite the efforts of the Minister and despite some of the policies of the Government that he represents.

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, did I understand the hon. member to say that the efforts of the Minister had had anything to do with holding wages down?

Mr. McCormack: — I did not say that, Mr. Speaker; but I say that the efforts of the minister to try to have this union broken up have not done anything to create any peace and harmony in the field. I would like to remind the Minister of Labour that over one-third of these men are veterans and they resent very much his inference that they are stooges for anybody.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, I have never, never used such a word in reference to the miners at Estevan or anybody else. It seems to me the member who is speaking had something to do, a year or so ago, with holding wages down, but certainly I never did.

Mr. McCormack: — The Minister and some of the officials of his Department, in fact one official who is now gone said it to me, directly, that this is just a company union and a bunch of stooges, and one former employee of the Government, when he was done at the Coal Commission and who seemed to direct a lot of the policy of the Government, Dr. Shumiatcher, made exactly the same statement; and I am quite sure that if the Minister does not think that this is a company union, his good friend John Stokaluk who is the vice-president of the United Mine Workers, would like to hear it.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. member, is that a company union? May I ask my hon. friend if he thinks that is not a company union.

Mr. McCormack: — I do not think it is a company union. If it is a company union, it is too bad you haven't got all company unions and getting some decent wages or your employees. These men, Mr. Speaker, have good wages and good working conditions, and they do not want to lose them because of the outside interference of anybody. Another interesting act is that the Saskatchewan Coal Miners' Union has never lost one day's work because of being out on strike. Their wages and their working conditions have always been well ahead of the rest of the fields. Again, Sir, I would like to invite the members of the Government side of the House and this side of the House to come down and visit the Estevan coal fields, the power centre and the brick yard, and I am sure that they will get quite a revelation as to what is going on in those three places.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer, for a few minutes if I may, to the question of the school unit. The Minister of Education when speaking in the House on Monday made reference to the larger school units, and he suggested that in this Session there had been no Liberal member get up and make any statement respecting the larger unit. I had not intended to make any reference to it. I sincerely believe that it is a question which should be decided by the ratepayers and the parents of the children involved, directly themselves, on its merits.

March 16, 1950

Hon. W.S. Lloyd: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: the hon. member is misquoting me. May I correct him? My statement was that not only in this Session but at no time had any Liberal member in this House ever stood up in his place and said one good thing about the school unit. That was my statement.

Mr. McCormack: — I misunderstood the hon. member and I accept his explanation. I am going to say quite a few good things about it, Mr. Minister, and I am going to say quite a few bad things about it. From what I have seen and heard and read of the larger unit, I am convinced that it has a lot of advantages and disadvantages. At the outset, so that there will be no misunderstanding, I am not opposed to the principle of the larger unit. What I am opposed to, and what I am concerned about, is the fact that this Government has caused a lot of resentment by the method it adopted in putting the larger school unit in, and many people who are strongly in favour of giving the larger unit administration a fair trial resent the manner in which they were deprived of their democratic right to have a vote on the question.

What is the history of the larger unit legislation in Saskatchewan? The Liberal Government, believing that the larger unit possessed some merits, passed an Act in 1940 making provision for establishment of the larger units. Well, I see my hon. friends opposite laugh because I am quite sure they are one hundred per cent in favour of the principle of not letting anybody have a vote on anything if they can avoid it. Now the Act that was passed by the Liberal Government provided for the establishment of larger units, but only as a result of a vote of the ratepayers concerned. Under the Liberal Act, . . .

(Interruption by Mr. R.A. Walker) . . .

Well, Clarence Darrow over there seems to know all the laws, but if he will just keep quiet he will have his chance to get up and speak some time later. Under the Liberal Act, two hundred ratepayers representing not less than twenty rural school districts could petition the Minister of Education for a vote on the question of organizing the large school unit. The Act further provided that, upon receipt of a petition, the matter could be submitted to a vote of the resident ratepayers concerned. Assets and Liabilities were to remain the property of the individual school district itself.

In the province at that time, there was a growing sentiment in favour of the larger unit. I believe, however, that the high-handed and arbitrary methods employed by the Government in imposing the larger units on the people without giving them an opportunity for a vote, has done much to injure the case in favour of the larger unit. In the first Session of the Legislature in 1944, when the C.C.F. took office, they made some very significant changes in the larger unit legislation. They took out of the Act the provisions guaranteeing the ratepayers the right to vote as to whether they wanted the unit or not. They replaced it with a provision giving the Government the right to impose larger units on any particular districts. Another drastic change was with respect to village districts.

They were to be included as larger units were organized, and they lost all their rights to have a vote as to whether they wished to be included in the larger unit or not.

Under this Act which was passed in 1940 by the Liberal Government, assets and liabilities would have been left with the districts, I do not know whether or not that was a feasible proposition. Under the new Act, however, assets and liabilities were transferred to the larger unit board. Now this provision, as I said, rightly or wrongly has given rise to much injustice and a great deal of resentment and I think that, for the most part, all the objectionable features to the larger school unit have arisen out of the legislation which was put into effect by a C.C.F. Government. The larger unit boards in my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, for the most part have been composed of hard working, industrious men who have had municipal and school trustee experience. They worked very hard in their endeavour to make the larger unit a success and they have been conscientious people who are interested in the educational welfare of the children in the province just as much as these men who are advocating the larger school unit, who feel that they are not getting the same educational services now for the money expended as they should be. The Estevan unit, for example, was established in November, 1944. Under the present Act a petition may be presented to the Minister at the end of a five-year period, any time within six months after the expiration of five years, so these people have six months from November 14, 1949, within which to get a petition and send it in to the Government. I believe that there is a petition being circulated now, and I sincerely believe that if 50 per cent of the ratepayers in that unit request a vote (that is what the Act calls for, 50 per cent), the Minister should . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Fifteen per cent.

Mr. J.R. McCormack: — I submit that if the 15 per cent Sir, request a vote, they should be entitled to have that vote, and I sincerely hope that, if that petition is presented, those people be allowed to have the vote and that the Minister will direct a vote.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — On a point of privilege: is the hon. member inferring that they won't have the right to vote?

Mr. McCormack: — I am not inferring, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that they are going to have it. That is the main thing.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege and I think I am in order, the Act provides that there will be.

Mr. McCormack: — I do not believe that that is correct, that the Act provides that there will be. I think you had better check that, Mr. Minister. In any event, I believe that the whole question requires serious consideration of everybody in this province, and I think a review of the administrative difficulties of the unit should be made and particularly with the view of retaining the progressive features of the unit whatever they may be.

March 16, 1950

Above all, I think that these people should be entitled to have a vote without any outside interference from anybody telling them which way they should vote. They can judge that pretty well on their own experience, from the advantages and disadvantages that they have enjoyed or otherwise under it. I do not know how I can make it any clearer. Probably some other people on the other side of the House might be able to; but I do not think the Minister of Social Welfare could understand it if I drew it out in a picture for him.

I was not surprised to hear the Minister of Education, the other day, echo his 'blood brothers' or may be his bloodless brothers; but he called on the Federal Government to take over the burden of education from the province. I was surprised, however, to realize . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I did not call on the Federal Government to take over the burden. I said before Saskatchewan people and youngsters in any other province were going to get a square deal in education, then the Federal Government was going to have to take some consideration of the problem.

Mr. McCormack: — I agree with the hon. member on that, I think that we should get some assistance on it but I would like to point this out. This is what the Premier had to say in a radio broadcast on February 16, 1943: "The first thing which the 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 the buck to municipal and local school boards for maintaining our education 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."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the budget, this year, indicates that a major share of the taxes which we are going to have to pay are going to be spent on Health, Welfare and other social security measures. With these measures of health and social security, I think we all agree in principle, and the amount to be spent on these services is directly equivalent to the amount to be spent on the development of natural resources, agriculture, education, and municipal matters. However, the money we spend on government services of any kind must of necessity be related to the amount of money that can be collected from the people of Saskatchewan and their ability to pay these taxes. Up to the present, we have been able to stand the strain of a large budget mainly because farm income has been kept at a high level in the province during the past few years. But if we have any prolonged reduction in this farm income, it is my opinion that the province will find itself in a serious and difficult financial position. Because we need more industries and industrial development in the province of Saskatchewan in order to develop our economy, and in order to provide a more balanced economy, and because the policies of the C.C.F. Government, in my opinion, discourage that industrial development, we are finding ourselves out of step with the rest of Canada which is taking unprecedented steps in industrial expansion, particularly if we look to the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba.

If we are going to pay for these increased services, we must not only enjoy a population increase, but our economy must be stabilized by the encouragement of private capital to come in and develop our secondary industries in the province. It is my belief that the C.C.F.'s adherence to its creed of Socialism is the main reason why the Government must accept full responsibility for the province's failure to enjoy the expanding economy that the rest of Canada is having, and for this reason I shall oppose the budget.

Mr. John G. Banks (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in entering this Budget debate, I would congratulate the member from The Battlefords and the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts). It is certainly an education to any person to hear the vivid description of his constituency that was given by the member from Meadow Lake. These were both "maiden" speeches, and I am certain that he, after living 43 years in that constituency, must be highly respected. He gave us a good speech. It was all material from his own constituency, and I am sure that he would be pleased to place his cause in the best light possible at home. With regard to all the other speeches, I wish to say that they were very well delivered. I haven't given congratulations yet to the members on the other side. I am going to give them a little later on when I get going.

Firstly, I have a request to place before this House, and it comes from the Cote Indians who have three reserves right adjoining my town. There are roughly between five and six hundred of these people living there, and it would appear that, within the last 10 or 12 years, they have developed quite a little. They are in farming now. I think that 30 per cent of them have automobiles, possibly 50 per cent have tractors, and I would say that they are very modest in their demands, because all they have asked me to present for them is a request for Mothers' Allowances and the rights of hunting. That's a very modest request, Mr. Speaker, and they base that on the fact that they pay taxes. They pay a lot of education tax, and a lot of gasoline tax towards the Province, and they say "we are entitled to this Mothers' allowance." They have the same trouble as there have been other places — domestic troubles; women left alone with children — and in view of the fact that they are participating in the upkeep of this Province they quite properly say, I suggest, that they should receive those rights.

While the other may be a contentious matter — it has arisen since this Government took power — and while these Indians are becoming Canadianized, they still want to hunt. Now, the area from which they would hunt is around our district and there is a game preserve there, a private game preserve. Some seven or eight men have those rights and I am informed that they take off of that preserve each year \$500 apiece, and it has been as high as \$1,200 apiece, trapping muskrats. Now, the Indians are completely shut off. I don't want to say or give an opinion today as to the legality of that; but these Indians are continually calling on and referring (and I have heard it many times) to the treaty with the late Queen Victoria, and this appears to be a direct transgression on the rights of the Indians, and I am pleased to be able to present their case here.

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): — Is the hon. member not aware that the Indians are entirely the wards of the Federal Government, and it is a constitutional matter over which the Provincial Government has not control whatsoever?

March 16, 1950

Mr. John G. Banks: — I have told the House that I was presenting their case, and, whether it is a constitutional question or not, I say they have reached the stage where they are paying large taxes here, and they demand these rights in return. Now, having done that, I don't intend to proceed further.

There is a matter here which may cause some contention, but it has arisen by reason of a statement made, yesterday, in this House by the Minister of Highways. He presented a tax receipt. He said it was a tax receipt. Firstly, let me say that I am not attaching any blame to the Minister for bringing that evidence here, but that tax receipt is so palpably wrong and misleading that I would not be doing my duty to both sides of the House and to the people here, if I didn't bring it to the attention of the House.

In the Municipality of Cote, which adjoins our town and surrounds it, they have the following taxes: larger school unit, 20 mills; hospital tax, 8 mills. Now let me explain that. The hospital has been built, it will be open there very soon, — I'd better go into that matter now and have it cleared up. It is built under The Union Hospital Act, and I want to say a good word for the Government in that. They have contributed \$40,000 to that hospital; the Dominion Government have contributed \$76,000; the balance has been made up of taxation, and at the end of 1950 that hospital will be paid for and there won't be one dollar in debt on it. I certainly appreciate, and I want to thank this Government on behalf of my constituency, for what they have done for us, publicly and in a wholehearted manner. This hospital tax of eight mills, which seems very high, is assessed — there is about 16 mills to clear up the hospital, and as it was paid by all the municipalities they decided to do it and pay it off, so that in 1950 there is a mill rate of eight mills. Now that, gentlemen, with the public revenue tax, brings the mill rate up to 30 without providing anything for the municipal rate. Now, I think that is 12 mills; but I have put it down to 10, and we have 40 mills. On an assessment of \$3,200 that would bring a tax of \$128 on a Saskatchewan property. Now, I think I know where that thing came from. I think I know the purpose of it, and I want to exonerate the Minister. He has nothing to do with it. But it was made for the purpose of misleading; it was made for the purpose of creating an impression and to provide him with an argument yesterday. Now, the Minister — I don't think he knew anything about this . . .

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — I would ask the hon. friend what Municipality he was quoting?

Mr. Banks: — The R.M. of Cote.

Hon. Sturdy: — Wasn't the Minister quoting from the Municipality of Togo?

Mr. Banks: — Well, what I am saying today is municipal office, and I put this municipal rate at 10 mills — I believe it is 12, but I put it down to 10 to be on the safe side. In that case it would be \$128. He didn't tell us either the cause of the higher taxes in Manitoba. The reason of that is the consolidated school, which is operated by the municipality of Shell

River in Manitoba for that very purpose; and I don't know, but I rather think there will be a run on the municipal office over that statement that was made yesterday, asking for refund of taxes. They are not going to take the word of the Secretary any more when a Minister of the Crown, innocently I believe (and any of us might do it), makes a statement which is so wrong and erroneous.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — The Minister quoted from a tax notice. Is my hon. friend now either inferring that the tax notice is a fictitious one or that somebody has altered this tax notice; that the tax notice is erroneous and it is not a genuine and authentic tax notice. I think he has to clear that point up.

Mr. Banks: — Absolutely erroneous. Completely erroneous.

Mr. A. Loftson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There seems to be something wrong with the sounding here. I couldn't understand the speaker from that side. I was wondering if the same echo is from this side. If that could be corrected — it's almost impossible to understand.

Mr. Tucker: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the other day I was quite surprised, I know that the hon. friend from Cumberland has fairly good hearing, but several times he was asked something from that side of the House and he couldn't hear at all what was being said. Now, I had to tell him what was being said from the opposite side of the House. There's really something wrong with the acoustics here, because my hon. friend's hearing is good enough that he can hear ordinarily, and he said he couldn't hear anything. Now, there must be something wrong with the situation.

Mr. Speaker: — As far as the acoustics are concerned I think the trouble is that they are trying to keep it down because the hon. member moves backwards and forwards from his microphone, and when you get it up so you can hear it, it just squeals, that's all.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, it was mine. I was too close to the mike, and when you are too close to the mike it disturbs it. But I would ask my friend that, when he makes a statement that the tax statement is erroneous, he is not implying that there was anything wrong with the authentic tax notice. If there was anything wrong with the tax notice then there is some mistake in the municipal office.

Mr. Banks: — I am not attaching any blame to the Minister, and I am not responsible for the tax notice.

Mr. Tucker: — When the Minister has undertaken to read from that document I was on the point, several times, of asking him to make that available to the House by tabling it. I would have done so except that I was voted down by this Assembly on a previous occasion when a Minister did exactly the same thing referring to a public document. To avoid the misunderstanding that has developed today, I wish now that I had asked that that tax receipt had been tabled so that we could all have seen just what was being referred to.

March 16, 1950

Mr. Speaker: — Perhaps the hon. member who used that tax notice could substantiate his position.

Mr. Banks: — Mr. Speaker, last night I spoke to Mr. Douglas, Minister of Highways, when he came out, and he seemed very much surprised. He didn't seem to know exactly what was the question. What I thought was that he had read out the municipal taxes, and had not given the school taxes; but he said "No, this was complete".

Now while we are on this question of the municipalities, there is a matter I want to bring up and it seems as if every part of the province has the same problem. We have in our town a number of men, mostly heads of households who have worked hard all their lives; I could cite very well the labourers in the town of Kamsack. They have given just about everything they have. It has been pick and shovel work, and they can't do any other class of work except manual labour, and nobody wants to employ an old man. Many of those men of 58, 59, 60 are still heads of homes and they have no means of livelihood. Don't forget that this question of relief is one that we have not been worried with a great deal; but we have this question of need — that a man who has worked all his life may be able to get a job running an elevator in the city or he may get some light job, but in a small town those positions are so limited that it really doesn't amount to anything. They are not able to go out and saw wood, or do pick and shovel work, and the question is what are we doing for them? I know a few municipalities who give them \$10 a month and that is supplemented by the Government giving them a further \$10 a month. Well, that is not enough. These men are worn out. I have come in contact several times in the last few years with that arrangement the Dominion Government made with the returned soldiers; even in the last war they gave a worn-out pension. It is not because a man is sick or is lazy or anything of that nature; it is because he could not carry on his obligations any longer. That worn-out pension I wish to commend to the House, today, for those people who are between the ages of 58 and 70 (when they become eligible for old-age pension). Something should be done. I would suggest here that this Government consider a scheme of that kind. They don't want to call it relief. These men shouldn't be branded as relief recipients. Many of them have raised large families. What we want to say is "We are going to grant you a pension." Let the municipality carry one-quarter of it (they would do it) and pass the rest on to the Provincial Government — a pension of even \$40. a month, say, after the age of 58, not to be given indiscriminately, but to be given on a doctor's examination, when he can come and vouch and say "I have been examined by the doctor and I am not fit for that occupation on which I lived and maintained my family for a number of years."

I would like to commend that to the Provincial Government for their consideration, and it seems to me a worthy cause. As a practising lawyer in that district, I come in contact with that continually, and I can only tell them, "You'll have to go back to your municipality;" but as far as giving a living wage is concerned, these municipalities where a living amount is concerned, are wholly unable to do so.

The speech of the Minister of Education, (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) was very well prepared and was quite well delivered, but there was one word in that speech that stuck in my mind, Mr. Speaker (I haven't forgotten it yet),

and that was the word “pickpockets”. He was talking about these large industrial concerns who manufacture the agriculture implements for Saskatchewan. Pickpockets! and he wanted to tender in evidence in support of that the fact that during the period under discussion they had made some money — that is, from 1944 to the present. These pickpockets! Well, I wonder if he ever considers what went on in that period 1944 to 1950. What did we get? Do we know anything about the tractors that came into Saskatchewan? The mechanizing of the farms in Saskatchewan? I wonder if the hon. Minister knows anything of the farms in Saskatchewan? I wonder if the hon. Minister knows anything about that! It was so at first, but we couldn’t do everything at once. Any member from the country knows how these farmers were pressing for implements, and you know that, from 1946, the revenues of this province have doubled. The value of agricultural products sold jumped to \$406 million. 1947 came along about the same; 1948 down a little, and 1949 is down; today we don’t know just how much it is — but I wonder if that could have been accomplished without the “pickpockets”. I am going to ask this House, is there one man in this House or in Saskatchewan would trade the implement companies for this Planning Board, and let them supply the implements? And the answer will be “no”. Well, so the pickpockets made money. What else happened during that period? Didn’t everybody make something? I can tell you what happened in our district. When that quota was off, at the end of 1943, the spring of 1944, all the mortgages were paid off, and I don’t think we have any today, I don’t know of any, and I’m in that business. There was all these small businesses started up in Saskatchewan, some of them on a shoestring, but I am going to say they prospered in this period and liquidation and bankruptcy are unknown today. Business multiplied and why was that? Because of the production on the farm produced by those tractors that were sold by the implement companies. We don’t want to trade them for a Planning Board. Oh, no, no!

Now, just by way of something, he didn’t tell us what was the reason of that cost; but have you seen the scale of wages? You know, Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in a little pamphlet put out under “The Dome”, three or four months ago. I still have it. And on that pamphlet was a picture of Pat Conroy. My, he’s a round-faced fellow, healthy looking, well-groomed; and, you know, beside that picture was a fair man — I had to look a second time to recognize him — it was the Premier of this Province. Pat Conroy — well, I want to tell you this, that this very thing is probably what brought about some of the racial prejudice, because there has been quite a levy on labour. They had to raise wages and they couldn’t pay the campaign funds that Mr. Pat Conroy promised, unless they were getting substantial wages. And then those promises came to this Government. Well I didn’t think that the Premier was entirely at home on that picture — his picture didn’t look that way; but I am glad and I want to assure him that I think he is in perfect health today, and I think possibly he was a little worried to have that picture appear. That may have been the cause of it at that time. Now, I can only say that we need the implement companies. They are just as important in the economic life of this province as the Crown Corporations. We have just as much right to say that and I want to say that that term has never been addressed with respect to the Crown Corporations. If the Minister wants to indulge in speeches of that kind, he will get the same sent back to him. His conduct is more the conduct of a hide merchant than a Minister of the Crown of Saskatchewan.

There was another thing he referred to, and that was the taxes

March 16, 1950

which are paid to the Dominion government. The hon. member for Biggar (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) got into quite a hysteria in dealing with the Dominion taxes. Mr. Speaker, what is the use of hearing one side of the case unless you hear the other side? He did not tell us that the Dominion Government was paying back to Saskatchewan \$17,400,000 this year. He did not tell us that, in the constituency of Yorkton, we received \$1,125,000 in children's allowances — and there are twenty constituencies in Saskatchewan. Well now, why have one side of the picture and not the other? That is what I can't get at. If he is going to refer to the taxation field, why not come out and tell people about it? Under that constitution under which we operate, the Province of Saskatchewan is just as independent as the Dominion and in the field of taxation have absolute right over direct taxation. That has been in effect for eighty-three years and the province has undisputed jurisdiction in that. The Dominion has undisputed right equally in indirect taxation, so that we can only say the Ministers haven't faced the question very fairly because these taxes are levied, not in one province, but in nine provinces and if we go over the whole field we will find out that there is a pretty fair distribution of taxes today. Always this talk against Ottawa! I don't know whether that is the first step towards secession or not, but it is talk that we don't want to listen to very much. How could Saskatchewan be what she is today if it hadn't been for the Dominion Government? Do you recall 1937 — 1938, those terrible years. I do. Those years were very bleak ones. We didn't have anything in Saskatchewan. And what happened? The Dominion Government came in — our Ministers were able to get the support. I am just going to tell you that, at that time, there was \$90,000,000 advanced without a scratch of security, and at a later date, in 1945, we cut that in two. Is that very bad treatment for a parent Government? Well, why don't they come forward and tell some of the good things.

I am not going to take very much time. I don't think the House is in the humour for speech, today. All the members have heard enough I believe. But I do want to talk about this little "pet" of the Government; I want to say something about it. I refer to the Planning Board and the Finance Office. Now, I don't know about the "problem children", but I would say that both of these — the Planning Board and the Finance Office — are the parents. I don't like to see it in Saskatchewan where we are used to responsible Government which we inherited from our fathers, and I don't like to see this disregard of that. We are asked, each year, to appropriate money for His Majesty's services; that is what we are asked to do; but in any event these Crown Corporations and the Finance Office seem to be an exception. They are both the creation of Socialism. If it wasn't for Socialism we wouldn't need it, and the great objection I see is this. They went through it in the other provinces a hundreds years ago — that is the right of this Planning Board to appropriate money which this Legislature hasn't voted. That is a right which doesn't exist in law; that is contrary to custom, and has been for more than a hundred years, that all the expenditures of His Majesty must be voted by the people's representatives. I guess one of the older men here, and the younger ones too, will remember the row in Ontario over that — the Governor and his Council. Well, here we have today appropriations made, money handed over to the Planning Board, to finance these without appropriations. Some of them were called loans — I admit there are some appropriations. I told you I didn't want to go into a long list of figures — I am only going to speak ten minutes more.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member must either state it or withdraw it.

Mr. Banks: — Eight million dollars has apparently been appropriated, and all of that money has been placed at the disposal of the Planning Board, and all of that money has not been voted by the Legislature.

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. member state what money has not been voted by the Legislature?

Mr. Banks: — \$1,500,000 was given by way of loan — that was to start them out.

Premier Douglas: — Would the hon. member mind quoting his authority for that?

Mr. Tucker: — That is not a proper question of privilege or point of order. There are lots of things said on that side that the actual chapter and verse is not given for, and certainly if we started rising up and asking the Ministers “What is your authority for that?” and so on, I think Your Honour would call us to order and I think that you should call the Premier to order when he does the same thing.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I was on a point of order then. Is a member of this House suggesting that the Government is spending money without proper legislative authority? I say that that statement is not so. It is a reflection on the intelligence of the Government and on the integrity of the members of this House. The statement is not correct.

Mr. Speaker: — If an hon. member gets up and makes a direct statement against a certain division of the Government, I think the Premier has the privilege on a point of order to rise and ask for the statement and where it comes from.

Mr. Banks: — I will withdraw it; but I want to talk about some of the fruits of this. Now I did not expect, last year, although I was quite shocked at some of the reports of these corporations, to see the developments that came about this year. We are asked to appropriate today, the sum of \$364,000 that is \$364,264 for the Fish Board. I just intend to deal with the ones in liquidation. Then we are asked to make a further appropriation of \$260,877.92 to buy over from the old Fish Board the buildings and holdings they have. Mr. Speaker, if the Government came forward and said, “we are selling that to the fisheries for the fishermen up there for \$1.00”, I could appreciate it, because their prosperity is worth that much money to the province of Saskatchewan; but when they come up and ask for a direct appropriation of \$260,877.92 to replace money that has been lost in that, and without any statement as to what is going to be done with those things, I look at it with suspicion because I am afraid that there will be more next year.

Now then the question of the Hon. Minister of Education — his Tanning Factory and the other one; we are asked today to replace in the Finance Office \$155,763.48. It is a lot of money. Again in the supplementary estimates we find an item under Public Works. Insofar as I know this is the first time we have any connection between the Public Works and the Crown Corporations; but we are asked here for an appropriation of \$300,000. Well this is for the Crown Corporations, and I understand they will need that sum to pay for the buildings. I understand, also, that the Department of Public

March 16, 1950

Works is taking over these defunct buildings of the shoe factory and the Tanning factory. Well, here are the amounts and I am going to read them to you — oh, just before I finish, there is another item here of \$440,000. Now it comes up in this manner — a year ago the capital of the Fish Board Advance was shown at \$846,000. Today it is shown at \$406,000; the difference is \$440,000.00. Well if that loss occurs it will bring up the losses which this parliament has got to vote for these Socialists' schemes. I think we could get along very well without the Finance Corporation just as soon as these corporations fall on the wayside. The words liquidation and bankruptcy are ugly words. We have almost lost the meaning of them here, but that undoubtedly is what is going on here, today, liquidation in its ugliest form, because it is in Government form. Whether we like it or not, those are figures that we cannot get away from. I hope, but I don't know, that a further loss of \$198,370 on the Fish Board is contained in the larger amount, but these are the figures in the estimates, and unexplained, it means that this province is stuck for \$1,520,965. We are stuck and we have to vote that money to replace what has been spent by the Government Finance Office.

I do not propose to follow this matter any further but I would say that it is an alarming situation and it is one that we cannot continue with for very long.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — I didn't want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but a few moments ago he referred to the "Dome" put out by the Civil Servants Association, and he referred to the fact that there was a picture of Pat Conroy and myself on the front page. I then sent for a copy of it, and I think it should be drawn to the attention of the House, first, that this is the picture of two people on the front page asking the Civil Servants to support the Canada Savings Bonds, 1949 — a statement by myself saying "I would highly recommend the purchase of Canada Savings Bonds, these bonds outrank any other security available today and as a medium of saving their value cannot be challenged. Members of the Civil Service would be completely wise by subscribing to Canada Savings Bonds". That is opposite my own picture.

The second picture is not of Pat Conroy. This picture is of Percy R. Bengough, president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and Mr. Bengough is quoted as saying:

"the payroll savings plan is the most convenient and effective method of making savings grow."

I thought that those facts should be placed before the House in view of this somewhat distorted statement which had been made by the hon. member.

Mr. Banks: — I regret that wrong statement. I should have written the name down — I have the thing at home. I was just dealing with the pictures.

Hon. J.A. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SECOND READING

Education & Hospitalization Tax Act

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer) moved the second reading of

Bill No. 39 — An Act for the Imposition and Collection of Taxes in Consumers and Users of Tangible Personal Property in order to raise Moneys for Educational and Hospitalization Purposes.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — This really doesn't establish any new principle. It does somewhat extend the scope of the previous Act insofar as it changes a small figure "2" to "3" and one or two other little things like that. It raises the exemptions, however, and satisfies my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) in that we have removed now the tax on grasshopper bait, garden seed, forage crop seed, fertilizer, school texts and reference books.

The other very important change is the one which I announced in my Budget Address, and that is that the title has been changed so that the Bill with the short title will now be "The Education and Hospitalization Tax Act". The Bill provides that one-third of all revenues collected will be used for hospitalization, and two-thirds will be used for education and will go into the Education Fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the unanimous feeling there is in the House that expenditures must be increased, as has been evidenced the last few days, I am sure that this Bill will meet with unanimous support. I would therefore move the second reading.

Mr. Tucker: — I wish to say, first of all, in regard to this matter, that, if all the various promises of the Government are going to be carried out in reverse as is being done here, I shudder to think of the position of this province and what we are going to be met with next year and the year after, and if they hang on for three years, three years from now. However, I think it would be better for me not to go into that, this afternoon, and, as it is now twenty-five minutes to six, I think Mr. Speaker, that the debate should be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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