

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**26th Day**

**Thursday, March 23, 1950.**

The House met at three o'clock.

**ON ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell this Assembly that we had a very unique celebration, yesterday: Mr. and Mrs. Thorne, of Indian Head, celebrated their sixty-eighth wedding anniversary. That couple are hale and hearty and I think on that account they have always voted Liberal, and, therefore, they are always in good health and they know what the conditions are in our province. I want to say that I think that is a record in this province, or probably in Canada: sixty-eighth wedding anniversary celebrated, yesterday, at Indian Head.

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Wednesday, March 22, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to extend my congratulations to my colleague, the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E.M. Culliton) for the very good job he did in his speech as our chief critic of the Budget Address. It was his first speech in that particular role, and I think, judging from what is said by all members in the House and also in the press, it is the common consent that he did a very fine job in that address, and I certainly wish to extend to him my congratulations on a very splendid effort.

There were some other, I thought, very good speeches in this debate. The one that, perhaps, was the most notable, due to the fact that it was connected with an announcement which naturally was of great interest to the province as a whole, was the speech of the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Jacob Benson). When a member is elected in support of a policy which he sincerely believes in, and after being so elected and having sat with a Government, in support of that Government, as long as the member for Last Mountain has, and in view of his long experience in the public affairs of this province — when he feels he must leave colleagues that he has been associated with for so long, such a decision can only be come to after the most anxious and careful consideration. I feel that anyone who heard the member for Last Mountain giving the reasons why he felt he could not support the C.C.F. Party any longer, and that he would not be a C.C.F. candidate in the coming election, must have been impressed by his sincerity and also by the weight of the arguments he advanced. I felt at the time that the arguments which he gave were the arguments which had moved thousands of people in the last elections and in the Federal election of 1949, to feel that they could not support the C.C.F. Party any longer.

The impression that I got from his speech, Mr. Speaker, was that the C.C.F. Party had started out by professing that they were not going to

**March 23, 1950**

carry on as older parties had carried on, that they were going to be more or less the heirs of the idealism of the Progressive Party, and that they would strive to carry on their work on a higher level, from a standpoint of idealism, than either of the older parties. There was no doubt that many people decided to support the C.C.F. Party before the elections of 1944, because they believed that the leaders of the C.C.F. Party sincerely believed in these professions and intended to carry them out. Well, of course, in the result we have found that the C.C.F. have, in many respects, been much below the high standard that they professed they were going to adhere to if they ever attained office, and I think that the greatest evidence of that is that a man who has been as long in public life as the hon. member for Last Mountain should feel constrained to get up in this House and say that because they had not lived up to their promises and professions he could not be associated with them any more.

I realize how hard it must have been for the hon. member for Last Mountain to take that stand; but if a man comes to such a conclusion, sincerely and honestly, one must respect him. I say, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as I am concerned, I compliment the hon. member for Last Mountain on his courageous and clear-cut statement as to the reason why the C.C.F. Party no longer deserves the support of the progressive-minded people of this province.

First of all, I wish to deal with the question of agriculture. As your honour knows, I have at all times supported the Minister of Agriculture in any steps that he has asked this House to endorse in the way of assisting the agricultural industry of this province, and I have always appreciated the very evident interest that the Minister of Agriculture does take in our agricultural industry. I particularly commend him in certain respects: to begin with, for his attitude in saying that this question of co-operating with the Federal Government in regard to P.F.R.A. work should not be in an attempt to make political capital. I took it that as there had been quite a bit of criticism from the other side of the House on the splendid programme of P.F.R.A., the Minister of Agriculture, in a very nice sort of a way, was suggesting that that was not in the best interests of the farmers of Saskatchewan. I felt that the remarks of the hon. member for Last Mountain were certainly in order and I compliment him for them.

That programme, Mr. Speaker, as you know, has meant that there has been spent on rehabilitation of our farmers, on small water projects, stock watering dams, dugouts and small irrigation projects in Western Canada, \$33,000,000 since that programme was inaugurated in 1934. Now of that thirty-three million, \$23,000,000 has been spent in Saskatchewan, and the fact that we have had in some parts of Saskatchewan six years of crop failures, and that there is not anything like the suffering and hardship in those crop failure areas that there was before we had P.F.R.A. developed to the extent it is, is an indication of the value of that programme. I do commend the Minister of Agriculture for his willingness to co-operate with the Federal administration in extending that programme.

I do say, however, that the members on the opposite side of the House should not be continually finding fault with that programme, because it

has this effect. This programme at the present time, and up until now, has been a western programme, and having sat in the Federal House for thirteen years, I have some knowledge of the difficulties sometimes of getting votes for one particular part of the country. The necessity and wisdom of the vote has to be brought home to the people from other parts of the country and, if people living in Saskatchewan are going to get up in this House and continually belittle that programme, they are not doing a good service to Saskatchewan, because they are making it much harder to get that programme extended.

One of the things that we are hoping for, and which I have every faith and confidence will be put through by the rest of Canada, is the necessary appropriation of money to establish the great South Saskatchewan River development scheme. That will have to be carried out in co-operation with the Provincial Government. The Province will have to do with the titles to the land the question of the use of the impounded water and the question of the use of the power that will be developed there. That last item alone is a tremendous proposition, Mr. Speaker, because there will be more power developed there than is used in all the settled area of Saskatchewan at the present time, and, of course, the province will have the right to use that power. People who should know something about it tell me that, if the problem is handled right, the province could hope to carry its share of the cost of this scheme by sale of the power at reasonable terms. So I am satisfied that a very satisfactory programme can be worked out. But it is necessary to get the country as a whole to vote perhaps from \$70,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to put through that great scheme. Therefore I do suggest that the members opposite should cease sniping at the Federal Government in regard to this P.F.R.A. work, and that, in this case at least, they should let politics take second place to the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan. I compliment the Minister of Agriculture for suggesting that, and I hope that the members of his own party will take his advice to heart.

The next thing that I wish to mention is the big programme that has to be carried on in regard to weed eradication. Here again, I think that there are some very able men in the Department of Agriculture – certainly there is a very fine and able man acting as the Agricultural Representative in our district. I feel that he is doing some very splendid work in enlisting the co-operation of the municipalities and the farmers in the question of weed control and pest control. I do not think that the importance of that programme is realized enough, and my main purpose in mentioning it this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is to solicit the co-operation of everybody with the Department of Agriculture in making that programme the greatest possible success.

I find the report of the Field Crop Commissioner contained in the report of the Department of Agriculture, deals with the battle against three very terrible weeds which are beginning to invade our country in greater numbers, namely, leafy spurge, hoary cress, and Russian snap weed. I read this report very carefully and I am glad that the Minister's staff has realized the importance of this problem and is doing all that that staff can do to co-operate with the municipalities and farmers in combating these weeds. Anyone who reads that report must be struck with the importance of that campaign.

**March 23, 1950**

Not long ago, I read an article in the 'Western Producer' of March 9, 1950, in regard to another weed which is going to be a very bad menace unless it is halted in its encroachments on our agricultural areas. I compliment the 'Western Producer' for this very fine article by Mr. Fraser. It points out that yellow toad flax is of such a nature that it is very difficult to eradicate, and it speaks of the fact, that, in an area of about 1,500 square miles between North Battleford and Lloydminster, there are nearly 25,000 patches which would account for about 25,000 acres infested by this terrible weed. To indicate how bad it is, I will read just one sentence from this report. It said one agricultural committee member in Manitou Lake municipality says:

"My summerfallow had been worked fourteen times this year, and when I went out after two weeks delay during harvest time, the yellow toad flax was as green and healthy as if it had never been touched."

This statement serves better than anything else to illustrate how persistent this so-called ornamental plant can be. It is estimated that it costs more than the assessed value of the land to eradicate this weed. I certainly wish to say that we of the Opposition will support the Minister of Agriculture and his staff in any work they will attempt to assist the farmers of Saskatchewan in their battles against such weeds as well as insect pests.

I am glad to see also that there is a real hope of more success in battling against grasshoppers from the new grasshopper poison, Aldrin. As the Minister knows, last year, I, in a humble sort of a way, urged that we put more emphasis on the use of sprays by assisting municipalities and farmers more in the use of sprays. I realize that, until there is sufficient vegetation to carry the spray, you have to use other methods. Once you have the vegetation to carry the spray, however, from any investigation I have been able to make (and I think it is borne out by the opinion of the officials), spray is the most effective weapon. I would like to compliment the farmers and the members of the Department of Agriculture and municipal officials for the good job they did in this fight, last year. The trouble is, I think, that probably several million dollars of crop were still destroyed, and I do hope that everything will be done to make the campaign even more successful, this coming year.

I would say, in concluding on this particular matter, that perhaps everybody should realize that complying with the cultural methods suggested by the experts is very important in the success of the fight to control and exterminate grasshoppers. I wish every possible success to the Agricultural Representatives in their bringing of the latest knowledge in what is best in regard to cultural practices to the attention of our farmers. I hope and expect that they will have even more success in that regard, this year, than they had last year.

There is only one other matter which I wish to deal with now in regard to agriculture – rural electrification. I feel that I must deal with it in this speech, because it is something in regard to which I disagree with the present Government. I am getting more and more letters all the time from people who would like to have their farms electrified, but they are finding this situation: In Manitoba, the Manitoba Hydro-Electric fetches the electricity right to their farm buildings, just the same as it does to the home of a

person in the city, without any initial cost to the farmer at all. On the other hand, in this province it very often costs well over a thousand dollars to get connected with electricity. Under present circumstances, farmers find it very difficult to make that initial outlay. I am getting letters asking me why it is that, in our province where there are such tremendous revenues being taken in by the Government, we cannot get the same service in that regard as the farmers across the provincial boundary line in Manitoba.

That is the point of some of the letters. Some of them also suggest that they understand that, in Manitoba, half the ultimate cost of this farm electrification scheme is going to be carried by the people of the Province as a whole, whereas there is no suggestion of that being done in our province. They cannot understand, if the people as a whole in Manitoba, including those that have the advantages that go with living in urban communities, are expected to pay some of the cost of furnishing those similar amenities to the farmers in Manitoba, why that policy should not be carried out in Saskatchewan. Surely in that regard, people living in cities with all the modern conveniences they do have, would not mind paying part of the cost of seeing that the farmers get the boon of electricity. So I disagree with the policy of the Government in trying to put the entire cost of this upon the farmers. They will have to pay the entire initial cost of getting connected and there is the idea that there should be no subsidization of the programme by the province as a whole. That is the policy, in spite of the experiences of every other country in the world, that you cannot have a successful farm electrification scheme, in circumstances such as we have in this province, without the state as a whole subsidizing at least half the cost.

The members opposite will claim – “We are not in as good a position as Manitoba in the matter because we have not got the same amount of hydro-electric power.” I would like to point out that that is not the obstacle it is made out to be, because it does cost a lot of money to establish these hydro-electric plants. The cost in Manitoba of generating electricity from hydro-plants runs pretty close to half-a-cent a kilowatt, whereas in Saskatoon, where we have got to haul the coal to Saskatoon and generate the power there, it is generated for about one cent a kilowatt. So lack of hydro-power is not the tremendous disadvantage as it is made out to be.

If our farmers are slightly more scattered over the farming areas than they are in Manitoba, that is all the more reason why, if we are going to fetch the boon of farm electrification to our farmers, there has to be at least as much help from the state as a whole as there is in Manitoba. After all, that is why you have got to have help. Farmers are not as closely settled as the people in the towns and in the cities, and the very fact that we are up against that in Saskatchewan is all the more reason why we should have at least the same amount of help. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the time is going to come, and I hope it will not be too long now when the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to get the same help in regard to getting farm electrification as they are getting in the province of Manitoba.

I would like to deal for a moment with the question of education. In regard to the question of education, I understand that the number of school rooms in the larger school units is 3,919 with 1,288 outside the larger school

**March 23, 1950**

units. The number of schools being operated is 4,285, leaving the number not operating, according to the last report of the Department of Education, 922. In the schools being operated on January 31, 1950, there was 418 so-called supervisors, otherwise colloquially-known as ‘sitters’, not supposed to teach; they are just supposed to be there and to encourage the children to study. Now then, those ‘sitters’ are working practically entirely in rural areas.

The partly-trained teachers released to teach in the Province increased from 776, in 1944, to 964 in 1948-49. That is, in spite of the fact that in 1944 we were still at war, still had some of our finest people serving in the armed services, we have to have more untrained teachers sent out now than we did when we still at war. And then there were those who were teaching on ‘letters of authority’ from the Minister, who had no training at all to speak of; the number of these who were teaching, according to that report, is now 335. Well, where are they teaching? Of course, they are teaching in the rural areas.

This brings up one of the points of complaint in rural areas, and explains why parts of this country are turning against the C.C.F. Party because they professed to be so interested in these rural areas when they were seeking the support of the people. To prove that, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to resort to a speech or anything like that. I am going to quote to you part of resolutions moved in this House on behalf of the C.C.F. Party and supported by the C.C.F. members. No wonder the member for Last Mountain cannot stand this repudiation, this absolute attitude of ignoring the very basis upon which they got thousands and thousands of votes! I have here the Journals of the Saskatchewan Legislature covering February 28, 1944, when they were fighting to get into office. Here is part of this motion by Mr. Phelps, seconded by Mr. Feeley – two of the most outstanding leaders of the C.C.F. Party. Here is part of their resolution:

“In order to improve existing conditions of education particularly in our rural areas, this Assembly recommends for the consideration of this Government the advisability of implementing the following educational programme . . .”

Now here is what the C.C.F. recommended:

“1. Assumption of full financial responsibility for the costs of a minimum standard of education in all parts of the province, this minimum standard to include: . . .”

In other words, the Province is going to assume the full financial costs of this programme, and what did this programme include, Mr. Speaker?

“Suitable school buildings with proper equipment in every district where a school is required;

“All schools staffed by fully qualified teachers who will be paid regularly a salary to be determined by qualification and experience, such salary to be sufficient to make the teaching profession attractive as a life vocation . . .”

Again the Province was to assume the burden of that, and then:

“Adequate scholarships and maintenance grants provided in greatly increased numbers to deserving students.”

There was the policy which the C.C.F. got up in this Legislature and said they favoured. Is it any wonder that, when they went and asked for votes on the basis of that programme, and got good sincere people to support them, and then act as they are doing today, with higher revenues and taxes than ever before known in our province, and when they still refuse to pay any greater share of the cost of education, or a very little more than when they came into office, people do not like that sort of business – pretending to be in favour of a programme like that and then going along as the C.C.F. have been going along since it was elected.

I realized, during this debate, that there is a very evident desire on the C.C.F. Party's part, to try to make out that the Liberal Party is against larger school units as such. They professed at the same time, Mr. Speaker, to be very much concerned about the success of larger school units. Can you believe they are sincere in that, if they do their best to try to drag that question into politics, try to make out that one of the parties is against it in its policy? They do this just because of comments made from time to time about some respects in which the larger school units might be improved. Oh yes, that has been very obvious. They talk about us not worrying about the best interests of this and that for the sake of getting a few votes. I wonder if we didn't have a good example of that during the last two weeks in this attempt to drag the larger school units into politics. There is no question where the Liberal Party stood, or stands, in that matter – no question where it stood in 1944; no question where it stood since that date, and no question where it stands today. (Government interruption) My hon. friends, if you don't know that, then of course it makes one think that they can't read.

Our policy was put on the statute books in The Larger School Unit Act. My hon. friend laughs at that; but he will remember that, when they were seeking office in 1944, they said that they would take advantage of that Act; there was no suggestion the C.C.F. were going to impose larger school units. It was only after they got elected, Mr. Speaker, that our people suddenly found out that the policy the C.C.F. had advocated in their programme was not what they were going to carry out.

Our Policy was one of leaving it to the local taxpayers – my friend here laughs at that; the idea of leaving it to people to decide these things for themselves strikes people, who have a totalitarian state of mind, a desire to manage things from the top and think they know better than the local people – it strikes them as very funny; but they are going to find out when they have to face the people what they think of that attitude of contempt for the ordinary ratepayer, the ordinary people of this province, the attitude that 'we know better than you'. Because the Liberal Party say that you should have the right to decide, and that there should be jeering at that as there has been in this House, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, will not be forgotten by the people when they come to mark their ballots. Now our Liberal Party's policy had been one of leaving it to the taxpayer of each proposed larger

**March 23, 1950**

school unit to decide whether they wanted it or not. We have said that this was a matter for the people to decide. My hon. friend says we left it there for seven years. It was there for any group of local taxpayers to make use of. The Government thought because they apparently did not want it then they would jam it down their throats. Well we saw what the people thought of that, last year, and the C.C.F. are going to see, when they go to the people again next year or in the next two or three years, what the people are going to do about it. I am very interested in that regard to see what the result will be but they are trying to create the impression that they should not go to the people until the last possible moment. The hon. Attorney General, in his radio speech, is suggesting they are going to hang on for five years, if they possibly can. That is a good indication, Mr. Speaker, that they are afraid to go to the country at the usual time of four years.

**Premier Douglas:** – Your Government held on for six years.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Of course I know you say six years. You ignore the fact that there was a war on when the last government went six years. I know most of my friends over there took the attitude, when the war broke out, this is the chance to advance the interests of the C.C.F. Party. They followed that policy during the course of the war, and so the attitude they take now is exactly the same as the attitude they took then, Mr. Speaker.

Now there is one other thing in regard to the larger school units that I would like to say, Mr. Speaker. As I have made plain to my hon. friends, in regard to larger school units, it should be left for the local people to decide one way or the other. That is the attitude that, I think, is the democratic attitude, and that is the attitude that the Liberal Party takes. We go on to say that people in districts, where after due “exploration” by the Department of Education, the Government decides that the time is not ripe to let the people vote, they don’t give them a vote; but at the same time, admittedly, schools in these areas that are not in larger units get from three to four hundred dollars less in grants than similar schools in larger units. Now, Mr. Speaker, we don’t believe that that is right. We think that people that aren’t in larger units should get the same treatment as those that are in large units. They all pay the same taxation and should be treated the same. As far as we are concerned, that is our attitude on that.

Something has been said about the way in which school grants have been increased. I would just like to give, while I am dealing with that, some figures that I am sure would be interesting. I have here a record of the school grants given from 1943-44 right down to 1948-49, and I find that school grants during that period have been increased by actually less than the amount of the increase in Education Tax. That is a very interesting figure; as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when so much credit is taken by the Government for increasing school grants, it is very interesting that actually the increase in school grants should be less than the amount of the increase of the Education Tax between the period of 1943-44 and 1948-49.

That brings me to the question of the municipalities. This is a larger question, and I think perhaps the best way in which I could open the question of municipalities itself would be to read to this Assembly from the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs of this year, at page 31.

It is very interesting and here is how this Government report reads, and I am going to quote from it:

“The expenditure in all classes of municipalities shows an increase over the previous year. In rural municipalities the situation is not as favourable. It is true Rurals only overspent one million dollars in 1948 as against two million in 1947, but this tendency to spend beyond current revenues must definitely stop in many more municipalities. If it does not resources will disappear to the point where either essential services will have to be drastically reduced, or general mill rate substantially increase.”

It is very interesting that the Department of Municipal Affairs should extend that as advice to the municipalities. I commend it to the Provincial Treasurer. It says that this overspending must disappear or essential services will have to be drastically reduced, or general mill rate substantially increased. That is the advice they give the municipalities, Mr. Speaker. It goes on to say:

“The items of cost and the picture of municipal finance that are surging ahead that should be of some concern are, in order of importance, education, public welfare, maintenance of public roads, and in orphans’ protective services.”

Here is what the report says about that:

“All these will be likely to continue to rise for some time at least. New sources of revenue must be tapped to meet these increasing costs and local councils . . .” (and again I commend this to the attention of the Provincial Treasurer) “. . . must exercise more care in preparing budgets in order to limit expenditures and particularly to avoid waste in expenditures.”

Isn’t that amusing, Mr. Speaker, that this Government, which has been the most extravagant in the whole history of our province, spending twice as much as the Government it succeeded, should go out to municipal councillors, that everybody knows are much more careful than they are, and tell them they must be more careful in their expenditures. Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! Surely that is the case here! Of course, the municipal councillors are going to find it very interesting that this Government should start lecturing them on saving money.

The report goes on to say:

“Rural municipalities have less resources by one and one-half million than they had a year ago. Municipalities, like individuals, must keep in mind some of the fundamentals of sound financing.”

**March 23, 1950**

This is from their own report:

“Neither should buy what it cannot afford or spend money on anything, however desirable, which he cannot pay for immediately, or by way of reasonable credit.”

This is your own advice, and it goes on to say – and I think this should also be brought to the attention of the Provincial Treasurer over and over again – this is again from their own report:

“The cruse of oil was a remarkable receptacle, but its peculiarities do not in any way apply to public treasuries.”

Now, isn't that good! They put that out in a public document addressed to municipalities. Well, that is really something to remember, Mr. Speaker. Now it seems to me, if this report is correct that the municipalities are going to go on having increased costs in regard to education, then there is nothing else for them to do but find new sources of revenue or curtail expenditures. We know that municipalities have cut their expenditure down, in regard to education, more than most people think it should be cut down. In regard to roads it is the same. Well then, what does this Government propose to do about it? It has already said that it is not going to adopt the proposal that was adopted in Manitoba – it hasn't done so yet anyway – of passing on to the municipalities one-half the increase in Federal grant to help them out in this difficult situation which the municipalities continue to point out and which our own Government points out in the report tabled in the Legislature. If that were done the same as Manitoba, there would be passed on to the municipalities from the increased Federal grant – half of the increased Federal grant – to help with their road work, school financing and so on a sum of \$4½ million.

But apparently the Government has something else in mind. They went before the Municipal Convention in 1947, and said to them ‘Now you need some more money; just let us put a tax on purple gas of two cents a gallon, and then we'll turn it back to you and in that way you will get more money’. The municipal officials may think, ‘it is up to the Government to give us some help from the taxes we are paying already – much higher taxes than we ever paid before – without asking us to tax our farm fuels that have never been taxed in this province, except during the war when there was a small three cent tax of the Federal Government.’ Well, farm fuels have not been taxed in this province, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** – On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has made a statement that is not correct. All that I wished to say was that ever since 1937 gasoline has always been taxed in this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** – It has been taxed by Education Tax certainly, but I am referring to tax per gallon and the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows it very well. I wasn't referring to the Education Tax and he knows it; but he thought he would have a chance to score, that is all.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that we listened to a lot of things that we didn't agree with from the Provincial Treasurer, and there was no attempt made on this side to try and do what he has just done; and I point out to you again, Mr. Speaker, that I would ask you to enforce the same rules on the Provincial Treasurer that you enforce on us.

**Mr. Speaker:** – I have never refused any member of the Opposition the opportunity of getting up to make a denial of a statement that is untrue.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** – Well, he got up and brought in a different point entirely.

**Mr. Tucker:** – I was dealing with the tax per gallon on gasoline, and my hon. friend brought up the Education Tax – another matter altogether. Let it be, Mr. Speaker, if that is what they think they have to do to try and get out of this situation. The fact remains that the Provincial Treasurer, in dealing with the question, spoke about the position of the Province and he said:

“We may be facing falling prices and danger of losing our markets. In my opinion we may now have passed the peak and from now on revenue will decline . . . I do not anticipate any sudden fall during the next six months but rather a gradual steady decline.”

That is what the Provincial is saying about provincial revenues. Now then, is he going to be looking for more money? Next year, he says he expects revenues to decline. Well, there is a good clue to that. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) went down to Saskatoon, made a speech to the municipal officials and suggested they were still willing to put a tax of two cents a gallon on their farm fuel. Are they now paving the way to put that tax on? Because their own officials say that municipalities must have more taxation, and the Provincial Treasurer said that revenues are going to decline in the province, are they getting ready now to ram that tax down the farmers' throats?

Of course, there is nothing they can say now that is going to remove apprehension about that, because they told us, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to take the Education Tax off when they had other revenues to take its place. They just talked and talked of that promise; but not only have they not taken it off, but they have increased it by 50 per cent. Now then, is there any possibility that this may be what is in their minds now, of putting this tax upon farm fuel? Certainly, they have laid the foundation for it.

I mentioned that this Government is the most extravagant government that this province has ever seen. I would just like to give some figures on that point:

The 1943 expenditures from revenue account	\$29,799,000
from capital account	<u>4,818,000</u>
Total	34,617,000

**March 23, 1950**

The 1950-51 estimated expenditures:

revenue account	– \$55,000,000
capital account	– <u>18,000,000</u> (nearly)
Total	– 72,993,000,
	almost 73,000,000

These are the people who have raised expenditures in a matter of seven short years, from \$34½ million to nearly \$73 million, who lecture municipalities about saving money! Well, as I say, the municipal officials will be very interested to have that lecture and to be told that finances are not like ‘the widow’s cruse of oil, inexhaustible’ and so on. It is something like the attitude that the Provincial Treasurer takes in this House, and that he has just taken in regard to myself. However, the last word rests with the people, no matter how smart the Provincial Treasurer may think he is.

Now then, these expenditures, approaching \$73 million do not include the personal hospitalization payments; they do not include supplementary expenses, which, for the last two or three years, have been around five million dollars. If we get the same supplementary estimates, next year, why of course, the expenditures for 1950-51 might well approach \$20 million – and they lecture the rural municipal councillors because they have to spend more on education and these other necessary services. Well I just wonder what they intend to do.

I mentioned about their promise to take off the Education Tax when they got other revenue. What is the record in that? The increased revenue, as compared to 1943-44 when they were making these promises, on Dominion subsidy, liquor profits, Education Tax and gas tax – on those four items alone, this Government took from the people, in 1948-49, eighteen and a half million dollars more than the previous Government in 1943-44. And the Education Tax, which they promised to take off when they got revenues to take its place, was a little over four million more in 1948-49 than in 1943-44. They made a categorical promise to take this tax off when they got other revenues. They got other revenues in four items alone of eighteen million dollars. Then they not only do not take the tax off, they increase it by 50 per cent. Surely that is a breach of promise to the people of this province!

The hon. Premier smiles at that. I know it doesn’t affect him; he doesn’t worry about it. But I tell him again that the people are watching how these promises are being broken and flouted, and, of course, there will be another chance when the time comes.

**Premier Douglas:** – They are watching you.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Well, they may be watching me. I do my best; I don’t jeer and sneer at other people all the time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend from Gravelbourg pointed out, these people have left these burdens upon municipalities. They have not helped them as they promised. They have not taken on the problem of looking after schools as they promised, although they are spending twice as much as

the Government that they succeeded. They have left these burdens on municipalities so they have had to use up their arrears of taxes that were accumulated, and in addition, increase their tax rates from 17.9 to 27.76 mills, an increase of 10 mills. They have had to do these things because the Government wouldn't take some of these burdens off the municipalities, particularly rural municipalities. Then they read them a gratuitous lecture that they should save money. Well, it's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when people get into that state of mind of thinking that they can scorn the saving of money themselves and then lecture other people about it. People have a way of dealing with that sort of a dictatorial attitude and state of mind.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great deal about the way provincial grants have been increased. I would like to give you the figures on that. In 1948-49, school grants were up, not quite \$2½ million over 1943-44; municipal grants were up \$293,000 over 1943-44 – a total increase of \$2,772,000, about \$2¾ million up.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** – Good!

**Mr. Tucker:** – My hon. friend says that's good; but let me read to him how much the Education Tax was up – \$2½ million; the subsidy from the Dominion, up \$7,700,000; the gasoline tax, up \$3,300,000. They took from the people over \$13½ million more and passed on in increased grants, \$2¾ million. They passed on less than one-quarter of the increased money they took from the people on those three things alone.

My hon. friend says 'good'. Well, the people are listening to him and I hope they will know that that is his attitude in regard to their present situation. I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that in regard to this question of municipal expenditures, municipal costs and so on, they come largely out of the taxation on homes and farms of the people. And I have some figures on this. The revenues of rural municipalities in 1943 were \$17,976,000. The taxation, which was largely on farms and homes, made up almost nine-tenths of that – 88 per cent to be exact. You know how much, Mr. Speaker, this magnanimous Government paid towards those municipal receipts? Out of nearly \$18,000,000, only \$912,000!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** – What about Federal taxation?

**Mr. Tucker:** – In regard to the interjection of the Minister, I deal with provincial matters, not Federal matters; and if I want to deal with them, I can show that the Federal Government pays back into this province much more than they take out of it in taxes. I am not going to take time to deal with that, today; but it is very curious, Mr. Speaker, that when I begin to deal with figures like this that indicate a failure of this Government to live up to the promises by which it was elected, they immediately try to divert attention to Federal matters. By so doing they stand self-condemned as unable to answer these arguments. The people of this province are getting sick and tired of those smoke-screen tactics of the C.C.F. I think it is one of the reasons, from what I understood from the speech of the hon. member for Last Mountain, that he decided he was not going to be associated with them any more. I think he is a man that likes straightforward arguments and not this business of camouflage and attempting to divert attention whenever a reasonable argument is being put forward.

**March 23, 1950**

To return to the point I was dealing with, the revenues, the receipts of rural municipalities were nearly \$18,000,000 and this Government did not contribute to those with Government grants more than 4½ per cent – less than a million dollars.

Now let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that the present situation with regard to municipalities, with regard to our schools, with regard to the whole set up, the rural municipal officials say that costs of administering education and other municipal services are bound to go up. They say that some other way of finding money must be found. Well do they intend to put a further tax on land and give it to municipalities, or do they intend to put this tax on gasoline, or do they intend to leave the municipalities and school districts to struggle with this problem as they have done and try to solve it themselves by increasing municipal taxes upon the land and home of the people? The Government is budgeting, this year, to get over \$17,000,000 from the Federal Government and no previous Government ever got more than something over \$8,000,000 before: about nine million dollars more than any previous Government. Manitoba passes on half of its Federal grant to cut down taxes on their local taxpayers on their land and homes. The Manitoba Government passes on half of it. If this Government did the same, they would not pass on to rural municipalities less than a million dollars in grants. They would be passing on to all municipalities to help them keep down taxes, \$2½ million.

Well, I hear the Ministers say “nuts to that”. And I’ll repeat it for the benefit of the radio audience; the people in the country will be very interested to hear that is the attitude taken by the members of the Government towards a reasonable proposition to cut down their taxes. They will be very interested to hear that. It shows the attitude taken by this Government. But, Mr. Speaker, the people in a democracy have a way of dealing with that sort of arrogance.

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, just to keep the records straight; what the Minister said was “nonsense”, it may be “nuts” to my hon. friend but it was “nonsense” from the Minister.

**Mr. Tucker:** – It sounded like “nuts” over on this side.

**Premier Douglas:** – It sounded like “nuts” on this side too, but we’ve got to listen to it.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Yes, that’s very funny! And, Mr. Speaker, when I am dealing with the serious matter of taxation on our land and homes all the Premier can do is try to make a joke of it. Well, I tell you that that sort of tactics are just about played out. The people of this province want more than jokes and nonsense from this Government.

A great deal has been said about debt reduction by the Provincial Treasurer, and I wish to deal with that for a moment. The amount of debt at the end of the fiscal year 1943-44 was \$214,000,000 and some thousands dollars; the amount of debt at the end of the year 1950 was \$147,913,000, almost \$148 million – a reduction of \$66,339,000. That is the reduction according to the

Government's own figures. Now I want to give you, Mr. Speaker – that's the reduction, that's all the reduction – I want to give to you some figures as if the money, according to the answers made by the Government itself, that was paid by other people and that was used to reduce that debt.

There was an answer made in this House to a question of mine on March 31, 1950, and also a return made by this Government on March 9, 1950, as to the contribution made by other people towards the reduction of public debt. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this question of the contribution made by the people towards the reduction of public debt was passed as an Order of this Assembly in March, 1949, and we did not get it until March of this year. Now, that shows something, Mr. Speaker. But in any event, we finally got the figures from the Government and here is what they admit themselves now, after boasting up and down this country about the way they reduced debts.

They first of all admit that over \$5,000,000 was reduced by the Patterson Government before it went out of office. That is right in the official return. Then they admit that the Federal Government cancelled treasury bills over \$36,000,000. That is in this reduction of debt they try to take so much credit for. Then the Wheat Pool repaid money guaranteed by this Government, which was used to reduce the debt to the extent of over \$11,000,000. Why should the Government take credit for that? They didn't pay a nickel of it. And then the farmers of this province repaid the Farm Loan Board, which made up a sum of money in reduction of public debt. This Government didn't pay a nickel of that. They just applied the money. The Farm Loan Board repaid them for over \$2½ million. And then the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, again a guaranteed indebtedness, paid in fees by the people, telephone and fees and so on, they repaid \$3,800,000. And then the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries paid \$246,000. Natural Resources settlement – we settled with the Dominion Government for any further claim in regard to our natural resources to the extent of \$8,031,000. The farmers repaid on their seed grain, \$4,758,000. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a total of money paid by the people, guarantees paid off and so on, of \$73,000,000. The total debt was only reduced \$66,000,000. And they, the Government, are going around and boasting about this. Are they trying to claim credit because they did not misappropriate the money or something?

Now then, I would like to go further, Mr. Speaker. If they had applied all the liquor profits to debt reduction, the way the Government ahead of them did for the last two years before they went out of office; if they had not taken into current expenditure any of those liquor profits, the total liquor profit taken in by this Government was nearly \$35,000,000. And if you add those liquor profits to the reduction of public debt made by other people, then you get a total of \$108,000,000. And that is what they have been running up and down the country boasting about!

It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, they had capital expenditures of \$47,000,000, but these receipts that I have just mentioned exceed the reduction of public debt by \$42,000,000. Now that leaves capital expenditures unaccounted for in the figures given, of somewhere around six to seven million. Well, what have we found about that? Just take the increase in three receipts, during this period of time, namely, Education Tax, gas tax and Federal subsidies. The increase in receipts by this Government over the amounts received by the previous

**March 23, 1950**

Government over the same period of time, from these three items alone, was \$49,407,000. So to sum up, Mr. Speaker, actually they took in or there was applied, from other people \$73,000,000, from liquor profits, \$35,000,000, a total of \$108,000,000. They paid off \$66,000,000 of the public debt when they took in or had paid, that \$108,000,000, and, during the same time, from those three items of receipts alone they took in \$49,000,000 more than the previous Government took in during the same time. Then they run up and down the country and say, "Look what great financiers we are! Look at all we paid off of the public debt"! Well, if that is all they have to talk about, the people have found out there is just nothing at all in the great claim by the Government to paying off a large amount of public debt.

Now I come to Highways, and that is a very interesting question. I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in some figures given by the hon. member for Last Mountain in that regard. They certainly offended his sense of fair play, and I think they will offend the sense of fair play of every ordinary citizen in this province, because they all pay gas taxes, we all pay licence fees. And I would just like to compare the expenditure in regard to construction, reconstruction and surfacing of highways in the five-year period from 1944 to 1949. The total expenditures in all five Liberal seats, Mr. Speaker, was a little over \$132,000.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** – What are you dealing with?

**Mr. Tucker:** – I am dealing now with what you did; that's what I am dealing with. Always pretend that you do not introduce politics into the road expenditures. Say it after you hear these figures. Here are the people that were going to be different from anybody else! Different from the Liberals and Conservatives! Well, listen to these figures; \$132,000 in five Liberal seats, and in the seat represented by the Premier during that period, \$787,000 spent in one seat – more than five times as much in his seat as was spent in all the five Liberal seats. And in Biggar, represented by the hon. Minister of Education, \$746,000, and in Rosetown, represented by the Minister himself, \$554,000. A total in those three seats of over \$2,000,000 – and in five Liberal seats, not two million but \$132,000. Then the Minister says, "There are no politics in the administration of his Department".

Well, of course some people are willing to make statements like that, I suppose. I have heard from them over and over again throughout the country. I suppose the idea is that, if you say a thing often enough with enough confidence, perhaps you may get people to believe it. It will be very hard to get our people to believe it when over \$2,000,000 is spent in the seats of the Premier, the Minister of Highways, and the Minister of Education, and only \$132,000 in five Liberal seats. Have the C.C.F. party got to the point where they have to resort to that sort of thing? That sort of injustice is a lack of fair play. Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, thousands of people are saying, "That's not the party we thought we were supporting in 1944". No wonder they are leaving in the thousands; and all their C.C.F. organizations and all their workers are not going to get those people, who voted for them in 1944 because they thought that they meant some of these idealistic statements, to vote for them next time. They are not going to cajole them into voting for them this time, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** – That's what you said in 1948.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Well, you almost lost out in 1943, and you did lose out in 1949; and that's nothing to the way you are going to lose out in the next election.

I hope the Provincial Treasurer will not put on his act, that he put on last year, getting very self-righteous because we were suggesting that we wanted to do certain things that would cost money and at the same time were against the increase of taxation. I will explain it to the Provincial Treasurer.

In Alberta, they had a Sales Tax like our Education Tax and, because they did not drive private enterprise out of the province, because they welcomed it in, they have had such a development there of their oil resources that they have been able to increase their payments in social security matters and take off the Sales Tax there; and if this Government had not been elected in 1944, I think that we would have had the same development and perhaps even more than Alberta has had, and then we could have, without increasing the rates of taxes in the slightest degree, done as Alberta has done.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** – When did Alberta take off the Sales Tax?

**Mr. Tucker:** – The Minister asks when the Sales Tax was taken off in Alberta. I know it was taken off; I do not recall at the moment the exact date. Mr. Speaker, you will notice this. They cannot stand it apparently. But the fact is that this tax was on in Alberta and it was taken off. It was not taken off ten years ago; but it was taken off anyway and the fact remains. In Manitoba, they once paid a wage tax put on during bad times and they took it off; but this Government, Mr. Speaker – and I wonder that the Provincial Treasurer has the sheer effrontery to heckle me about this since, after their promise to take this Education Tax off, he has to come to this House and ask to increase it by 50 per cent. I wonder that he has the effrontery to heckle me about it, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that could be carried much further. But I want to tell this . . .

**Hon. L.H. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** – How about B.C.?

**Mr. Tucker:** – Who is it? The Minister of Municipal Affairs? Well, you should tell somebody other than the municipal officials how they can save more money. You had better tell it to the Provincial Treasurer instead of going out and lecturing the reeves and councillors throughout the province. They could give him a good lesson in wise expenditure of public money and in saving money. I suggest that the Minister of Municipal Affairs might be better engaged telling that to the Provincial Treasurer than in talking as he just did to the reeves and councillors of this province.

He wants me to deal with British Columbia. I could deal with it. I will just say this. In British Columbia they have just given to the British Columbia municipalities six million dollars extra – about last Christmas time. This brought the total payment in the way of grants paid to B.C. municipalities, to cover municipal costs and school costs, up to \$28,000,000. Compare that with the niggardly treatment being given by this Government. I hope that satisfies the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**March 23, 1950**

Now then, just to go on with what I was going to say in conclusion about this matter. We feel that once the incubus of a government that insists that it is devoted to bringing Socialism about, is removed from this province, and once the unfair competition, tax free and interest free, of Crown Corporations is taken from the commercial enterprises, we feel that we will share the development of other provinces. There is no reason why we cannot go ahead as Manitoba has done and Alberta has done.

The Government's policy is now changed, it is true. The Government admits it was wrong, apparently, in taking the attitude it did in 1944. But the trouble is that the same powers are left in the statute books to confiscate rights of people who may invest money in mineral development of this province, and the Government still says that it intends to carry out that policy if and when it is able to do so. Well, that means we are not going to experience the same development of our resources that other provinces have experienced, and I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with our coal resources, our oil resources, and other great resources in 80,000 square miles of the Precambrian shield – I am very satisfied that we can have at least equal if not greater development than either the provinces of Manitoba or Alberta. And if we were to get that development, we could have money to provide for social services without raising tax rates. Now the attitude of the Provincial Treasurer does not take that into account, and I do not think it does him justice to get up and talk as he did at the end of the last budget debate.

Now I should say a word about Crown Corporations. We finally got all the reports but one in regard to the Crown Corporations, and I should say a word about them. It will be subject to the tabling of that one report, today. All I want to say about Crown Corporations is this. The one tabled today was the one on Saskatchewan Minerals, and I understand that the net loss on that was about \$25,000. Well, nobody should laugh about it. We have been wanting this report for the last several days, asking for it and asking for it. It is tabled ten minutes before I am able to make my speech.

I say that according to that report tabled, there is a loss on that corporation of \$25,000. I presume that does not take into account the interest invested in that company. But leaving that particular item aside, and taking the ones that are already tabled, leaving aside the Power Corporation and Saskatchewan Telephones because they are public utilities and I think the people of this province expect they will be operated for service and not to make a profit. They were set up with the idea in mind; and if you try to raise the charge for the use of telephones, try to make money out of the Power Corporation; if, for example, you raise your telephone rates when you are already making a profit, it is just a way of raising taxation. It is not a genuine profit at all.

If you take the other Crown Corporations, you will find that the net profit, before you allow for interest on the money which the Province supplies and which it must pay interest on (and that is just as much a cost to this Province as people hired to work for their Crown Corporations), the actual profit before you count interest is \$268,350. The interest on the money advanced is \$290,000 which, as members will see, is \$22,000 more than the profit claimed. Now, of course, if you take into account the Minerals Crown Corporation, you will have to increase that by \$25,000 plus the interest on the money

invested in those companies. So on the figures I have, just taking interest alone on money invested in these corporations outside the Power Corporation and the Telephone Company at four per cent, if we had this money that is now invested in the Crown Corporations, we could pay it off on our provincial debt and save at least four per cent interest on every cent of it. Well, I do not think the Provincial Treasurer will say “no” very loudly to that. And so it means that having over seven million dollars invested in this way is costing this province \$290,000 – and all they can claim in profits is \$268,000 so there is a loss right there of \$22,000.

We are told, also, that the entire cost of auditing these corporations is paid out of the public purse, out of Provincial funds, by the Provincial Treasurer. The cost of provincial audits in 1933-34 were \$67,000. The cost in 1948-49 was \$163,000; an increase of \$96,000 in the cost of provincial audits. And that figure does not take into account an item here in the Public Accounts for 1948-49 for auditing of utilities. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, it can be assumed that some of that increased cost of audit is due to looking after these Crown Corporations, and is not charged up to them.

Throughout this province, wherever this Government takes over a business, such as when they took over the lumber yard in Meadow Lake, they went into competition with other lumber yards and paid no taxes to the town on that lumber yard. That means that our people have to make up those taxes. It means, Mr. Speaker, that they are having other people carry the load of providing education facilities, providing fire protection and so on at the expense of the taxpayers in respect of the property so taken over. In this City of Regina there is a great deal of property owned by Crown Corporations engaged in business, that bear no taxes; nothing allowed even for the provision of police protection or fire protection. Nothing provided along these lines. I am satisfied that, if these corporations throughout the province that engage in business, in making money if they can – unfortunately they lose money; but if those engaged in business trying to make money and competing with people who are having to pay taxes actually did pay municipal taxes, they would pay at least \$30,000 to \$40,000. There is another obligation besides interest that they do not pay. If they do not pay as other taxpayers have to do, there has got to be an increase of taxation on other taxpayers. The result is that people who might think of investing in this province in industry, or people who might think of investing in business, know that this Government is allowed to take over business alongside of privately-owned business, advances the money required, sets it up without it having to pay taxes. So they say, “we are up against that possibility as the Government works toward the attainment of Socialism”, and this very policy, outside of what we are losing in actual money in the operation of these Crown Corporations, is having a very bad effect upon the development of this province. If these Crown Corporations would pay taxes, pay interest for their money, pay their own way on a fair basis, then it would not have quite so bad an effect. Private investors know, no matter how much they may go in the hole on their operations, no matter how much money they may lose, the Crown Corporations can dip into the public funds to keep going. Are people going to invest money in any great amount in our province, when they are threatened with that sort of competition? Of course we are going to have stagnation in this province while we have the C.C.F. in office. Nothing like the development that our natural resources would warrant or the ability and energy of our people warrant, will take place.

**March 23, 1950**

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to deal with one other aspect of this Crown Corporation business. Before I pass on to this further point I should mention our friends, the Planning Board. I almost forgot them. I suppose this province could get along without these expert planners if it had not embarked in business on these other different lines. And this Board costs us over \$53,000 – that is the estimate for this year; and if you add all these items together you find that these Crown Corporations, outside the public utilities, are just a ghastly failure. That is all, Mr. Speaker, and the figures show it. Now, of course, My hon. friend opposite thinks that is nonsense. Well, then it is pretty hard to know what would make sense to him.

However, let's go on to another point. To make up even this sorry picture, they have got to use compulsion. In this statement of trying to bolster it up, you have got, for example, the Timber Board which shows a profit of \$80,000. They tell you, "You can't take out lumber; you can't go into the bush to take out timber products, unless you sell to us at the price we set."

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – No!

**Mr. Tucker:** – Well, that was the way it was during the period that I am speaking about. The Minister may say "no", but that is what I understand it is, and I am entitled to my opinion. I certainly understand that nobody can take out a permit unless they are willing to sell the lumber at the price that you state, and you won't let them take out lumber unless they have a permit. The result is that they are making these people produce lumber at much less than they could produce and sell it if they could sell it where they wanted to. They actually have the right to fine a man and put him in gaol. If he does not turn over his lumber to the Timber Board. That is in the law. If my friends laugh at that, it shows they do not know what their own laws are in this province. I say that because of this, all timber left on Crown land is the Crown's, and if you take that lumber and sell it to somebody else without a permit, they can charge you with theft, Mr. Speaker. The Minister cannot deny that. My hon. friend says, "Why should there be?" He admits there, now, that it is all right to exploit the people who produce lumber. That is just as if the Wheat Board were to say to every farmer; "You've got to sell your wheat to us at \$1 a bushel", and then, the rest we will call a profit. It is just the same thing, exactly the same thing, Mr. Speaker. You have no right to call this a profit that you get out of exploiting the producers of lumber, than if you took wheat from the farmers at \$1 a bushel and sold it at \$1.50 and called the difference a profit.

Then take fur marketing. You force people to sell certain furs through your Fur Marketing office – their beaver, muskrat and so on. They have no alternative. If they don't sell through that office they can be fined. If they don't pay the fine, they can go to gaol. Now then, I am just dealing with the exact situation. Of course, they made \$31,000 at it. I wonder if they would make \$31,000 if they did not force people to deal with them and charge them what they want to charge them, whether the people like it or not!

Then we take the item of insurance. I see that some school districts object to being charged what the Government Insurance Office charges them; but they have got to give their insurance to the Government. Will anybody say that without that compulsion they would have had this profit of \$205,000?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** – Yes!

**Mr. Tucker:** – Oh, well, my hon. friend says “yes”. Well, why do they make it compulsory then? The mere fact that they make it compulsory shows – well, if my hon. friend wants to make interjections that have nothing to do with the matter under discussion, of course, he is at liberty to do it. It shows his ignorance. My friend is certainly a political accident, that’s all, and I am not surprised about his attitude. He was elected with three opposition and with about 30 per cent of the vote in the constituency . . . Now then, if I can go on with this matter, Mr. Speaker – and I ask you to bear in mind what is happening, and when you start to call us to order I ask you to bear in mind the treatment I have received from the opposite side of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Unless the hon. member ceases the implication that I am not acting fair in my position, something is going to happen. That is the second time you have said that today. You are directly implying that I am not conducting this Legislature in a fair manner.

**Mr. Tucker:** – All I said, Mr. Speaker, is that when we are called to order for heckling a bit, you bear in mind the way I have been heckled. That’s all.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Haven’t I called them to order?

**Mr. Tucker:** – But they haven’t paid any attention, Mr. Speaker. Have you threatened them the way you have threatened me? Have you threatened a single one of them?

**Mr. Speaker:** – I have threatened no one. I have drawn to the attention of the House that certain things are happening and if they do them, and do not discontinue, certain action will have to be taken.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Well, Mr. Speaker, how many times have you told me that if I do not do certain things you will take some action. Have you said it to anyone across there?

**Mr. Speaker:** – When you have refused to comply with a point of order.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Well, I don’t care. They can carry on as they have if they want, but I am just pointing it out to you, Mr. Speaker. I will go on and make my speech no matter what they do.

Now then, in regard to insurance, I would say that part of this profit of \$203,000 is the direct result of compulsion, so that, instead of this overall Crown Corporations’ profit, there would be practically unmitigated loss if it weren’t for the compulsion imposed by this Government. Those items that I have mentioned, when compulsion figures, add up to over \$300,000 of the profit claimed. You take them out of the situation, and it shows a loss, even although they did get their money interest free. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not taking into account the cost of auditing, the cost of the Planning Board and all the other costs that are borne by the Province to try and keep these Crown Corporations functioning.

**March 23, 1950**

Of course, I realize that, when the Power Corporation and the Telephone Company are put in as Crown Corporations, it enables the Government to make these misleading statements throughout the country that their profits are \$5,000,000 one year; \$3,000,000 another and so on. They have no more right to count the Telephone Company and Power Corporation surpluses as a genuine profit than to make the Liquor Board a Crown Corporation and then pretend they were making the profit that they make out of liquor. I probably should not have mentioned that because probably they will do that now. They will have to do something to cover up the rapidly deteriorating Crown Corporation position. But there's the situation, Mr. Speaker.

I have dealt with the question of highways; the figures cannot be contradicted – \$2,000,000 to three seats of cabinet ministers, and only \$132,000 for five Liberal seats. I have gone into the question of debt reduction about which there has been so much boasting going on throughout the country. It shows that it is accounted for, by more than the amount of it, by payments made for which this Government can take no credit. I have dealt with Crown Corporations to show that if you take into account the cost of the money supplied to those Crown Corporations, but without taking into account the many other items besides interest, they have lost over \$22,000. As to municipalities – I have dealt with their problems and pointed out that the Minister of Municipal Affairs' report to this Legislature shows that the situation was that their costs were going to go up and that they should economize. At the same time you have got the situation that the Government refuses to pass on grants which are passed on by other provinces. Then you have got on top of that, in spite of these swollen revenues of the Government, increased expenditures. You have got actually, according to the last Public Accounts, that the school grants increased less than the increase in Education Tax. Now, those are figures that cannot be denied.

In the field of education, you have got a situation there where hundreds of people are teaching in the fact of the considered statement in this Legislature of the C.C.F. Party, that the Provincial Government would take over the basic cost of maintaining teachers and building schools – and then the Provincial Treasurer talks about us breaking promises. It was on the basis of those promises that he came to this Legislature in 1944. They have just ignored that promise to the people.

The Premier himself went out and echoed those promises that education would be a Provincial responsibility, that there had been too much passing the buck on to the municipalities. Oh, he made most eloquent speeches about that. Has he kept that promise, Mr. Speaker?

No wonder there are a number who can't stand it any longer and leave them, so that last year they were only able to send four members out of twenty to the Federal House, where they had eighteen before. No wonder. Because, after all, thank goodness!, we still live in a country where a government has to answer to the people when it makes promises like this one has, and then laughs and jeers and tries to make a joke of it when anyone tries to bring it to public attention.

Finally, Mr. Speaker – and it is very interesting to see, having in mind what is going on in the country – this party that was going to go to the country every four years is talking, through the Attorney General of trying to hang on an additional year. It shows that they realize that they haven't kept their promises, and their budget; and the climax of it all – the tax that they said they were going to reduce they have increased by 50 per cent.

I must vote against that budget.

**Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora):** – Mr. Speaker, before I go into my speech I would like to glance over some of the notes that I have made in connection with the Leader of the Opposition. I notice that, first, he castigated the C.C.F. in connection with the high ideals of carrying on in this House. May I again, point out to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that, at one particular time, as a student in the City of Regina, I had the opportunity of sitting in the gallery over here and listening to the Legislative Assembly, back in 1929-30, when the Conservative Coalition Government was in power, with, of course, the hon. member for Last Mountain being present, and the Liberals in the opposition. May I point out that I came into the House then as a Liberal, or at least I thought I was a Liberal, and 'Jimmie' Gardiner in those days was my little tin god. But, I assure you, after sitting in the gallery over here a few evenings listening to the mud slinging that in those days used to go on, and not only that, but when they did throw a good chunk of mud across, they pounded tables and yelled "Hear, hear!", and then some member of the Assembly would even rise and would start singing, "When it's Springtime in Regina" – all those silly songs, when a terrific depression at that time was already sweeping across the North American continent and Saskatchewan also. They were singing silly songs at that time. That is probably one of the reasons that I got interested in politics. I refused to have anything to do with the Liberal Party or the old political parties, and convinced my Dad and my brothers to come with me and fight in a people's party in a people's movement.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on bringing down another humanitarian budget, a budget that looks after the people first; that honours the people and not the almighty dollar. The main critic of the Opposition got up, and I don't blame him. He was pretty mad. He stood by the old economic order, by old capitalism. Dollar was the almighty god of capitalism, and he stood by the dollar. He said economize and through economizing the economy of the province is going to become better. Well, Mr. Speaker, they did that after the last war, and the economizers got us into one of the greatest depressions this province had ever seen and then, in order to pull this country out of that particular depression, another world war. Today, after the war, we hear

**March 23, 1950**

the same thing – economize – instead of expanding the economy of this province and the nation as our Provincial Treasurer has done today, in time of peace, certainly. It is not only in time of war that we should have an expanding economy. I believe we should have a greater expanding economy in time of peace, and this is exactly what the Provincial Treasurer is doing.

Now, in the last two weeks since the budget was introduced, all we have heard from the Opposition is two main criticisms: one dealing with every department of the government and telling us continuously that in each department we didn't spend enough money. After they got through stating that, they say we are going to vote against the budget because the budget is too high. Mr. Speaker, who do they think they are talking to? I say that they are insulting the very intelligence of the Saskatchewan people. They seem to be thinking that the people of Saskatchewan have no sense of reason or thinking. In one instance they tell us you are not spending enough, and then they turn right around and say, we will vote against the budget because you are too extravagant; you are spending too much. Now – which is it? If we are spending too much, then why, for example, did not the Leader of the Opposition, this afternoon, tell us where we could cut down?

The first item that I want to touch on is rural electrification – a pet subject of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I understand that it is a year or two ago that he was requested to speak to some organization in the province and he was to speak on rural electrification. He didn't know anything about it, so he rushed down to the library and got a hold of some data about rural electrification in Manitoba, and since then all we can hear is Manitoba and electrification in Manitoba. Why don't they ever refer to their past record? They have been in the province – they have a thirty-five year record in the province of Saskatchewan. The Power Corporation was commenced in 1929, and they operated this Power Commission for some fifteen years. Why didn't the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, point out and say, "Look, you boys are not doing the right thing". "Here is the way we did it; do it like we used to do it".

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to point out just what they used to do. For example, in 1940 they electrified four farm homes; in 1941, seven farm homes; in 1942, three farm homes – oh, successful electric expansion, Mr. Speaker, yes; in 1943, five farm homes; in 1944, the most prosperous year that they had, eight farm homes. What a record! What a successful electrification programme under the Liberal administration. But, you know, these whiskered Bolshevikies on this side got in, and, for example in 1949, we electrified 1200 farm homes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us compare that to the increase in the budget. In 1944, they had a budget of thirty million dollars; in 1949 ours, I believe, was forty-seven million, or an increase of 80 per cent in our budget. I will agree that it is the highest budget in the history of the province, but when they had a hundred per cent budget, they electrified eight farm homes. When we increased that budget from 100 per cent to 180 per cent, we electrified 1200 farm homes, or an increase in percentage of fifteen thousand per cent. One hundred and

fifty times as many farm homes were electrified, last year, as under the Liberal administration, and of all people, the Leader of the Opposition has the gall to get up and speak on rural electrification. I would be ashamed of myself.

Now, I have taken rural electrification where our budget increased by eighty percent and we increased rural electrification by fifteen thousand percent. Now, let us see how the money was spent. In 1944, I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Government of that day – the boys over there – spent \$320,000 on expanding the whole electrification system of the province. In 1950, these Bolshevikies on this side are appropriating \$5,000,000 – an increase of 1600 per cent over what they used to do, and then the Leader of the Opposition gets up and he says, “Why, that isn’t enough. It is an insult to the people of Saskatchewan. You should spend more”. Then he turns around and he says, “Why, you are the most extravagant Government we have ever had in the province”. Who is he speaking to, Mr. Speaker? To a bunch of morons – or who?

I say that, in the past two weeks, we have heard the most childish criticism of a budget that you could ever experience anywhere – not only in this province, but in the world. Childish criticism. In one way they tell us “You are not spending enough money”, in the other place, why, we are extravagant, we are just throwing money right and left. At least, be honest about it and tell us what you want anyway! Do you want us to decrease the services? Do you want us to cut rural electrification? Or what do you want? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they know themselves.

Point No. 2 Education; and, of course, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had something to say on that. I would like to point out that, in 1944, the total expenditure on education by the past Liberal administration of this province was \$4,000,000, or approximately that. Today, in our budget, we are estimating to spend \$9,000,000, an increase of 125 per cent or comparing this to our total budget: our total budget from 1944 to 1950 has been increased by 85 per cent, but although we have increased the budget by 85 per cent, on education the increase was 125 per cent. Is that not good enough? But, oh no! The Leader of the Opposition and the others get on their high horses, and they want us to spend more millions on education – but you must decrease the budget. And, of course, any member of the Opposition hates to speak about Saskatchewan beyond 1944. They would not speak about their own record. The Leader of the Opposition always has to jump across into Manitoba, and the next time he is in Alberta, and the next time he is in B.C. He should probably jump a little further; but he then turns around and the next time he will be in Soviet Russia or in Czechoslovakia.

I want to go a little further on education, and I want to point out, especially to the Leader of the Opposition, that, for example in 1948 (and he had it right), the average school levy in the province of Saskatchewan was 14.4 mills. But checking Manitoba, I find that the average mill rate, in 1948, for school purposes, was 18.79.

**March 23, 1950**

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Leader of the Opposition checked that, but he could not use it in this House. It is bad stuff. He is talking about Manitoba using half of their subsidies towards helping the schools of Manitoba. Well, they are not giving them an awful lot of help when their overall tax is 4.37 mills higher than in the province of Saskatchewan. Mind you, they know it over there. They checked those figures; but they would not use them – they are bad. For example, I quoted in this House and was misquoted by the hon. member for Gravelbourg in the Budget debate, that the average tax in Manitoba, school tax, was \$36.81, that is the average tax per quarter. I will leave the mill rate and now go to the actual tax. In Saskatchewan, the average school tax per quarter is \$25.26, eleven dollars per quarter less than in that blessed Manitoba where that generous Liberal Coalition Government over there gives them half of all the subsidies!

I am going to quote Alberta. In Alberta we have only the figures for 1947. In Alberta, the average per quarter school tax, in 1947, was \$32.19 and may I point out, because it was referred to here in the House that those are only fairy-tales that this information is obtained from the municipal record of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and of Alberta and a chartered accountant in this building gave me these figures, who was engaged by the previous administration some 25 years ago. I hope that they will believe that these figures are true; in fact they know they are, because they have checked them but will not use them.

Mr. Speaker, the increase in school taxes, if you multiply it with the cost of living index, you will find that the school taxes in Saskatchewan, today, should even be higher than they are. The increase in school taxes is definitely caused by the decontrol policy of the Liberal Government in Ottawa. But mind you, they play that, and mind you they love to play it, to the S.A.R.M. Association. You know they used to control that body pretty solidly. I am a municipal secretary-treasurer, and remember in the old days when I came down to the S.A.R.M. Convention, you just about stumbled over the civil servants of that day. Every relief and every highway inspector was at the S.A.R.M. Convention and shipping the boys into line and offering them a few dollars of grants and so on.

Now, I am going to speak a little bit on rural municipal aid – another pet subject of the Leader of the Opposition. We are not helping the municipalities plenty. I am going to point out some of the help that we are giving to rural municipalities, and nobody knows better than, for example, the hon. member for Kinistino or the hon. member for Cannington, who is just going out. They are both municipal men and they know the truth. For example, I would like to quote the grants given to the rural municipalities in the time of the Liberal administration and in our time. Under the Liberals over the five years from 1939 to 1944, their total grant to the municipalities of Saskatchewan was \$336,712. Now, from 1944 to 1949, under a C.C.F. administration, also five years, our grants to the rural municipalities was \$1,549,745. Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn that to percentages, keeping in mind that the budget from 1944 to 1949 was increased by 80 per cent. Our total grants to the rural municipalities was increased by 400 per cent, five times as much as the Liberals gave in their particular five years.

Is that not good enough, Mr. Speaker? Oh no, they want more money – but reduce the budget! How in the world could you do that? We must have a bunch of magicians over on the other side. Who are they speaking to? A bunch of children in the province of Saskatchewan?

Now, I will go on a little further. I want to quote the grants, for example, of three constituencies, and one of the greatest critics of aid to municipalities was the hon. member for Cannington who himself is, I understand, a Reeve of a municipality for the past twenty years, and then, of course, the hon. member for Melville threw some criticism in, too. I find out that, for example, from 1939 to 1944, five years under the good old Liberal administration, the grants to Cannington amounted to \$22,744 – and keep in mind the ex-Premier of this province and the ex-Leader of the Opposition, was the member for Cannington. Now we will take Melville, and, of course, they have got the political boss there with a whip. Melville from 1939 to 1944, also a five-year period, received in grants from the Liberal administration \$25,200. Now let us go to Canora; that is my constituency. And, of course, in Canora, we had that grand old gentlemen my friend Mr. Feeley, a Socialist. Of course, you would not expect any discrimination. Oh, no! They always told that over here. Canora received the grand sum in that period of \$8,500, and half of that in 1944, in the election year, when my friend Mr. Feeley gave them a good trimming.

We come to the C.C.F. – these terrible Bolsheviks on this side. They took over in 1944 to 1949. Let us see the grants received by these three constituencies, and I would like to quote a statement here by the hon. member for Melville referring to the Minister of Highways: “Let us get down to fairness and distribute this money in a little fairer proportion than we have been receiving, Mr. Speaker.” Now, let us see. Cannington, from 1944 to 1949, received in grants for municipalities in this totally Liberal constituency, \$76,277, or three times as much as they received under the Liberal five-year period. Did we discriminate against the Liberals, the very statement that the hon. Leader for the Opposition made only a few minutes ago? Were we playing politics? They are not two different things.

Now, for example, Melville – the man who said, “Let us get down to fairness.” Melville, from 1944 to 1949 received \$42,217, or just about twice as much as he got under a Liberal government. Was that fair to the Opposition? And now, of course, comes Canora. In Canora from 1944 to 1949 instead of \$8,000, we were placed on the same basis as Cannington and Melville, and Canora received \$62,514, or eight times as high as we got under the Liberals; but we did not get any more than the Liberal Cannington got. Cannington received more than Canora.

Now, I am going to go on a little further to timber bridges and repairs. There again especially the hon. member for Cannington, had something to say, and it looked as if all the timber bridges in the Cannington constituency overnight became rotten and unusable. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. ex-Premier, “Billy” Patterson, was over there for years; now what in the world was he doing?

**March 23, 1950**

Certainly in the past five years under our administration, those bridges could not have deteriorated completely – or were they asleep during their thirty-five years? Yes, war – that is all they know; war all the time. That is more or less thirty-five years under a Liberal administration. I would like to point out that, for example, from 1939 to 1944, in those five years the Liberals spent on timber bridges and repairs \$676,970. Our Government, in five years 1944 to 1949 spent \$1,059,114, or an equivalent to the rise in our budget, which is fair enough. And of course, they will say, spend more, we need more bridges, but you extravagant bunch of C.C.Fers – you must reduce the budget.” You cannot have the cake, Mr. Speaker, and eat it.

Now on timber bridges; I would like to go back to Cannington, and show the hon. member for Cannington the amount of money that was spent under Billy Patterson and the Liberal Government in their last five years, 1939 to 1944, and the amount spent was \$27,000. In the next five years by the C.C.F., we spent on timber bridges in your constituency \$31,950 – better than Billy Patterson was able to do. I could do the same thing with Melville. In Melville, during the four years under the Liberal Government, they spent on timber bridges \$8,000; in our four years, Melville received \$14,937. Are we discriminating against them? Yet those were the statements the hon. member for Melville gets up and says: “Now, let’s get down to fairness, Mr. Minister.” I would like to know what fairness is?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am still speaking on aid to rural municipalities. I have pointed out that, as far as grants are concerned, we have increased the grants to rural municipalities by 400 per cent while our budget was only increased by 85 per cent. We did the same thing in connection with the bridges. In fact, the bridge expenditure is increased by exactly the amount of increase of the budget. Of course, the hon. Leader of the Opposition just a few minutes ago, said, “Why, they didn’t do anything.” And, of course, he told the truth.

Let us go a little further, Mr. Speaker. For example, on old age pensions, mother’s allowance, blind pensions, the medical and hospital aid for these people was the responsibility of the rural municipalities under the Liberal administration. Mr. Speaker, we took that responsibility from the rural municipalities of this province and, for example last year, only for these unfortunate people we spent the sum of \$1,500,000. Now, we could have done the same thing as the Liberals, not cover these, and we could have given the rural municipalities another grant of a million and a half dollars, because they had to look after the hospitalization and the medical aid of these indigent classes within the province of Saskatchewan. Yet the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up and says, “They didn’t do anything.” But he’s playing over the air for those votes, and I assure you that air was pretty heavy, this afternoon.

There is another item in which this Government aids the municipal finance. For example, in normal times like these under a Liberal administration, they did not pay any portion of direct relief, although in such buoyant times as we have at the present time, we are paying one-half of all the direct relief expenditure of every rural

municipality within the province, which, no doubt, runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars. But the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not give us that credit. Oh no, we don't do anything!

Another aid that we are giving to rural municipalities that under the Liberal administration they had to pay themselves: For example, children of unmarried mothers were the responsibility of the municipality, and may I probably here point out that one hon. member got up in this House and spoke on that very topic: we didn't treat this young girl right. But I am going to tell you that, under a Liberal administration, those young girls were kicked about. They told them to go to the municipality. The municipality was bankrupt and they would say, 'we couldn't do anything about it, we haven't got the money'; so finally the Government would have to pull the municipalities into court and order payment by the municipality, and they had to pay the shot.

Now that responsibility has been taken over by the Province of Saskatchewan.

Another item that I would like to bring forward is hospitalization to all indigent cases within the rural municipality. I say that, since we have taken over the hospitalization of all the patients of the province, today, the rural municipality do not have to pay hospitalization for indigents. If they do, it is a \$100.00 amount. I can see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Cannington is smiling; he knows it is true. Oh, but it is an awful thing to admit.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to analyze the municipal taxation within this province. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, just a few minutes ago, stated that the general municipal levy in Saskatchewan had risen to 27.6 mills, and he has got that figure right. I would like to point out that the municipal levy alone – I am not taking in the school taxes – but the municipal levy alone in 1944 was 8.96 mills – that was quoted by the hon. member for Gravelbourg – and it is 'okay'. In 1948, that municipal mill rate had risen to 13.26, and I admit it, and, of course, they say it is the C.C.F. Government that is to blame for that increase; they didn't help the municipalities enough. Well, I have just pointed out to you the aid that we are giving to the rural municipalities, and, Mr. Speaker, if, for example, you take the average mill rate in 1944, that is 8.96, and multiply that by 1.6, by the cost of living index, you get a mill rate of 14.35 which is higher than the average mill levy in the province of Saskatchewan.

That, Mr. Speaker, is due to the decontrol policy of the Federal Government.

As the cost of living of everything increased, it is only natural that the municipal levy must increase by this natural increase in the cost of living. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the aid we have given to the municipality is the reason why this natural increase did not come about. It is lower than it should have been. Yet the hon. Leader of the Opposition will tell you that it is due to the C.C.F. Government. I would like to know how!

**March 23, 1950**

And then, of course, he flies over to Manitoba, and Manitoba gave half of all the Dominion subsidies to their schools and municipalities. Now I gave you, for example, the educational levy in Manitoba. I am going to give you now the Manitoba municipal levy, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition checked that, too, but he wouldn't use it. Bad stuff! The general municipal levy alone in Manitoba is 27.6 mills, or twice as high as in the province of Saskatchewan. Now put that in your pipe and smoke it!

Let us look now at the Manitoba 'Municipal Record' of 1948. I would like to point out that for the total municipal, school, and municipal commissioner's tax (which is a public revenue in Manitoba), the average levy, last year, of these three put together was 50.08 mills in Manitoba, or, in other words, 60 per cent higher than the total of our municipal, educational and public revenue taxes in Saskatchewan. Yet he tells us that the Liberal Government of Manitoba poured thousands of dollars into the coffers of the municipalities! What did they do with it? Burn that money up? Why is the levy in Manitoba so heavy?

Now I want to point out the average tax per quarter, in 1948, that is the total tax – municipal, school and public revenue. In Saskatchewan, it was \$52.00 or \$52.03, that is the average in dollars and cents – and I would like the hon. member for Gravelbourg to mark that down so he doesn't misquote me again, and only use the municipal levy. In Manitoba, the total tax on an average quarter is \$98.09, almost twice as high as in the province of Saskatchewan. In Alberta, we have the figures only for 1947, the average municipal, school and public revenue if there is any, is \$63.08, which is \$11.00 higher than in the province of Saskatchewan also. The province of Saskatchewan has the lowest municipal and school taxes of any province in western Canada, and I will challenge the Leader of the Opposition, or any of them over there, to prove it to me otherwise in cold facts, and not only a political speech.

In spite of all the help that we are giving the rural municipalities – keep this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that over the past two weeks we have heard from every speaker on that side that we should give more aid, we should spend more millions in helping municipalities, but your budget is too high, you must reduce it, you are extravagant. What sense!

Go on to Social Welfare. I would like to point out the total social welfare expenditure. For example the hon. member for Pelly is not here, but he wanted to bring about some cripples' pension or something like that – more millions to be spent in social welfare. I would like to point out that, in 1944, the Liberal Government on Social Welfare spent \$9,900,000; in 1948, we spent \$20,000,000. Although our budget between 1944 and 1948 had increased by 80 per cent, we increased the social services by over 100 per cent – and yet they say 'spend more millions – but reduce the budget'.

Speaking on the Department of Agriculture, they all, of course, say the same things 'we want more money for drainage purposes and so on' and I don't doubt it a bit.

Sure we do. But I would like to point out that, in 1944, the total expenditure in the Department of Agriculture under the Liberal Government was \$990,000 – not even a million dollars. In 1949, we spent \$4,000,000, an increase of over 100 per cent. While our budget increased 80 per cent, we increased the expenditure in Agriculture by 400 per cent – and they say that is not fair enough, ‘we want more money for agriculture’, but, “make sure you reduce that budget”!

The Department of Highways: in the Department of Highways I am still going back to my friend, the hon. member from Melville. He made the statement in this House that not one mile of new highway was constructed in his constituency and then he said, “Let us get down to fairness and distribute this money in a little fairer proportion than we have been receiving.” I would like to point out that on new construction, re-construction or paving in the fiscal year 1948-49, for example, the Department of Highways spent in the Melville constituency \$78,629 – and yet he said nothing was done. And the Canora constituency – a good C.C.F. representative from Canora – the Minister of Highways on new construction and re-construction spent \$40,505 – half of what he spent in the Melville constituency, and yet the hon. member for Melville gets up and says over the air “I want fairness. You didn’t do anything in my constituency”. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the Minister to probably decrease that budget a little bit, but decrease it in the right place.

The hon. member for Cannington, too, complained about his highway system. You know it is a funny thing: under the Liberals it was hunky-dory, and then all of a sudden the C.C.F. got in and everything went to pieces. Yet, under highway construction, I see in Cannington constituency, in the fiscal year 1948-49, the Highway Department’s expenditure was \$41,840 – and you have it in your Public Accounts; Look it up – which is more than Canora, a C.C.F. constituency, received. This is Cannington. That is higher than anything you got under the Liberals, and I am sure that the same thing applies over here. To go further – that is new construction and highway maintenance, and both those members, for Cannington and Melville, when they got up – why, it was a terrible thing, they have no highways at all.

**Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville):** – On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering how it is that you let the hon. member from Canora quote in his speech on the Budget with respect to my speech in The Throne Speech debate. How is that?

**Mr. E.M. Culliton (Gravelbourg):** – Yes, how is that?

**Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain):** – Mr. Speaker, on the point of order: you cannot recognize the member because the member for Melville is not in his seat.

**Mr. Kuziak:** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a speech of the hon. member for Arm River, the other day, and again the same approval, today, by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that some eight Liberal constituencies were discriminated against by the Minister of

**March 23, 1950**

highways. They both tried to leave that impression on this House and the people of this province. Let us check the truth of these statements.

The total expenditure by the Department of Highways from 1940 to 1944 (a 5-year period) in the Arm River Constituency was \$102,916.06 under the Liberals; under the C.C.F., the total Department of Highways expenditure for 1944-45 to 1948-49 (5-year period), was \$257,149.09, an increase of 150 per cent, or 2½ times as much. Is this playing politics or discriminating against Arm River, a Liberal constituency?

**Mr. G. Danielson:** – I would ask, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is referring to.

**Mr. Speaker:** – The hon. member has quoted some figures from public accounts. Does the hon. member for Arm River dispute that?

**Mr. G. Danielson:** – No, Mr. Speaker, I do not dispute that; but what I do dispute is this – when he says, Mr. Speaker, that what I quoted the other wasn't correct.

**Mr. Kuziak:** – I am telling the truth, and I never made that statement, if I did I would apologize.

**Mr. Speaker:** – The member for Canora denies that he made the statement that you are ascribing to him.

**Mr. Kuziak:** – I realize that that is a wonderful trick: For Canora, if I want to lambaste the Minister of Highways, I could quote the amount of money spent in the Canora constituency for blacktop, and it is nil; therefore he is discriminating against me, as in such and such a constituency, for example in Yorkton and some other one, they spend so much more on blacktop. I am giving you, Mr. Speaker, expenditure under the Department of Highways, under your Liberal administration, 1940 to 1944, and the total expenditure was \$102,916. Now, let us go over to the record of these Bolsheviki here – and in Arm River, from 1940 to 1949, our total expenditure in the hon. member for Arm River's constituency was \$257,149.09, or an increase of 150 per cent over what you got under the Liberal administration.

**Mr. G. Danielson:** – I am rising on a point of privilege, and my point of privilege is this, that he takes the figure, that I quoted for three specific purposes – one was reconstruction . . . (Interruption) . . . He was quoting maintenance.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order. Is the hon. member for Arm River rising on a point of privilege to contradict the hon. member for Canora, that his statement is incorrect? That would be a point of privilege. It is not a point of privilege to get up and make a speech. Order. The hon. member will kindly take his seat.

**Mr. Kuziak:** – The truth usually hurts and I see that it does. Now I am going to take another one – oh, that hon. member for Rosthern,

the hon. leader of the Opposition, he complained he wasn't treated fairly either, and I would like to point out that in Rosthern, under a Liberal administration from 1940 to 1944, over a period of four years, the Liberal Government spent, total expenditure in connection with the Department of Highways, an amount of \$102,253.17. (The figure is very similar to Arm River); and in Rosthern, under a C.C.F. Government from 1944 to 1949, the total expenditure in that constituency under the Department of Highway was \$225,627.15, or an increase over what the Liberals gave of 140 per cent. And yet, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. leader of the Opposition was speaking here, this afternoon, it looked as if they didn't get a cent. Now, I am going to quote another one.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** – Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is this: I said the money expended on reconstruction, construction and surfacing. I didn't say there wasn't a cent spent on maintenance. I didn't suggest that they didn't maintain the highways that were there. I didn't suggest any such thing. If you are going to let the hon. member say what is untrue and then object to our rising on the question, well of course Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** – I didn't hear the hon. member for Canora say that your statement was untrue.

**Mr. Tucker:** – He just said it just now. He certainly did.

**Mr. Speaker:** – He said you were leaving a wrong impression, which is a different thing than saying that what you said was untrue.

**Mr. Tucker:** – Mr. Speaker, he did say I deliberately left a wrong impression. Now if that is a parliamentary expression, and you think it is parliamentary, well, of course, we have to submit to your ruling; but if you say that a person deliberately leaves a wrong impression, you are making out that they are trying to mislead somebody, and that is unparliamentary.

**Premier Douglas:** – On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition shouldn't attribute statements to the hon. member which he didn't make. I didn't hear him say, and he tells me that he didn't say it – that he didn't make the statement that it was deliberately leaving a misleading impression. If the hon. members says he didn't say it, I am sure the leader of the Opposition will accept his statement.

**Mr. Tucker:** – I heard the hon. member say 'let's be fair, let's tell the truth' and all this sort of thing. Is that not an implication?

**Mr. Speaker:** – The hon. Leader of the Opposition gave his version of the expenditure on highways, and the hon. member for Canora is giving the quotations from Public Accounts. I can't see that it makes any exception.

**Mr. Kuziak:** – One other constituency that I would like to mention, one that

**March 23, 1950**

has always been represented by a Liberal member, too, and that is Cannington. For example, under a Liberal administration from 1940 to 1944, their total expenditure in the Department of Highways was \$164,929.28; under a C.C.F. Government, to that same constituency from 1944 to 1948, four years, we spent \$455,922.68, or an increase of 180 per cent over what they had been receiving under the Liberal administration. I realize that the leader of the Opposition doesn't like it but I can't help that. We have to give them the facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition made mention of British Columbia, and they are usually very careful in mentioning British Columbia. But the Leader of the Opposition came out with it, referring to British Columbia, that British Columbia had aided the rural municipalities and the schools by the sum of \$28,000,000. Oh, he smiled and everything else – it is a great thing. Why didn't he go a little further and tell us that in British Columbia the budget has been increased from \$30,350,000 in 1944 to \$105,000,000 an increase of 250 per cent, the highest budget in the history of British Columbia and the highest increase of any province of the whole of Western Canada? Why didn't he tell them that over there their Liberal-Coalition Government, the same kind of a Liberal-Coalition as we have in the Opposition over here, Mr. Speaker, they put on a three per cent educational tax right across the board – sales tax? They don't talk about that. Maybe they should probably call on, for example, the hon. member for Gravelbourg to advise them on sealing their budget a little better down there because; they really need this advice. I would like to point out, too, that in British Columbia the hospitalization tax is \$21.00 per head, instead of \$10.00 as it is in the province of Saskatchewan, and the maximum under hospitalization in British Columbia is \$33.00, while here it is \$30.00. I would like to point out to the hon. members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that in British Columbia the licence plates on a Ford or Chevrolet automobile is \$35.00, while in Saskatchewan it is \$15.00; that while we obtain insurance on this new Ford automobile in Saskatchewan for \$10.00, in British Columbia you have to pay anything from \$40.00 to \$90.00 insurance. It would be a nice thing for the Leader of the Opposition to tell the people of Saskatchewan over the air as to what they are doing in British Columbia; but oh, no! he only referred to the amount they gave their rural municipalities.

**Mr. G. Danielson:** – Do you expect anybody to believe that statement?

**Mr. Kuziak:** – It is true. You may not believe it, but that is quite all right; there are a lot of things you don't believe. I don't blame you for not believing them either.

I will go a little further, and, for example, compare the budgets in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The budget of British Columbia in 1944, was \$30,350,000 increased in 1950 to \$105,000,000, an increase of 250 per cent, a Liberal-Coalition Government, the same kind as is over on the other side, the only thing is they are Opposition here, and they will stay Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Let us take the province of Alberta. Their budget, in

1941, expenditure was \$21,654,000 and they are budgeting this year for \$74,000,000 an increase in the budget of 230 per cent, coming neck-and-neck behind Liberal-Conservative British Columbia.

In Manitoba their expenditure in 1944 was \$18,315,000, and you saw, when they brought down the budget of \$39,000,000 an increase of 100 per cent.

Saskatchewan, in 1944, the year of the Liberal administration, was \$49,799,000; this year, \$55,000,000, an increase of 85 per cent. Ours is the lowest increase in Western Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I would like to say a word or two on the educational tax. Just the other day I remember that the hon. Leader of the Opposition shed crocodile tears and everything else. Why, he was really bawling for the poor children of the province of Saskatchewan because there was an increase of one cent in educational tax. I would like to point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that, if he actually wanted to help these people so badly, he had a wonderful opportunity when he was in the House of Commons in Ottawa, where he could have, for example, decreased the sales tax. We will take for example a package of cigarettes. On that the Federal Government takes 20 cents; they put an 8 per cent sales tax on top of that which is probably 21 or 22 cents. But when we ask for an increase of one cent – that's a terrible thing, while they take twenty-one or twenty-two cents. That reminds me of that great saying of the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) when he said, "when they look at the doughnut, they always look at the hole". That is the trouble with you fellows, you are always playing in the doughnut hole. If you want to help the people of the province of Saskatchewan, you have a great opportunity in pressing upon those Liberal members that Saskatchewan sent down, last year – and they have been sorry ever since; those boys that were going to do great things in Ottawa to help the people of western Canada. You could reduce the sales tax. You could probably get those boys over there, instead of arguing and chewing the fat over splitting Saskatchewan in two – maybe they can put up a decent fight in checking the freight rate increases, but they haven't done it; in fact we sent one of our own Liberal friends from this House down there and I wouldn't be a bit surprised that he voted for the 40 per cent increase in freight rates, where they are going to skim off the province of Saskatchewan \$21,000,000 and not \$2,500,000 of educational tax that we put on. And why did we put it on? Instead of going into a deficit (and it is for hospital purposes), we had no alternative but to increase it one per cent and raise that amount of money.

Now to generalize the whole thing I would like to say that while I am a member of the Government, I am going to stand by, Mr. Speaker, in support of the Government, believing in an expanding economy instead of contracting it as the hon. member for Gravelbourg would like to do. The moment we start curtailing expenditure, whether it is in Saskatchewan or in the Dominion of Canada we are headed again for another depression. I realize it is coming, but, for God's sake! let us work together in the interests of security and an expanding economy in the province of Saskatchewan – and, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will support the budget.

**March 23, 1950**

**Mr. E.M. Culliton (Gravelbourg):** – I just want to clarify one point. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member while he was speaking, but it has been the rule since 1862 that you cannot refer in one debate to statements made in a previous debate, and I want to know whether your ruling, this afternoon, changes that rule which has been in effect now for eighty-eight years.

**Mr. Speaker:** – To my knowledge, I didn't catch it if the hon. member was referring to a previous debate. I thought the hon. member's speech was mainly replying to statements that had been made in this debate. He may have referred to some statements. Oh, it is all right, the point of order. It is pretty well established by usage; but when members on that side of the House have been making speeches at this time, the other side are certainly entitled to refer to what they said in that previous speech on this debate. If there was any reference to other debates made, I certainly didn't catch it.

**Mr. Culliton:** – Mr. Speaker, the point of order was raised – maybe you didn't clearly understand it; but the point of order raised was the reference made by the speaker to statements made by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) on a previous occasion. Now I will substantiate that by saying that the hon. member for Melville did not speak in this debate. I didn't want to interfere with the speech at the time, but I want to have it clearly understood that if the rule is going to be followed – that you can't refer in one debate to speeches made in a previous debate – it should be clarified, because your ruling, this afternoon, did not indicate that was the intention of that ruling.

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I quite agree with the member for Gravelbourg. Everyone knows that the rules prescribe that a member cannot quote from a debate that has taken place previously in a Session; he can from a previous Session. The theory is that once a debate has been closed and a vote taken, it is closed for that particular Session and can't be rehashed. Everybody agrees to that. I want to point out two things to your Honour: first, that the hon. member did not directly quote – he made reference to statements that had been made; secondly, I want to point out that he didn't say when the member said it, and it is not Your Honour's responsibility to stop a member and ask him 'which debate was that in?'. It is up to the member who is taking exception to rise in his place and properly, on a question of privilege, point out that the member is quoting from a previous debate. I point out that the member for Melville did not properly rise – he was not in his own seat, and properly speaking, the Speaker should take no account when he said he was raising a question of privilege when he was not in his seat, and no one else raised a question of privilege.

**Mr. Culliton:** – The only point that I wanted clarified – I am not making any objection to the ruling – that that was the ruling, because I understood from Your Honour's ruling that you could refer to previous debates. Now it is clear that you can't – thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** – I have a list here but it is very hard for me to keep track of everyone that has spoken, and when he did refer to it, as I understood it, he simply referred to something that had been said and I couldn't tell whether it was in this debate or not. When the hon. member rose on a point of order, the hon. member for Last Mountain drew it to my attention that he wasn't in his seat, and he wasn't in order.

**Mr. Kuziak:** – On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to admit that I did refer to what the hon. member for Melville said in the previous debate. I had understood that it was wrong, but I remember that even the hon. member for Gravelbourg made use of the \$22.00 which I talked about in the Throne debate, and I thought, if he has the right to do that, so have I.

**Mr. Culliton:** – The hon. member is right. In trying to avoid transgression of the rules I did say that a ‘member’ had stated – but there was no reference to the hon. member. He must have inferred that I was referring to him – I never mentioned the hon. member for Canora at all.

**Mr. Speaker:** – It appears that the hon. member for Gravelbourg is now giving a lesson to the hon. member for Canora as to how he can break rules without breaking them.

**Mr. Culliton:** – I am just trying to clarify the speaker’s mind as far as the rules are concerned, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** – It is pretty hard at times to clarify the rules.

**Mr. A.W. Loehr (Humboldt):** – Mr. Speaker, not having spoken in this House so far this Session, I want to take this opportunity of voicing my regrets of the demise of two of our fellow legislators and join in that respect with every member of the House I am sure. I had not the opportunity of knowing the late member for Gull Lake, Mr. Murray, intimately, but knowing his activities in the House I am convinced, from his attitude of sincerity and in his beliefs and convictions, that the trust put in him by his colleagues and electors was not misplaced.

I felt a personal shock at the death of my friend, Paul Prince, of The Battlefords. I had known Paul since the early ‘20’s and I had the privilege of counting him as one of my very intimate friends. I am quite convinced that it was a shock to all his friends throughout the country. His loss was a great one to the people of The Battlefords and the people of the province as a whole.

I wish to congratulate the newly-elected member for Cannington, Ross McCarthy. I am sure that if he in even a small way replaces the loss that we sustained in the removal of our friend ‘Billy’ Patterson, he will repay the people of Cannington for the great loss of \$800,000 that they had been promised in highway construction, if they would elect the C.C.F. candidate. I also wish to welcome the new member for The Battlefords, Mr. Maher. If he can worm his way into the hearts of his fellow legislators and the people of The Battlefords like his predecessor, Paul Prince did, he will have gone a long way to make himself a valuable man to the Legislature and to the people of the province.

To the hon. member for Gull Lake, (Hon. T.J. Bentley), I want to extend congratulations. When he made his maiden speech in the House I thought that perhaps the position of Court Jester had gone along with the portfolio of Minister of Public Health. But later I thought that perhaps this position was in open competition amongst the members of the Government side of the House, and I want to say that if that is the case my vote would go to the jovial Attorney General (Hon. J.W. Corman) and my second choice would be to the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Harry Gibbs).

**March 23, 1950**

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate. I thought that the pro and con of the budget had been thoroughly discussed. The members on the Government side of the House had taken us all over the activities in the province, and, so far as our side is concerned, I felt that my colleagues had covered the ground very well. However, the other day a number of members on the Government side of the House threw out a challenge that none of the speakers on our side had taken a stand on the larger school units, so I want to come to that a little later. I have decided to invade the sacred precincts of education and go into the inner sanctum of the larger units. Before I do this, however, I want to spend a few moments with some other matters.

The hon. member for Canora (Mr. A.G. Kuziak) on several occasions in dealing with his pet subject, the hungry '30s, threw out the charge that during that period when they were getting relief from the Liberal Government, or through the Liberal Government, I should say, from the people of the Dominion, politics were being played by relief inspectors, and that families went hungry. Now, this was followed up by the statement that the hon. Minister of Social Welfare made in this House when he said that his Department serves people irrespective of all political affiliations, that these tactics passed in this province since the Liberals are out. Now, I want to say the reason that I opened this thing is that I was one of those relief inspectors and I have, every time I have heard a remark like that, resented it secretly very much because I knew that that was not the case.

In late August of 1937, I at the time being with the Department of Agriculture, was called into Regina and was told that I was to take over and help in administering relief in the province, I along with other men who were at the time in the employ of the Government in various Departments, were called in for a consultation. We sat in consultation for a matter of two full days and evenings going over these schedules, the manner in which relief was to be handled. We got implicit instructions and also were told how to go about helping the people to dispose of the surplus cattle that they had to dispose of in order to be able to take care of the balance. To make a long story short, we met from early in the morning until late at night, and I want to tell you that three or four times our superior officer, a member of the Government, told us very explicitly that under pain of instant dismissal any one of us who was found to be influenced by either political affiliations of a relief recipient, religious affiliations, or personal feeling, if we were found to be influenced in any way in administering relief, we were to be dismissed at once. Now, we were told that so many times that there wasn't any doubt that it was meant that way.

Now, I want to say that this charge of \$3.00 per family for relief, so far as I know, is utterly ridiculous. I don't know of any family that I ever had connection with in so far as doling out relief is concerned that got any sum like that. I have stacks of files and records at home today yet, of relief that was handled. I always kept a copy of the relief in all the municipalities where I handled relief, and the only family that I ever knew of that got less than \$5.00, if they needed any relief at all in a month, was one family: an old gentleman, who was a Central European, came to this country and, of course, had gone through hard times in Europe apparently, and in his application for relief he said he wanted \$4.00.

The councillor, in whose division he lived in that particular municipality, told the council in session with myself that he was sure that this family needed more relief and he wanted to know whether I would be willing to give them more. I said, "Certainly, if you say so he will get more; but he will have to apply for more. I certainly am not allowed to give this man more than he applies for". So – at the next sitting we had, the councillor had seen this man in the meantime and the man had said, "No, that will do, I don't want any more." Otherwise I stuck strictly to the relief schedule, and I want to tell the hon. member for Canora that was nothing like \$3.00 a family.

I also have, to verify this just administering of relief so far as I am concerned, a number of letters at home which I cherish very much. They came from individuals; they came from councillors; they came from reeves and secretaries, and they congratulated me on the way that relief was handled. And, so far as I was concerned, I never at any time made any inquiries, nor did I want to know, whether a relief recipient was a C.C.F., Liberal, Conservative, Hindu or otherwise, it didn't make any difference to me. I treated each case on its merits. In fact, I didn't want to know, and neither did any of the other relief inspectors. I think those are nasty charges to make, especially when they are made over the air.

I spoke at some length, last year, regarding the Hospitalization. I am not going to say anything further regarding Hospitalization. I again reiterate that I am all for it; I'm all for hospitalization. The only fault that I find is with the administration and application. I still maintain that a big improvement can be made, and I am glad to notice that members of the Government, members of your party, members of this House on the other side and public men throughout the province, are beginning to realize that the major objections that I voiced, last year, are really true. The hospitalization scheme is being abused. There's no doubt about that; and I want to say what I said last year: if the plan had been adopted or formulated by municipal men in this province who had years of experience in the matter, you would not be faced with the necessity of cutting down hospitalization to individuals. If the Government had started this plan on the basis of semi-hospitalization, it could have always been increased; but you can't reduce it, and you will find that you will have an awful lot of trouble if you ever want to cut down on it. I have no fault to find with it otherwise.

I want to just say a few words regarding highways. I also have a copy of the tabulation of amounts expended in various constituencies that the member for Last Mountain (Mr. J. Benson) had, and going through this I find that in the years 1945, 1946, 1947 and 1948, a total of \$280,571 was spent in the Humboldt constituency. I know the very near approximate number of farmers in the Humboldt constituency, and I also know, I daresay within a few dollars, the amount of money that each one of those farmers spends in a year on gas tax. I don't mean the two per cent on the farm gas tax; I mean the gas tax of 10 cents a gallon, and the licences. Now in those four years that I named, a computation of the amount of money expended by those people in gas tax and in licences, comes to approximately \$2,075,000 in those four years. That does not take in account the people living in urban centres – the town of Humboldt, the town of Watson, and the various villages.

**March 23, 1950**

They also have cars and, of course, drive them the same as the farmers. Now if you take that \$280,571 I mentioned off the \$2,075,000 you find there is \$1,794,000 or approximately that sum, went somewhere else. It was not spent in Humboldt on the highways or on municipal grants.

I want to say to the Minister of Highways (I see he is not in his seat) that the people in the Humboldt constituency want some money spent in that constituency in the very near future. They need highways very badly. It is a mixed farming community, one of the best in the province; there's no doubt about that, and, as I said, last year, we have one farmer living on approximately 2 quarter-sections of land throughout the whole district, and they need roads to go to town in the winter time, and to go to their trading centres. That is all I want to say about highways. I do hope that the people of the Humboldt constituency will get recognition of their need in that respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, back to education. I am sorry to see that the hon. Minister of Education is still not here. I think he is perhaps still in Saskatoon talking to the Provincial School Trustees, but I can't help that, I had made up my mind that I was going to speak on the subject, and I will have to do so. To more or less explain my position in so far as education in the Humboldt district is concerned, I perhaps had better tell you that I was a school trustee in my own little school from 1907 to 1943, perhaps one of the oldest school trustees in point of service in the province. I might also, in order to give you a picture of comparison of at least one school district in the Humboldt large unit, give you a resumé of the accomplishment in that little school district. In that school district, so far as secondary education is concerned, at various times when any youngster in the district wanted to take secondary classes, it was given to him, or her. We never taught Grade XII, but we did teach Grades IX, X, and XI. I believe Grade XI was only taught to one pupil but Grade IX and X were taught quite often. In so far as the elementary classes are concerned, however, we have perhaps in that school a unique record, possibly as good a record as any school in the province of Saskatchewan has ever had, and that is that, from the time the school was started in 1907 to 1943, only three of the pupils that received all their elementary education in that school failed to pass the 8th Grade. It figures out to about 98½ per cent of the pupils that received all their elementary education in that school passed the 8th Grade, and somewhere in the neighbourhood of 83 per cent of those, during the period when they had to make a written examination, passed with honours. Now, I daresay that that is perhaps a very good record, but of course, I don't want to set that up as a general accomplishment in the area comprising the Humboldt Larger School Unit. I know that that is not the case.

I may say that the School Board in that little school district always took a very keen interest in the success of the school. I remember that we hired and fired a teacher within a half year, and yet, on the other hand, we have had school teachers there as long as four successive years. One teacher was there in two different periods of three years each. We were always very careful; if the school teacher did not give good satisfaction we didn't keep them. The autonomy was ours, and we simply didn't keep them, and I would say that, in our experience, in my experience if you

like, I always found that a technical standing or, if you like, the qualification of a teacher by way of certificate, classes of certificates, does not necessarily mean that every teacher is a good teacher even if they have the qualification as far as education is concerned by way of degrees or certificates. Teaching is a God-given gift. I have always held that, and I think that it cannot be denied. The gift to impart their knowledge – and that is something that nature gives and that cannot be acquired by education. Education, of course, is a necessity, and it helps to make a good teacher if the person has the ability to impart that knowledge that he or she has to their pupils.

Now, I might say that in that school, the highest salary that we ever paid to a teacher was \$1,600 in the mid '20s, I think for a period of two years – I'm not so sure about that. The lowest we ever paid was \$600 in the '30s, but, at the same time, I daresay that the teacher with the \$600 salary in the end had just as much money left over as they have today with \$1500. They got their board very cheap and living cost all-around, clothes and everything else, was low. A very interesting fact though is that, while we never paid less than \$600, the school district bordering our school district to the south, the ratepayers being comprised of something like 95 per cent C.C.F., paid as low as \$325 a year. Now, that's a fact that you can verify in the records of the Department of Education; I can give you the name and the number of the school district. And they not only keep that up for one year, but they kept it up for two, if not three years.

When the large school unit was started in Humboldt, we were paying \$1200. And we had come up in salary as the money came in a little freer, we at once started elevating the salary of the teacher.

I might say that the taxes in that school district were never higher than \$26. That was in the day when we had a flat rate, before the mill rate was used for school taxes. That was the highest that we ever had. When the mill rate assessment was put into effect, there was the odd quarter, of course, that had a high assessment, that would pay more and others would pay less, but that would be about the highest.

The hon. Members, as I said, threw out a challenge, the other day, some three or four of them, especially the hon. Member of Elrose, that none of the speakers on our side did, or dared, (I believe he used the word) take a stand on large school units. Now I want to say this, and I believe our Leader made the same statement this afternoon: there is no doubt about our stand on larger units. We have no fault to find with large school units. If people want them, why by all means let them have them. But our stand is, and you know it, you Members on the other side of the House, you know it very well: our stand is, and we never change, that the people in those large school units should and will have a chance to vote on whether they want to retain or abolish them, and we're not going to put almost unsurmountable restrictions against a request for a vote on the matter, such as, 25% of the ratepayers having to make affidavits that they are a taxpayer and a ratepayer in that large school unit, and giving the quarter-section where you live and all that. If the people of the large school unit want a vote they can have it, if we have the say

**March 23, 1950**

Now there is no doubt about that, and we want that distinctly understood, and we don't want anybody going around telling people that we have no stand on the matter. We have.

I'm going to give you some notes on the functioning of the Humboldt Larger school Unit. I might say that the hon. Minister of Education, last year, speaking on the estimates, (he was on the air at the time) made a certain statement. When I spoke about the large school unit, when the large school unit in Humboldt was started, or before it was started, at a little meeting that I attended and where I was asked to voice my opinion, that if the instituting of a large school unit would bring secondary education into the rural schools, I would be very pleased to accept it if the people want it, even though I knew it would take the autonomy from the local school board, it would destroy the community centre of those little schools, it would take, or cost more, though the gentleman at that meeting maintained that the cost would be reduced rather than increased. I said that I was absolutely convinced that circumstances would make it imperative that the cost of education would be increased. But, I said, if it would do the one thing, bring secondary education into the country school, give the country child the same chance in life that the urban child had, I would be very glad to accept the system of a large school unit. Then I went on to say that from what I had found so far in the Humboldt large school unit the education had not been improved, it had not brought secondary education into the rural schools any more than it was before, and that the general standard of education had not been improved.

Now the hon. Minister of Education, speaking a little later on the estimate, came back at me and he started quoting figures. In fact he quoted one figure that absolutely astounded me. He said that in the Humboldt large school unit at the end of the school term ending on December 31, 1948, which then was just passed, there were 311 more secondary scholars in the Humboldt large school unit than there was in that same area when the large school unit was started. Well, I had no means at the time of replying that and had no right to speak on the matter, so I had to accept it: but, a little later, when I started thinking this matter over, I considered that the amount was almost beyond all reason because, after all, there were only 93 classrooms in the larger school unit. I believe that is right – I may be wrong on one or two as far as classrooms are concerned. But I thought the matter over, and that an average of three more secondary scholars would be in every school, and so I rather doubted the thing.

Then further to minimize the effect of my criticism, he said that he had received, just a day or two previous, a letter from a man in Humboldt large school unit, and he named the name and I know the man very well. The letter (he read the letter) commended the Government for instituting the large school unit. Now, this man, I'll tell you here who he is. He is the principal of a school, in a village school in the Humboldt large school unit, where they have a fully modern school of which I am going to speak a little later. No wonder, to me at least, that he wrote to the Government commending them for the instituting of the larger school unit!

Now to go on about the 311 alleged increase in secondary pupils in the Humboldt large school unit, shortly after we arrived, this Session,

I asked the following question:

(1) “How many pupils were taking secondary classes in the area now comprising the Humboldt large school unit at the end of the school term immediately prior to its establishment: (a) in urban schools, village or town: (b) in purely rural schools?”

(2) “How many pupils were taking secondary classes in the Humboldt large school unit at the end of the term ending December 31, 1948. (that was the term which had been mentioned by the hon. Minister of Education): (a) in urban schools, village or town: (b) in purely rural schools?”

Now, I got the astounding answer that for (a) on the first question which is urban schools, at the time the unit was started, the number of pupils was 112, and the answer on no. 2, also the urban schools as at the end of the school term of 1948, also was 112: The same, no change. There weren't any more in the urban centres. Then for (b), here is where it comes in: that's the rural schools. At the end of the term just before the large school unit was started, the number was 151, and (b) on the December 31, 1948, again the same date that was mentioned, 147, or four less. So the over-all picture shows that there were, at that time when there were supposed to be 311 more, actually four less all told. Now, I do know that there may be a few less in the over-all attendance in those schools, but it is not proportionately that much that when the education in the unit was supposed to be so much better, it would reduce the total of secondary pupils during that time.

I believe that the question was asked and I don't know whether I ever got it and I haven't looked it up. I don't know what the total enrollment is, secondary and elementary, in the Humboldt large school unit. But I daresay it isn't less. I think it should be more rather than less. So far for that.

I might say that the hon. Minister of Education in speaking on the Budget quoted figures here until we were dizzy and according to press reports he was also very prolific in quoting figures in Saskatoon at the Trustees Convention. I hope that they are more accurate than those that he quoted, last year, over the air, and that is the thing that I resented very much. When the statements go over the air, they should at least be halfways accurate. Now, that is the picture so far as the result in the standing of education in the Humboldt Large School Unit is concerned.

Then we come to a very interesting thing. Here is an article that appeared in the local papers in the Humboldt district, and, by the way, I got a copy of that sent to me through the mail with nothing but an address on the envelope. I don't know where it came from, but I have my ideas. Now this is a report (it's too long to read) allegedly coming from the trustees of the Humboldt Large School Unit. It is a report that deals on the matter of the functioning of the Humboldt unit as if it was coming from the large school unit board. Now I know every member of that board very well. They

**March 23, 1950**

are all good friends of mine, and they are all good honest men, and I am sure that they are administering the affairs of the Humboldt Large School Unit to the best of their ability and belief according to the set-up of a large school unit. I have no fault to find with those gentlemen in any way, shape or form, with one exception perhaps, that the president of that board is a ratepayer of a school district in which this gentleman resides that wrote this nice letter to the hon. Minister of Education, last year. He is a ratepayer of that district and, as I am going to explain a little while later, the ratepayers over the whole large school unit built a \$32,000 school in that little school district. Now, I don't know what he had to do with that in particular, but there it is, and the people of the large school unit resent that very much. I don't know if they do that in any other parts of the province where they have a large school unit. If they do, I am sure that people are more or less up in arms over it.

I might say, too, that so far as the class standing in the Humboldt Large School Unit is concerned, this report does not deal with that at all. It deals with the teachers' certificates however. It does state that they have no supervisor functioning in that large school unit and, outside of that, it deals entirely with materialistic matters such as building of schools, cost of repairing and so forth. And I might say I know very well where this report comes from. I know who wrote it, because members of the board told me they never knew it was being written, or never knew that it was going to appear in the press, until they saw it themselves in the press, and the whole set-up of the report purports to come from the large school unit board. Now, I would not be a bit surprised – I am again sorry that the hon. Minister of Education is not resent – but that he had a copy of that in his hands before the large unit board of Humboldt ever knew it was going to be printed.

I got some information regarding the set-up so far as building schools is concerned. I have lately spoken to members of that board, and I found out a lot of things. It was volunteered to me, and these members of the board, I might say, came to me voluntarily and gave me information that was astounding to me. I found out there is such a thing as a building grant, a special building grant, which goes to large school units; at least they have been going to the Humboldt large school unit. They have a building programme of approximately \$45,000 each year; sometimes it runs a little over that, but they attempt to hold it to about \$45,000 a year. The general building grant that they have been receiving is \$4,200 a year. Now, I got information that there are special grants going out, a special building grant, and the other day, in committee, I asked a question whether there were any of these special grants going to anybody else but through the large school unit board, and the answer was, "no". Well I don't know, these gentlemen that I have known for years and years in Humboldt and have always recognized as very truthful people, tell me that one little school board from a certain little village school district on the extreme east side of the Humboldt Large School Unit came to Regina armed with something, and I think that they were armed with a warrant of merit of having voted C.C.F. consecutively, ever since the C.C.F. started, and they got a \$12,500 special grant to build a school in that little village. I hope somebody takes that down. They came back, they never asked the large school unit

board about it all, and whoever is in charge of doling out the grants here never consulted with the large unit board either. They came back with this grant, a warrant for this grant, all signed, sealed and delivered, but not with a cheque, of course; not yet. And then they came to the large unit board and told them that they wanted to build a school and that they had a \$12,500 grant (and, by the way, that grant eventually came through), and they had the plans all ready for it. Apparently they had the plans all ready some time before the large school unit was started. They had the plans all ready, and the approximate estimated cost of that school in that village was \$18,000. Eventually it cost around \$20,000; but the cost was supposed to be around \$18,000. As I said they had this grant, or the assurance of a grant of \$12,500, and, of course, this tied the large unit board's hands. They needed the school, though they were not in dire need; they had perhaps as good a school, possibly a little too small, as any of the rural schools in the district at least; but they built the school and finished it, and, of course, the large school unit board supplies the balance of the funds to pay for the school. That is one thing.

Then there is the school where this gentleman who wrote that nice letter, last year, lives, and where he is the principal of the school. The school that I spoke of just now is at the east end of the large school unit and is outside of the municipality where I live. In the municipality where I live is situated a little village, and I was reeve during the hungry 'thirties in that municipality, and consequently knew the mill rate of every school district in that whole municipality, and, though I don't remember the exact mill rate, I do know that at no time in the 'thirties when the teachers' salaries were lowest, was the mill rate below 20, and as far as I can remember the highest was 22 mills in that school district. As I have said, the president of the board of the large unit is a ratepayer in that village school district. They built a \$32,000 school in this little village and now, since the large unit board is in operation there, they pay the same as we do. First, the Unit started out with 15 and, last year, it was 19 mills. Actually, that is one of the districts where the mill rate is reduced; they pay less and we, the rest of the people of the large school unit, built them a \$32,000 school – a gift by the taxpayers of the large unit. Now, I don't know if that is supposed to be the system – well and good, but I am not so sure whether the people of the large unit are going to be quite satisfied with it. By the way, during the year when they built this school, they got a \$4,200 grant, not a special grant for that school. The large unit school board got a \$4,200 grant for building purposes and, as I said, they spent approximately \$45,000 during that year in building schools.

I might say that in the first-mentioned place, there are several dozen ratepayers in that school district that could have built that school before the larger school unit was instituted. They could have built that school all by themselves and only gone halfway, possibly, down their pocket. That district is situated in the best crop-yielding district in the province of Saskatchewan bar none. Since the late 'thirties, when the prices have been good they have never had anything less than an average of thirty and up to forty-five and the extreme high of even fifty-five and sixty bushels an acre of wheat. If that is the way the equalization grants system is being used in this province I have grave doubts of its merits. I suppose that it is being used differently in other places. I hope so at least.

**March 23, 1950**

Now the Large school unit board also started a school, last year, at another village. That is not a C.C.F. section though, and, of course, they don't get an equalization grant there. That is also costing a lot of money – just a neat little \$65,000. Now I don't know what the mill rate in that district was previously, because it is not in the municipality where I live and I don't know; but I was told it was always fairly high, and if it was, it is lower now.

Then we come to taxes. I believe, if I am not mistaken, there would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of ten of the members on the Government side of the House who have asserted that taxes, since the large school units have been instituted in the province, have come down. I see here where the hon. Minister of Education himself made the statement, just yesterday or the day before, at the Trustees Convention, that the per capita school tax in the province has come down rather than up. Well I don't know. That may be, but that is certainly not the case in the Humboldt large unit, I can assure you of that. Just yesterday, I was in my room at the hotel and the telephone rang. I went to the telephone and answered, and a party I know very well, have known since about 1907 when he migrated to this country from Norway, was on the 'phone. He was here at the Buildings to be exact, and he asked for me and they told him that I was very likely in my room. I have known him, as I said, since 1907 when he migrated to this country, and I also know that he was one of the staunchest, even violent, supporters of the C.C.F. Party from the day of its inception. He wanted to talk to me and he came to the hotel-room, and he handed me some tax receipts that do not bear out what is being claimed on the Government side of the House. He has a quarter-section, and, by the way, I could bring thousands of these tax receipts along the same principle; I could bring thousands of them from the Humboldt school unit. He said he had to leave home in a hurry and he couldn't look through all his files, but he found the corresponding tax receipts from one particular quarter-section for the year 1942 and the same quarter-section for 1949, last year. In 1942, there had been no building going on in that particular school district. The school in that district had been built previous to that, and the taxes at that time were taking care of debentures that were still owing on that school. I know that to be a fact, as the school was built in the early 'twenties. The school taxes on that particular quarter were \$22.80 in 1942. In 1949, the school taxes on that same quarter, in the large school unit now, are \$72.20, or \$49.40 more than they were when that land was in the small unit district. That's just a little more than 225 per cent increase. Now I haven't got my own receipts here. I could have brought them. They are almost identical on the same basis. That is why I want to say that I could bring thousands of them.

**Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** – I wonder if you could tell the House if there has been any change in the assessment between 1942 and 1949 on that quarter?

**Mr. Loehr:** – No, I couldn't tell on these, but as far as my own are concerned, the re-assessment in my case brought them lower, – I would say an average of about \$250 per quarter-section lower than they were previous to the re-assessment. But in this case I don't think it was raised, because this land here (I know the quarter-section very well; in fact, I know all that

man's land just like I know my own). The assessment throughout that district was around \$4,000 – from \$2,600 to \$4,000, and that is just about the top for that district.

**Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington):** – Have you got the comparative figures for teachers' salaries?

**Mr. Loehr:** – No, I don't have them, but that, of course, can be found out. I failed to ask him that; but in that district I am quite sure that, in 1942, they were paying very close to, if not over, \$1,000 because that was the general level of the teacher's salary throughout the district. We, in our little school district, paid more I think, in 1942, and as I said in 1945 we were paying \$1,200.

If you wish, I will dwell a few minutes on why, in the Humboldt large school unit, the taxes are so high. It isn't the teacher's salary; teacher's salary is not a factor hardly at all. The average there is from \$1,200 up to \$1,800 and a few teachers, such as the gentleman who is teaching in that one village school, got I think, \$2,400, last year. I was told, but I have forgotten the exact figure; but it's around \$2,400 or \$2,500. In rural schools, however, the salaries are from \$1,200 to \$1,500 and in very few cases, \$1,800. I may say that in the district that I have had reference to where I have been on the board of trustees for years, they put in a teacher there who gets \$1,800. He has a first class certificate. Now, I don't want to say anything against the man because I don't know. I have no children going to school myself, and I am not going to make any statements; but I may reiterate again that a certificate does not necessarily make a teacher, and that is what the fathers and the mothers of the district tell me.

Now, going on as to why the taxes are so high in the Humboldt large school unit. I can tell you: The cost of the work that the secretary of the small school used to do, I mean the writing of letters, the engaging of teachers, the writing out of cheques and the work that he has – well, I never got more than \$20.00 per year from 1907 to 1943, and some years I even felt guilty for taking the \$20.00 because I felt I didn't earn it. The average cost in my municipality, No. 369, in the '30's, when I was Reeve and knew the average that the secretaries got for their work, was around \$32.00. Some of you no doubt know that there was a limitation at that time, confining the amount that the school secretary could accept as compensation, of \$65.00 per year. There was one school district in that whole municipality where the secretary got the limit of \$65.00, but most of them took only \$25.00. I took \$20.00; they insisted that I take that much. Now, under the large school unit system – I have the tabulation of the expenditures of the classified work of the administration of the large school unit and it was printed in the paper, too (that's where I got it), the work that is done in that large school unit by the large school unit secretary in the office in Humboldt which covers no more than the work that I did and my fellow secretaries in other school districts did. It covers no more than we used to do, and now costs over an average of \$200 per school district. Now somebody got a raise, but it wasn't the teacher there. That's what it costs; you can get the audited statement if you like.

**March 23, 1950**

Then another thing is, as I originally claimed that it would, that by removing the autonomy from your little local district you have removed all interest in that little community centre where, years ago, before the large school unit, the annual meeting was attended by every ratepayer. In our district the total of resident ratepayers, I think, was 21, and we usually had 21 at the meeting and now hardly anybody attends. We burned wood; that was our fuel. When the matter of wood supply came up at the annual meeting, we auctioned off the supply of wood. We asked for a bid, who will supply a cord of stove wood and for how much money? And somebody would make a bid and somebody else would bid lower and lower and lower until we got to where nobody wanted to supply it any cheaper, and then the party making the lowest bid supplied the wood. In all these years, even in the mid-'twenties, when labour was almost as high as it is at the present time, we never paid any more than around \$35 for our year's supply of fuel. Now it costs around \$100 for fuel. They don't want to make wood any more when the large school unit is paying for it. The same with the janitor. We never paid any more than \$55 a year in our school for this work, and that applied in nearly all the rural schools. We never paid any more than \$55 for a janitor starting the fire, scrubbing the school, etc., and we always kept the school nice and clean, too. But now, for that same little school where I live, the cost of the janitor is \$210. That's where the money goes, and that is why I claim that when the system of large school unit doesn't produce a better education than it has, then there is no cause, no reason, for the establishment of larger school units.

A very interesting article appeared in today's press, not emanating from your Department or from your Government, but from the meeting in Saskatoon of the larger school unit boards where the president, a Mr. Teach, made the statement that he urgently advocated a policy of central budgeting of large school units, or in other words, setting up another board, possibly within the sanctum of the Government, to set a mill rate for the whole of the province, because, as he qualified it by stating, the larger school unit budgets are not properly handled. This again reiterates what I have stated, that when one small school district is improperly handled, it is doubly bad or a hundred times worse. So I cannot see where, so far as my experience goes, there is any good cause for establishing larger school units. I can assure you that, no matter how many figures are quoted over the air by the hon. Minister of Education, or how many figures are quoted in reports, the people in the district recognize just one figure, and that is the one that they have to pay in taxes on their land in the fall of the year. That is what is going to guide the people in the Humboldt large school unit, and in others, when they cast a vote as to whether they want to retain the large school unit or not. I must say I have never gone out condemning the large school unit. I am saying this right here, and I am saying it openly. This is the first time that I have talked about the large school unit since its inception. I have, of course, talked to people about it; but people from all over, fathers and mothers, come and tell me – including the gentleman that was here yesterday – that the educational standard has not improved, and the fathers and mothers are the ones who know. I believe that you will agree with me that, after all, they are the ones that know.

After what I have said, I believe you will take it for granted that I am not going to vote for the Budget.

**Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats):** – Mr. Speaker, I think by looking around that I am the tail-end of this debate and you know what you may expect. I had intended to tell the hon. members on the other side, or a part of them, that, in view of the fact you have been listening to oratory here for a long time, I think that you may be just as anxious to cut it short as I am. I have not really prepared a speech to deliver to the House and suggested to our Whip here that I might say something at this Session, sometime in the middle of it or maybe before. He suggested it might be advisable that I lay off for a while and give the other boys a chance, because I have the record (I do not think I am entitled to it,) of being a little long-winded. So I thought probably that we would leave that honour to our hon. member from Arm River, (Mr. Danielson), and I will reserve my contest for it for another Session. However, we all have to contribute something to debates and to give Mr. Speaker an idea of what we think, and the only way we can do that is to get up and say it.

Before I start, I want to associate myself with the members of this House in expressing my sincere regret for the passing of the members, particularly Mr. Paul Prince, my seatmate here, whom I knew very well. I did not know Mr. Murray as well, but from the reputation that he has had voiced on his behalf, I am sure that he was entitled to all that was said. I also want to congratulate the members who have replaced those who are absent, and also our friend “Billy” Patterson. I certainly want to congratulate the member from Cannington, (Mr. McCarthy), on his success in view of the campaign that was waged against him, and also the member from Battleford, (Mr. Maher). And I think I am fair in saying that I would like to congratulate the new member from Gull Lake (Hon. T.J. Bentley). I was rather surprised, knowing him better than I do the other two – he happened to be a Pool fieldman at one time when I was associated in a small way with the Pool – and I had never thought that I would see the day that his mental condition would lead him away from the stable orthodox methods of administration, and while I appreciate the three members very much, I certainly have to put my preference to the two who stayed with the old ship. As a matter of fact, I have reason to think of their mental stability as considerably better than that of the hon. Minister of Health.

Now, since I have to make this thing short, I promise you it will be the shortest address that has ever been attempted in this House. I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance, (Mr. C.M. Fines), because I really think that he made a marvellous job considering the position he was in. I must remind him, however, that I suggested here, last year, that he would be looking for just what he did look for when he came back this year, and, while I am no real financial prophet, it would not surprise me if he would be looking for another one per cent or maybe two per cent next Session. If he does not ask it in the way he did this Session, then he will probably ask for it in some other way. I told him, that time, that the administration, and particularly their health system, was breaking down under the weight of a top-heavy administration, and that has not been eased since then.

I also want to congratulate our financial critic here (Mr. Culliton), I think he did a masterful job. Of course he had a great deal better material to work on, I admit; but even at that if it is not a good man, good material can be spoiled by a poor man. So I really want to congratulate him, because I think he made a presentation here in this House that is

**March 23, 1950**

worthwhile for every member to consider, and those who have voiced their rebuttal to him have been on pretty thin ice. I never sat in front of men who would glory so much in their own vociferous verbosity as my hon. friends over there. Of all the bunk that I have listened to, coming from there, to justify this three per cent tax instead of two per cent, I think they are entitled to a medal for it.

I have listened to practically nothing but Federal taxes, increased prices on implements, increased prices on freight rates, as if that had anything to do with the increase in the Education Tax in this province. Well, I do not know where it would connect. I would like to ask my hon. friend, if they did not know that these Federal taxes were on the people long before this, and the three per cent tax is a new tax. I would like to say to my hon. friend that instead of the Federal Government increasing taxes, they are always consistently reducing them, while this Government is just doing the opposite. I would also ask him if they would like to have the Federal Government withdraw from the taxation field in this province in every way and at the same time, naturally, withdraw their social aid and other payments for purposes of assisting the province of Saskatchewan. I think that the Federal Government would be quite willing to let Saskatchewan go on their own if she wants to. As a matter of fact, I think it would save the Federal treasury something like \$30,000,000 in spite of all the utterances from our hon. friends. That Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

The pamphlet that is quoted in this House of the Federal Government taking some \$136,000,000 out of the people of Saskatchewan while paying only \$20,000,000 back, is just as absurd as anything that can be uttered, and I would say that it hardly behooves educated men like the Minister of Education, the Premier of this province and the other men who carry titles from the university, to utter such nonsense. I can tell these hon. gentlemen that, if that is the standard of education that our university hands out, I would far sooner go out in the street here and pick out some of these commonsense fellows and let them run our business. That is quite true, as the hon. member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) said, that, after all, education is of very little value to anyone unless he applies commonsense with it, and I sometimes think that our hon. friends over there lack that commonsense.

I will go just a little bit further in respect to this high cost machinery. Now I would just like to remind this House that, if they will go back a little bit, follow up the reason for these high costs of machinery, they will find that the actual cause for a lot of that lies at the door of the C.C.F. Party and the Communist Party. There has been in every strike and every agitation for increased salaries and wages and shorter hours, leadership from the C.C.F. leaders of unions or Communist leaders of unions and, in spite of all that my hon. friends can say about increase in wages without increase in taxes or prices, all they have to do is to go to Great Britain, to the Socialist Government there, and see what they experienced every time they increased wages. I think it is fair to say that there never was an increase there for wages, unless there was an increase in the price of the commodity that goes with what is produced; and when they talk about increases in machinery then they can go right back and see that it is a result of an increase in wages, and that is what increased the price of machinery.

Railway rates are going up, of course. What else can you expect? If you can see the ratio of the increased salaries during these last few years, you will wonder at the railways not having increased the rates before this. And if they increased it again, that is the salary rate, then they are sure going to have an increase in freight rates. We have been unfortunately situated in the West, as we are, and we naturally take the brunt of it, and it does not seem very logical presenting that sort of argument to justify an increase in the Education Tax in this province.

Then there is an awful lot said about the marketing. I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it is rather amusing when you look over those who have so much to say about how the farmer should market his wheat, and the lamentation that went on over the fact that the government has put the coarse grain on the open market. The hon. Minister of Education shed tars over the fact that the marketing system was being jeopardized and the Federal government was falling down on it and they lost the markets. The Minister of Co-Operatives, the Premier himself, also went a long way to condemn the Government because they were now going to get from under. The Minister of Agriculture contributed his share of criticism until the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) reminded them of the fact that they were "all wet", that the farmers had taken it in hand themselves and were going to organize a co-operative board for the handling; and that is the way it should be, Mr. Speaker.

Now who are these men that were condemning the Government for having raised the price of coarse grain by putting it on the open market? Well, where is the Minister of Agriculture? I am kind of sorry he is not in his seat. There seems to be a very good reason why the Minister of Agriculture could not criticize the board for having put the coarse grain on the open market which increased the price to the producer from 25 cents a bushel on oats to 50 cents a bushel on barley. He was very mad about that. Well, I understand that he does not grow enough of that stuff – or, at least, all that he would have for sale, he could push into an elevator with a wheelbarrow. That is the interest that he has in the price of coarse grains. He wants to buy that grain, and that is why he wants it down at the floor prices, to feed it to the steers that he is selling for \$250 to \$300 apiece, at a price "for use and not for profit". I presume that the next thing he will want is the basic price put at the price it prevails at today. I am sorry for the hon. member if he is losing money at \$250 or \$300 a critter.

Now the member from Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen), lamented very much over the fact that he had to pay three cents a lb. for barley to feed his hogs, and he wanted to know where the profit went – that the speculators were stealing the difference between the floor price and the price that he was paying. Well, I want to assure the hon. gentleman that we who are raising that coarse grain are very much appreciating the increased price, and that we are getting all of it except the one-cent commission that goes to those who handle it. We are going to get it from the Board.

Now when you have simmered down, you will find that every kick and every complaint that comes from over there is motivated by some personal reason; that everyone who has advocated and criticized the Government

**March 23, 1950**

for having got out from under dealing with the grain, are men who have not raised a bushel of grain, men like the Minister of Education. How much wheat has he raised for market? Yet he was very much concerned about the marketing methods of the Federal Government.

How about the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker)? He also shared the tears over the very lamentable matter; and the member from Elrose, a teacher, (Mr. Willis) was very much in tears over the fact that the Government was not doing a good job of marketing wheat. But I have not yet heard a farmer say anything about it – or haven't they got any farmers over there? There hasn't been a farmer over there who has criticized the Federal Government in the marketing of grain. Everyone of them has been a lawyer or a teacher or somebody that wanted to buy grain themselves. They did not grow enough to push into an elevator in a wheelbarrow.

Now that is the situation and still that is where the professional advice is coming to the farmer as to how he should handle their own products. It is any wonder that the farmers have taken it in hand themselves? I hope that they will keep those professional wheel-chair advisers out of the administration of it. The proper place for the marketing from now on, when the emergency is over, is in the hands of the co-operatives with proper selling facilities. Let the Government assist in the selling; let the Government open the channel for the market; let them adjust their talents. That is a government function; and, if necessary, let the Government provide the funds for the farmers to handle it. We are going to have to meet competition; there is no use in fooling ourselves. When Great Britain starts to pay for the grain and our other products instead of getting it on dole as she has been doing, she is not going to pay us any more than she can buy it from any place else. And why should she? No government in Great Britain, whether it is a Labour government or any other government, is going to make long-term contracts unless she can make them at a price that she is sure that the price will never go beyond that during the term of that contract. They are just as shrewd buyers and as anxious to buy their product cheap, as we are anxious to get the best price available.

I know of no better method of marketing than the one we had before the "crash", and the mistake that was made in 1929. If the Pool had been using commonsense and let the Pool elevator man handle that grain at that time, instead of devising some fantastic holding scheme that was brought on through the administration at the time, there would have been a different story among the farmers at the present time. I am very anxious to see our co-operatives succeed; but I do not want them to hog it, because then they may become a monopoly and I do not like to see wheat or other products piled up in the show windows where the buyers will have the upper-hand and can say, "All right, boys, we will just wait for a few months and then you will have to sell it at our price". The proper place to store surplus grain is on the farm and the proper way to market it is to feed the market and not glut it. There is the proper place to do it.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas;** – I would like to ask the hon. member if he ever signed a Pool contract?

**Mr. Lopton:** – The hon. member signed a Pool contract. Did you?

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** – Yes, I did.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Well, then I did too. Not only that, but I served on committees for years; and not only that, I was the one who worked the hardest to set up an elevator system because they were handicapped for the first year or two because they did not have elevator facilities. I still have the certificate.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** – I would like to ask if he still believes as he did, last year, that the Wheat Pool is under Communistic influence, a statement made in this chamber, last year, by himself.

**Mr. Loptson:** – I am very glad you asked that question, because I have not had an opportunity to hear that. I never said that the Pool was under Communistic influence at the present time; but they certainly were in 1929 when the U.E.C. was then controlling the Wheat Producers Limited. That is the time that they were under Communistic influence. Since then, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the complex is entirely different. These men have learned by their experience; and I believe now, if the Pool was set up to handle wheat, they would be a success, and they would give the service to the producers that they were originally organized for. I believe that. We have two co-operative grain-handling facilities in this province – The United Grain Growers and the Pool – and I would not want to see the day that they would amalgamate, because we want competition. It gives better service and we want more than one agency to sell our product.

I wonder if the hon. members ever realize that we are pretty vulnerable with our wheat here in Canada, in Saskatchewan, or if some of these hon. members realize how much wheat there is consumed and grown in the world. I want to tell them that there was over five billion bushels consumed in the world, last year, as a whole. What percentage is the little bit that we have to sell? Any time that the other competitive countries have a good crop we are up against keen competition and, naturally, low prices. What other competition is there to wheat? We have potatoes, we have rye, barley, rice and corn. All these are commodities that are in competition with wheat; that is why these fluctuations are so large on the market, and there is not a thing that we can do about it. We have just got to be ready to meet competition if we are going to be exporting wheat and I would like to see the day . . .

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** – I have a question, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather from what you say that you are favourable or are not favourable to the International Wheat Agreement?

**Mr. Loptson:** – I am highly favourable to it, but I am afraid that we are not going to get it renewed unless we can set the price. If we can continue with the International Wheat Agreement, then we do not need any particular agency set up in this country. It is only when we have got to go out and meet open competition that we have to guarantee a set of machinery that we are not going to force our wheat on the market and take a “glutted” price. If we can continue the International Wheat Agreement, then I would say that we have gone as far as we can possibly hope to go.

I did not really intend to say anything about this thing, but

**March 23, 1950**

There is a matter that I think is of great interest to us and that is our development of our natural resources – and I want my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources just to check me up if I am wrong. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it was a fatal day in Saskatchewan when the C.C.F. Government was elected in 1944. That was a fatal day, and no one knows that better than the Minister of Finance, who has had to increase taxes this Session.

When we had the Imperial Oil here scouting for three or four years and had spent \$3½ million dollars, had drilled no less than fourteen wells and were just on the verge of getting somewhere, when this Government came in and they said where they stood. After all, the policy of the Government was not very favourable to capitalists. It is a lot of money they had already spent and probably would have put in another three or four million dollars before anything was got back, and what was the reply that they got? “Yes, you had the right to go ahead and drill, but if you find anything, then it is our policy to take it over for the people.” I am not going to accuse the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources for having been responsible for that reply, but the man who did make it was at least candid about it, and I want to give him every credit for his courage in carrying out the policy of this party in the socialization of the various industries of this country. Where is he wrong? Let’s just thresh it out right here, there is no better place. Where was he wrong? He was told that that was just what would happen. And what did happen? They pulled up the drill and then went over to Alberta. It was Alberta’s fortune which was Saskatchewan’s misfortune.

Let me draw the attention of the hon. Minister: Would you need to put out a 50 per cent increase in the Education Tax if you had nine million dollars in cash for an excess bonus on twelve quarter-sections of land? That is what the Alberta Government got in the last sale only held in February of this year. Nine million dollars in cash over and above the 12½ per cent. But I am going to read some more. The only thing is that it is not in red letters.

It goes on to say that with this nine million dollars during the last twelve months, their receipts were a little better than 30 million out of their oil resources. It is an orthodox method of doing development. Just the policy that you are now going to try to encourage capital with. I am not criticizing your policy now, because that is going to make it hard enough to get them in even on that; but here is the stinger. Look up the terms of your new contracts. Most of them are for 2½ to 3½ years. Where does that land the end of the contract? I do not think that the oil companies in this province are any more anxious to take a chance on being socialized than Imperial Oil was. I do not think they are any more anxious. They are fortifying themselves with a 2½ to 3½ year term to give them that long a time to do the seismographing and the surveying and whatever information they want before they start drilling. By that time, they hope, and I expect, that there will be an election and they will have somebody over there that they can have more confidence in, and know that their investment is going to be safe. So we are going to have to be set back another two or three years. We have already lost five years as the result of my hon. friends sitting over there. We may have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue. Who knows? And I can tell my hon. friends that if this Government would resign tomorrow and another group would get in there, inside of six months you would have this province littered with derricks from the international border to the forest reserves.

I know that much about it. You would have it littered with wells that would be actually drilling for oil. The seismographing is all right. I am talking about something which I know. These people are not throwing any money away. How can they in view of what took place right on the floor of this House, this session.

I wonder just who this Government figures on double-crossing. Isn't capital guaranteeing them all the safety that is necessary under an orthodox administration? – and then standing up on the floor of this House and declaring their faith in the “Regina Manifesto”, which, if it says anything, then it says “eradicate capitalism.” Now be reasonable! How would you take that performance? Is there anybody on that side of the House that would put money in Saskatchewan under conditions of that kind? Would anybody who has control of millions of dollars of people's savings put money here after seeing it worked here, admitting that their policy is to eradicate capitalism? Well, you are trying to fool somebody but you are not going to fool these oil companies. I am satisfied of that. As much as we would like to have them come in here, and no one would want to see them more than I would; as long as they have some other place to go for oil where their investment is safe, that is where they are going.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? The words he said about no wells being drilled got me a little bit worried. I would like to know if he could advise me if the D.L.P. Company will drill within sixty days after the first of April?

**Mr. Loptson:** – Well, if you can find me anybody that would pay for it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – Well, they will either drill or lose their permit.

**Mr. Loptson:** – That is exactly what we are getting right now. We have been all over, to every friend we have got, to try to get them to put their money into this to develop it for gas even, and they are afraid to put even a few dollars to develop gas. I know what I am talking about.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – You figure they do not trust the companies?

**Mr. Loptson:** – They do not have to. They do not have to deal with the company at all. We will give the lease for nothing if they will drill on it. You can have it tomorrow, if you will drill on it. There is your chance. So I am not talking about something I do not know anything about. I know of another case here, and it is pitiful that this condition should prevail, because I am satisfied that we have just as good a chance to find oil here as they had in Alberta. I am satisfied for the reason that the Imperial had just as good a chance to scout in Alberta as they had here in 1942, and there was some reason for them to come into here in the first place, and that company and any other big company are certainly scouting around for the most favourable location before they put their money into it. One of the encouragements that we have here in Saskatchewan, is the fact that they spent \$3½ million in scouting around for oil in this province and, therefore, they must have figured that they had a better chance of getting oil here than there was in Alberta. That is only logical.

**March 23, 1950**

Now, there was a remark made here in respect to the marketing of our oil at Lloydminster, and I am going to say right here that I am 100 per cent, behind the Minister of Natural Resources, or any member of this Government, in trying to get some adjustment of this flagrant discrimination that now exists in the freight rate between fuel oil and coal. I think that is an unjust discrimination not only against the industry but against the people that want to use the oil for fuel. I can promise him that I will do everything to co-operate with him in trying to get that unjust freight rate adjusted.

I want to say a few words about the mineral development. We have heard a lot about the riches in the North, and I believe that there is any amount. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard), is probably better acquainted there about the possibilities than anybody in this House. He is not a man that blows or talks much about things, but I have heard him pass remarks about some very valuable things that would be worthwhile if we could get the capital interested to develop it.

A great hullabaloo was made, a couple of years ago, when this Government thought they had better try to get some capital in here because, after all, they are not going to do it on their own. They appointed this man with great hopes that something was going to be done, and I have been interested to read the note that appeared in the "Northern Miner." My hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources would probably know about that magazine, and it is pretty much the "bible" of the miners. Here is what they state – they call it "The Sheep's Eye; Saskatchewan C.C.F. Government woos capital from the East:"

"The province of Saskatchewan, seat of Canada's only Socialist-C.C.F Government, is taking belated steps, the "Northern Miner" understands, to catch up on development of its mineral resources. For some time development in Saskatchewan has lagged mainly because of the hesitation on the part of well-financed mining organizations to trust their talent and resources to the uncertain mercies of the government that appears bent on nationalization of every industry on reaching maturity in the province."

And then it goes on.

"Recently overtures had been offered private mining capital to enter the Saskatchewan field by means of an Order-in-Council amending the Mineral Resources Act to provide for the granting of exclusive prospecting rights in cases where the applicants for such rights are prepared to insure large expenditures in carrying out prospecting operations. The fee of \$500.00 and a guarantee of financial ability and intention to make the expenditure are the principal requirements for the application. Saskatchewan

bid for private capital in return for exclusive prospecting privileges follows quick on the heels of an announcement that W.J. Bichan had been appointed to the newly-created post of Director of Mineral Resources, and Mr. Bichan is expected in Toronto around the year end on a mission which will include discussion of Saskatchewan Mineral Resources, presumably with some of the well-heeled mining organizations with a known flair for exploration. In mining circles there is considerable eyebrow raising at the news of the Socialist-C.C.F. conversion to the idea of exclusive prospecting rights for a financially strong mining company. There is also a tendency to discount the news pending further assurance of satisfactory guarantee against nationalization. After the money has been spent, the risk taken, and the reward within arm's length, the experience of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, which is subject to the heaviest provincial tax in the Dominion of Canada, still rankles in the memories of the eastern mining people."

**Mr. Loptson:** – Just let me read that again: oh yes, it says here something about the Order-in-Council; that's right. That is a quotation. But it does not make any difference, Mr. Speaker, that is what happened anyway.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – I want to keep the record straight. I am pretty sure that not even the regulations were amended as that article states.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Well, would you say that you have not – that you are still going to socialize it; that you are not going to give these people what you have been offering?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – I am not making a speech. It would take a speech to answer that.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Well, that is the inference of the article – that you are offering these people rights to come in here, in an orthodox method, and that you are prepared to guarantee them their investment.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** – We are guaranteeing their investment?

**Mr. Loptson:** – That is what this article refers to. But they say that as a result of what happened to the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, the people of Eastern Canada are doubtful about their safety.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** – Might I ask my hon. friend a question? Is he opposed

**March 23, 1950**

to the province getting nearly \$1½ million royalty from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operations?

**Mr. Loptson:** – Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to any sort of royalty, but I am opposed to a man charging himself out of the market. If that million dollars from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting has been the cause of keeping tens of millions of dollars out of this province, probably, in revenue by all of the companies coming in, then I say that the charge has not been a very profitable one. And besides, putting the squeezers on those that you have in here, is bound to keep the others out. Then my hon. friends say, “Oh well, we guarantee them their safe passage and they are going to get the money.” Who is it that is in authority to guarantee that? My hon. friends are not sure of themselves, except from one convention to another. There is not a man on that side of the House that can say that they will be there. My hon. friend the Premier himself was hoisted out of the portfolio of Health by the convention, and they pulled him right out.

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, that statement is simply not true. My hon. friend has no right to make it.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked a good C.C.F.’er when he came back from the convention. I said, “You did not handle the premier very well;” and he told me, “He spends most of his time memorizing funny stories. He should be with the co-operator, because that is where they like them.”

**Premier Douglas:** – Nobody told you that at all. You made that up, didn’t you?

**Mr. Loptson:** – Then the hon. Minister of Highways . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – That is as fictitious as the rest of the speech.

**Mr. Loptson:** – The Minister of Highways has a noose hanging over his head. He has got to be a good boy or he will be out of his portfolio at the next election. My hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources – I like the man because he is a friendly little chap and we get along all right; but he is “a monstrosity.” They call him a monstrosity, and say that he has no business to make these arrangements with the big oil companies in throwing the natural resources away. Now, that is what you are up against. I sympathize with you. From the experience that you have had since you went on these treasure adventures, you have found that your theory is absolutely cuckoo. It is impractical. You know that. But in order to make yourself safe with your supporters, you stood up here 100 per cent standing behind the “Manifesto”, which threatens to clean out anybody who puts any money in here.

Now I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, if my hon. friends really have the welfare of the province at heart, in view of what they know in respect to the development of natural resources and the possibilities of revenues from their development, they resign after this Session, in a body, and let somebody else in there. I will go further

than that. I will support any move that will pay them their indemnity for the rest of their legal term. I do not think we would have to pay them all, because some of them have pretty good jobs waiting for them, and if it would save them resigning before the people kick them out, they would make good fellows of themselves. Mind you, the people would appreciate it, because that is the only way that we will ever get our natural resources developed.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** – Might I ask another question? I think what the hon. member meant to say there was that was the only way he would ever get the C.C.F. out.

**Mr. Loptson:** – No, there is no question about being out in two years. We are not worrying about that; the oil companies are not worrying about that. That is why they have taken these two- and three-year terms; because they know then there isn't going to be any trouble. But if you would step out, it would give the people of Saskatchewan a chance to participate in the development of natural resources while this capital is available. Two years from now it may not be available, just depending on the conditions of the world. And I am telling you in all seriousness: if my hon. friends have the welfare of Saskatchewan at heart and want to really do something for the people of Saskatchewan, they should resign after this Session. And we will see that you get paid if you have to get paid for your full legal term. Yes, we will take it out of the oil companies. We will take it out of them and pay you for the next two sessions. I will not say any more. You have gathered that I will not support the budget.

**Premier Douglas:** – I move the adjournment of the debate.

A motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

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