

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 9, 1951

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

PRIVILEGE

On Orders of the Day: —

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — I have before me a copy of the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' and in it is a reported statement by Nelson Clark, the Communist Party leader in Saskatchewan; and he states, in this newspaper report, as follows:

"Premier Douglas had correctly estimated the sentiments of Saskatchewan people', and he said he had sent a telegram to Liberal Leader, Walter Tucker, saying: "Now you can either put up or shut up. Defend your war policies on the hustings or admit that they are anti-Canadian policies and start working for peace."

Now then, my first remark on the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that I want to emphasize very strongly that the policies I have advocated are not war policies. They are policies designed to work for peace in the way that is deemed best by the vast majority of the United Nations.

I would like to say, also, that apparently Mr. Clark is under the impression that there will be an attempt to defend these policies on the hustings. I take it that he took seriously the statement of the Premier that he was prepared to hold a general election at once. Now, if Mr. Clark is right in that, then I am authorized to say unanimously by every member on this side of the House, that the sooner the Premier calls an election the better pleased we will be. We say to Mr. Douglas, unanimously, "bring on your election just as soon as you possibly can."

Premier Douglas: — It is hardly a question of privilege, Mr., Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to inform the Assembly that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the Assembly for the electoral division of Gravelbourg, consequent upon the resignation of the sitting member therefor, Mr. Edward Milton Culliton, whose resignation I received today.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 8, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Howe for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

February 9, 1951

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to continue the review which I was giving yesterday, and which I stopped giving at 6 o'clock for the adjournment of the House.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that in the Speech from the Throne it is intimated by his Honour that the Government proposes to introduce redistribution legislation at the current Session of the House. I may say that having examined the election results as they appeared in the daily papers after the last election, I was struck by the wide disparity of voters which appeared to be in the various constituencies. I remember that, particularly in the constituency of Rosthern, it struck me that the Leader of the Opposition was elected (I believe he took the deposits of both his opponents), he had only about 2,600 or 2,700 votes, if my memory serves me correctly. I remember that in other constituencies in the province, candidates were defeated with as many as 4,800 votes. I say that that is a denial of the elementary principle of parliamentary, representative government — that there should be representation by population.

I think that the effort that the Liberal Party is making in Saskatchewan now in trying to discredit this Government for bringing in a Redistribution Bill, in advance of seeing it, in advance of knowing anything about its contents, is an effort which will boomerang on the Liberal party. The Liberal party is trying to create a fear in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan that this Government is deliberately drawing constituency boundaries for political party advantage. The people of Saskatchewan, however, are assured by a statement which was given by Premier Douglas and quoted in the 'Star-Phoenix' on January 10th, and which was reported there partly as follows:

"Premier T. C. Douglas said, Tuesday, in Regina that there would be no attempt in the Legislature to gerrymand the provincial constituencies in favour of the C.C.F."

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan accept that assurance. I would say that, of course, the Liberal Party can't accept any assurance of honesty and decency, because the Liberal Party doesn't have a proper appreciation of those terms. The Leader of the Opposition gets all worked up because he says we are going to take away some seats from rural areas in Saskatchewan. Let me remind the Leader of the Liberal Party that it was the Liberal Party at Ottawa that took away one out of the twenty rural constituencies in this province in the Federal redistribution of 1948. And let me challenge the Leader of the Liberals to tell us this. Will he give assurance on behalf of his colleagues in Ottawa that, when another Federal redistribution is brought out in 1951 or 1952, Saskatchewan won't lose some more seats in the Federal Parliament?

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to answer that, I will say that the Liberal Party will follow the constitution and not break it.

Mr. Walker: — I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party has changed the constitution many times. As a matter of fact, the last time that Saskatchewan lost representation in the Federal Parliament came about as a result of a change which was made in the constitution since 1940. Now, so much for that, Mr. Speaker.

I was one of those who were here in the House, one day last week, when we had occasion to see the hanging of a portrait of the present Federal Minister of Agriculture and I heard, along with the other members, the presentation address that was given by the Liberal leader at that time. One thing struck me in that address which I remember particularly. In glowing terms he described the accomplishments of the Federal Liberal member. I think he praised the Federal Minister of Agriculture most in this regard: he said he had succeeded in getting elected to office eleven times. It seems to me that that was regarded by the Liberal leader as being the pinnacle of success.

He also referred to another thing, Mr. Speaker. He said that he hoped the Federal Minister of Agriculture would live to see the completion of the Outlook Dam on the South Saskatchewan River. I suppose he would have to live to be a hundred. The people of Saskatchewan have got kind of tired hearing about the promises to commence work on that project. In 1949 the Federal Parliament voted a large sum, in the vicinity of 10 million dollars, to finish up the survey work which was required to be done on the dam site and also on the surrounding farm territory which would be irrigated thereby. I have in my hand a pamphlet which I picked up at Fort Peck in July, last year. There they have an earth dam of somewhat similar specifications to those proposed for the South Saskatchewan River project. In this little pamphlet there are a number of pictures of the power development, of the spillways. On the back of the little pamphlet is an outline of the history of that particular project. I am just going to read about half of that history, the second and third paragraphs:

"On June 22nd, 1933, the Chief of Engineers instituted a more extensive investigation of the Fort Peck dam site, including underground exploration, geological feasibility, topographical survey of the reservoir area to determine its capacity, and laboratory testing to determine suitability of soil for use in construction of an earth-filled dam."

Now, that is approximately where we were in this particular project in Saskatchewan in 1949. And notice the date, June 22, 1933.

"As a result of this investigation a report was submitted to Congress, recommending construction of the Fort Peck dam. Construction was approved by the President on October 14, 1933. Under the Public Works Administration, actual construction was started by the corps of engineers on October 24, 1933."

I submit, Mr, Speaker, that there is an example of what can be done by a Government that has a will to do it. I am sorry to say that the Speech from the Throne that was delivered by the Governor-General at Ottawa last week made no reference to any further progress contemplated in that project in 1951. I suggest that we will probably have an election in 1952 or 1953, and the thing will be dug up again out of the waste-paper basket of the Minister of Agriculture and trotted out for that election.

I was gratified, as I have no doubt all members were, to note in the Speech from the Throne a reference to the financial reports of the Crown Corporations for 1950, and a statement of the fact that the surpluses of those

February 9, 1951

Corporations would, this year, be the largest since their inception. That, I am sure, is a culmination of a magnificent achievement on the part of the people of Saskatchewan in working together to establish new and basic industries in this province. I am sure that report finds favour with every member of this Legislature who sincerely and honestly has the interests of the province of Saskatchewan at heart.

However, during the reply, the Leader of the Opposition in this House was led to believe that there were no surpluses. These Crown Corporations were not a success. The Leader of the Opposition does that in season and out of season, in this House and in the hustings. He attempts to convince people that the profits which are claimed by the Provincial Treasury for these Crown Corporations do not exist. He tries to leave the inference that they do not anywhere appear in the Public Accounts of the province in the amounts as stated in the reports to the public. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition might refer to the Journals of this House of Friday, March 3, 1950, page 157. The hon. member for Arm River asked the question: "What amount or amounts have been paid into revenue account of the net profits of Crown Corporations of over \$5,000,000 in the 21-month period of April 1, 1947 to December 31, 1948, as reported in the 'Saskatchewan News', and of the net earnings of \$3,152,502 for 1948, as reported in the 'Saskatchewan News'?" And then he asks, "Where was that reported in the Public Accounts?" In the Public Accounts for 1945-46, page 1; and 1946-47, page 1; and for 1947-48, pages 52 and 54; 1948-49, page 47, he found the answer. These entries were and are in the Public Accounts, Mr. Speaker. They are listed under the heading of 'Statement of Cash Received by the Provincial Treasurer'.

Let us have no more of this attempt to misrepresent out in the country that these Crown Corporations are not producing some revenue for the people of this province.

Mr. Danielson: — What are the figures?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, we claim the success of these corporations is that the Crown Corporations are developing Saskatchewan industry, and they are providing service and employment and wealth to the people of Saskatchewan. I think that the Liberal Party, if it is seriously claiming support of the people of Saskatchewan, owes an explanation to the people of Saskatchewan as to just what their policies are in respect to these Crown Corporations. The people of Saskatchewan have upwards of \$40 million invested in public enterprises. Now the Liberal Party tries to make out that these enterprises are a failure. What are they going to do with them? What would they do with them if they had the opportunity? Would they give them away? Would they sell them for a dollar? Or would they operate them at as great a disadvantage as possible so as to get as little money as possible from them, and thereby discredit them in the eyes of the people of this province? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan could be ill-advised to trust this investment of \$40 or \$50 million to people who go about sniping at us and carping at everything we do.

I want to say something also, Mr. Speaker, about our Automobile Accident Insurance Act. I am sure that there will be an opportunity later in this Session for us to review more fully the operations of that Act.

I want to deal more or less with a statement which appears in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix', that estimable journal at Saskatoon . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — . . . in which there is the following report. And this is a quotation from the issue of November 15th:

"Liberals promised to remove the inequities, such as inadequate payment of death and disability benefits to housewives from the compulsory automobile insurance scheme."

Mr. Danielson: — Correct!

Mr. Walker: — The hon. member for Am River says "Correct." Well, let's just see how much the hon. member from Arm River knows about the so-called discrimination against housewives under that Act.

I think everybody who knows anything at all about insurance, indemnity insurance, knows that one of the basic principles of such insurance is that there should be compensation for financial loss suffered by a certain turn of events. It is based upon compensating for financial loss. Our Automobile Insurance Act recognizes that fact, Mr. Speaker, and in section 18 of the Act as passed by this Legislature in 1947, we find this paragraph:

"If bodily injuries disable an insured and prevent him from performing one or more important daily duties pertaining to his occupation or employment and his income therefrom, whether wages or profits or both, is thus reduced, the insurer shall ". . . (and so on) . . ." pay weekly indemnity benefits for the period of continuous disability."

Now that principle is recognized by the Act, that before you can claim benefits you must have suffered a financial loss as a result of the accident. There can be no other kind of insurance unless it is specifically provided by Act of the Legislature.

Now, in this Act, two exceptions are provided, Two classes of people are given the benefits of receiving financial compensation for their injuries whether they have suffered financial loss or not — and only two classes of people. In sub-paragraph 3, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1:

"A housewife who is totally and continuously disabled, the insurer shall pay for a period of such continuous total disability a weekly indemnity of \$12.50."

Now these people who are complaining about this discrimination, what would they do? The only thing they could do to remove the discrimination would be to repeal the section. And then, there would the housewife stand? If she was in an automobile accident she would then have to prove a financial loss because of loss of income, loss of employment as a result of her injury. She would have to prove a financial loss, and she would be unable to do so, Mr. Speaker, and she would thereby be put in the same class as all

February 9, 1951

other people. She would be compensated for her actual lost income which would be nil, and she would receive no compensation whatever. The only discrimination in this Act, so far as the housewife in concerned is discrimination in favour of housewives. It gives them a guaranteed \$12.50 a week whether they suffer financial loss as a result of the accident or not.

I am sure that, when ill-informed people in Liberal conventions get up and condemn this so-called discrimination, there are members opposite in attendance at those conventions who know what the facts are. I can only assume that the reason they do not inform their fellow delegates at the convention of the truth is because they are seeking to take selfish party advantage by stirring up and allowing misconceptions to be used as a basis of unfair criticism of this scheme. So these people who talk about removing the discriminations would probably do it if they were ever successful in getting elected to office. They would keep their promise and they would deprive the housewives of the benefits which they now get under this Act.

I want to say just something about the Hospitalization Plan. It is apparently Liberal strategy to go out around the country and to find little niggling criticisms that they can make of the hospitalization scheme. Oh, they are very careful never to get in print as being opposed to the scheme! But they like to stir up a little discontent from people who have not paid the tax, from people who have been prosecuted. My goodness! They fuss over these people and make you think that they would usher them into a new heaven upon earth.

Well, how are we going to find out, Mr. Speaker, just what their policy is with regard to the Hospitalization plan? They have not yet come out and said they would do away with it. We have to look at their statement very closely to find out what their real policy is. Last year, the member for Gravelbourg spoke about the Hospitalization Plan and he said, "Oh, it's a fine plan; but," he said, "let nobody forget that it was the Liberal Party that gave Saskatchewan a hospitalization plan". He said it was the Liberal Party which encouraged the first hospitalization plan in this province. Some 20 per cent or so of the people of Saskatchewan were covered, only partially, by these municipal schemes. We would gather from that, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party is in favour of municipal schemes rather than an overall provincial scheme. We do not have to draw that inference, however. All we need do is read a statement that appears in the 'Star-Phoenix' of November 14th:

"The Saskatchewan Liberal Party" (and this is issued from their Convention in Saskatoon) "this morning committed itself to the support of the complete system of hospitalization for the province."

That is very good. That should get the support of those people who believe in the scheme. And then it goes on to say:

"A Liberal administration would iron out defects and increase the efficiency of administering, the hospitalization scheme. Local autonomy would be restored to do away with present costly centralization."

That is the whole report, and I suggest that we should direct ourselves particularly to the last part of the report, "present costly

centralization". Something less than five cents on the dollar, Mr. Speaker, are consumed in administration costs, the lowest administration cost ratio scheme of any such scheme anywhere in the world. "Costly centralization," they say. Well, it is very nice to be against centralization, but what is the opposite to centralization? What is decentralization? If you are going to decentralize it, who are you going to put the responsibility on? The next lower body of government in this province is the municipal body. Are you going to turn it back to the municipality? I do not think that statement is open to any other interpretation. Taking the statement as a whole it means this: "We are in favour of hospitalization; we are in favour of the municipalities doing it." That is what it means.

How would that affect the municipalities? I do not think there is any municipal body in this province, Mr. Speaker, which is not aware of the increased burden that would be placed on municipalities by turning this scheme back to municipal administration. Right in my own constituency, the town of Hanley, for example, in 1949 had three patients from town in hospitals in this province who stayed in long enough to incur a hospital bill in excess of \$500. Those three people alone would have imposed a cost of approximately \$2,000 on any municipal scheme that might be operating within the town of Hanley. The town of Hanley could not pay that kind of cost. Take the town of Allan, for example. There are approximately 500 people in that town, and of that number 63 were in the hospital at one time or another in 1949. Would anyone tell me that the town of Allen would welcome having a Liberal Government in this province, decentralize the hospital scheme, imposing that responsibility on them? The Rural Municipality of Rosedale had 11 patients in 1949 who incurred hospital bills in excess of \$200. Anyone tell me that the Rural Municipality of Rosedale wants to assume any part of the responsibility of paying hospital bills for the people in that municipality? And I could go on.

I think we should examine with great care the statements which the Liberal Party issues to the people of this province. And when they say they are in favour of hospitalization, the preamble which they put on it ought to be paid very close attention to. Decentralize it; restore it to local autonomy — that is the only interpretation that can be put on those words, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that the Liberal Party ought to take a course in plain-speaking. They ought to tell the people of Saskatchewan if they propose to abolish the present provincial hospitalization scheme on its present basis, or what they intend to do with it if they ever get the chance.

We listened for some little time in this debate to discussion on Education. I am one of those who welcome every forward advance that is made in improving the educational institutions of Saskatchewan, because I believe the expenditures made on Education are investments in a permanent asset. Expenditures made on education are the highest form of investment that the people of Saskatchewan can find, and I am always glad to see in every successive budget of this Government that the provincial expenditures for education have been increased. Not only that; not only are we spending more on education, but we are providing a larger proportion of the total cost of education in this province than has ever been provided in this province's history. It is a fact that provincial grants are increased.

The Leader of the Opposition likes to say that the basic grant just the same as it was in 1940. That may be so; that is so, with exceptions. The fact is, however, that the basic grant is the least important of all the grants this Province makes on behalf of education.

February 9, 1951

He said that there was discrimination being made between those districts in larger units and those districts which are not in larger units, and he quoted some figures which purported to show that there was such discrimination. He pointed out that more money was being granted by this Province for construction grants and repair grants than was granted to districts outside of larger units. The fact is, of course, as everybody knows, that larger units are doing a bigger job of construction and repair than the other districts of the province. Then, in order to spike his argument, he took a couple of examples. He said, "What about those that are not in the larger unit?" Then he went on to this effect: "I think it is unfair", he said "to discriminate against districts like Warman and Osler, because they are not in the larger unit". Well, if he calls it discrimination, let's just see what he means by discrimination.

I happen to have the figures, Mr. Speaker, that indicate just what this Government has done with the districts of Warman and Osler, which, incidentally, I am happy to say are in Hanley constituency and contributed to my election in 1948. The Osler School District, for example, in 1943-44, received total grants from the then Liberal Government amounting to \$1,796. Then in 1949-50, the total was \$2,449, an increase of some \$800 or 50 per cent. But, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that increase in operation grants, and equalization grants, there is a further additional amount of \$4,000 for special building grants. In addition to that \$4000, there was a further \$5000, which was advanced in the form of a loan to that district to assist it in establishing new facilities there.

What about Warman School District No. 1605? Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have had the pleasure, a year ago, of attending the official opening of a new school at Warman. They have built a beautiful new school, largely I must say by the co-operation, the industry and the perseverance of the local people who participated in building that school. The local people did magnificently there, and they got backing from this Government. Now, what are the figures for Warman? In 1943-44, the Warman district received \$1,928 in all grants from the then Liberal Government. This year, the Warman district has received \$2,898 in grants, an increase of \$1,000 in operational grants alone.

The Leader of Opposition referred to construction grants. The district of Warman built a new school, as I said a moment ago. That new school cost them \$23,000 and some odd dollars and of that \$23,000, \$18,000 was provided by the Provincial Government. The Leader of the Opposition then says that this is discrimination against districts which are outside the larger units. Those are districts which are outside the larger units.

And that is not the whole story, Mr. Speaker. Just east of Osler there are four school districts which are very heavily populated. The schools were inadequate; they were small and they were crowded, and the question arose — should there be some improvements made in each of those four schools? The assessment is very low, the mill rate is very high. Being outside of larger units they are subject to that sort of thing. One of them, for instance is paying a mill rate in 1948 of 35 mills. That sort of thing happens when you get outside of the larger unit. There you have those four school districts, overcrowded and heading new facilities; but this Government did not go to them and say, "You'll have to sell debentures; you'll have to go into

debt for the rest of your 'lives and the rest of your children's lives to get decent education facilities." This Government said, "Right in the corner between those four school districts, we will build a new school." Incidentally, those four districts were very small districts, four or five miles square. But right in the middle, the Provincial Government built, at its own cost, a new school which cost this Government \$18,400 to build, in 1947-48. That new two-room school has handled the overflow from the four schools in that area. That school is being operated today with an enrolment of some 70 students, with two teachers. It is operated today entirely at the expense of this Government. I suggest that if that is what the Leader of the Opposition means by discrimination, the people of Saskatchewan ought to have a lot more of it.

Now, I want to say something briefly about the Civil Service. As everybody knows, the Civil Service has since 1945 been freed from political interference.

Opposition Members: — That's a joke!

Mr. Walker: — My hon. friends laugh at anything they do not understand, and that gives them an almost unlimited scope for laughter. We are proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken the Civil Service and set it up on a basis of merit. We have set it up on a basis of permanency. I might say that when this Government was first elected the present Leader of this party publicly stated, "This Government is not going to dismiss people because of their political complexion. This government is going to keep every person who is doing an honest and efficient job in the Civil Service." And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that if this Government had gone back on that promise, if this Government had broken that pledge to the people of Saskatchewan, every daily newspaper in this province would have castigated us for it time and time again. I would draw to your attention that we have been singularly free of any criticism that we have attempted to introduce or inject partisanship into the administration of the Civil Service.

Well, you know it is always rather grim and gloomy to go back; but you will remember — those of you who have been here longer than I have will remember very well, the kind of thing that used to happen in the Civil Service. You will remember the story, and it is a true story, about the 1934 election, for example. Somehow there happened to be seven or eight C.C.F. votes in the poll which included the Weyburn Mental Hospital. A Liberal organizer in this province is still bragging that the Liberal Party went down there and held an inquisition within one week and they could not find the seven or eight, so they took seven or eight hostages and kicked them out of the mental hospital. They lost their jobs. Because the Liberal Party knew, just as Adolf Hitler knew that if you want to completely control any group of people, you have got to keep them fearful and keep their jobs and their livelihood in jeopardy. That is the sort of thing . . .

Mr. McCormack: — Does Stalin know that too?

Mr. Walker: — That is the sort of thing that Liberal partisanship is built upon. You can not build a Liberal Party without depending on that sort of thing. You do not have to take my word for that. I am going to quote Mr. B.J. McDaniel, who once sat in this Chamber as Liberal member for Regina. He was addressing the Regina Liberal Council in this city. He said as follows, as reported in the 'Leader-Post' of January 18, 1939:

February 9, 1951

"In future, no appointment will be deemed to be properly made unless it bears the initials of Mr. Hogarth, Mr. McNiven or myself."

and he said:

"It is impossible to build up a political faith if party members see the daughters of men who are definitely opposed politically getting the jobs while we are denied. We have called a halt (he said). No application of any resident of Regina will be considered unless it is O.K.'d by Mr. Hogarth or myself."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize that times have changed. That was back in the 1930's. Times have changed. I hope that the Liberal Party has changed with the times. I am not so sure of it, however, I am not so sure that they have learned anything from their experience because, in order to play those cards right, this is what they have to do. Civil Servants today know that they can not lose their jobs just because they vote or talk against the present Government. But they know too, that if by some strange quirk of fate a Liberal government may some day occupy these seats, they say, "If our jobs are going to be safe, we'd better be careful how we talk." The Liberal Party is trying to intimidate those people even while they are in Opposition. The Liberal Party knows that if they ever got elected to power in this province, they would give the axe to every person who was appointed by the present Government. Not only would they give the axe to those who were appointed by the present Government but to those who were promoted in any way by this Government, within the Service. You do not have to take my word for it, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Perhaps the hon. member is saying what we would do when we get into office in 19 . . . permit me to say . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! When members make a statement the hon. members have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the Leader of the Liberal Party wants to say anything about this subject that he give to the people of Saskatchewan now, any time during this Session, a categorical assurance that no person in the Civil Service will be interfered with for political reasons if a Liberal Government is ever elected.

Mr. Tucker: — I tried to make a statement now and you wouldn't let me.

Mr. Walker: — But that's not the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that he does say when he opens his mouth. This is what he says. He was quoted by Mr. Fines in this House just a year ago, speaking at Ituna. Mr. Fines said, "Yet my hon. friend suggested the other day that we should get rid of all those people who have been appointed by this Government. The hon. Leader of the Opposition verified that when speaking last summer during his campaign." And the Liberal Leader got up and said, "I did no such thing". And Mr. Fines said "I'll send out and get the clippings". And I noticed how much more comfortable the Leader of the Opposition looked as the minutes rolled by and the time that we were on the air finally expired. And then he sat up and looked quite perky. After we had got off the air, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fines rose in his place and said, "I now have the clipping referred to earlier." The hon. Leader of the Opposition was

the saving of between four and five million dollars by "dismissal of C.C.F. hirelings and their retinue from the Civil Service and restoring it to its previous numbers." Now, then, to me that looks very much the same thing as Mr. Fines said in the first place, and the Leader of the Opposition got up and said, "Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I said."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the only difference between what Mr. Fines said in the first place and what he said in the second place was that in the first place we were on the air, in the second place we weren't. That is the only difference. I suggest that probably the Leader of the Opposition would like to keep Civil Servants in a state of fear and trembling about their jobs and security in this province. I do not think the Civil Servants are going to be unduly alarmed. I think they know what the situation is. I think they know the people of Saskatchewan aren't very likely to put their jobs at the jeopardy of the Liberal Party. But I want to say that when the Liberal Party deliberately try to foster that fear within the Civil Service they are doing it because they intend to do it if they ever get the chance. The people of this province do not want to go back to the days of 1934 and 1935 when they had a Liberal Government sweeping out a Conservative government. You will remember that little column that used to appear every day in the Regina 'Daily Star': "The Axe Falls" — every day why there were 5 or 6 or 10, sometimes 30 names of Civil Servants who had got the axe because they were appointees of the Anderson Government. This did not only apply to just select jobs. It applied right down the line to every employee in the Government. And we have the confusion of the Liberal Party that they have not changed their policies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time to speak about what I consider are the issues in this debate. The issues in this debate are this: do the people of Saskatchewan approve of the policies, the forward-looking policies of this Government, do they approve of a Government which has given Saskatchewan something new and unique in the history of this province, an honest, efficient and businesslike government, or do they want to go back to the dalliance days of Liberal partyism in this province? I think the answer is clear. I think the vote in this House will accurately reflect the opinions of the people of Saskatchewan on this issue. I do not think the people of Saskatchewan are likely to get fooled, not once in 20 years nor once in two years, by the newly-painted face of that jaded hag, the Liberal Party. So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude with this:

I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

John Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, in the discharge of the duties of your high office you have just declared the seat of the member for Gravelbourg vacant. As I look across at that chair I am reminded of a cartoon that appeared in 'Punch', some years ago, under the caption of 'Dropping the Pilot'. It was at the time, some years ago, that Kaiser Wilhelm was beginning to 'feel his oats', and he thought he could get along very nicely without Chancellor Bismarck. Those of you who are familiar with the work of the pilot will appreciate the very neat little cartoon in 'Punch', in which the pilot skiff had drawn alongside of the vessel, and the pilot was being lowered over into the little skiff that would take him back to the safety of the harbour,

February 9, 1951

while the captain took over. He was on his own responsibility. History was revealed to us what a disaster that was. It was the beginning of the end of the German Empire, and I can only express the hope, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, that history will repeat itself in this province.

It was drawn to our attention, yesterday, that the duty of an Opposition in the general recognition of the two-party system is that when the Opposition takes exception to any of the legislation brought down by the government, it should have an alternate policy to present. Now if anybody is under the delusion that that sort of thing exists in the province of Saskatchewan, they have only to listen to the speeches from the members of the Opposition to be very quickly disillusioned. I remember that, when I was a boy, we had a neighbour with rather a stirring offspring, and sometimes his inquiring young mind would lead him into certain avenues of activity if he was quiet, or if there was a noise arising that betokened that he was busy about something, the mother, instead of going to inquire as to just what was occupying that active young mind, would yell at the top of her voice, "Whatever you're doing, don't!" Since sitting for six or seven Sessions in this Legislature, I notice the similarity between that inane injunction of that mother to her offspring, and the speeches that we have had from the other side of the House. I want to just cite one or two instances.

Now, the Opposition are getting very much concerned at the present time with regard to the welfare of municipalities and farmers. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that one of the promises that we made before taking office was that, if returned to office, we would roll that burden off the back of the municipalities and the farmers of this province. Every step that this Government took to implement that promise was opposed by the Opposition. If any of you new members doubt it, just look up in the Journals of 1947 when we were taking the last steps to remove the debts of 1935, 1936 and 1937; advances for seed grain were supplied. Every Liberal in the House opposed it, and we caught them, that time, on a recorded vote. Some are in the House now who were supposed to be in the House when the vote was taken, but every Liberal in the House opposed the cancellation of that indebtedness.

Then again, with regard to The Exemptions Act, we felt that when the province of Saskatchewan elected a C.C.F. Government it was proof positive to us that they were getting out of the horse-and-buggy days and they were getting into something a little more advanced. So we thought, that The Exemptions Act should keep pace with the trend that was taking place out in the country. Legislation was brought down when we thought it would be advisable, to extend to the farmer the right to exempt sufficient grain to seed his land that he had ready for seeding, instead of the restrictions that were in The Exemptions Act at that time. We thought it was a sane and safe thing to do — to exempt enough seed grain for a farmer to seed all of the land that he had available and ready for seeding, and thus give him the chance of overtaking his responsibilities and his debts. Not so the Liberal Opposition! Look up the Journals again and you will find that every Liberal in the House voted against extending the exemptions to the farmers of this province; and yet they pose as the friend of the farmers.

Then again, when you come down to The Mineral Taxation Act of 1944, they made the welkin ring on that one! We would be driving capital out the province; we would be stopping progress in the province, and I do not now what else was not going to happen. And they said, with regard to the

Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company: "If you put that increase in the minerals taxation against that company, you will stop their operations right away". I was very pleased to hear the reference, in the Speech from the Throne, that that plant, which we were surprised to be going to shut down, had increased its capacity to produce by an expenditure in this province of \$9 million.

When the previous Leader of the Opposition sat across the aisle, time and time again, he would say: "What about Goldfields?" Well, Goldfields was a 'ghost town' under the Liberal administration, and like a good many more of their misdeeds, they were trying to put the responsibility on to us. But Goldfields was a ghost town before this Government ever came into power. Under the present administration, Goldfields is reviving again and the Eldorado Mine, which is close to Goldfields, will possibly spring up another strong settlement there which will be a tremendous asset to the province of Saskatchewan.

Then in connection with the salt plant at Vera, just South of Unity. The first time I heard it mentioned by the Opposition in the House was when the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) mentioned it the other day. We have there, since this Government came into office, a plant for the refining of the salt from that well at Unity, and I think every man and woman who has any pride in the province should be proud when they are stamped on the bags of Purity Salt — "Unity, Saskatchewan" in addition to the other names where that company, the Dominion Tar and Chemical Company has plants.

I was in Unity at the time of the Federal election. I was there the morning after the Leader of the Opposition spoke in the town of Unity, and my one regret is that I did not contact the hon. gentleman and accompany him over that plant. Those of you who happen to go up into that part of the province will find it is a revelation to see the wonderful high class of refining machinery that they have in the plant, south of Unity, right out on the open prairie there, a plant now valued at \$2 1/2 million. Of course, if the Leader of the Opposition would look back on the things that he said with regard to us driving capital out, he would have a great difficulty in reconciling his statements with such a distinct step towards progress as the Unity salt plant. Possibly, looking back he might have got in just the same trouble as Lot's wife did when she looked back. Maybe that is what kept him from visiting the plant.

But one thing I was interested in was the 'Financial Post', in 1945. It ran the brief succeeding article in connection with the Vera salt well. And this is one paragraph from it:

"Quoting Arthur O. Pounder, president of Dominion Tar and Chemical Company, he stated the company had been deeply impressed by the spirit of fair play displayed by the province — by the Government of the province, and in particular, by their desire to make an agreement beneficial to the people of the province."

And yet all this time, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition were going up and down the country saying that we were keeping risk, speculative and development capital out of the province of Saskatchewan.

February 9, 1951

I would like to deal, for a few minutes, with the matter of Saskatchewan highways. The Opposition have unwittingly and quite unintentionally rendered us a valuable service in focusing public attention on the highway system of the province of Saskatchewan. In the early 1940's, we had the unenviable reputation of having the worst roads in the Dominion of Canada. In 1944, we took over that mess from the Liberal Government, and you will recall that, at that period, the war was still in progress, and for two years afterwards heavy machinery . . .

Mr. Danielson: — They're getting no better fast.

Mr. Wellbelove: — No, I was not in that war, but I lost my only son in the last war. Pretty cheap stuff, I would say! Cheap stuff!

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I have a right to defend myself. He is accusing me of some remark that I never made, He mentioned something about the roads, and I said, 'they are getting no better fast'. That was the only remark that I made in this House, and if he is crediting me with anything more it is an untruth, absolutely an untruth. I won't have anything like that passed on to me.

Premier Douglas: — You keep quiet. If you would stop speaking when other people have the floor, you would not be misunderstood.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order in the House!

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I would ask Your Honour to tell the Premier not to attempt to dictate to this House, or to Your Honour. He has just finished saying "You've got to keep quiet". I would like to tell him he has no more rights before this Legislature than any one of us. We take our orders from you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, he is not going to nail any smear on to me. That is a typical attitude in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Will the hon. member take his seat now?

Mr. Danielson: — I will.

Mr. Speaker: — I think it is mighty high time that members, on both sides of the House, kept the dignities of this House in order. There are offenders on both sides of the House. There is altogether too much shouting across from one side to the other, and I would like to say that, especially when the proceedings of this House are going out over the air, it certainly detracts from the dignity of the proceedings of this Chamber, when these interruptions are going on while a member is speaking.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I have drawn to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member from Arm River got up, in a very gentlemanly way, on a question of privilege, he was told on two occasions by the Premier, in a loud voice, to 'sit down and keep quiet'. I suggest to Your Honour that that is very unparliamentary and very much out of order, and that Your Honour should so state to the Premier.

Premier Douglas: — I did not tell the hon. member to sit down. I said that if he would stop speaking when other people were talking, he would not be misunderstood — if he has been misunderstood which I very seriously doubt

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member was misunderstood, then he was in order to say so on a question of privilege. However, the hon. member in question is one of the worst offenders in this interrupting, and if he will wait until his time comes he will have ample opportunity to say what he wishes.

Mr. Wellbelove: — And now that they have taken five minutes of my air time, I will continue, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, in the two years subsequent to the war heavy machinery was very difficult to obtain, and what a field day the Liberals had in drawing attention to the deplorable condition of Saskatchewan roads, which we were all prepared to admit were very bad. But they were a Liberal legacy; they were not of our making. Now, today, every commercial traveller who is not a bigoted partisan will readily admit the tremendous improvement that has been made in Saskatchewan roads. Occasionally you will get a slight note of praise from the daily press of this province which is not altogether partial to this Government in power, and I refer to August last, where the Moose Jaw 'Times-Herald' took exception to an article written by Jack Scott, which appeared in the Vancouver 'Sun'. Quoting from the Canada Year Book the Times-Herald editor states:

"British Columbia, in 1946, collected \$9,491,325 in motor vehicle and gas tax, for the maintenance of 22,155 miles of highway and roads; that Saskatchewan dwarfs every other province in the Dominion, with 212,978 miles."

He quotes, further:

"Alberta with her 80,523 miles; Manitoba with 91,354 miles; B.C. with 22,155 miles; Saskatchewan with her 212,978 miles has 28,000 more surveyed mileage than the totals of Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia combined."

Jack Scott told about the great roads and highways in the provinces Manitoba, B.C., and Alberta, and then the Editor of the Moose Jaw 'Times-Herald' comes out with the figures that Saskatchewan has 28,000 more surveyed mileage than those three provinces combined.

That, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the highway problem in the province of Saskatchewan. I am willing to admit that the Liberals have done us a real first-class publicity stunt in focusing attention on the highways of the province of Saskatchewan, because every fair-minded man and woman who travels the highways of the province of Saskatchewan are loud in their free praise of the vast improvement, not only in the mileage but also in the type of roads constructed, and it has not cost us a nickel for that publicity.

Now let me give a brief summary, a very brief summary, of what has been done. In 1944 to 1950, there have been, 1,179 miles constructed and 1,610 miles reconstructed, making a total of 2,789 miles. New gravelling, 2,449 miles; re-gravelling, 1,154, making a total of 3,603 miles.

February 9, 1951

I went down to the maintenance department to get a few figures and I am not surprised that the Liberal Government could not keep its roads in anything like shape, because the department had, at that time, 60 motor patrols, 20 of which were obsolete, while today we have 197, or an increase of 132. In connection with the V-type snow plows: in 1943, they had 37; today we have 69, and so on. All down through the general maintenance equipment, the increase is proportional to those figures that I have given.

The member for Wilkie (he is not in his seat; I wish he were), yesterday, suggested that there had been discrimination in road construction, and I think the member for Melfort followed him and he complimented the Minister of Highways for work done in that constituency. One of the members I am alarmed about is the member who interrupted me just now, the member for Arm River, because everything that the C.C.F. Government does is really terrible in his sight. I understand that he has moved into the town of Davidson to reside, and now, at least next year, he won't be able to make a front entry to his farm without going over a blacktop highway. At the present time they have him pretty well hemmed in. He can not go to Saskatoon without travelling over a new C.C.F. highway. He can not get to Regina by way of Lumsden without travelling over considerable mileage of first-class blacktop highway, and he can not get around by Moose Jaw without again going over new blacktop highway. I do not know what he can do: he will have to take one of the back roads, the municipal roads, possibly, to get into those cities; either that or travel over a C.C.F. highway.

Mr. Tucker: — They are not as good as that in Rosthern.

Mr. Wellbelove: — I'll come to Rosthern in a minute. The Wilkie constituency: Well now, when this Government took over, the roads in the Wilkie constituency were all gravelled — well, reasonably well gravelled, I think — with the exception of one or two small pieces. Now No. 14 was gravelled right through the Wilkie constituency and, by Liberal standards, was a good road. This Government has gravelled that part of No. 31 which was ungravelled at that time in the Wilkie constituency. They built and gravelled the part of No. 29 that is in the Wilkie constituency, and, with those exceptions, the other roads were supposed to be in good condition, judged by Liberal standards. Now I am prepared to concede to the member for Wilkie that if you judge them by C.C.F. standards, he had some pretty poor roads there, but the Liberal roads that were built in that Wilkie constituency, have been gravelled, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be classed as political discrimination.

Now the member for Wilkie is a pretty fair-minded man. I know his reputation up through the north end of my constituency, and I do not think he would want to leave any wrong impression when he was quoting those figures yesterday; but he was speaking about the construction costs in the adjoining constituencies. All of the period — or at least the greater portion of the period in which that construction occurred, Wilkie was represented by a C.C.F. member, so you can not, by any stretch of the imagination, Mr. Speaker, call it political discrimination. Four of the six years to which he refers, we had a sitting member on this side of the House in the Wilkie constituency, and I think he would be the last man to say that that discrimination had occurred during his term of office.

I was interested in seeing in the 'Star-Phoenix' of November 6, a report of the annual meeting of the Rosthern Liberal Association. The heading was, "C.C.F. road policy rapped: Tucker alleges favoritism." But

the gem which caught my attention was this: "This, of course, was nothing more or less than an attempt to punish the people for voting as they did. Such tactics might work inside the Iron Curtain, but the C.C.F. Government would find that the people of the province as a whole did not approve of the way in which they, as free Canadian citizens, saw fit to vote."

That "Iron Curtain" business was a flashback to that old "Tucker or Tyranny" rubbish. When the Leader of the Opposition builds up an imagery in his own mind that he is the Saviour of the world or some great emancipator, well then, you can expect practically anything. I got a mild satisfaction and some amusement as I read that article, for the simple reason that I live in a constituency where the old Kindersley constituency consistently returned an Opposition member. And the municipality in which I live, with an assessment of about \$6 3/4 million, has paid more into the public treasury, by way of public revenue, motor licence and gas tax than any other municipality in the province of Saskatchewan, I would undertake to say. The old Kindersley constituency as it was before the last redistribution, was possibly one of the most productive and richest constituencies, with possibly the exception of the one on the Regina plains. Yet, what do we find? From 1909 to 1945, we were not within 25 miles of a gravelled highway, and yet we had a town there of over a thousand people and had to go 25 miles to touch gravelled highway. That was the way we were penalized for voting for our independence. And when you talk about discrimination — I do not like to see government discrimination in any branch of the service; but seeing what they did to us, I do not think it would hurt the hon. member from Rosthern to stew in his own juice for a little while. We had it for 36 years.

Mr. Tucker: — It won't be long now!

Mr. Wellbelove: — We had it for 36 years, and I do not think it would do any harm to let it stay just a while.

Mr. Tucker: — We'll put up with it cheerfully and wait for the chance.

Mr. Wellbelove: — In connection with oil development, it is strange how the developing events give the contradiction to the statements of the members of the Opposition. On June 23, the member for Maple Creek spoke over a network of Saskatchewan radio stations on C.B.C. "Provincial Affairs." This is what he is reported to have said, in the 'Leader Post' of June 24:

"Oil company distrust of the natural resources policy of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan is hindering oil development in the province."

Referring to oil development in Alberta, the speaker said:

"During the past six years this very same capital has been seeking admittance to Saskatchewan, but found the doors closed."

By one of those strange ironies of fate, just two days afterwards, the 'Leader-Post' of June 26 gave a list of 11 companies that had 31 geophysical crews at work in the province. Now, seeing that Turner Valley came into production a good many years ago, and seeing that the member for Maple Creek is

February 9, 1951

interested in checking up with regard to figures on oil development, possibly when he speaks he will let the House know why there was not comparable development on the Saskatchewan side of the border to that in Alberta after the Turner Valley discovery. Possibly he will enlighten us with regard to that, because we would like to know whether it was a Liberal Government which kept them out, or what it really was that kept them out during that time.

I listened with a great deal of interest to a newscast over the radio of the provincial leader's address to the Liberal convention in Saskatoon in November — and what a booster he is for the province when he gets on the radio: He had the same dismal dirge about investment and speculative capital being driven out of the province. By the same quirk of fate, while the Liberal convention was in Saskatoon, there appeared two articles in the 'Star-Phoenix'. One was a three-column article describing the increased demands there have been for the Lloydminster crude and reviewing the possibilities of the future through new process of extraction; and then, secondly, there was quite a review taken from the *Sohio*, the journal of the Sohio Syndicate, where in they gave a very considerable write-up with regard to oil development in Saskatchewan.

Every schoolboy who has watched a crew blast one of those test holes during the summer months (and there are hundreds of them) knows that there is oil development going on in the province of Saskatchewan, but it has not found its way into the minds of the Opposition yet. But what surprised me was the member for Maple Creek who said, "We have closed the doors; the capital could not get in." The hon. Leader of the Opposition said, "We are driving them out." Well, now, I wonder just how it got in. But they are no more mixed about that than they are about most of the things when they are referring to the policies of the C.C.F. Government. But I think there is one thing they should bear in mind. They are misjudging the intelligence of the people of this province, and they are taxing the credulity of their Liberal supporters right throughout the province. There is only so much that they will take and then they are through with you.

But I would like to review very briefly the activity of drilling in this province. At the close of 1949, approximately \$5 million had been expended in exploration work. In the present year, as has been stated previously in the House, the expenditure is approximately \$8 million — \$7,900,000. Now, let's take a look at the drilling work, From 1909 to 1919 there were 14 wells drilled in the province, with total footage of 22,000 feet, We were not in power then. From 1920 to 1928 there were 12 wells drilled, with a footage of 27,000 feet. And then you go on with varying figures until 1942, when there were only seven wells drilled, shallow ones at that, with a total of about 6,000 footage. All of that period of development was under Liberal and Conservative administration, and has nothing to do with the Government of today. In 1943, there were 25 wells drilled; 1944, 32 wells drilled; 1945, 31 wells drilled; 1946, 53 wells drilled; 1947, 107 wells drilled; 1948, 72 wells drilled; 1949, 63 wells drilled; 1950, 129 wells drilled.

Mr. Speaker, how can any sane person try to reconcile those figures with the statements that we get from Liberal speakers on the opposite side. If anybody wants to have their statements discounted, that is going

at it the right way. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in the past two years, there have been 192 wells drilled in this province. That is a greater number than in the whole period from 1900 to 1943. In the last two years there have been more wells drilled than had been drilled from 1900 to 1943, when there was a total of 183 wells drilled for that 43-year period. I think Mr. Speaker, in view of the figures that I have submitted, the premier was well justified in making the statement he did that the Liberal Party would prefer to wreck the economy of the province rather than see prosperity come under a C.C.F. Government.

Now to the Hospitalization Plan. The Liberal Party has taken the stand that the present hospitalization plan could have been administered more accurately and efficiently if there had been less centralization and more responsibility left with the local governing bodies. The hon. member for Hanley has already quoted that the cost of administration is lower than any comparable system on the North American continent, which disproves anything that the Opposition may say in regard to that. But with regard to the Union Hospital Plan which was introduced by the previous Government. I do not wish to discredit that in any shape or form. It was my pleasure and privilege to serve as a member of one of the first union hospital boards that was formed in the province of Saskatchewan in 1916. I want to say, however, if you look over the map of the hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan you find that those districts where there was fairly good land where the assessment was high, the revenues were buoyant, and the people could afford hospitalization services and implement the doctoral scheme. But all through the province, if you notice on that old map; all throughout the province where the need was just as great as it was, those areas that were served by hospitals, you found people silently suffering, putting up with pain and suffering for the simple reason that they could not afford to go to a hospital except in cases of emergency.

What has this hospital system done? It has made uniformity of entry to a hospital fairly reasonable of access right throughout the province. With regard to the building grants which have been made by this province, some of the members of the Opposition say that we are not taking advantage of the full moneys that are available for the 'matching' grant. When this Government took office in 1944, the per capita rate of hospital beds was a little over three per 1,000. This rate is now pretty close to seven beds per 1,000, which is considered to be a pretty good ratio in which to have hospitals distributed. Once we got over that, there will be deficits pile up on the hospitals because of non-occupancy of beds, and we need to be very careful as to how far we go, and not be stampeded as far as that is concerned.

I would like to quote some of the figures in connection with the grants made by the Federal Government. Before grants were ever thought of by the Federal Government, before March 31, 1948, this Government had paid but a total of over \$460,000, and it happened that in our constituency we were constructing a new 40 bed hospital with all the modern conveniences and appliances just about the time the Federal Act came into force. The cement basement had been run and, through the Department here in Regina we made application for consideration, seeing that there had to be yet a lot more work done on that basement, whether we would not be eligible for the full grant of \$1,000 a bed; but even then we were whittled down to a fractional proportion. They made us a good grant, which was very, very acceptable

February 9, 1951

indeed, but we were denied the full \$1,000 per bed even although the hospital in course of construction and only just a small portion of the work had been completed.

Up to the present time the total amount committed or paid by the province is \$1,807,000, an assistance never dreamed of under any Liberal administration. There is one place where some of that excess money which comes to us by way of Federal grant seems to be worrying the Opposition as to where it is going, that is where some of it is being spent to obtain the matching grant from the Dominion Government. There are several other plans mooted with regard to the University Hospital at Saskatoon and the Moose Jaw Training School which it is hoped this Government will be in line for a matching grant from the Federal Government.

One thing I was interested in when you make a comparison between Saskatchewan's financial position as far as its hospitals are concerned, and the Province of Manitoba. It is a funny thing the Opposition do not refer to Manitoba when they are speaking of hospitals. They refer to Manitoba when they are speaking of some things, Alberta when speaking of others, Ontario or British Columbia when speaking of others. But I would like to refer to an article which appeared in the 'Leader-Post' on February 21, 1950:

"Mr. Longworth, the President of the Board of Directors, told the city council on Monday that Brandon General Hospital will have to close its public wards, or close completely, if now sources of revenue cannot be found. It has a bank overdraft of \$44,000 with deficits continuing to pile up. He also said that \$250,000 debentures mature next year. These were guaranteed by the Provincial Government; the hospital had no funds with which to meet them, and the Government would have to meet them."

So evidently other provinces are not in as satisfactory a condition, as far as their hospitalization schemes are concerned, as the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like briefly to refer to the Kindersley Larger Unit. All eyes were centred on the Kindersley Larger Unit during this past year, because a petition was circulated and a vote was called. The first five years of the establishment of that unit had expired and, under the terms of the Larger Unit Act, if within the stated period there were a certain number of signatories to a petition for disorganization, a vote would be taken with regard to disorganization. Some of the opponents of the C.C.F. Government thought, "Well, now, this is a wonderful opportunity. If we can drop the flag out there in Kindersley, which is the most outstanding example of the advance of the larger unit of administration, well then we will be working wonders." We have there a splendid school, giving a full course in academic training for the benefit of the boys from the farm, we have a dormitory there accommodating 84 pupils — 42 boys and 42 girls. They can come right in there from the rural areas and take all the courses that are available in the average technical school in the cities of our province, a wonderful opportunity which should never be denied the people of our rural population. They can take the full course; commercial course, home economics course, shop course including drafting, woodwork, shop metal, motor mechanics and electricity. They have a splendid system in connection with their dormitory. They elect their Board every year. The chairman of the larger unit by virtue

of his position is a member of the Board; the superintendent of schools is a member of the Board — and then, from their number, they elect two of the parents of the students attending and two of the students. They draw up a very fine set of rules. I have a copy of them and any of you who would be interested in it would be amazed at the rules that that Board draws up for the guidance of the children.

Well now, there was a conflict of opinion there amongst some of the people. We have some people who have considerably large holdings of land, whose children have finished school who possibly were opposed to the larger unit. We have a few (only a very few) of that type of Liberal who will put a quirk into anything that is progressive if they can blackmail or, at least, if they can give the C.C.F. Government a black eye. We have a few of these, but, on the average, very few. There were other large landowners who have been wholeheartedly behind the scheme, and might I say to the credit of the Liberal residents, the people who support the Liberal Party in the Kindersley constituency, that the great majority were wholeheartedly behind the larger unit scheme — not just exactly like the representatives here in the House on the Opposition. These gentlemen give partial lip-service to the larger-unit form of administration for their schools, but when they get out in the country they will endeavour to queer it by all of that faint praise and by picking out here and there points of differences.

I have never seen yet one member of the Opposition stand up in his place in this House and pay any tribute to the magnificent work that is being carried out by the larger unit scheme of administration of schools in this province; but in Kindersley, it does not matter what their political or religious faith is, they recognize the larger unit as an asset. There were 672 signatures to the petition to disorganize, and the peculiar thing about it was that when the vote was taken, there were 479 that voted for organization, or 193 less than signed the petition. There were 1,764 in favour of continuing, and 479 for disorganization. That overwhelming vote gave a wonderful sense of security to the balance of that constituency. They realize now that their children, within easy driving distance and easy access of the farm home, have all of the advantages and the opportunities that are presented to the child resident in the city.

Just one or two other little points that I would like to speak on. First, with regard to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. What has amused me more than anything also in this House is the futile attempt of the Opposition to link the Premier of this province up as being an exponent of the principles of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. That might form the basic for a comic strip; but for sensible debate, it is far away. Everybody knows that we are wholeheartedly behind the policy, on this side of the House, of marketing our grain through the Wheat Board; but what we do ask for is more producer-control so that we can have an assurance that the Wheat Board, which should be under the control of the farmers of this province, will not be made a political football by the party in the power — the same as we had a taste of before last Federal election, when they were endeavouring to bribe us with our own money.

So far as the Liberal Party is concerned, they have it in their hands, anytime they want, to put an end to that horde of speculators and gamblers and scalpers that gather in the pit of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

February 9, 1951

Do not let us have any more talk about the Liberals being opposed to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. The Federal House has it within its power, any time it has the courage to do it, to close down the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment.

The question being put, the amendment proposed by Mr. Tucker was negated by 28 votes to 18.

The debate continued on the main motion.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, now that the non-essentials are removed from the main debate, we can proceed with the more important parts of this particular stage of the Legislature.

Before going into the main part of what I wish to say in this debate, I would like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Wellbelove) and the seconder (Mr. Willis) of the reply to His Honour's address. A very old friend of mine whom I have known for a good many years, a competent and an able farmer, a man who has devoted more time than probably he could properly spare from his own affairs to the public welfare, who thoroughly understands all the difficulties that agricultural life has had to contend with in this province, both from climatic and Liberal political hazards that agriculture has had to face, moved the Address-in-Reply. He was followed by another gentleman whom I have known, almost as long, a schoolteacher to whom, I believe, someone on the other side of the House, referred to as "a schoolteacher who knew nothing about farming". The person who made that statement over there — I have forgotten who it was but it does not make any difference — certainly did not know what he was talking about. I have known the member from Elrose for nearly 30 years. I knew one of the first schools he ever taught was a rural school in a country where mixed-farming was the vogue, where he lived amongst them, and where he attended our regular little meetings in our community affairs and took an active part in them, not only with regard to the operations of the school he taught, where our children went, but with regard to all the other activities that we were faced with in that farming community. He was a much younger man then than he is now and being an able man and able to learn, with that background and the intervening time between then and now and his intelligence, he certainly knows as much about agriculture as anyone can know that is not intimately everyday doing the job. He is to be congratulated on his knowledge of these affairs and his ability in his chosen profession on both counts, and for his speech on this debate.

The Leader of the Opposition, if we want to measure the value of a speech not only by the length of time (as referred to by the Premier) but by the volume of criticism without one constructive suggestion in it, made an excellent speech, He found something wrong with every single department governed by this side of the House.

Mr. Tucker: — It was not hard.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — It is never hard for a nagger to nag, and that is what he

did; but he made no constructive suggestions at all. I would think that a responsible Leader of an Opposition in a democratic assembly such as this would say, "I criticize the Government for these reasons, and this is what we will do to correct those things when we come in". But no suggestions came from him, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to some of the others, frankly I congratulate them on their speeches, because each of them spent quite a little time endeavouring to indicate a knowledge of things of which they had no great knowledge, endeavouring to suggest that if they were in the position of power they would do very much better about things without ever offering us any idea of what those better things would be. I am amazed that they were able to make even as good a case as some of them did out of the very little that they had. However, as I said, they are well schooled by their leader.

I want to congratulate our Premier over here for the many excellent things he said during the course of his address. During the time I am on the floor in this debate I am going to remain in Canada, mostly in Saskatchewan. The only trip I will take out of Saskatchewan is where the lines of our economy do take us down to Ottawa and back again. Before I am finished I will follow some of those lines. The only time I will go outside of Canada will be to say that if I had the ability to say what is in my mind about the situation in the Far East, if I had the ability that the Premier has, I would have said exactly the same things, and I endorse every word he said.

I want also to congratulate the speakers from our side of the House, Mr. Speaker. These are men who, like the mover and the seconder, have given a great deal of their time in thinking and studying, not how to maintain the status quo, not how to continue in operation economic and social and political practices that have been found wanting in the past, but men who, outside of the scope of their job of making a living have given serious and constrictive study to how to improve things in our province and in our country, something my friends across the way cannot seem to understand or believe that they should do. They, in contrast, spend all their time trying to turn the hands of the clock back whenever they do manage to get ahead, and to see if possible the clock is stopped altogether. I want to congratulate these men on our side who have shown their ability to study and to present the things that they believe to this House in a constructive and intelligent manner, which they have done.

Before I go any further I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity, the same as my seatmate and colleague the member for Kerrobert has done this afternoon, to bid a hearty farewell and good luck to the hon. past member for Gravelbourg who has left for other realms of endeavour. I am going to miss Mr. Culliton this year, when my estimates appear before the Legislature. I was really looking forward to it. Last year, I was comparatively new in this particular position that I have been honoured with and was not always, possibly, familiar with the answers. This year, I hope whoever succeeds him in that will proceed as he has done and will get the answers that are required for the general public information and good. I am sorry he is not going to be here to be able to conduct that examination. I do wish him the very best of good luck in his new field of endeavour.

February 9, 1951

I often wonder why he went just at this particular time, but I have no doubt the Leader of the Opposition knows; and as the hon. Premier remarked to the press, it is hard to tell what motivates people or groups of people to blow their brains out.

Now, when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking the other day he took a great deal of pains to compare Saskatchewan with either of the provinces on our east or west. He was dealing mostly with oil exploration, but he also spoke about industrial development. The question is often asked, and I am going to ask him now, why it was, when these things were going on in the other provinces, that under the government of the party which he espoused and presently leads, there was not some of this development here, I interjected a remark while he was speaking that there was oil development in Alberta in the early part of this century. And there was. I was in Calgary in the years 1909-10, I used to know Bob Edwards and I read his paper, and if my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition will dig up some old Calgary "Eye-Openers", he will find they were having oil exploration not only in the Turner Valley but as far north as Athabasca Landing. In 1909-10 in Athabasca Landing there was a pipe in the ground burning night and day. They had found natural gas then, but not in sufficient quantities to make commercial use of it. They were looking for oil then. They were looking for other industrial development. Why had not the Liberals here, who were in power from 1905 until 1944 with four years exception — that is 39 years — done anything? What happened to the private enterprisers' brick-plant down at Estevan under Liberal administration? They could not even make it pay and it was tumbling down. They could not even make it pay enough to make a contribution to the Liberal campaign fund. I suppose it is going now, and even supposing it has not been a profit-making institution up till now, in these last five years since this Government has resurrected that broken-down private enterprise that institution has, during the period when building material was very scarce, supplied building material for the building of structures which otherwise would not have been built. It did not take the place of any other. It augmented and added to the present supply of building materials ever since we started to make bricks there, and so far as the improvement in it down there I am told, and I expect the person who told me was telling the truth, that the present member who sits on the other side of the House from that area of the country is very happy, he and his colleagues, to know that the plant is being brought up-to-date and made a real productive enterprise.

Why weren't the products of the salt lakes at Chaplin developed before this? There was nothing to prevent my Liberal friends' private enterprisers, with the great big amounts of capital they say we are keeping out of the country, coming in and building a salt plant there. It was lying there doing nothing, just an ugly blot on the landscape, a great big soapy alkali flat (and nobody likes the look of them) with commercial value. It did not require a great deal of capital. All my Liberal friends had to do was to find some of their enterprising friends when they were in power and bring it here. But they did not. Why didn't they do it? Why didn't they do any of these things? Because they did not have the nerve.

There is one thing the Premier said the other day that I am going to take exception to. Very surely do I ever disagree with anything he says, because he knows what he is talking about; but he made the statement here the other day, that the Liberals during their rule in this country did nothing and he said they did it magnificently and with dignity. I will agree with him on one-third of his statement. They did nothing. I cannot agree, however, that

they did it magnificently and they certainly did not do it with dignity. They did it with utter degraded boot-licking of their friends, "organized capital," and when big capital, monopoly capital, did not want to come in here and would not permit any Government development in here which a few progressive Liberals might have promoted at that time, they were told there would be no contribution to the campaign funds of the Liberal Party if any Government enterprise was started out here that was going to interfere with them. That is why the cream of the power of this country was left in the hands of private power people. That is why all the little things, the few things that did happen, were left in their hands. When it came to real development here, never at any time while the Liberal Party was in power did it ever carry on any promotion work whatsoever to induce private capital to come in and develop Glauber's salt, ordinary salts, oil or gas, or the minerals in the north or any other thing that would have made this province a diversified and industrial province.

The Leader of the Opposition at one time used to get the headlines because he was supposed to be progressive. One time, some years ago, you would see his name appearing in the paper: "Mr. Walter Tucker, Liberal Member of Parliament for Rosthern, deals with monetary reform". He and his other two colleagues in that particular field in the Liberal Party, Mr. McGeer (gone to his reward now) and Mr. Slaght, were supposed to be the great exponents of monetary reform in the Liberal Party. Ever since he was made parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs in the House at Ottawa, we have not heard even that much progressive suggestions from the Leader of the Opposition.

Another thing that our friends across there have mentioned on one or two occasions and that is mentioned by my friend alongside of me here, others on this side too, is this matter of Hospitalization. My friends across the way speak about the highly centralized Hospital Services Plan. They have not told this House or the country whether they intend to continue the plan or not. During the course of this debate or the course of another one, I am going to give this House and the country a complete history of the health' services presently in operation here and as they were dealt with by the Liberal administrations in years gone by.

This afternoon, however, I want to confine myself to one particular phase of their criticism, namely, that it is centralized here. I say it is not centralized. Every hospital has its own board of directors and management. Every hospital is dealt with by our Hospital Service Plan administrators as an individual entity, each one presenting its budget and its requirements and each one across the bargaining table having its rate struck — done with the utmost of democracy, the way it should be done, and there are no orders issued from a centralized place. There is nothing centralized except the gathering of that particular part of the fund that is collected as hospital taxes. The various hospitals receive the payments from the Fund, and the administration of each hospital is entirely in the hands of the hospital board of directors. That is not centralization. There is the utmost of democracy in this system. When they start to talk about decentralization again, they should tell us exactly what they mean. What is the Liberal Party going to do with the Hospital Service Plan? First, are they going to keep it in operation? Second, they talk about decentralization, they should tell us how they are going to do it. Who are they going to give it to, to administer? What are they going to do to decentralize it?

February 9, 1951

Very shortly, Mr. Speaker, I am going to adjourn the debate for today. Before I do, I want to mention something I believe the House will be interested in. It is a proposal, which the Government is going to bring before the House for its consideration during the Session, that some alterations be made in The Hospitalization Act with regard to delinquent taxpayers of the Hospitalization Tax. Heretofore it has been the practice that if a delinquent taxpayer comes before a magistrate for that delinquency, he can be ordered to pay the tax and, in default of carrying out the magistrate's order, he can be sent to jail. Well now, it does not seem to us over here that that serves any particular good purpose in the collection of this tax. What we want is to be sure the taxpayer and his family are covered and that the tax is paid, and that family then, and the municipality concerned, and all concerned, will be relieved of any responsibility if illness requiring hospitalization takes place. So I propose to recommend to you that that be altered to that rather than the magistrate ordering a person to pay or in the alternative go to jail, that the person will be ordered to pay or, in the alternative, some method of seizure of some of his assets can be made up to the amount of the tax that is owing, and when that is done nobody will have suffered by going to jail, the family will be covered, the Hospital Fund will have received its proper premium and I believe that everybody in, this House, on both sides, will likely welcome that change. I hope so anyway. Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What exemptions are you proposing to give in regard to those seizures that you are going to provide for?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — All those matters will be dealt with; I did not want to deal with them in detail. I just wanted to advise you that we are proposing to give you that. It will be dealt with as fairly as possible, and the exemptions will be stated at the time the amendment comes in.

Mr. Speaker, when the debate resumes on Monday, I propose to go more fully into a number of other things. With your permission at this stage, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.