

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

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

VISIT OF MISS MARIAN ANDERSON

Before Orders of the Day: —

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), seconded by Mr. Tucker:

ordered, That the proceedings of the Assembly be now (3.15 o'clock p.m.) suspended during pleasure for the purpose of welcoming in the Chamber Miss Marian Anderson, world-famous singer.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker and members of this Assembly, we are extremely fortunate that we are having in our midst today Miss Marian Anderson, world famous contralto. Miss Anderson is singing this evening in the city of Regina and I know that thousands of people in this province who have listened to her over the radio and who have enjoyed the recordings of her voice will be disappointed that they are not to have the pleasure of hearing her at the concert which she is giving this evening in this city.

It seems most appropriate, Sir, that when Miss Anderson was in the city, we should avail ourselves of the opportunity of welcoming her here publicly on behalf of the people of this province whom this Legislature represents. Miss Anderson has become known throughout the world not only as a great singer, not only as one of the outstanding representatives of her race, not only as a good-will ambassador for the United States of America, but she has become known and loved for her own fine spirit and for the encouragement and the comfort that she has brought to thousands upon thousands of people through the ministry of music, which has helped all of those who have been privileged to listen to her. Toscanini is reported to have said that only once in a hundred years does the human race produce such a fine voice and I would like Sir, and I am sure I speak for all the members here, through you, to extend a welcome to Miss Anderson and say how delighted we are to have her here in our midst, to say on behalf of the people of this Province, it is a great honour and a great pleasure to have so distinguished a personage and so great an artist visit our Province and our Capital City.

Miss Anderson: — Premier Douglas, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, it is indeed a very deep, a profound pleasure and a great honour that you do me today by having me come to this Session. I declare, most truthfully, that I would be much happier if I should be able to sing for you than to speak. However, there are managers and they have their rights and privileges, and when one is "signed" you abide by those things. Therefore, I am left with no other alternative but to speak. Since I am not a speaker, I shall not take up your time. I would like to say, however, that in the short time that I have been already here I have learned to know that the people in this province are exceptional people, people whom you feel better for having known even if for a very, very short time. I wish it were possible for me to express myself as I should like, but my talents do not run in that par-

ticular direction. Therefore, I wish to thank you again very much, very deeply and with profound appreciation for this honour which you have done me. Thank you very much.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker members of the Assembly and Miss Anderson, speaking on behalf of this side of the House, and I believe for everyone in the House, and for the people of Saskatchewan, I can say that we appreciate very much your very generous words about us. I can assure you that the people of Saskatchewan have enjoyed your singing very, very, much. I join the Premier in expressing regret that the people of the province more generally could not have the privilege of meeting you as we have that privilege, and also that many, many more could not have the privilege of hearing you sing. I do hope that some time in the future you will be able to make a return visit to Saskatoon when there will be an opportunity for a much greater number of our people generally throughout the province to meet and to hear you. We do appreciate your taking time to come here today and visit our Legislative Assembly. We do appreciate very much your visit to our province and we do extend to you our best wishes for continued success and continued chance serve humanity in your chosen field. Our very best wishes go with you.

The business of the House was resumed at 3.25 o'clock p.m.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Monday, February 12, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Howe for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to express my pleasure at seeing you all again. I am very pleased to see the Minister of Social Welfare in his place again, and I hope that his health will be such that it will enable him to carry out his duties during the Session. I also hope that, before too long, we will have our good friend, the member for Kinistino (Mr. Woods) with us again.

A great deal has been said in this debate about Korea. I do not intend to discuss it at any great length except to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the statements of our leader (Mr. Tucker) and the other members on this side of the House, who have, in their speeches, referred to this matter. I would, however, just like to read you an article written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, which appeared in the Minneapolis 'Star' of February 5, this year — and the heading of it is "Keep straight on how U.S. got into Korea." This is what she said:

"This nation must have a very short memory. A number of people, lately, have asked me how we happened to be in Korea, and why did the President start the war there.

"The Japanese first occupied Korea; then when we conquered Japan we took the country over from them. Having come into the war a few days earlier as our allies against Japan, Russia claimed a part of the responsibility — the 38th parallel; north of that was the Soviet responsibility, south of it

was ours. We asked the United Nations to supervise a freer election in South Korea. Syngman Rhee, though out of the country during the Japanese occupation, had been constantly agitating for Korea to freedom. Since this was the first election participated in by the Korean people, it is perhaps understandable that they voted for this man whom they considered a leader for Korean independence.

"The Soviet refused to allow the U.N. to supervise the election, or any other interference, and set about militarizing the North Koreans. When they were ready they invaded South Korea; the South Koreans resisted. Immediately our President asked the U.N. to take action. They did so promptly, and the call went out for volunteers to enforce the U.N. stand. That is how we happen to be in Korea."

I just read that, Mr. Speaker, to point out to you the difference between what Mrs. Roosevelt says and what was said by the Premier of this province on the same situation, the other day. I am prepared, and I think most Canadians are prepared to agree with what Mrs. Roosevelt said.

I have another short clipping here. This was written by that great statesman, Benjamin Franklin, in the year 1784; but these statements are just true today as they were when they were written:

"Let us beware of being lulled into a dangerous security and of being weakened by internal contentions and divisions."

I am going to emphasize that, because what was the Premier doing the other day? Was he weakening the United Nations by internal contentions and divisions? Benjamin Franklin goes on:

". . . of neglect in military exercises and discipline and in providing stores of arms and munitions for war. For the expense required to prevent a war is much lighter than that required, if not prevented, that will be necessary to maintain it."

I would suggest that we should watch these internal contentions and divisions. If the people want to support Russia, I say to them "Go to Russia. Live there!" — and that will cure them. Leave this Canada of ours to Canadians who believe in the Canadian way of life and in our fine British traditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to my own constituency, last year's harvest was rather a varied one in the constituency of Cannington. In that part of the constituency west of No. 9 Highway, the wheat crop was very disappointing. In the early part of the season we had the prospect of the best crop of wheat we ever grew. But, in the early part of August, it was attacked by aphids, a small green bug that attacked the crop by millions and sucked all the moisture out of it — or nearly all of it. Then on August 17th we had a disastrous frost and the wheat in that part of the constituency west of the Moose Mountain was all feed, weighing from 30 to 40 pounds to the bushel, with of course, a very poor yield per acre. On the east side of the mountain they did not get the frost, and had a good crop of fair grade wheat. But, unfortunately, they had so much wet weather that a lot of it is still out under the snow, and a lot that was threshed is very tough.

Just in passing, I would like to mention the enormous amount of damage that was done to the crop in the eastern part of the constituency by ducks. I think we are all in favour of preserving our wild life; but when a farmer sees thousands of ducks fly in and ruin a crop, as happened down there in that area this year; especially if they grew barley and Durum wheat, one wonders if this programme of preservation of wild life has not been carried too far. I am not sure just what can be done about it, but I would suggest to the Game people or the Game Branch, or whoever has charge of it here, that if a situation like that develops again, they go on the air and advertise the fact that there are millions of ducks (and there were millions down there that were doing an enormous amount of damage) that they could funnel our sportsmen to that area. We did that locally, of course, but there were so many ducks that our local sportsmen did not make much impression on them. I just throw that out, Mr. Speaker, as a suggestion.

Fortunately for us, the coarse grains over the whole area were a fair crop. The farmers in that area also keep a considerable number of live stock, not as many as we formerly did, but they are still kept in quite large numbers. This year again emphasized the necessity of not putting our eggs all in one basket. The farmers who lost their wheat crop and had no stock, or little stock, are finding the going pretty tough.

Just in passing, I would like to say how much I enjoyed the speech of the hon. member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe), the other day, but I am sure when he made that sweeping statement that everything a farmer has to sell has gone down, that he forgot about our 32 cent beef and our high price of pork products. I am quite sure the member for Kelvington did not make that omission intentionally, and I am merely pointing it out to him to keep the record straight.

During the last few years of good yields and high prices, the farmers in my area, while objecting to the steadily increasing price of taxes on their farms, did not take the matter too seriously. But I found, this fall, when the proceeds of the crop in a great many cases were not sufficient to pay the harvesting expenses, that they were complaining about their higher taxes, more especially their school taxes which are sometimes three times as much as they were in 1944. This feeling was general among all the farmers, but I think the C.C.F.'ers put up the biggest howl. While these fellows are supposed to believe in the theory of work for use and not for profit, I notice that when you touch their pocket-book they put up a bigger yell than either a Liberal or a good old Tory.

I would like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, about wheat and wheat prices. There has been a lot of loose talk going around about our Wheat Board and the prices they are paying for this year's crop, and also the five-year pool. I think it would be wise at this time for us to remember that it took a great number of years to get the Wheat Board established, and I am proud to say that I had some small part in that effort. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you the objective that we had in mind when the Wheat Board was formed. It was simply this — that we would pool our wheat throughout the year, we would pool our wheat through the Board, throughout the year so that the wheat could be sold in an orderly manner throughout the year. We asked them to give us an initial payment at the time of delivery of around 70 per cent of what appeared to be the cash value of the wheat at the time it was delivered, and the balance to be paid at the end of the crop year when the crop was sold.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): —At election time.

Mr. McCarthy: — I wonder if the hon. member knows when a crop year ends.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Tisdale): —You don't know yourself.

Mr. McCarthy: — That policy is being carried out this year, and in addition, they have paid a 20-cent interim payment. When the crop is all sold at the end of the crop year we will get a final payment. I was rather surprised the other day to hear the Premier say that the Wheat Board was improperly holding some of the money that belonged to the farmers, from this year's crop. I think the Premier should stick to subjects with which he is familiar.

Again I say, I wonder if he knows when the crop year ends. If he does not, I will tell him — it is August 1. That means that the local elevators will be taking in the 1950 crop up to August 1, 1951. After that the elevators have to load it out, get it to the head of the lakes in a saleable position, add up the total, see what the average price was during year, close their books, and make the final payment. That is the way it is done. That, Mr. Speaker, is what we asked the Wheat Board to do, and that is what they are doing. It may take us into December or January of the following year before the payment is made. No farmer, certainly no farmer who had anything to do with setting up the Wheat Board, would want it done otherwise. That is what we asked them to do, and that is what they are doing.

The Premier also made the statement in the House the other day, that the farmers had 28 cents a bushel coming to them on this year's crop after the 20-cent payment was made. I wonder how he arrived at that figure. Did he look into the crystal ball and pull out that 28 cents? Mr. Speaker, no one can tell at this date what the final payment on the 1950-51 crop will be, until it is all sold. I am sure neither Mr. Wesson, the chairman of the Wheat Board, or Mr. Howe, would venture a guess at this time as to what the final payment will be, and they are the men that would know, if anybody does; and for the Premier to say that the farmers have 28 cents a bushel coming, is sheer nonsense. It might be half that or it might be double that amount.

We used to sell our wheat in the fall and carry the money over to the next year to pay our running expenses. Very often we found that we had sold in the lowest market. Now, we get the average price over the year. It ill behooves the Premier of this province to get up as he did in the House the other day, and say that the Wheat Board is improperly withholding our money. That is not in accordance with the facts. If we believe in the Wheat Board system of selling wheat (and I believe most farmers do), we should support it and keep it out of politics. I am sure that a good many members on both sides of the House were sorry to hear the Premier, the other day, refer to some of the actions of the Wheat Board as a "political pork barrel". We have plenty of people outside of this province who are anxious to wreck our Wheat Board, and any person in this province who indulges in unfair criticism of our Board is doing an injustice to the farmers of this province.

The hon. Premier must have been suffering from an overdose of ego the other day when he made the statement in the House that farmers were now getting 20 cents a bushel because of the protest aroused by the C.C.F. Party. I wonder if those people who criticize the Board ever stop to think what we would be receiving for our feed wheat today, if we had to sell it on the open market as we did years ago. The truth of the matter is that the Wheat Board do not pay any more attention to the Premier than they would to a dog barking up a tree at a chipmunk. There are two reasons for this. First, the Wheat Board knows he does not know what he is talking about. The second is that they are in the business of selling wheat and have not time to listen to political propaganda. In the days before the Wheat Board, when we had a frozen crop the spreads were not too bad in the early fall; but when the grain deliveries started to pile up, the price went down until it was hardly worth threshing. The wheat in my district this year weighs from 30 to 40 pounds per bushel and, with the interim payment, it nets us \$1.04 at the elevator, about \$1.20 at the lake head. I think by the time it reaches the man who is going to feed it, it will cost him around \$1.40 a bushel. Frankly, I would not like to pay that much for it. We used to have a grade called "2 feed"; fortunately for us we have no such grade now. If we had, our wheat down there would be all "2 feed", and I have sold lots of it for 15 and 20 cents a bushel in years gone by. Yet we have people saying that the Wheat Board is not functioning properly. I wonder if those people ever stop to think, when they threaten the Federal Government with all sorts of disaster if they do not do certain things, that only a small portion of the people of this Dominion are interested in our wheat prices. If they get too unreasonable the Dominion Government could quite properly say, "All right boys, here is your wheat, it is yours; sell it yourselves".

A few words about the five-year pool. I believe the Dominion Government has some responsibility to pay the difference between the price our wheat was sold to our own millers and the price we received for the balance of the crop. I feel confident that when the final payment is made, all reasonable men will be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that is causing a great deal of concern in my constituency is the number of people who are in charge of our schools down there without any training for the job: "Supervisors", I believe, is the proper name for them, but we call them "sitters". The unfortunate part of the situation is that the situation is getting worse. It would almost seem as if someone were trying to perpetuate this sort of thing on the farmers. I would like to give you some figures from the Broadview Larger Unit. I use these figures for two reasons. The first is that I happen to live in that unit, and the second, I believe it is an average unit in my constituency. I want to make it quite clear, however, that in using these figures I am not directing any criticism to the larger school unit board. These men are public-spirited men who are devoting a lot of their time and energy to that position to the end that the children in that area may receive a better education; but they are hampered in their duties by the policies of the Department of Education, or it would probably be more proper to say, by the lack of policy of that Department. The duties of the unit board and the Department of Education are pretty well defined. I think it is the duty of the Department to see to it that there are sufficient teachers trained and available to man the schools, and they are falling down on the job. It is the duty of the unit board to place these teachers in the schools and generally manage the schools.

I would like to submit some figures to show just how serious this is. These figures are for the year 1949, because that is the last year we have figures available for. In that year the Broadview Larger School Unit had 88 classrooms in operation; 24 of these were in towns, villages and hamlets. The balance of the 64 classrooms were strictly rural schools. In those rural schools we had 39 teachers who had Normal training, 25 who had no training at all. That is a serious situation. Out of 64 teachers, 25 had no training at all and 39 did. The unfortunate part of it is that all those sitters landed out in the most isolated out-of-the-way schools in the area where it is impossible for an inspector to visit them from November until April or probably May. That is to say, for five or six months of their ten months' teaching career, these young people are out on their own, without any training or without any help. I sometimes wonder just where the Minister of Education stands on this matter. Speaking in the House, last year, the minister said:

"May I say that a reasonably capable supervisor, with more assistance from the superintendent, with assistance from helping teachers in those units which have helping teachers and with the assistance of the correspondence course, will do a better job than many inadequately trained teachers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a remarkable statement to come from the Minister of Education. What about these young people who never see a superintendent for five or six months and where there is no helping teacher? Does the Minister ever stop to think what a boon to some school district that capable teacher would be if she had the advantage of a year of Normal training? I sometimes wonder if the Minister realizes just what this policy means to people that live in outlying school districts. Where is his much advertised policy of equal educational opportunities for all? Certainly not in those rural schools manned by sitters, some of whom are sitting in their second year. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious situation and, with the present attitude of the Minister, I do not see any relief in sight.

I would like to read to you another statement made by the Minister in this House last year. He was speaking about the shortage of teachers, and this is what he said:

"There are some encouraging aspects, however, (he calls this encouraging). Last year, 48-49, we put in to the teaching profession or in to schools, about 400 short term students and about 200 supervisors. In other words, we put about 600 new or partly trained people — that is partly trained or not trained. (That is the 48-49 picture). This year, (that is 49-50), we have introduced no short term students, we are using 400 supervisors. In other words, there is a comparison of about 600 as against 400, a gain of about 200 in that regard."

That is what the Minister said. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the encouragement or the gain he talks about — 200 sitters in 1948-49, 400 sitters in 1949-50. It is not a gain, it is a distinct loss: 200 sitters in 1948-49 — and our rural children are suffering for it. And this year, I believe, we have gained some more. We have just about 500. I think the number, to be exact, is 490 and some odd. I suppose that will be another gain.

Mr. Speaker, this is having the effect of driving our farmers off the land. They are selling their livestock and moving into town where they can send their children to school, and farm from town. I think the Minister of Agriculture will agree with me that in a mixed-farming area such as ours this is a serious matter. The best type of farmer for this province is the man who lives on his farm and keeps some stock. And yet, I do not think anyone can blame a man who has a family to educate and is compelled to send his children to a school headed by a teacher who has no training and no prospect of getting a trained teacher, for moving to town, in spite of the fact that he is paying the highest school taxes ever collected in this province. In addition to that, when the Minister says it is encouraging and a gain to increase these sitters from 200 to 400 in one year, there does not seem to be any relief in sight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do about it? Surely we are not going to sit idly by and see this thing go on. That is not the spirit of the pioneers that made this country great. Those pioneers faced many difficult problems and they solved them. We can solve this one if we have the will and the courage to tackle it. First of all, we must adopt a policy that will encourage our young people to train themselves for the teaching profession. These young people will train themselves for the teaching profession when we make it financially attractive for them to do so. The Department is doing exactly opposite now. They are making it more attractive financially to be a sitter than to be a teacher. Let me illustrate what I mean. We will take two students who got their Grade XII in July, 1949. One goes to Normal for a year. Her parents or someone has to put up \$800 in cash to pay her board, fees, etc., for the year. I think probably the average will be higher than that. We will take the other one now. She goes out as a sitter at \$6.00 a day or \$1,200 a year. She will probably have, after paying board, etc., \$700 left over for her year's work. The Normal School student has spent \$800, the other has earned, we will say \$700. So far, the sitter is \$1,500 ahead. Next year they both teach. The sitter gets a salary of \$1,200, the Normal School student will probably get \$1,350. Out of this the Normal School student has to pay superannuation and Federation fees of over \$50; the sitter pays none of that. Then suppose they both get married. The sitter comes out of the teaching experience \$1,400 ahead of the normal student.

How about the children? They are the most important. The children under the sitter have suffered two years of the handicap of having no qualified teacher. This may affect their whole school career and future education. For this kind of education the taxpayer is paying a rate of about 20 mills, which may be two or three times what he paid before. He is powerless to help himself because he just takes the sitter that is sent to his district. Today the qualified teacher is at a disadvantage compared to the sitter. The teacher has gone into debt to obtain her certificate, while the sitter starts out without any debt.

Effective measures should be taken to remedy this situation. I have three measures to propose. Adequate grants or scholarships should be offered by the Provincial Government to deserving applicants for Normal. I am aware the Government is offering loans, but it is not sufficient. This is borne out by the fact that the unit boards, who know the situation, are making loans to Normal students. That, I do not think, is a function of a unit board; I think that is a function of the Department of Education. These

unit boards are only taking it up because of necessity, because of the lack of the policy I mentioned by the Department of Education. There is too much red tape too many restrictions on these loans. In an emergency such as we have now, the Department should make grants as well as loans to Normal students. This should not be treated as an expense but an investment in the education of our young people.

Secondly, I would suggest that our Regina Normal School be reopened for training teachers. When three Normal Schools were in operation the number of students enrolled was about 900 a year. The two schools presently operating will accommodate about 600. These two schools cannot accommodate the number of students required to replace the large number of teachers who annually leave the profession in this province. There are quite a number of young people in and around Regina, also in my part of the province, who would go to Normal if there were a Normal School in Regina. They do not wish to go to Moose Jaw.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — What is the matter with Moose Jaw?

Mr. McCarthy: — I'll tell you that in a minute; do not get in a hurry. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the reason we have more than our share of sitters in the south-eastern part of the province — and I believe we have more than our share — is because of the closing of this Normal School. There must be, in the City of Regina, with its 70,000 population, a large number of young people who would enter the teaching profession if they could go to Normal School in Regina and board at home. For them to go to Moose Jaw they have to pay out \$400 or \$500 cash for board; so they enter some other profession. You would also attract a large number of students from the south-eastern part of Saskatchewan. In 1941 we had over 900 students in our three Normal Schools. Last year, with two Normal Schools operating, we had 502. There is a difference of 400 and that is just about the number of sitters you are introducing into schools.

The third suggestion I would make is that school grants be greatly increased. The Government has much to say about increased school grants. The Britnell Report shows that the proportion of educational costs provided by grants has increased very little, if any. The Premier frequently talks about a 50-cent dollar. In a recent radio address he said: "Every housewife knows that a dollar today will buy the equivalent of what fifty cents would have bought less than ten years ago". The school boards have also found this out. The C.C.F. Government has made no effective increase in school grants. The only sure way of providing our schools with a sufficient supply of well-qualified teachers is to make grants sufficiently large to guarantee that reasonably good salaries can be paid whether local taxes are collected or not. We found that out in the 'thirties'. That is what our Party intends to do.

I am glad to see the Provincial Treasurer looking so well; I was rather worried about him. He has been making some very funny statements this last summer, and I wondered if his health was all right. I picked up a paper one night last summer, and this is what I read, under a Nipawin dateline, June 8, 1950. This is what the Provincial Treasurer told a meeting in Nipawin: "Not a single five-cent piece of taxpayers' money has been used to finance Government industries. This money was all borrowed". The Provincial

Treasurer was talking about Crown Corporations. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. He borrowed the money on the security of this province and says it was not taxpayers' money. I wonder who he thinks it belongs to? If I put a mortgage on my farm for \$1,000, that money is mine, my responsibility to pay it back. Similarly, if the Provincial Treasurer borrows money on the security of the province, that money belongs to the taxpayers of the province and they will have to pay it back. Just whose money does the Provincial Treasurer think he is playing around with when he makes a statement as he did in the speech, that not a nickel of taxpayers' money went into these industries? Not only are the taxpayers responsible for the principal of these loans, but they have to pay each year the interest on this borrowed money. The Telephone and Power Corporations pay their own interest. The C.C.F. Crown Corporations have paid none. At the present time these Corporations have on loan millions of dollars of taxpayers money, and they have to pay interest on it at 3½ per cent. That interest is being paid by the Provincial Treasurer out of taxpayers' money; yet the Provincial Treasurer was running all over this province last summer, telling people not a five-cent piece of taxpayers' money was used in Government industries. That is not according to facts, Mr. Speaker.

In the same speech at Nipawin, and talking about Telephones, the Provincial Treasurer said: "While rates are going up in British Columbia and Ontario, no increase has been put in effect here". That is not true. The Premier made the same statement in the House, the other day. The hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Woods), asked a question in the House last year; the answer appeared in the Journals. This is what he asked: "At what dates were increases in charges of telephones made, and what were the amounts of such increases?" Now here is the answer: "On January 1, 1950, all rural connecting fees were restored to their normal classification and now are at a proper relationship with one another." Now, that is the political propaganda part of the answer. But here is the real answer, and it is contained in this answer. Continuing on with the answer, the first part is political propaganda, but here is the real answer: "this resulted in a \$2.00 increase per rural subscriber per year at all exchanges, with the following exceptions; at Biggar, North Battleford and Yorkton, the increase was \$1.00 in rural telephones; at Qu'Appelle, Indian Head and Melville there was no increase." With those few exceptions, the answer says, this resulted in a \$2.00 increase per rural subscriber per year at all exchanges, and those rural subscribers take in small towns, villages and hamlets in the province too, they are classified as rural . . .

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Would the hon. gentleman mind if I explained where your comparisons are incorrect?

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, I would rather you wouldn't take my time. I have a certain length of time to speak.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker; the hon. gentleman is speaking of rural connecting fees; the hon. Premier was speaking of rentals — of the rates that are charged for a telephone.

Mr. McCarthy: — I didn't get that.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Thai point is that you are speaking of rural connecting fees, not of telephone rates.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, that is just fine; they are one and the same thing. I belong to a rural telephone; I have been a director in our local rural telephone since 1911. How do we set our rates for our rural subscribers? So much of the connecting fee goes to the Provincial Government for connecting fees. When you raise that connecting fee \$2.00, you automatically raise the whole thing \$2.00. That is the answer. You do not need to take my word for it; go out and ask any farmer who had his fee 'upped' \$2.00 — and they all did last year. Yet they say there is no increase.

There are, I believe, something like 55,000 rural telephones in this province. That means an increase of over \$110,000 in rates charged subscribers since January 1, 1950. Yet we have the Provincial Treasurer telling a meeting at Nipawin on June 8, 1950, that there has been no increase in telephone rates. Then, Mr. Speaker, what is probably more serious, we have the Premier of this province making the same statement in the House. I submit to you, Sir, that it does not add to the dignity of this House, nor to the cause of democracy, to have the Premier making statements that are incorrect.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has said that the statement which I made was incorrect. The statement which I made was that there had been no increase in rental by the Telephone Corporation. That statement is true; the statement is correct. Any increase by rural telephone companies is not an increase by the Saskatchewan Government Telephone Corporation. My hon. friend ought to know that, and I take exception to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McCarthy: — Are you making this speech or me?

Premier Douglas: — Well, I am not reading one like you have been for the last half hour. If my hon. friend would stop reading his speech, he might be able to make one.

Mr. McCarthy: — The Premier has made the same objection to my statement that the Minister of Public Works did, and it is not a valid objection. He said he did not say rentals; as matter of fact he said "rates". And what are rates? Rates are rental rates, Mr. Speaker. He has made the same statement. My statement still holds good. Speak to any bunch of auditors they will tell you I am right.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say . . .

Hon. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — On a point of order, is the hon. member reading his speech?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The member is speaking only from notes. Go ahead.

Mr. McCarthy: — No, I have some notes here. I will tell you one thing over there, that if there were less interruption a man like myself, who is not used to public speaking, would not have to refer to his notes so much. Well, I am telling the truth. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, the people of my constituency are also very much concerned about highway and bridge construction, but I will leave these matters until the new policy on bridge construction is announced. I do hope that we will have more of an opportunity to discuss highways than we had last year, and that we will not be

leaving this important matter until the final day of the session.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to support the Motion.

Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I would like to say that this is the first opportunity that I have had to partake in a debate on the Speech from the Throne.

First, I would like to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of the motion. While I do not agree with many of the things they said — I think they got away off the field — I still want to congratulate them, at least on their sincerity. I would also like to say a word about the past member from Gravelbourg. I just want to congratulate him on his promotion, and I know that what we in the Legislature here have lost, the judiciary has certainly gained.

I would like also, before I got started, to congratulate the Government on the policy it has established during the last few years of bringing University students down here. I think this is an excellent thing, and I want to say, personally, to the Minister of Social Welfare, that I sincerely hope this practice will be carried on in succeeding years.

I want to pay tribute, today, to the excellent address of the Leader of the Opposition. I think he did an excellent job of covering, generally, all of the problems in this province, and I would say that I think he did it more thoroughly than any member of the other side of the House. I want also, to associate myself with him on two matters; firstly, on his stand on the Canadian Wheat Board. This association has been put together by the efforts of a great number of farmers, and I think it is something that we, in this province, should try to preserve rather than destroy.

I also want to say something with regard to his stand on the United Nations. Per myself, I would rather rely on leaders of these various nations than take too much cognizance of the statements made by the hon. Premier here. As a matter of fact, I was quite shocked at his remarks, and I sincerely hope that we in Saskatchewan will not do anything to destroy the unity that is so necessary in critical times in this country of ours.

I was rather surprised, yesterday, when the hon. Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) was talking. I listened to him last year, and naturally I expected that I would hear a talk on public health. For reasons unknown to me he spent a great deal of his time on other subjects. I expected, yesterday, to hear a talk on public health, but I don't think he mentioned anything as far as this particular Department is concerned. Now I have no objection to a private member on either side of the House talking on affairs out of the phase of this Government, but I think that a Minister of a department should deal with some of the matters in his department, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the Department of Public Health.

I have before me here a copy of the 'Star-Phoenix' in which there is a headline, dated October 13, last, reading:

"Abuse of Hospitalization benefits common knowledge, meeting told".

Now, these are things that I think we should hear in this House. We will assume that the hospitalization plan has worked to the benefit of a lot of people in this province, but are we going to allow it to be destroyed? The thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is these statements. I would like to read just one, not from any Liberal party or any other party in this province, but rather from the Deputy Minister of Public Health, when he said that widespread abuse of benefits available under the Saskatchewan hospitalization plan was common knowledge. The Deputy Minister said that, and he goes on: "We all know the plan is being abused", and so on. I am just bringing this up here because I think it is time that the Ministers of the Crown in this Government get back and discuss questions dealing with the affairs of this province.

With regard to the Speech from the Throne, I was rather disappointed in it also. Firstly, it spent a great deal of time on affairs outside its realm, and it told us a little bit of what the government attempted to do in the past year; but to me it was disappointing in that it didn't tell us about future legislation, or what they were going to do for the people in this province. I was disappointed because they did not forecast enactment of enough of the recommendations of the Cronkite-Britnell-Jacobs report. As far as I can see, they are just going to enact two minor recommendations. I realize the report said that they would have three years, but at that rate it is going to take a lot longer than that.

Another thing I want to mention here, today, is a matter which came before this House last year. That was the question of housing. I may have ideas on housing that don't agree with those of a lot of people in this province, but I do say that the people with families in this province — veterans, particularly young veterans — are entitled to adequate housing. I was very sympathetic towards this last year, in the hope that we could do something to assist in solving the housing problem that is apparent in this province. I don't know how bad it is in the larger cities, but in cities the size of North Battleford or Estevan, it is very difficult. I thought that when this Bill went through that by now we would see some start in housing.

I was a little critical about the question of passing over a portion of that to the municipalities, but I am more critical today because I think the prime responsibility of finding housing accommodation rests more with the Provincial Government than it does with the municipality. I think it is all right for the municipalities to supply the land and supply the services, but I think the responsibility lies with the Government, and this is where I think the Government has failed. We were in this position: the Federal Government would contribute 75 per cent of the cost of housing, and the Provincial would contribute 25 per cent, of which they said the municipalities should contribute 12½ per cent. Now the difficulty with the municipalities, particularly the smaller cities and towns of this province, is that with the backlog of capital goods that they require, such as sewer and water connections, public buildings, etc., they are getting very close to the position where they cannot borrow sufficient to look after this 12½ per cent.

Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if you provide a man with a house, with a low enough down payment and low enough monthly payments over a long

period of time, that he should be encouraged to buy that house. The difficulty today is that the average working man who wants to buy a house finds that it takes too much money; and if this Provincial Government, with this 25 per cent which they are putting out, would embark on a housing scheme in which they would ask the purchaser of that house to put up in the neighbourhood of 5 or 10 per cent, I think we would get somewhere in housing. A lot of bickering has been going on in the province between the Government and the municipalities, and I don't know who is in the wrong; but at the same time we are not getting any housing.

I would like to go on from there along another angle. In North Battleford, the Department of Social Welfare provided in the neighbourhood of 88 suites — and I give the Minister of Social Welfare credit for that; I think he did a good job. I want to say, however, that these were temporary, and these properties are beginning to depreciate very rapidly. Furthermore, they are on airport property as are many others in similar communities in the province, and if any of these airports are taken over again by the Department of National Defence, I don't know where these people are going to go. And certainly, as I said before, I believe that they are entitled to some housing accommodation. I would suggest to the Minister that he spend some time in considering the question of providing two types of housing: firstly, a type of house where a man can buy it with a small down payment and monthly payments over probably 25, 30 or 40 years, that are no greater, including principal, interest and taxes, than he would pay for normal rent. I would suggest further that he go into the question of providing low rental units in cities for those people who are not interested in buying. I think if this were done at the provincial level, we would certainly get somewhere.

I was in the United States during the last year, and I saw advertised, houses for \$8,000 to \$10,000, with \$800 cash down; and incidentally, veterans in the United States don't have to put any cash down on a house. I think this is the type of housing that we need in this province, and I would strongly recommend that something be done along that line.

Hon. J.A. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): —May I ask a question on a question of privilege? When the hon. member was in the United States, did he not discover that housing construction over there is a Federal responsibility; that all the money is provided by the Federal Government, both for veterans housing and for private housing, and that the individual States do not contribute to the housing in that country? Did he not discover that?

Mr. Maher: — I was under the impression that the States did contribute. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal policy on housing is correct. I can criticize that; but I am going to suggest that with this Bill that was put through this Legislature, last year, the housing problem in this province could have been solved, and it is not being solved.

I want to say something about highways, and I want to be very brief as I see the time is getting on. As far as my constituency is concerned, I have no particular quarrel with the Minister of Highways. I just want to thank him for seeing that the completion of No. 4, after many long years, is now getting very close. I would suggest, however, that he still give

consideration to one particular highway, which he is quite familiar with is very close to his seat, and that is the providing of some accommodation, some highway, on No. 29. He well knows the problems there, and I sincerely hope that before too long he will be able to do something in this particular of my constituency.

I would also like to congratulate him on bringing the pavement from No. 5 a little closer to North Battleford. I am going to suggest to him now that, as they have come halfway, he should start from North Battleford and work east and west. I say this, not particularly on account of North Battleford, except that I believe he has reached the maximum density, or minimum density, of traffic coming to Radisson, and the road east of North Battleford is deteriorating very rapidly. I would suggest that in the continuation of that highway, he should start from the larger centres and work out.

I would also like to say a word about provincial parks. I have, Mr. Speaker, a map here. You know we, in The Battlefords, are quite proud of the lakes we have around; but when one looks at the map put out by the Saskatchewan Tourist Bureau, it is rather interesting to note that if you draw a line west of Saskatoon and north and south through Saskatoon, there is certainly nothing in the way of park development in our area of the province. I would suggest to the Minister (he lives in that area, so does the Minister of Education) that some development in the northwest portion of the province be carried out, rather than over in the northeast, as has been done in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a little time on Crown Corporations today. I do not know whether they are a pet subject of mine, but I have done a little work on them and I have been rather concerned about the statements, particularly by the hon. Premier, about the vast profits that these corporations are making. I want to go through them briefly and present a little different picture. These statements originated, as far as I was concerned, during the by-election a year ago, when the Premier stated that the profits of the Crown Corporations amounted to \$3,152,000 and so on, and that this profit stayed in the province to help build the roads and schools, to help the hospitals and to help the people of Saskatchewan. Further than that, he also spoke in Davidson on May, 1950, and the startling headline is:

"C.C.F. aims at security".

He also mentions that the net profit of the Crown corporations was \$3,152,000 or 7½ per cent on the capital invested.

I also have a clipping from the hon. Premier's address at the banquet that was held in honour of George Cadbury, the famous expert on Crown corporations. He also mentioned there that the surplus would be over \$3 million. Further to that, he spoke over the radio; I heard that he was going to speak on 'Mind your own Business'. I thought probably he was going to tell us to mind our own business, but I was very pleased that it was of a different type.

I want to present to you, today, a little different aspect of minding the business of this province. The Premier stated the large profits that these corporations were going to make — I do not think he gave a figure in that speech; but the inference was still there that it was somewhere

around \$3 million. Now I believe, and I believe sincerely, that to make a proper analysis of the Crown Corporations in this province, it is necessary to do two things: first, remove the Power Commission and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones from those statements.

Premier Douglas and Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Why?

Mr. Maher: — I will come to that. Secondly, charge interest on the capital invested. I propose to go into each one of them in detail.

The Power Commission is, in my opinion, a public utility. It was started as a utility by previous governments for two purposes: one, to provide power at lower costs to its users; and second, to extend the use of power to the more remote areas of this province. Now I will give the Power Corporation credit that they have done a pretty fair job in this particular aspect, but I still think that it should not be a Crown Corporation. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reason it was made a Crown Corporation was probably the fact that they needed, in the Crown Corporations of this province, a little push to build up those profits and that is why it was put there. I would suggest that I do not think the Manitoba Hydro Commission or the Manitoba Power Commission or the Ontario Hydro Commission, are taking profits out of that for other parts of the Government. The same with the Telephones. Telephones were established in the year 1908, not for the purpose of making a profit for the revenues of the province, but for two reasons: one, to consolidate the many local exchanges throughout this province; and, in addition to that, to provide capital so that the Department of Telephones could be expanded to what it is today. I believe, on that basis, that these two corporations should never have been included in the Crown corporations statement, or have anything to do with Crown corporations.

Furthermore, I think, after an examination of these Crown Corporations, that in the first place these two corporations were not socialistic as this Government intended to socialize this province. They were not created by this Government. They were created by past administrations, and I think we do not want a profit in power or telephones. I think the corporations that should be examined are the corporations this Government developed. Let us look at the record. In the revenue, according to this statement that we received here just within the last few days, of all the corporations there is \$3,035,755.04, and the revenue for the Power corporation and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones was \$2,852,135.29. This leaves a net profit by Crown Corporations originated by this Government which they should take the responsibility for, of around \$184,000, not \$3 million.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend if he thinks, by virtue of the fact that the present Government invested about three-quarters of the capital that is now in the Power corporation, that they ought to get some credit for the surpluses produced by that corporation?

Mr. Maher: — I will answer the hon. Premier this way. As I said a few minutes ago, I will give the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan credit for what they have done in Power and Telephones. I think if they had not been Crown Corporations they could have gone a lot further; but at the same time I will give you credit for what you have done.

I could go into that quite lengthily, but my issue is that these two enterprises are public utilities. They are not corporations for profit.

Premier Douglas: — Isn't the Bus Company a public utility?

Mr. Maher: — I am coming to that, if you will just leave me alone for a minute.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on and show the investment now. On the investment angle, according to this last statement, the total advances by the Provincial Treasury to the Government Finance Office are \$42,602,683.05, and the investment in the Power Corporation and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones is \$34,508,763.10, leaving a net investment of just over \$8 million — I think round figures are easier to say. Now, if the Government had taken this \$8 million and forgotten about their Crown Corporations, and if they had invested it in Victory Bonds, they would have had \$240,000 at 3 per cent, rather than \$183,000 profits that they have; or if they had invested it at the average interest rate that the Provincial Treasurer pays, at 3½ per cent and 3.4 per cent, they would have had an interest return of \$280,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, between what the profits that the Crown Corporations made and rate at which the Government sells their bonds — at between 3 and 3½ per cent — the actual interest lost on Crown Corporations, in my opinion, was \$96,000, exclusive of anything for provincial auditors' fees, planning board, or any other services that were paid by the public revenue of the province.

Mr. Walker: — What would it have come to at 15 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Maher: — The Premier also objects, which he did the other day, on interest charges. Now I would like to ask the hon. Premier, if he objects to interest charges on the Crown Corporations, and assuming that he believes the Power Corporation and the Department of Telephones should be Crown corporations, why interest is charged on the Power Corporation and the Department of Telephones? In other words, they are charging interest on some of these Crown Corporations which this Government believes should be theirs; that is the first reason.

Just while I am on that particular question I would like to refer to a statement the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) made in the House the other day about the 1950 Journals and the profit turned over to the Provincial Treasurer of \$3,821,000, etc. He should probably check that a little closer, and he will find that all but \$600,000 of that was interest paid by the Power Commission and Department of Telephones. In other words, \$3,821,000 is rather misleading.

Mr. Walker: — It is true, is it not?

Mr. Maher: — It is not true. All but \$600,000 was interest paid by the Power Commission and the Department of Telephones.

As the Premier asked me a minute ago to prove this, I want to go into this question of interest. He brought in, when he spoke on this question of interest, Mr. Speaker, a bunch of statements of various companies —

Toronto General Trusts and a few others — and I think that a little analysis as to public money and private money is necessary. I think his comparison is rather incorrect. Let us think where the average corporation gets its fund from, corporations like the Toronto General Trusts or Consolidated Mining and Smelting. They get it from subscription of voluntary capital from individuals, and these people give capital for one purpose — either to gain by an appreciation or obtain a dividend; and they take the risk of that corporation going bankrupt and losing that investment, in other words, the money that is invested in private companies, Mr. Speaker.

This does not apply to the Crown Corporations. They did not go out and sell stock, all over this province, in the Crown Corporations. That capital came out of the capital account of the Province of Saskatchewan. It is right in the Public Accosts. It tells you exactly where it came from. Well then, the obvious question is this: where did the province get the capital from? Well, if you look at the Public Accounts, all the capital in the Province of Saskatchewan is borrowed, and interest is paid on it. It is obtained by the sale of debentures, and, therefore, every cent that is put into Crown Corporations is money from the capital account of the province on which interest is paid, and I can not see, for the life of me, how anybody can justify the fact that the Crown Corporations should not pay interest.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask my hon. friend a question? One of the financial statements I quoted from the other day was the C.B.C. Surely my hon. friend would not consider that risk capital! That was money which was put up by the Federal Government, for the people of Canada. The people of Canada had their money invested in the C.B.C. and there is no interest set aside. Any return from the C.B.C. is simply a dividend for the people of Canada, plus the service.

Mr. Maher: — I will say this to the hon. Premier. The C.B.C. is something like your Power Corporation. It is a public utility; it is not a corporation for the C.C.F.

Premier Douglas: — They have not got any profits to boast about. They lost \$80 million.

Mr. Tucker: — The C.B.C. is a public utility.

Premier Douglas: — You mean if they lost money, they are a public utility.

Mr. Maher: — Now, if you charge interest on this 3½ per cent basis on the \$8 million which they have invested, it will show definitely, with a profit of \$184,000, that the loss of the Crown Corporations which this government must accept the responsibility for, is \$96,000; in other words, \$280,000 interest and the profit is \$184,000, which leaves \$96,000.

That is not all that I criticize the Crown Corporations about. It is rather interesting to note, and I noticed this last year, although I did not know too much about it. One thing this Government Finance Office has never done and that is make a provision for some of those corporations that have the misfortune to go out of business. Now so far, there have been three of them go out — I refer to the Fish Board, the Tannery and the Shoe factory . . .

Mr. Tucker: — The very 'improvident children.'

Mr. Maher: — Now, if you will take the supplementary estimates of this province that were brought down last year, you will find that out of the revenue from the taxpayers of this province — Education Tax, Public Revenue Tax — we estimated for \$520,000 and some odd dollars to clean up the accumulated deficits of the Fish Board, Tannery and Shoe Factory. Now that came out of the revenues of the Province of Saskatchewan, not out of the Crown corporations at all. In other words, if you take (and I am trying to be as fair as I can about this) interest charges on the \$8 million and switch it to Crown Corporations which this Government is responsible for, it is \$280,000, and if you take this \$520,000 to more or less throw out the Fish Board, Tannery and the Shoe Factory, there is \$800,000, according to the statement for the last fiscal year, that was taken out of the revenues of the Province of Saskatchewan, and the total profit only amounted to \$183,000 or \$185,000 on their operations.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker — I have not had a chance to dig this up; but certain provisions had to be made to look after the capital assets of these corporations and they were put in under "Natural Resources and Industrial Development — chargeable to capital" — there is \$260,000 there. Now that did not come out of the revenue, but all the assets of the Tannery, Shoe Factory and the Fish Board were transferred to the capital of the province, at (the question was asked, last year) the book value. Now I am sure, unless the Government of the province finds somebody to operate a tannery, they are certainly not going to get the book value out of the equipment, the machinery that is in the building of the Tannery. They may do all right on the lands, but for the life of me, if they could not make money on the Tannery, I do not know who else could make it.

I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree with me that actually the Crown Corporations of this province are dismal failures. I can not see how there is much future in them. However, I would like to discuss briefly a few of the ones that are losing money. Let us have a look at them. I think it is in the interest of this House to examine these things and see what the individual picture is.

I have here the Sodium Sulphate plant. Now the Sodium Sulphate plant, last year, according to this statement of March 31, 1950, showed a profit of \$15,000, but they have invested in the Sodium Sulphate plant \$1,113,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the return on the investment in the Sodium Sulphate plant is less than two per cent.

Let us have a look at the Brick Factory. Now the loss, for last year, was \$40,984; but in addition to that there was an accumulated deficit of \$69,265.42. In other words, the total deficit of the brick factory, as at December 31, 1949, is \$69,265. Now the hon. Premier, in 'Mind your own Business' told us that they had a loss for 1950, and they have invested \$400,000 of the people of Saskatchewan's money, and as he said in that 'Mind your own Business', "We are going to put another \$400,000 into it to see if we can make any profit, or pick up some of that loss."

Premier Douglas: — Is my hon. friend disagreeing with that?

Mr. Maher: — Yes, I am. I will tell you about that in a minute.

Now the Woollen Mills — another little problem. Their loss for the fiscal year, 1949, was \$77,600, and their accumulated deficit, Mr. Speaker, up to December 31, 1949 (that's a year ago last December was \$225,000 on an investment of \$788,000. In other words, a third of the investment has been thrown down the drain, and they are still losing money. The hon. Premier mentioned in this 'Mind your own Business' that they are putting more money in there, too, to try and keep that ship from sinking.

One thing I would just like to mention is the Printing Office. Now the printing office made \$36,000, but last year, an answer to a question that was asked in this Legislature said the printing office only had one customer. Well now, surely, if the Government feels that they have enough printing to do in all the various departments, and they want to set up a printing press, that should be on the same basis as the shops they have to repair, say, their machinery and equipment. I can not, for the life of me, see how a printing office where the only customer is the Government can be classed as a Crown Corporation.

Premier Douglas: — It surely can not lose money anyway.

Mr. Maher: — No, it certainly can't.

Now, the Premier has asked if I agree with a few of these things, and what should be done. Now I am not a Socialist, but I am going to suggest what I think should be done. In regard to these Crown Corporations, particularly those ones that are losing money and are serving no purpose and which are sapping the financial strength of this province and are gradually increasing the tax burden on the people of this province, I think that in order to decide what should be done about them, one should probably go back and examine the function of a government, whether it be on a municipal level or provincial level or federal level, and I have outlined my own ideas. No doubt a lot of people won't agree with me. I am going to suggest that the functions of a provincial government are as follows: first, to govern the province; second, to make laws that are in the best interests of all its citizens; third, to provide and give service to our citizens, which in the opinion of that government can be provided by public enterprise and utilities; fourth, to provide a decent standard of living for those unfortunate people who are unable to do so for themselves, which should include the sick and the aged; fifth, tax the people of the province to pay for such services are deemed necessary.

Now, looking at it on that basis I would suggest first, the Power Corporation and the Telephones be put back where they belong, to be operated as public utilities of this province.

Premier Douglas: — That is how they are operated.

Mr. Maher: — No, they are not. They are operated for the benefit of the surpluses. Instead of going into the Government Finance Office, the surpluses should be used for the reduction in cost of the utilities, and also for the expansion of services to many of the remote areas of this province.

Premier Douglas: — That is exactly what we are doing.

No, you are not. There are profits in it. You are not taking the profits and putting them in for the expansion of services. You are taking the profits and putting them in the Government Finance Office — it is right there, if you read the statement; there is no argument about it. I would go on a little further than this — and I will give the Government a certain amount of credit. I would take such utilities as are providing service. I'll give the Government credit that, now that all private operators of buses in this province have gone, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company should be continued; the same with the Government Airways in the north. But they should be operated on a proper basis, on the same basis as the Power Corporation is operated — charging interest, and paying, in addition to that, municipal taxation, and put it on a proper basis and let any surplus from your Saskatchewan Transportation Company, particularly, be used for two purposes: for the expansion of bus lines to places in the province that have not any facilities, and secondly, for the reduction of costs of transportation.

Well then, that brings us down to what is left — the big losers. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, (I am sorry the Premier had to leave), I would throw the whole caboodle of them out the window.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — We know that.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): —And the people know it, too.

Mr. Maher: — All of these corporations that are losing money, like the woollen mill and so on, I do not think they are of any value to this province at all. I would suggest that, if the Government did things like this and got this economy back on a proper basis, this province would progress and we would have greater amounts of capital to provide employment for the people of this province.

I would just like to quote one thing that was in the Toronto 'Telegram' some time ago:

"Statements from the Department of Trade and Commerce on the establishment of new formed companies in Canada since the war show that, in relation to population, Saskatchewan has the lowest expansion of any province. Out of all the Canadian total of 1,031 new manufacturing firms in the last five years, Saskatchewan has only 12. Total employment reported — 41,399; Saskatchewan — just 393. The only provinces with fewer companies, both with smaller population, are Newfoundland with 7 firms employing 162 workers, and Prince Edward Island with none at all."

The quotation goes on, but I think I will just read the last phrase:

"Considering Saskatchewan is the fourth largest province from the population standing, it would appear to be a reasonable conclusion that overseas industrialists are somewhat doubtful about the benefits of setting up shop in the only province with a C.C.F. socialistic government."

February 13, 1951

Premier Douglas: — May I ask what my hon. friend what he is quoting from?

Mr. Maher: — The Toronto 'Telegram'. I have not got the exact date. I can get it.

Premier Douglas: — A good Tory paper.

Mr. Maher: — Yes, it is a good Tory paper, but the facts are there. There is no propaganda in that. It just gives you the facts.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but he still has not answered my question. I wanted to know if he is in favour of closing the Sodium Sulphate plant at Chaplin and the Brick Factory at Estevan.

Mr. Maher: — As far as I am concerned, hon. Premier, as I said when you were out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member answered while you were out.

Premier Douglas: — Sorry, I was called out.

Mr. Maher: — I will answer it again. This is my own individual view on it — it may or may not be the view of the Liberal Party, but I will take the responsibility myself. As far as those particular plants are concerned, I would throw them out the window. I do not want any misunderstanding about this as far as I am concerned.

Now, I have said all I want to say on Crown Corporations. I would like to say just a word on rural electrification and then I will sit down. I want to congratulate the Power Corporation, or thank them for extending the power into the village of Meota. You know it was said during the by-election that, if that, if they elected me, there would be no power in Meota, and I am very pleased that this Government had the plans all made and that the power is now a fact in the village of Meota. I think the people of Meota appreciate that very much and I think it is a worthwhile service.

I also welcomed the Bill forecast in the Speech from the Throne on the question of assisting farmers with the cost of putting in power. My constituency has a lot of small farms, and I think any assistance they can get will certainly be appreciated. I do believe, and I believe this sincerely, that power should go to the farmer's door, and that before we have a progressive speedier power development in this province, or rural electrification, that will be necessary. At the same time I give the Government credit for what they have done.

I do believe these Crown Corporations in this province are doing a great deal of damage. I will leave that thought with you, Mr. Speaker. You will no doubt agree that I am not supporting the motion.

Mr. Niles L. Buchanan (Notekeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take any time in extending all the congratulations previous members before me extended to various people in this House and outside of it, but I do want to sincerely congratulate the late member for Gravelbourg (E.M. Culliton) on his promotion to the Bench. This affects me very strongly, and I am very sincere in it because it will make winning my seat much easier in the next election campaign.

I have as usual listened to speeches this Session, and particularly speeches made on the Opposition side of the House. I notice that many of the members who came here just two years ago for the first time, are settling in their seats and they are becoming quite able on their feet, which is no easy task in this House. It is much easier to talk out on the hustings where you can say things and get away with it than you can say things here this House when your opposite number is facing you. However, I enjoyed speech of the member for Cannington (Mr. R.A. McCarthy). I enjoyed it very much. You know, I have a certain reverence for grey hair and I have a lot of respect for men such as he; but to hear coming from such a man such a comedy of errors as he just displayed, such a vast panorama of opposites as he tried to give us, gives one reason to doubt. On the one hand he was complaining about higher taxes. He said (and I wish he were in his seat because I may misquote him), that there were some people in his constituency complaining about higher taxes, especially school taxes, and he dwelt upon this to some extent. Then he switched right around and bemoaned the fact that we were short of teachers and that we were not spending enough money on education.

Now, I would commend for his reading and for the reading of all ore opposite, the Cronkite-Britnell-Jacobs report, particularly in respect to this very problem of education. You know, coming from a Liberal criticizing the C.C.F. for what they are doing with respect to education, it sounds very funny indeed. I was a teacher in this province under the Liberal Government. I was a teacher in this province from 1928 to 1940, and I went through those depression years. I wonder if, in order to get more teachers in the classroom, he would do what the Liberal Government did in 1936. I wonder if he would suggest that they should cancel all municipal taxes so that the teachers would have no security for their back pay. I taught that year, Mr. Speaker, one of the schools in Saskatchewan. I taught it during the entire year for the huge sum of \$10 in cash. Now, Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That is quite a high pay for you.

Mr. Buchanan: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the backlog of things such as this that we are paying for today. It is not only the backlog of those depression years that drove many of us out of the teaching profession never to return, but it has done other things too which they are suffering for all over the North American continent — and that is the backlog of marriages. Mr. Speaker, during those years young people coming up just could not afford to gat married and then right after the depression came the war — well, in fact the war ended the depression and young men went into uniform and so they had to postpone their marriage plans once again. Then, too, business picked up following the war and there was a huge demand for young girls in offices in the cities and different places in the province, not only here in Saskatchewan, but all over the United States and the rest of the Dominion of Canada.

Now, if we want to increase our certificated teachers, there is one way we can do it and there is only one way, unless the Opposition would suggest that we draft people into the teaching service and freeze them there once they get there. If they would suggest that, well, that might be a solution. But, there is only one solution, one practical solution, and that is to raise wages and make their profession more secure. Mr. Speaker, I have an aunt who is teaching in Seattle, in the state of Washington, United States. She is teaching a primary grade. She visited us during her holidays, last summer, and she is being paid \$6,800. They only have nine teaching months in the year and we have 10, and she is being paid \$6,800 for teaching what amounts to grade 2 in our schools in this province.

Just to pick out some special thing or some special spot, or even some province and criticizing from there and there only, is definitely unfair. The only way that fair criticism can be made is by taking into consideration the entire picture. The Cronkite-Britnell report does that. It takes the five western provinces, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, and, among other things, it compares the provinces' financial responsibility towards education. Here we have a statement taken from page 22 of the interim report:

"In 1921 the municipal government paid \$9.02 million or 82.1 per cent of education costs, whereas the Provincial Government paid \$2 million or 17.9 per cent. In 1926, the province over 23 per cent of the cost of local education, but in the early '30's the province's contribution had fallen back to approximately 21 per cent of the total. And in 1949 the province's contribution amounted to slightly over one-third of the total education costs."

In other words, the Province's contribution today is higher than it has ever been in the history of Saskatchewan, whether it was a Liberal Government, a Conservative Government or a C.C.F. Government.

Now going on and quoting further from this report, Mr. Speaker — and I would like the hon. members opposite to read this report, to study it. You know, they have said these things so often, have criticized this Government so often for not playing fair to the municipalities, not paying enough money out to education and so on, that sitting here I began to believe it. Members of this Committee that prepared this report even believed it. Why, on page 2, at the very beginning of their report they say:

"The allegation that municipalities are overburdened and that land is overtaxed have been examined with great care. The result of the investigation has been somewhat of a surprise to the Committee for it has been found that in no sense can it be found that real property in the average municipality is being overtaxed, either absolutely or relatively under present conditions. It is very doubtful if the tax burden on real property has been lighter at any period during the last three decades than at the present time."

Let hon. members opposite put that in their pipe and smoke it. Let them challenge the report that these three men have prepared.

Premier Douglas: — Why don't you go on and quote it?

Mr. Buchanan: — "In Saskatchewan" to quote further from this report:

"In Saskatchewan, to a greater extent than in any other province the production is restricted to agricultural resources, and assessment on land forms a relatively high percentage of total assessments. It must be expected, therefore, that the taxes collected locally for education against land assessments would form a relatively higher percentage of total expenditure on education than in any other province. Among the three prairie provinces, however, Alberta actually has the highest municipal education levy. In the light of the Saskatchewan Government's limited taxation basis the per capita provincial expenditure by government, by way of grants and services compared to the municipal levy compares favourably with. Alberta. In Manitoba, municipal education levy forms a greater percentage of total government education expenditures than in the case of either of the other two provinces."

The hon. member also suggested that in order to increase these teachers, certificated teachers, and decrease the number of student teachers, that we should offer grants for scholarships and, Mr. Speaker, this is being done. It is being made possible for young men and young women in the province to go on into institutions of higher learning to a greater extent than ever before in the history of the province.

He suggests that the Regina Normal School be reopened. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the use of opening a school if there are no students? We might open a Normal School here in Regina and the result would only have a very small number of students attending this school and the one at Moose Jaw. Yet the overhead expense would practically be the same as though the Normal School were full, and no great advantage obtained from it. In the same breath he suggests that we are taxing the people too heavily. Well, you just simply can not have your cake and eat it. As I said before — a vast panorama of opposites. School grants, should be greatly increased. Well, Mr. Speaker, I go on to the Cronkite report again and I read further, on page 28:

"With the revenues presently available your Committee is unable to recommend that a larger share of provincial revenue should be devoted to education."

I wonder if he read that. I wonder if hon. members opposite read that.

Mr. Egnatoff: — May I ask a question?

Mr. Buchanan: — I won't promise to answer it.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I would like to know whether my hon. friend agrees that the province should not pay any higher school, grants.

Mr, Speaker, that is a fair question: whether I agree that the province should not pay any increase in school grants to education or not. I want to answer it by stating that if and when more revenues are available, I believe that education should absorb a continually expanding portion of our provincial budget; but I also agree with this report where in it states, "With the revenues presently available your Committee is unable to recommend that a larger share of provincial revenue should be devoted to education."

To go on with this report. We have been criticized for attempts we have been making to equalize educational opportunities through the equalization grant. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1944 when we put out our little Manifesto, stating, among other things in those nine points, that we should seek to provide equal education for every child in the province? We maintained at that time, Mr. Speaker, that it was beyond the power of a provincial government in a province such as Saskatchewan is, to provide absolutely equal educational opportunities. We maintained that education should be a responsibility borne by the individual, by the municipalities, by the province and by the federal authorities, because an educated child is first an asset to himself and to his parents, secondly to the community in which he lives, thirdly to the province, and last, but not least, to the nation as a whole.

The only time that this principle was ever recognized in our history was in time of war. Previous to that, education had a price-tag on it. If a boy's father could afford to buy him an education, he stepped out and made him a doctor, a druggist, a lawyer, or what have you. The child whose parents could not afford to put him through University and give him the necessary training required, did not have the same opportunity as other sons. But in 1939, the war came along. I hope I won't bore hon. members opposite by repeating a story that I mentioned some years ago in this Legislature, about a boy I happened to know who wrote his grade 12 exams in 1910. The day after he wrote his exams he was so convinced that he would pass that he hitch-hiked to Saskatoon and joined the Air Force. They did not ask him whether his father had the necessary money to provide him with a navigator's qualifications. The only thing they asked him was, "Have you got the ability to learn?" He had the ability and he learned. He became a navigator. He navigated two tours of duty over the European continent, over Hitler's Europe. He made it possible for the bombardiers in his ship to drop down bombs to destroy the cities of Europe. At the time that he received his navigator's wing, it was estimated that it cost \$28,000 to train a navigator. It was also estimated at that particular time that the average life of service that they would receive for that \$28,000 was one hour in action. But, we in Canada (myself included) believed it to be necessary to expend that amount of money in training those navigators, in training our pilots and all the rest of the necessary armed forces that we needed at that particular time, and so we did not hesitate to put up the money. We did not hesitate to open the way so that these boys, regardless of their homes, regardless of the financial position of their parents, could go to the very highest rank and give to their country the very best that was in them.

Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. so far is the only party in Canadian politics that carries this principle into its peace-time administration of affairs of government. The Britnell report goes on to say:

"Whatever may be said about the principle of equalization in general, your Committee is prepared to concede it in the matter of education. What is meant is this. It should be an aim of public policy to see to it that all children have reasonable opportunities for acquiring an education. It seems fairly clear that the Saskatchewan government has adopted this principle to a considerable degree. The real solution of equalization problems lies in the assumption that a substantial measure of responsibility by the government of Canada. This solution was, in substance, recommended by the Sirois report. The implementation of this report should be pressed for by all concerned."

I ask, by members of the Opposition as well as by members of this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on speaking at considerable length about education. Education has always been very close to my heart. I spent a considerable number of years as a student in the classroom and later as an instructor in the classroom, and then again as an instructor in the parade square. I believe that all people in positions of public responsibility should throw aside political ideologies when it comes to making possible the handing on of those great truths learned by the great people of the world to our children, to the generation that is going to be sitting in our seats here in the future who are going to be taking a lead all over this country. And to get up, as the member for Cannington did, and speak from a purely parochial point of view, is not enough, not nearly enough: complaining about higher taxes on the one hand and the shortage of certificated teachers on the other. You know, Mr. Speaker, in 1920 and 1923 I went to school, in the primary grades, to an uncertificated teacher, the result of the first Great War, of the same situation as exists today, only today it is terrifically augmented to what it was in those days.

To go on, Mr. Speaker, I have only two or three pages of this report that I want to touch upon. Another one is, our promise in 1944 to do what we could to bring about medical, dental and hospital services irrespective of the ability of the individual to pay. True happiness of the individual, or of the community, cannot be attained without good health. That is one of the first things that our teacher taught us in our health class in grade 4 when I went to school. One of the first things that I learned about health was that a sick person cannot be truly happy, and so a government that has the welfare and the happiness of its people at heart must devote a considerable amount of its energies, and a considerable amount of its revenue, to promotion of good health among its people.

What has this government done? What does this report show that government has done? When we came to office in 1944, we found that provision of health was largely on the shoulders of the individual and municipalities. We found that there was not nearly enough hospital facilities to serve the population. We found that we had a shortage of doctors, a shortage of nurses, shortage of druggists, a shortage of dentists and everything else that goes to make up a good health programme for the community. The number of Union Hospitals in this province has been increased greatly in recent years. The report goes on to say:

"In 1944 there were 26 Union Hospitals in Saskatchewan. At the end of 1949 there were 164. The expenditures made by the Saskatchewan Provincial Government on public health and welfare are large, both absolutely and relatively, that is, as compared with other provinces."

In the report is a table showing the relative expenditures on health between those five western provinces mentioned before — British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario — in 1947-48. British Columbia in that year spent \$16,495,000 on health; Alberta, \$8,236,000; Saskatchewan, \$14,335,000; Manitoba, \$4,507,000; Ontario, \$31,103,000.

Breaking this down on a per capita basis, which is more easily understood: British Columbia spent \$15.79 per capita; Alberta, \$10.02 per capita; Saskatchewan, \$17.02; Manitoba, \$6.06; Ontario \$7.41. Saskatchewan spent \$1.23 more than one of the richest provinces in Canada, Ontario. Saskatchewan spent \$17.02, British Columbia \$15.79. And that is not the whole picture. Let us take a look at the budget, and compare the expenditure on health and health services with the over-all net budget of these different provinces: British Columbia, 19.4 per cent; Alberta, 21.1 per cent; Saskatchewan, 34.1 per cent; Manitoba 17.4 per cent; Ontario, 16.6 cent. So, in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, these figures alone prove that the emphasis is placed on health in this province, where it should be. On page 23 of the report for 1947 and 1948:

"Saskatchewan provincial expenditure for general health services was twice the average on a per capita basis of the other four western provinces. Provincial hospital grants in Saskatchewan greatly exceed such grants in other provinces. The Saskatchewan expenditures for 1949-50 were \$3.75 per capita, or approximately four times the Alberta and Manitoba average. In 1947-48, Saskatchewan expenditures on construction grants to hospitals was approximately on a par with Ontario and British Columbia. Manitoba and Alberta had no construction grants in 1947-48, Saskatchewan expenditures on mother's allowances were double the average of the other four provinces. In 1947-48, Saskatchewan Social Aid Service was 40 per cent above the average of the other four provinces and 50 per cent greater than Manitoba and Alberta average. The expansion of provincial government activities in the field of public health and welfare has relieved the municipalities of financial responsibility in a considerable measure."

Yet the hon. member for Cannington says we should make higher grants to education, that we should lower the burden of municipal taxation on the municipality and we should increase the services generally and decrease our taxes particularly. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — On a point of privilege, the hon. member is attributing statements to me that I have not made.

Mr. Buchanan: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that statement and say that the context of the member's statements was to decrease political revenues and increase provincial services.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, that is better.

Mr. Buchanan: — Well, he is fortunate. He has never sat on the Government side of the House. It is very easy to tear down on one side and then go to work and tear down the other; but it takes a real man and a real government to build on both sides of the picture. This reply — this statement (the Britnell report), the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, does that, and with these short words I want to declare to this House that I will support the motion.

Mr. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom in this House for some years to extend congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. At this particular Session of the Legislature I take great pride in extending to the member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe), and to the member from Elrose (Mr. Willis) my congratulations for the very excellent job which they have done in the moving and seconding of the Address in Reply.

I think I should also extend congratulations to the hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) for the down-to-earth address he gave to this Assembly. I was very hopeful, as a result of that address, that it would set the pattern for the addresses that we might hear from the members sitting to your left. However, as soon as the member from Wilkie took his seat the train seemed to have left the track and, up to the moment, has not been brought back upon the main line.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss the member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton). He is a very congenial chap, a very likeable personality and one who did, in my opinion, contribute to the public life of the province of Saskatchewan. We are naturally very hopeful that in his new sphere service to the public of this province and to the Dominion of Canada, his success will be equivalent to, if not greater than, what they were in the political arena of the province of Saskatchewan. You know, there are some of us who do appreciate when the train leaves the track and the ship is anchored in harbour.

Might I, Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.35 o'clock p.m.