

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**18th Day**

**Monday, February 26, 1951.**

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

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Friday, February 23, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

**Mr. Wm. T. Lofts (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this budget debate, I would first like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer on the smooth way in which he brought this budget down to us, and I would also like to congratulate the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) for the part he took in the debate as critic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the short time I have on the air I will use most of it in pertaining to the constituency of Meadow Lake. I will not take up Federal matters or stuff that has gone past here.

Speaking on the budget, Mr. Speaker, I quite realize it is quite a job, and it makes a lot of difference to the taxpayers if they are going to get any more services or not in their constituencies. I would touch upon some of the most important things — roads, telephones and rural electrification.

Mr. Speaker, you will realize that the constituency of Meadow Lake is a constituency which has to be built up. The roads and bridges that were built years ago are now worn out. They were built 'way back in the 1930's and before, and they are not up to the standard today in order to handle the heavy traffic we have. Speaking on the highways, I would like to take a little time in discussing the highways in the area of Meadow Lake itself, that is to say, if No. 3 was built and gravelled connecting it with No. 26, it would be a wonderful help for that particular part of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this road was built and gravelled it would take in many villages and hamlets, such as South Makwa, North Makwa, Loon Lake, Rapid View, Golden Ridge, Roleau Park, Four Corners and Goodsoil. All of these villages and hamlets are inland, Mr. Speaker, and as Meadow Lake is the end of the steel, it is the only possible means for these people from these villages and hamlets which I have mentioned, and the farmers, to reach rail to get a market for their livestock and their produce from the farm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Meadow Lake was settled up you may say all the way from 1928 all through the 'hungry '30's'. The people went in and homesteaded and made the best of everything. They have got along with the roads they had, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways — and I have no doubt that he has had letters (I know I have copies of many) and has had delegations, too — must realize the serious condition that these roads are in.

**February 26, 1951**

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another most important road. That is what we call the Green Lake road, and at times in the summer it is impassable. This road not only services the community of Green Lake, but I would say, Mr. Speaker, this road is a gateway to the north, and when I say the 'gateway to the north', it takes in the Athabasca constituency. All foodstuff, clothing, etc., including the mail, has to go up over that road, and all the fish that these people have to sell has to come down that road. Not only that, it makes a direct connection between Meadow Lake and Prince Albert, and is the only short route to reach that particular point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will come down close to my own constituency to that No. 55 Highway of which I spoke last year, and spoke of here a few nights ago in a short brief, which I am going to put a little more emphasis on this time.

No. 55, as the Highway Minister knows, is a connection between Shellbrook and Glaslyn, that is No. 40 Highway to No. 4. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, in the years when No. 55 is completed, you will see it is a route from Edmonton to Prince Albert through that northern part of the constituency and it goes through so many towns and services so many farmers (this is such a large mixed area) and is the only means, on account of the poor train service, for these farmers to deliver their livestock to the market. Take a little further south in Rabbit Lake, Mr. Speaker, where the district has been settled for a considerable time: they are not complaining badly, but they are complaining. The town and district of Rabbit Lake have no gravel road outlet whatever. Rabbit Lake is situated in a corner where it snows in early in the fall and the road is impassable in the spring. Now these people of Rabbit Lake and district pay the same car licences, the same car insurance and they can only operate their cars approximately half the time the people do in Regina, Saskatoon or anywhere else. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that these people are getting a fair break. I think the Minister should give serious consideration to this and try and get them a gravelled road out. In the year 1950, Mr. Speaker, we had no open truck route whatever, and, as I said before, we in that constituency have very poor train service. I would hate to be forced to the conclusion that the "stimulation" has anything to do with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am on highways, I do not want to forget to thank the Minister of Highways for the approximately seven miles that we got gravelled on No. 55. I am speaking on behalf of the people in that district and I convey their thanks to him for that particular piece of road which we had gravelled in 1950. I would also like to thank the Minister of Highways for the snow removal programme. After the storm there, I got a phone call this morning that it is not so good, but I feel sure that they will take care of it. I would also like to extend my congratulations to Mr. Stevens, our district engineer, and the snowplow men who have kept our road open. I think we owe them thanks and I am speaking on behalf of the people in that constituency.

I would like to take a few moments to deal with telephones. They tell us of the vast progress which was made, which no doubt is right, and of so many new hook-ups. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be quite all right where these new hook-ups are made and the service extended, but I assure you that we have no service like that in the north. That does not help us at all, when this was brought down and told to us, unless we get a little service out of it. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a little more assistance in setting up rural telephone companies. I will say, Mr. Speaker,

that we have 10 families on the rural phone in the constituency of Meadow Lake, and I am sure that if some of them were given a little assistance or a little aid in setting up, they would have had more.

Just a little on long distance service: I do not say this takes in the whole part of the constituency, but most of it. Our long distance service is poor. You will wait as long as two or three hours in order to get a long distance call through to North Battleford, Regina, Saskatoon or wherever it may be, and I strongly urge the Minister of this Department, Mr. Speaker, to use some of the huge profits that they say have been made out of these telephones to extend a little service to us in the north. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the telephone was taken over by the Government, not as a profit-making enterprise but as a service.

I would like to take a little while, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the rural electrification, of which we have none at all you may say, excepting about 8 or 10 miles west of Meadow Lake, which I think the hon. Minister is well acquainted with, and for which I would like to convey to him the thanks of the people in that community. I am sure they appreciate it. But this is the same thing as the telephones. It was taken over years ago – for service, not for profit. The people in the Meadow Lake constituency pay taxes and are just as patriotic as anybody anywhere else, and I feel that they should have a little consideration, and that they should put in lines there rather than better-paying lines some place else. I do not know if this is the case or not, but speaking for the people of the Meadow Lake constituency, I believe they should have some consideration. They have the Power Commission in the east there, and it could be extended along Highway No. 55 right through, which would take in a number of towns which I have mentioned before in this House, right on through to Turtleford. I have a letter here, and I think the hon. Minister of that particular Department has a copy of it. Take the town of Spiritwood where they have built a wonderful hospital for themselves, one of the best, and they built it mostly by themselves. Their light bill, last year, was in the neighbourhood of \$1,500 for just the hospital. They also have a very expensive X-ray machine which requires the best of power. Myself, Mr. Speaker, I have operated a light plant in the little village of Glaslyn, I think since the year of 1927, and I would be only too glad to discontinue it if the Power Commission would come in there, just to give my customers the service they require, at less cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am on this budget – we quite realize that this money is quite a proposition and I quite realize the task our hon. Finance Minister has; but I would like to take a little time in discussing the Big River sawmill. The Big River sawmill is a very nice mill, I visited the mill last summer, Mr. Speaker, and the machinery and the setup I do not think can be compared even on the west coast. It is a wonderful bit of machinery. I understand that they started to build this in the fall of 1949, and I am not just sure if it is ready to operate yet or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking through Public Accounts, you will realize in the next few years the large sum of money that has been spent on this mill. During one trip up to Meadow Lake I saw an advertisement in the Meadow Lake “Progress” under date of August 17, 1950, where Big River, “A” division, Saskatchewan Forest Products, were inviting tenders for a logging contract, No. 2, where they called for tenders for 32 million feet over a period of five years. Members on both sides of the House will remember that, last year, in the Committee room when we discussed the Big River mill, the hon. Minister

**February 26, 1951**

of Natural Resources (who I do not think had all to do with the start of this sawmill) told us they had two million two hundred and some odd thousand feet landed in the north, on Cowan Lake. Since this, during the summer weather, these logs have been rafted down to the mill at Big River, and, on account of the mill not being in operation I guess they threw it in the lake, but analyzing a contract for 30 million feet over five years, which is approximately between six and seven million feet per annum, I do not think it takes that huge sum of money to log such a small amount of feet. I will do it myself, and I think there are a lot of other mill operators in the north would take \$20,000 and cut that total amount of feet for half the price that it is going to cost our Government to do it.

This large sum of money – as one fellow referred to it, the other day, and I didn't particularly agree with him; but he said, "Bill, you have got a 'million-dollar baby' sitting up there on tripods underneath a tin roof in Big River." I did not agree with him, Mr. Speaker, but that is what he said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the money that has been put into this Big River mill – I don't say it is lost, but I just doubt if we ever get it back. You take that same money and use it in a constituency, say Shellbrook, where the Big River mill is, and I think it would have built a lot of roads or power lines in the Shellbrook constituency – or maybe in the Meadow Lake. I think it is too bad that the money has been put in there when there is so little timber to be cut. For example now, I think the hon. Minister of Natural Resources and the Government as a whole are quite familiar with this fact. There is a mill operating in the Green Lake area which is operated privately, and has been operating for the past number of years. They have done a very good job and have cut just about approximately as much per annum as the Government is asking its big mill to cut, without any expense to the Government at all. Now, why I say they have done a good job is because I was at a meeting in Meadow Lake one time when the former Minister of Natural Resources donated a \$100 prize – I am not sure if it was \$100; but he gave this operator first prize for being the best operator in that district. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that a privately-owned mill can operate for \$20,000 less, and cut the same timber, per annum, as this Big River mill is going to cut.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You are a long way out on your figures.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Lofts:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said last year, the Meadow Lake constituency is mostly in the L.I.D's, as you all know, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, I think the L.I.D's have done a pretty good job in the Meadow Lake constituency. I will grant you that they did not satisfy everybody – nobody can; but I will assure you that any time that I approached their officer or their administrator, he was only too willing to co-operate with me. He put in roads and some were expensive roads – probably he did not do them all; but I think, on the whole, he did a pretty good job.

I was also very pleased to notice that the Minister of Education was going to extend a little more assistance to aid us to operate the schools in the north. Now, Mr. Speaker, talking about the operation of schools, that is quite a task. We are up against increased teachers' salaries, increased janitors' costs, building is high, and we are up against quite a difficult problem; but since the Minister of Education has seen ways to grant us a

little more money, I am sure we should thank him for that on behalf of the school unit.

Teachers' salaries today are quite a problem. They are wanting, and I think they are entitled to, an increase in salaries, as well as anybody else, and it is one task to sit on a school board and meet those obligations without penalizing the taxpayer of your particular municipality, or wherever they may be. My experience in setting taxes, and especially under the conditions we have been through this year, is that the more you assess a farmer or a taxpayer, as a whole, the less taxes as a whole you will collect. So it has been our aim, Mr. Speaker, to keep our mill rate where it is and no higher; and if we receive a little further assistance, which the Minister of Education says we will be getting, it will help us in that particular problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stay on here for an hour talking about the affairs of my constituency, but as the time is limited I guess I will have to be concluding.

When considering the budget and the money that is being put in (I don't like to say wasted) to the Big River mill, from which I doubt if the taxpayer will ever receive any benefit.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It is not in this budget.

**Mr. Lofts:** — Speaking for the people of the Meadow Lake constituency, where they have no assurance as to any additional services, such as highways, telephones or rural electrification, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see my way clear to support the budget.

**Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell this Assembly where I come from and why I am here, because they all know – a great many of the Cabinet Ministers and 'big shots' came down there in 1948 to see that I did not get here any more. However, I might say that that was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, there has been something brought to my attention in regard to our Leader. One C.C.F. member said that we were not, on this side of the House, behind our Leader. I might say that we think a great deal of him and that we are behind him 100 per cent. I might say, also, that we had one of the outstanding citizens of this province taken away from this Assembly on his appointment to a judgeship. Mr. Culliton is one of the outstanding young men of our province; but I want to tell the government, that this appointment was not political; it was made on his merits.

Then, the other day, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier was speaking in the Throne Speech debate, he went out into foreign fields. He gave the foreign policies – and I believe his remarks were directed to the United Nations. I think there are about 60 or 70 members of that body, and I think probably that when they know the qualities and the qualifications of the hon. Premier probably they will ask him to come down there and help them out.

Then, the Minister of Natural Resources took upon himself to go after the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and myself for voting on

**February 26, 1951**

a certain resolution. I might say that the people of the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and the constituency of Arm River know that we are here to represent those people and we have to account to them for what we do, and I might say that it did not go against us very bad.

I might say also that the Minister of Agriculture, the other day, when he was speaking, brought in that wonderful, or that "terrible" fellow, Mr. 'Jimmie' Gardiner, the federal Minister of Agriculture. I might say that Mr. Motherwell in his day was a good Minister of Agriculture. I think he was outstanding at that time; but I want to say that the present Minister of Agriculture in the Federal Government has a great deal more to look after now than they had in those days, and I want to say that I consider the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner the best Minister of Agriculture that has ever been sent from any province to the Dominion Government. I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture that – that he forgot more than you ever knew.

**Premier Douglas:** — He forgot to keep his promise.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Now, then, the other day the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) branded us as a "disloyal Opposition." I want to tell him: You can't say a word about us, and I don't know anyone can – any too much. Maybe you weren't very disloyal. I don't know. But as far as I am concerned, you can't brand us as that, and, coming from a member of the opposite side, I think it is unbecoming. And I would say that the people of Canora will see to it next time that you are not returned.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — You want to come up to Canora.

**Mr. Dundas:** — He also said that the Liberals had to dig themselves into the foxholes. I think that after the next election he'll feel pretty small, and he'll go in a gopher hole. The Premier of the province and all his Cabinet Ministers all go around the province saying that the Liberals never keep their promises. I want to tell you that of all the promises that were made in 1943 and 1944 that were made by you people, you never kept all of them either. I want to tell you that there are a lot of promises that you haven't put into effect up to the present time. They tell everybody, you know, that taxes haven't gone up. I might say that since they came in, they put one cent gasoline tax on; then, when the Federal Government took off the three cents tax, this Government put another two cents on the tax. Then Motor licences and the truck licences are away up.

I might say, also, that I was talking to the Secretary of the Rural Telephone Company – the private phones in the rural part of my home town – and he said that the switching fees had gone up \$2.

The Minister of Agriculture put into effect a policy in 1949 that all implement dealers had to pay \$5. I don't know what they have to pay it for – the Government just want a little more money. In the town of Indian Head there are 11 implement dealers, and they got \$55 out of them. They got five out of my home town, and they will collect a lot of money. Well, now, I am going to say that, if they put any more such policies in we poor garage fellows and implement dealers will have to have a special stenographer. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that they have a man who comes around; I guess he is a 'heeler,' I don't know. They said that the Liberals and the Conservatives

had lots of heelers, but I think they have got more heelers than the two of them put together. This man came around, and I hadn't paid my \$5 – had forgotten about it I guess, and he reminded me that I owed \$5. I said, "I haven't got any money." "Well," he said, "You'll have to get the money someplace". So, I had to dig it up.

The Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) had a great deal to say about wheat, and never mentioned the use of hospitals whatsoever. I might say that his whole subject was wheat. I didn't hear it but I have been told that the Minister of Agriculture was speaking at a meeting in the fall and lamenting about the different spreads in the grades and he said, "Well, you'll get no more, you have had it." It must have been a terrible shock when they got the notice that there was another 20 cents increase in the initial payment. Yes, quite a shock; there'll be more shocks too. The Minister of Public Health mentioned that the United Grain Growers was just another line company. I might say that the United Grain Growers company in 1903 was started, when Mr. E.A. Partridge, from my home town, called Mr. Motherwell and Mr. John Miller at Indian Head, together, and they formed the Grain Growers Company. They advocated and got the platform to load their own wheat; they bought a seat on the Grain Exchange, and they started the Grain Growers Grain Company, and they did a great deal of good. I was one of the first ones in that district to subscribe to United Grain Growers' stock, and I have it yet. I might say, also, that the United Grain Growers Grain Company is now one of the best grain companies in existence. They have some 700 elevators in the three western provinces. In 1947, they bought 68 elevators in the province of Saskatchewan, and I am very proud of that. I was President of the Local of the United Grain Growers from Grenfell to Balgonie for some 8 or 9 years, and I might say that it is belittling for the Minister of Public Health to condemn the United Grain Growers Grain Company because it is one of the best companies . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I didn't condemn the United Grain Growers. I said they were opposed to the orderly marketing of grain.

**Mr. Dundas:** — No, I don't think so. I think that the United Grain Growers is one of the pioneers, and was started long before any other grain company.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Not in orderly marketing of grain.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Yes, they were in favour of it all the time, and I want to say that the United Grain Growers Company where there is an agent, is hard opposition, they are a company that I respect. When I was chairman of the committee, we had to have reports in regard to their activities, and a letter came one time and asked us if we were prepared to recommend that the Manitoba Pool buy the United Grain Growers' elevators. On that occasion we wrote that we did not think that it would be a good thing to sell those elevators. And they have expanded up to now, and are one of the outstanding grain companies of our province and our country. They have over 700 elevators in the three prairie provinces and I think that speaks well for them.

Now, I want to speak, Mr. Speaker, on highways – and I know something about highways, because I have built highways. I think the only two

**February 26, 1951**

members in this House that ever built highways are the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and myself. I don't think the present Minister of Highways ever built highways. I have told our party when they put in a lawyer and so forth as Minister of Highways, that they don't know very much about highways.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I was wondering who built those indentations down there.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Dundas:** — Now, how can the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) get any money for highways when in 1947, I think it was, the two Douglasses got about \$800,000 in their two seats to build blacktop and highways. I think that is right; probably it is a little bit more, but I am giving them the benefit of the doubt.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — You don't know; you are just guessing.

**Mr. Dundas:** — And, I might say, that in regard to roads, the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) said, the other day, that he was down No. 1 and it was a wonderful highway. Well, I think he must have gone down by airplane because No. 1 is not what you would call a very good highway, and the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) will back me up. I might say that I want to compliment the Minister of Highways for the Trans-Canada Highway that was started this summer, and I want to say that I couldn't figure it out why the Trans-Canada highway started at my home town and came to McLean. Can you tell me how that was? I want to thank you for that; that is a good highway.

**Premier Douglas:** — It probably started where you were building before.

**Mr. Dundas:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great controversy in regard to No. 56 Highway. When No. 56 was put into effect, the engineer came down and he had three roads that he went over. He went over the north road that they are figuring on putting in now. He said, "That's out of the question altogether because there are too many bridges and too many coulees." And then he said, "The other way is three miles east of Indian Head and down the Stevens' hill." Then, I came up to see the then Minister of Highways (I didn't see the engineer at that time) and I asked him if I could get the report of what the engineer had recommended. And he had recommended the road — No. 56, that is, at the present time. There is only one bridge between Indian Head and the valley. Rightly so, there is some .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — I hate to interfere with this gentleman's speech .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is it a point of privilege?

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — No, I just want to ask him a question. Did I understand you to say that I told you that the engineer had recommended the present No. 56?

**Mr. Dundas:** — No, no! I said the Minister of Highways at that time — Mr. Dunn.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry to interrupt.



**Mr. Dundas:** — No, no, not now. But, nevertheless, Indian Head is a town of 1,500, 1,600 or 1,700, and a town that has waterworks and sewage and has the facilities of the City of Regina. I said to Mr. Dunn that, as far as I was concerned, the road three miles east down the Stevens' hill was out of the question. As far as I am concerned, I think that the shortest road is as the road is now, by Katepwa. We have two summer resorts there that are second to none in the province. I might say that we built a road to the south summer resort there, and it is a good road. I might say that I, in my time, built quite a few roads in the province. We built No. 16; we built the road through the Indian Reservation; we built No. 56, and we built roads from Fort Qu'Appelle to B-Say-Tah Point and a great many roads, market roads, that have been built by the Liberal Government, and yet they say that the Liberal Government have done nothing in regard to roads.

We are here to discuss the budget, and I might say that the Provincial Treasurer made a good job of it; but he just went a little too far. He said that everything that the C.C.F. did was 100 per cent. Well, we have a right to our opinion and they have a right to theirs. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have a great deal in common in regard to the budget. It has always been my contention that if you get either a Liberal government or a Conservative government you get a stable government, but you get these 'fly-by-night' governments and you don't know what you have got — Socialism, Communism and Fascism and everything else. But you get the Conservatives or the Liberals, and you will get a stable government. And may I say that I predict (and I am a pretty good predictor) that after the next election, you won't be here. Now, you are laughing, but you watch out. We'll be around about that time.

I might say that I am 66 years old, and soon will be ready for the Old-Age Pension but still can hold my own in a campaign yet, but may I say in regard to Old-Age Pensions that I have always maintained that Old Age Pensions should have been on a contributory basis. I think everyone should contribute to their old age. I wouldn't say "old age" — I would call it "superannuation". This old-age pension — you know, I don't think that they should be called old fellows when they get to 70. We have lots of fellows down our way who are 90 and 92 and still going strong. But, I might say that they all support the Liberal candidate, and that's why they are so good and know what they are doing.

I want to say that a man, the father and the son-in-law had a section of land about 5 or 6 years ago and the father says to the young fellow, "I'll sell my half to you at so much and I'll buy your quarter." And he says, "Well, I'll buy your half at so much," and he thought he would come up to the loan company and get some money. So, he came up to the loan company from which he had bought this farm, and he thought he could get the money; but the manager of that company said, "No, I wouldn't lend any money now with this Government we have got in now." So the only loan company that is in existence now is the Federal Farm Loan Board. That is the only one, I think, that is lending any money at the present time. I am a great believer in young fellows starting on the land, and I might say that you can't get anyone to sell land now with this Government in power unless on a cash basis because they figure they are not very secure. And I think rightly so. But after the Liberals get in power it will start booming again, and the

**February 26, 1951**

young fellows will be able to get started. When I was a boy there were 12 in our family, and when I was 15 or 16 I pulled out from home and have been on my own ever since. That part of the country is one of the oldest that has been established. A great many people from the Old Country and from Ontario came there in 1882, and I might say my father came from Scotland and landed in Qu'Appelle in 1882. I was born in my constituency, and I think that I know my constituency better than anyone in this Legislature. I was defeated in 1944, but defeated the same candidate in 1948. I think that is pretty good, a pretty good feather in my hat. I might say that a great many of the members on the opposite side didn't like to see Mr. Burgess eliminated, but he told me the other day that he has got a better job and he is sure glad that I beat him.

In regard to the Budget I might say that you know I am Scotch, and I don't like spending money too freely. Then, too, sometimes I take a little drink, and I want to tell the Provincial Treasurer who has the Liquor Board under his control that a man told me that he bought some liquor and he put it out in his window to get cool and it was 40 below, and when he work up in the morning there was ice on it. You put too much water in it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in regard to Highways again, I would mention that it has been brought to my attention that the Indians should not be charged licences, that they should be charged a driver's licence; but the licence for them should be eliminated because it is a hardship on them and I think that your Department should take that into consideration. I think that the Indian – we took this country away from him – and in the early '30's I says, "How's chances to get a little money out of you" and he says, "Oh, I have no money. You know we gave you this country for nothing and now you are all broke." That was the early '30's, and I guess he was about right. But, nevertheless, I might say that I would like to leave that impression with the Minister of Highways that the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) said the members should get their licence off. I don't think so. I think that they should pay for them. But the Indian is a little different proposition.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Just the same thing.

**Mr. Dundas:** — In regard to the Indian I might say that I have a great deal to do with them and I would like to read a letter for the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. This is in regard to Indian ponies that they can't keep in their fences. This is a letter from the Montmartre Municipality:

"Herewith please find a resolution passed by this full council today of the Rural Municipality of Montmartre."

It is in regard to ponies, Indian ponies that they can't keep in the fence and which are getting out and destroying the people's crops. I might say that I took it up with the Mounted Police. They phoned me about it; the Indians had five or six horses and we tried to get them back into the fence or to put them in pound, but we couldn't catch them. I think that something should be done about that and I would so recommend to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I also saw the agent, and he said, "I can't do a thing, because we can't catch them." There are no fences to keep them in – only a page wire; and the Federal Government is not prepared to do it.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that any contribution that I have given to this Assembly today is given with good grace, and I am sure that after the next election we will be sitting there and you will be a thing of the past. However, in regard to the Budget, I think that since this Government came into power it has had good revenues. When we were in power \$11 million was the smallest we had – up to \$12 million in the '30's. Now it is \$60 million, \$70 million, \$80 million, and what you get from the Federal Government, and then it is not enough. But, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the budget, as I have to relinquish my time now because my colleague comes on at this time, and I must conclude, I want to tell the Minister of Natural Resources that I will vote as I think; he is not going to tell me how to vote, and I am going to vote against the budget.

**Mr. A.W. Loehr (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to join with those who have voiced their regrets at the sickness of our colleague, the member for Kinistino (Mr. Woods) and I might say that I had a letter just the other day and, reading between the lines, I got the impression that friend Bill is not so well and it is almost certain that we need not expect him to sit in this Legislature during the present Session. I also want to join my colleagues in voicing my appreciation of the work that our former colleague, the member for Gravelbourg, had done in this Legislature for the people of this province as a politician, as a public man, and I want to join in congratulating him on his appointment. We know and feel that we have a right to think and know that he is going to do his duties in his new position as well as he did in the past. I want to also congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer for the masterful way in which he delivered his budget and the smooth way that he attempted to sugar-coat the bitter pill.

Listening to the budget speech, I could not help but think back to the days when the C.C.F. were going up and down the province and promising the people this, that and the other thing “free”, and how they were going to improve the conditions for the people at no cost at all. They were talking about developing natural resources and getting a lot of revenue out of that and, in many ways, improving conditions at no cost to the people of the province. Listening to the Provincial Treasurer, I could not help but think back and think that, well, that does not seem to be the case any more and they have given that up. In fact, I was reminded of the pleasant occasion that I had, last fall, when I attended a board of trade luncheon at Humboldt at which the hon. Provincial Treasurer was the guest speaker. His subject at the time was “Cost of Government” and he held forth and told the board of trade about the cost of government and high prices. The whole subject of the speech was that no government could pay for anything for the people of their country or their province unless they had first collected the money, and big money. As time goes on and everything costs more, it will require more money. And I was amused at a seat-mate of mine who, in an undertone, whispered to me after the Provincial Treasurer had held forth a while, “Why, that man speaks my language, I always thought that we would never get anything free.”

My contribution to this debate will be very short, I hope, and I suppose you do, too. For one thing, I will try to stay entirely within the

**February 26, 1951**

bounds of this province in my discussions. We have listened during the Session so far to a lot of discussions that have no place in this Legislative Chamber at all, should not have been here.

The first item that I want to touch upon is again hospitalization. You will possibly remember that, two years ago, I discussed the hospitalization of this province at some length. I feel that I possibly contributed a little to the debate along that line and first of all I want to say that when the Hon. Premier got the hon. member for Gull Lake (Hon. Mr. Bentley) elected at the by-election and relinquished his portfolio as Public Health Minister to the newly-elected member for Gull Lake, I was a bit surprised because I could see that there was trouble in the offing in that Department, and I felt that the hon. Premier knew that it was time to get rid of that and look for a different portfolio. I dare say that the present Minister of Public Health has his hands full to satisfy people, especially as far as hospitalization is concerned.

Time and time again we on this side of the House have been accused of not offering constructive criticism on the floor of the House. They tell us, time and time again, that we continuously criticize and never give any constructive criticism. Now, regarding hospitalization, I say that this Government has been offered constructive criticism. First of all, the hospitals in this province are overcrowded; everybody knows that. I, two years ago, outlined the reasons for this overcrowding of hospitals. I told the Government at that time that the only way to remedy this over-crowding of hospitals would be if they would put some responsibility on the individual regarding hospitalization. In other words if a party who requires hospitalization is contributing to the cost of that hospitalization even to a small degree, that is an incentive to avoid overcrowding of hospitals, and no matter what you may want to do you will never cure that situation until you institute the method that was in vogue in the province to municipalities during the life of the former Government, who instituted hospitalization and health care through municipal organizations.

I also stated, as a reason for overcrowding of hospitals, the fact that there is a difference between “in” and “out” service to hospital patients. I mean by that that there was a certain service given to hospital patients who were in the hospital that people who were not hospital patients could not get. I mean by that, laboratory tests and X-rays and dressing for wounds or anything along that line. You know that if you are not a patient in the hospital you cannot get that service. If you are, on the other hand, a patient all that is free. I told you at that time that if you would give the service that is given by hospitals to people free, whether they are patients or not, you would forestall a lot of hospital bed space in hospitals. And that is a fact; there is no getting away from that. I dare say that a large percentage of hospital occupation comes about through the fact that doctors, in order to get these lab. tests, X-rays and so forth will put their patients into the hospitals in order to get those services free. If they do not, and the patient has to pay for them, then he, if he pays that time, will get sore and will go to another doctor who will put him in the hospital – or put members of his family in the hospital for that service.

We all know that members of the Government, the Minister of Public Health and others connected with the administration of the hospitalization in this province have appealed often by radio, by press and from the platform,

to the people of the province to avoid the overcrowding of hospitals, not to go to hospital unless it is absolutely necessary, that hospitals are overcrowded. They have been making that appeal. Now, lately they have adopted a new system to curb the overcrowding of hospitals and they do it in a different way. First we thought that it was an attempt to help the hospitals but it turned out that that is not true. So far as the hospital is concerned, there is a new rate that they have established, a new rate of pay. It is not a help to the hospitals at all. It is, in a way, stabilizing the hospitals insofar that they have a certain revenue every month, whether they have occupants or not, but it is not a cure, it does not keep the people from going to the hospitals. The basis of this regulation is entirely wrong insofar that the Department of Public Health has advised hospitals that they are to reduce their bed rate approximately 80 cents, and that the hospitals should attempt to hold the hospital patients down to certain numbers. For instance, hospitals whose bed complement was set at, say, 70 beds were told that they were expected to hold the bed occupation down to 50, (that is on a percentage basis), and that they would get the basic rate of pay for up to the 50 beds whether they had any patients in there or not. And then, in addition, they would get approximately 25 per cent of the basic rate added to that, so that for any number of patients that they had in the hospital over the 50 beds they would only get the 25 per cent of the basic rate. That, in my opinion, is the wrong way to go at it. In other words, it seems to constitute an attempt to make the hospital authorities a police force to curb the flow of patients into the hospitals. I think that that is entirely wrong.

The basic principle of hospitalization is that whenever anybody is told by a doctor that he is supposed to be hospitalized, he is supposed to be provided hospitalization space. Another thing is that in collecting this \$10 per person, or a total of \$30 per family group for hospitalization services, the Government has undertaken to give hospitalization to the people of the province. If, by prepaid hospitalization, a collective group were to take money from the people and then not provide hospitalization for them, they would be subject to prosecution and the Government, by doing that, are obligating themselves to provide hospitalization and, of course, the hospitals are full. We know that. If the hospitals are full and people cannot get the hospitalization when they need it, it is up to the Government to either find some means of reducing the occupation of hospitals or increase the hospitalization space.

Now the former Minister of Public Health prided himself two years ago by stating that the hospitalization bed rate had been increased from 3.7 per thousand of the population to 6.2 or 6.3 (I forget the exact figure), and I can assure him that unless steps are taken to curb the inflow of patients into hospitals in this province, they can still double this bed space from where it is now and still will not have hospitalization space enough. There is hardly any doubt about that.

I do not want to say very much more about that, it is a sad state of affairs. There are possibly thousands – and I dare say that I am not overestimating; there are thousands of people in this province who are actually in need of hospitalization and cannot get it; people who should have an operation performed, this or that, and they cannot get into the hospitals. They cannot get into the hospitals at a time, at least, when they would be in a position to take the time off for an operation in a hospital. The hospital space is occupied by a big percentage of people who have no business to be in the hospital at all.

To sustain the argument that I put up two years ago that when you put some responsibility on the individual that curbs the unwarranted, unnecessary hospitalization, I told you two years ago of experiences that we had in my own municipality and surrounding municipalities. We, for instance, (I might mention that again, it does not take very long) in our municipality, had free hospitalization under the contract with the hospitals in 1933 I think it was, for \$2,500. We had a contract with the hospitals to give us hospitalization for \$2,500. We had gotten that agreement owing to the fact that the hospital authorities had searched their records and found that approximately 1,100 hospitalization days had been taken over a period of years by the people of that municipality and, based on that, they agreed to give us hospitalization for \$2,500 a year. The result of that was that the people of that municipality, during that year, took over 3,400 days of hospitalization. It was entirely free to them and they took over 3,400 days of the hospitalization and the hospital realized 61 1/4 cents per day for the hospitalization given to the people of that municipality. And, of course, they would not renew that agreement. So, the next year we evolved the system of semi-hospitalization, a method, by the way, that we kept in force until the Provincial Hospitalization Plan was put into effect. Under that semi-hospitalization plan, the municipality paid one dollar per day per patient for every day they were in hospital and that year and in no year following until the hospitalization plan came into effect, in no year did the municipality pay over \$1,900 for hospitalization, In other words, the hospitalization days taken by the people of the municipality were immediately reduced. In the first year, by the way, it was reduced to 1,773 days (I believe it was), and in no following year over 1,900. In other words, it had the effect, when the people had to pay, when some responsibility was put on the patient, of reducing the hospitalization days taken from 3,400 and some odd days right down to 1,900 and never went above that. I do not know what the number of patient-days is from that municipality or any other surrounding municipality since that time, but it is safe to say that it is back up to the 3,400 and more, because the hospital is full day after day. Not only that, but other hospitals have been built in that vicinity. Hospitalization space in the district has almost doubled, and they are all full all the time. I would say that the Government should take steps to institute semi-hospitalization or subsidizing hospitalization or whatever means they want to adopt, but they must put responsibility back on the individual before they will curb this overflow of hospitals. There is no doubt about it. No matter what you do you will never accomplish your objective unless you do that. You cannot make a police force out of hospital authorities. They cannot stop the inflow of patients to hospitals. If the doctors say that the patient is supposed to go in they cannot but admit them, until their bed space is filled to capacity.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but I wondered if he would like to elaborate that. I am very interested in what he is saying. I understand he is saying that the patient should pay part of the hospital cost per day. Would my hon. friend like to suggest what he should pay — a nominal amount of a dollar or a larger amount per day, what would he suggest?

**Mr. Loehr:** — Mr. Speaker, that would be entirely up to the Government. Had they consulted municipal men before they consulted a bunch of 'back-room boys' when they instituted this plan then they would never have put themselves in the position they are in today. I am not in a position to

tell you how much you should ask the patient to pay towards his hospitalization, nor who should pay it; but unless and until you do that you will never hold hospitalization down to a sane basis.

I hope that you will no longer say that you have not had advice – I hope it is constructive; it is meant to be constructive, and I know what I am talking about because I worked at a municipal hospital in health service for a number of years. I gave a lot of time – not only myself but throughout the district. In many municipalities in which I worked, I gave them advice, which was asked for, and I was perhaps directly responsible for giving a lot of help in hospitalization service in a good number of municipalities in the years that I was with the Department of Agriculture.

I want to spend a few minutes talking about power. You know, in the Humboldt constituency we have, at the present time I think, in the neighborhood of 700 farms connected to the power. We are really grateful for that. We appreciate it very much. I say that with reservations, however, because, after all, we know that with these buoyant times that we have enjoyed now for ten years or more, had the Government not instituted the Power Corporation since material was available and left the field open for development of power to utility companies such as the Dominion Power, that we would have had power by now just as well as the Government is doing it for us; there is no doubt about that. And, what is more, perhaps it would not have cost as much to get it there. The people in the Humboldt constituency contributed somewhere in the neighborhood of \$375,000 (I do not know exactly) for the construction of power lines to serve those approximately 700 farms. We realize also that the erecting and putting in power in that certain area is not done by this Government because they like the people of Humboldt or the particular people of that district. It was done because the Provincial Treasurer and the Government have their eyes on profits, and that Humboldt district happens to be a district that is fairly prosperous with small farms, close together, and to put the power in there was a good stroke of business so far as revenue was concerned. Those approximate 700 farmers in that district contribute in light bills in the neighborhood of \$50,000 to \$55,000 per year to the Government of the province, or the Power Corporation if you like. It was a good stroke of business and, while we are grateful for it, yet we realize that it is no special concession. It was just a recognition of a place in the province where power could be erected and revenue derived.

In connection with education, I spoke at some length last year giving my views on the large school unit system. There are only a few words that I might say about that; I do not want to add to what I said last year. My views regarding large school units are well known and, so far as the large school units are concerned, I might say that I realize why, when a vote is taken to dissolve large school units, the people might vote against the dissolution of such units. I think that perhaps so far as Humboldt is concerned, were a vote taken today – I do not know whether there will be or not, I hold myself aloof from any connection with the movement, but I have heard that a movement is afoot to have a vote taken there some time between now and the first of July; but I have an idea that the people are going to vote against the dissolution. I realize quite well why. The financial situation is becoming more and more involved; the people's tax money is going into urban centres to such an extent that to dissolve a large school unit and return the money to the taxpayers in the country from those urban centres would be an utter impossibility. I mean by that – for instance, in a small district, in

**February 26, 1951**

a little town or hamlet where a school costing \$20,000 or \$30,000 has been built, the cost of that building cannot be thrown back on that small district. That is impossible, and, as I say, the financial situation is so involved that it is utterly impossible to give everybody satisfaction and dissolve the large school unit.

I have made an observation which I must say has alarmed me. Even in our district, the Humboldt district, where we have diversified farming and up until just the very last few years there were cattle and livestock on every farm, just as many as could possibly be handled by the occupant of the farm, I have noticed that here and there, at some three or four points, young farmers who have a growing family, children going to school, are divesting themselves of all the livestock, building a house in town and following their money and better education into the urban centres, and farm with rubber-tired tractor machinery from the urban centre. I think the trend is a dangerous one, a terrible situation for a country like this. The backbone of this agricultural country is the small, diversified farm. The large farm is not the backbone, though it may be so far as the tax collecting units to the municipalities are concerned; but it is not the backbone of the country as a whole, and it must be recognized that this system of alleged farmers moving into urban centres and farming their farms from there is dangerous. It is one of the worst things that can happen to an agricultural country. I have talked to two of them myself and asked them why they did that, and they said, "Well, I am out there. There is a small school and there is no improvement in that school, I cannot afford to send my children in for a better education, I will just follow my dollar and follow the education where it is. I can farm my farm from the town and it is no hardship on me." In fact, one of them said: "As far as I am concerned I prefer living in town, otherwise I would be out on the farm milking cows."

Now I come to highways. I told this House, last year, how Humboldt was being by-passed so far as highway construction is concerned. That is still the case; very much so. In fact it is getting worse. I do not want to tire the hon. members by quoting figures. All I want to say is that, last year, I quoted an estimate of the money paid by the people of Humboldt constituency by way of gas tax and licence fees. Since that, all we have to do is add about \$400,000 to it and we know how much we should have had. Now, looking over the return that I got from the Department of Highways of money spent in this Humboldt constituency during the fiscal year 1950-51, I find that there was the stupendous sum of \$200 spent, just \$200. And the classification of the spending of the \$200 says: "Gravelled surfacing investigation." There was no gravel put on, but something was investigated, whatever it was I do not know; but that is all the Humboldt constituency got by way of highway construction or highway expenditure, outside of maintenance, of course, and a few municipal grants.

I have here a map, it is a 1950 Highway Map. One day I got an inspiration. I superimposed on that highway map, a map of the constituencies in the province. I started by inserting the figures that were spent over a period of years in various municipalities, and I got so irritated I quit that because it was terrible. This map shows where the highways are going. I classified the province. In my mind I said to myself, "this shows a very peculiar situation." I classified the highway situation into areas and I thought I would classify them in four classifications, call them the "Cabinet" area, the "Liberal" area, the "Douglas" area and the "sucker" area – and by



the sucker area I do not mean the species that swim in the water either. This map shows that the money for highway construction goes in three directions, namely – one is, of course, now the transcontinental highway; one is the projected hard-surfaced highway to the North – for the, tourists to Waskesiu, and the other one to connect the Cabinet Ministers' seats; they are urban seats, of course, for the most part, but the out-of-the-city Cabinet members are very well served too.

So far as the rural seats are concerned, I know that seats represented by the C.C.F. apparently only get special consideration if they happen to be located in an area where the main roads go through that connect these "Cabinet" seats. As far as the Liberal seats are concerned it is the same way – they do not get anything special unless they are situated in a place where the road goes through to connect the Cabinet seats. We have one lucky Liberal on our side. That is the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). He is situated up there between the river and the lake where they have to funnel through to connect the Ministers of the province, and then he is double-lucky in being situated where the highway will lead through to go to Waskesiu, so that he is going to have two hard-surfaced highways in his constituency if this Government stays in power and, no doubt, if another government goes in, too, as far as that is concerned.

In connection with the highway leading to the National Park, I have often thought that possibly if the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) had been a good boy and always played the game possibly he would have participated on the east side of Last Mountain Lake in at least one of the highways leading through the funnel between the lake and the river; but, anyhow, he did not get it.

In Humboldt, we have another situation. There is a highway No. 20, that was supposed to be built north of Humboldt and branch out in two directions. One branch was supposed to go to Prince Albert and the other to Melfort. The highway was built to the eight-mile corner, and then continued the next year in the Prince Albert direction to a point within 3 1/2 miles of a hamlet named St. Benedict. The branch to Melfort was projected to continue the same distance as the portion to Prince Albert in the same year. However, it got late in the fall when they stopped the advance toward Prince Albert, and nothing was done on the Melfort road with the exception of, I believe, about a mile and a half. The crew was to this curve at freezing-up, and was then called away. But the peculiar thing developed later on. Last year, shortly before the Session ended, I asked for an interview with the hon. Minister of Highways, and I never got that interview until the Session was over. Of course, I did not blame the hon. Minister of Highways because his estimates, as you know, were the last estimates to go through the House and, no doubt knowing that I would want to discuss the highway situation in Humboldt, he never advised me that I could get an interview with him. I was not put out about that, because it was no fault of his that his estimates were not through and he was not in a position to discuss highway matters with me or any other member, for that matter, until his estimates had been approved. So, on April 13th, I wrote a letter to the hon. Minister of Highways outlining the situation in Humboldt district and outlining how badly this branch of No. 20 toward Melfort was needed. I asked him if anything could be done on No. 5 west of Humboldt, which is in a sorry state, that it would be appreciated, and also if they at least would continue to a point near

**February 26, 1951**

St. Benedict, within a quarter of a mile or half a mile it would also be appreciated, and it would be appreciated if that highway toward Prince Albert would be continued, even though it wasn't in my constituency; that is beyond St. Benedict.

I gave an outline, I have a copy of the letter here – a very reasonable outline and expected that I would give a summary and at least some work would be done. However, on the 15th of April I received a reply from the hon. Minister of Highways, and with reference to No. 20 running toward Melfort, northeast of Humboldt, he said: "With reference to your questions concerning highway construction in Humboldt constituency, I must point out that the road from the 8-mile corner north of Humboldt to Lake Lenore is not the responsibility of the Department of Highways. Any work that has been done on this has simply been done as assistance to rural municipalities; during the present year I have every expectation to complete the gravelling of No. 6 and No. 20 highways which has been constructed north of Humboldt." By the way there were nine miles ungravelled at the end of 1949, and though he has intimated in his letter that was a project for 1950, they are still not gravelled, and nothing has been done. Some investigation — \$200 worth of investigation has taken place, but nothing more. So, apparently I am in a worse position than the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman). He said that he didn't get any highway construction done in his constituency. In mine they even disappeared, and since that time I haven't written to the hon. Minister of Highways because I was afraid some more highways would disappear.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — I wonder if the hon. member for Humboldt is not aware that the contract to gravel that road was let last fall and unfortunately, because of early winter, the contractor was not able to complete the job.

**Mr. Loehr:** — And then, as intimated in this letter, the Government or the Department of Highways, no longer considers the branch of No. 20 to Melfort as a Government responsibility; in other words they don't acknowledge it as a projected highway.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — It never was.

**Mr. Loehr:** — All right; but that is directly contrary to letters that have gone out from the Department of Highways and what has been told to delegations and everything else. I have copies of letters sent out from the Department of Highways in which this, for a period of years, has been acknowledged as a projected highway, just as well as No. 20 leading to Prince Albert. I have copies here, and the people of that district are just simply bewildered. The people of that district, for several years, have been wondering when that branch of No. 20 was going to be constructed and now they find that the Government are not supposed to be contributing to the matter now, and that there isn't supposed to be a highway there at all. I might say that from the 8-mile corner north of Humboldt the banks running east from that corner, running east towards Melfort, going through Annaheim and Lake Lenore, Daylesford; St. Brieux and beyond, there is more traffic on that branch from that immediate corner – in fact, I have been told by people who observed the number of vehicles passing over the two roads, that very nearly twice the number of vehicles pass over the branch going east, than west; not that I want to say that the branch going to Prince Albert is not necessary. It certainly is, but so is the other one. It is not a highway that would carry as much through

traffic to Melfort as the other one would to Prince Albert – that is quite true; but it is a very very necessary piece of highway construction and the people certainly expected it and they must have it – and the sooner, the better.

Now somebody in this House (I forget now which member it was) made reference in his speech to a C.C.F. candidate, I think in the Rosthern seat – just a mere C.C.F. candidate, who made the statement that the people of Rosthern couldn't expect any special consideration because they didn't have a member on the Government side of the House. I can go you one much better. What would you think of a responsible Minister of the Crown making a statement to the same effect, telling a delegation that "You can't expect any consideration because you haven't got a member on the Government side of the House"? Now that is a thing that is very hard to believe, but it is still a fact . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Surely my hon. friend is not going to make that statement without saying what Minister uttered such words.

**Mr. Loehr:** — No, I don't say what Minister, but it is nevertheless a fact, and if any Minister thinks the cap fits him, he can wear it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, then on a question of privilege, I think that I can assure the House that I know of no Minister, and I am sure that I would know if this had happened; I know of no Minister at any time, who has ever told a delegation that they weren't getting consideration because of the political character of their representative.

**Mr. Loehr:** — Mr. Speaker, I was told by five different people that this thing occurred, and I am not taking anything back.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Name him.

**Mr. Loehr:** — No, I am not naming anybody; but it has occurred and if necessary I can produce an affidavit by five different persons that it did occur.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Naming the Minister?

**Mr. Loehr:** — Naming the Minister. I think that that is a very sorry state of affairs.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — It is a very sorry state, if it were true.

**Mr. Loehr:** — This Government has got its benches full by people who went up and down this province and gained support by saying that they were going to represent all the people, no matter who they were or where they were, and it is a case that they represent only those who are supporters of theirs, and I say it is a very sorry state of affairs.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I wish to state, categorically, that, as a Minister, I never made any such statement.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — I, too, Mr. Speaker, wish to rise on a point of privilege and make the same denial.

**February 26, 1951**

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would like to say, on a point of privilege, that it is much worse to act that way than to say it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I think that the Ministers concerned are perfectly in order to arise on a point of privilege disclaiming any responsibility for the charge that has been made by the member. If the member is going to make a specific charge then I think it is a point of privilege in which they can make their positions clear.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I would like to state, as the other Ministers have said, that never on any occasion have I ever intimated, by word or otherwise, to any delegation that they wouldn't be properly looked after if they were represented by an hon. member opposite.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Also on the same privilege, I shall have to make the same denial, categorically.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — On a point of privilege. The hon. member could have saved a lot of time had he named the Minister, but I will have to make the same statement — that never, at any time, have I ever said that because a constituency was represented by a Liberal, they need not expect anything.

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear, on a point of privilege, that, as far as I am concerned, whether a man be a Liberal, whether he be a Conservative he is going to pay exactly the same taxes and he is going to get exactly the same treatment as anyone else.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Mr. Speaker, may I just add to what my colleagues have said, that never, at any time, has any delegation visited my office and gone away with the impression such as mentioned.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, may I also say that I likewise have made no such statement.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege — likewise I stand condemned. I have, at no time, made such a statement.

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the deferred elections, the hon. Premier intimated to the people in the constituencies of the North, that if they expected this great programme of the Government to be carried out, then they should express approval by voting for the Government candidate, thereby clearly implying that if they didn't, this programme was in danger; and he held out the threat to them that if they didn't vote for the Government candidate, they wouldn't get the benefit of this programme.

**Premier Douglas:** — That question is not true, and is certainly an attempt to cover up the distortion by the gentleman over here, that is all, and trying to wiggle out of the fact that this man has been caught, caught lying.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The point of privilege is now in the Government and in this Chamber. The hon. member made a sweeping assertion and the point of privilege taken by each Cabinet Minister, I think,

is in perfect order. What is said in a political campaign is outside this Chamber.

**Mr. Loehr:** — Mr. Speaker, I was told by five men whom I have known for years and years and whose veracity I never have had any reason whatsoever to doubt. Now this may have been a slip on the part of the Minister of this government, or it may have been a deliberate statement, I don't know; but they all told me the same thing and, therefore, it must be so. Whether it was in the way of a joke, or whether it was meant, I don't know; but those gentlemen and myself know very very well . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — On a point of order. A charge has been made and I dare the hon. member to bring evidence to substantiate his charge, and name the person.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member has made the statement on his own responsibility and must have something to substantiate it. This hearsay stuff cannot be used as evidence.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — He is dragging in five others with him.

**Mr. Loehr:** — I never said the statement was made to me. I said it was made to a delegation, and there were five men who told me that and, as I say, I have never had any reason to doubt their veracity and, subsequently, not having had anything by way of highway construction, I, too, assumed that it must be so.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I think the hon. member for Humboldt must accept the Ministers' statements that they, as individuals, have denied ever making that statement to anyone.

**Mr. Loehr:** — I will accept it for the time being. If they want us to go further . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — I take it from what the hon. member has said that he is now intimating that I made that statement, and if he is, I will have to ask him to retract it, for at no time did I ever make any statement to any delegation that I would not carry on construction work because of their political representative.

**Mr. Loehr:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Highways is mistaken. I never named him, nor did I mean to intimate that it was him. I said the fact that we never got any consideration insofar as highway construction is concerned, led me to assume that possibly the Minister who allegedly made that statement was correct, in that we were only to get consideration when .

**The Speaker:** — The hon. member for Humboldt will have to withdraw that, because, by implication, he is saying that the hon. Minister of Highways did make that statement.

**Mr. Loehr:** — Well, if it is an implication, Mr. Speaker, if you wish; but I never so much as said that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member will withdraw the implication.

**Mr. Loehr:** — I will withdraw the implication if it was taken that way. I never mentioned anyone.

Now I am just about through. I didn't want to raise any controversy. This implication of favouritism has been thrown out against the Liberals for years and years, and if they ever did practise it, it certainly has been practised by this Government, and we are tired of that kind of thing. We had expected from what the C.C.F. candidates had been telling the people of the province, that they were going to represent the people in the province here, irrespective of who or what they were. We had expected that, and apparently we are certainly not getting it in some directions. I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, I never want to know what anyone is politically, whether he is a C.C.F. or a Liberal or a Conservative-Progressive, or whatever they may be, I would give them my service no matter who they are, and I fully expect that we should get the same treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I want, first, in rising to this debate, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on the very fine job that he did of presenting a very excellent budget in this House, last Wednesday. I am sure I speak for every person who heard his budget address when I say that his budget was one of the most pleasing budgets that has been brought down in the history of Saskatchewan. I must confess that I felt a good deal of sympathy for the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) when I heard that he had been 'joe'd', or selected, to try to answer the speech of the Provincial Treasurer.

I want to say, too, Mr. Speaker, how glad I am that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) hasn't got up yet in the course of this debate and injected extraneous matter which is foreign to the jurisdiction of this House, namely, "international affairs", into the debate which would have been better left out. I cannot refer, of course, to any of the statements that were made in the previous debate. All I can do, Mr. Speaker, is rejoice, along with the other members of the House that the Leader of the Opposition has not had a chance yet to muddy the waters in this debate.

I would like to say just one thing about the speech given by the hon. member for Arm River, I have already expressed the sympathy I felt when I heard that he had to make the speech, and I want to congratulate him now on the excellent job he did of arguing a very poor case. I took a copy of the report of the address which he made as reported in the 'Star-Phoenix' and the 'Leader-Post', and I read it over very carefully, and I must say that I was just about as amused on reading it in the 'Leader-Post' as I was on hearing it delivered. I suppose I should not say that I was amused by the member for Arm River, but I was amused at the tortuous extent to which he had to go to try to make a case.

Very early in the speech he said that no Provincial Treasurer in the history of Saskatchewan had been favoured with as much good luck and good fortune. He tried to intimate that the buoyant state of the provincial revenues was due to good luck, and I could not help feeling that he resented,

a little bit, the fact that the present Provincial Treasurer had been the recipient and the beneficiary of that good luck,. Resentment just bristled forth from him all the way. How he and his cohorts would have liked to have got their hands on some of the money that is now flowing into the provincial treasury! It reminds me of Mr. Culliton's address, a year ago, when he was lamenting and bemoaning the fact that they only had \$17 or \$18 million to play around with.

I think the people of Saskatchewan will congratulate themselves on the fact that neither the member for Arm River nor any of his cohorts will have the chance to play around with large sums like \$57 or \$58 million. It is no wonder he is a little bit resentful. The only thing that he could have applied that statement to was the buoyant state of provincial revenues; but then he went on a little further and he took exactly the opposite tack. He said, "There has never been a Government so greedy or grasping." Well, what does he mean? Does he mean that these revenues came to the Provincial Treasurer by good fortune and because provincial economic conditions were buoyant, or does he mean that we have imposed a lot of new taxes? He takes both sides of the coin and tries to exploit two entirely inconsistent arguments. Well, that is an attempt which the Leader of the Opposition and lesser Liberals are prone to make – that this Government has tried to tax the farmers to death, has tried to tax the people of Saskatchewan to death.

They go around making the statement that the C.C.F. is trying to drive the farmers out of business by oppressive taxation. Just six months or a year ago, I remember the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) was quoted in the 'Star-Phoenix' as saying that the C.C.F. Government was trying to tax the farmers out of business. Well I took occasion then to look at the estimates for the year 1950-51 to see just under what heading this Government was taxing the farmers to death.

Under the estimated revenue column, just inside the first page, we find the sub-heading, "Taxation Branch". Now those are the revenues, which are brought in through the Taxation Branch, and the first one we see there is the Public Revenue Tax — \$1,600,000. The rate, of course, is exactly the same as it was when the Liberal Party was in power – 2 mills, in rural areas – and it has not been increased by this Government. Then, "Wild Lands Tax" amounting, in all for the whole province, Mr. Speaker, to \$100 in the estimates for next year. Is that the one that is putting the farmers out of business? The "Gasoline Tax" estimated receipts are \$7,300,000. Have we imposed heavier taxes on the farmers under the heading of Gasoline Tax than the Liberal Government did? Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the two Liberal Governments, between them, in Saskatchewan, prior to 1944, had a total of 11 cents gasoline tax; and three cents of it was on farm fuel. Immediately that field of taxation was vacated by the Federal Government, this Government knocked off one cent a gallon of that three cents and left the tax at 10 cents, instead of 11; and furthermore, they took it off farm fuel entirely, which saved the farmers of this province several million dollars. There was a tax of three cents a gallon on purple gas which was levied by a Liberal Government and was taken off by this Government when that field of taxation was left open to the exclusive occupation of the provincial taxing authorities.

**February 26, 1951**

Then, we have the "Education and Hospitalization tax." Well I confess that, a year or more ago, it was a little easier to prove that that tax was not an impost upon our agricultural industry, because when the Liberal Party left office in this province, they had imposed a two per cent sales tax on almost all of the commodities which you buy. Subsequent to that about one-third of the taxed commodities were exempt from the tax; estimates have gone as high as 50 per cent of the articles, of goods, which were taxable before, and which were removed from the tax category. Even in regard to the three per cent tax, it still amounts to less per \$100 of goods purchased than did the old two per cent tax imposed by the Liberal Government and kept on by them right up until they went out of office in 1944. If you take \$100 worth of taxable goods and impose a two per cent tax on it, you have \$2 in tax. If you exempt one-third of those goods or one-half of those goods and put a three per cent tax on, you have less of a tax burden on the purchases of the people of this province than you had before. The fact remains that three per cent of \$50 is only \$1.50; two per cent of \$100 is \$2. That cannot be the tax that the hon. member from Maple Creek was referring to and that the member from Arm River refers to when they say we are oppressing the farmers with taxation.

Then the next one on the list is the "Pari-Mutual Tax." I am afraid I have never paid any of that tax – of course I am not a farmer. The hon. member from Arm River must have paid a lot of that tax; that must be the one that is taxing the farmers to death! That tax brings in a revenue of only \$40,000 in the whole of the province of Saskatchewan, and I do not think it is a tax that is bearing particularly upon farmers.

Then there are licence fees under The Vehicles Act. Well, I know that most categories of farm trucks and automobiles are just as low today as they ever were. As a matter of fact, Saskatchewan claims the distinction of having the lowest schedule of motor licence fees of any of the provinces in Canada. I have heard Liberal speakers repeatedly make reference to increases in the motor licence fees, and, as far as I can determine, there is no increase, no general increase that is applicable to farmers or the ordinary users of automobiles. I appreciate, of course, that the rates have been increased for some of the categories of vehicles which use our highways most intensively, and that is as it should be, because those people are using the highways more now than they have ever used them before. They are being provided with highways that are decent roads to travel on, and they don't object to paying for that extra facility. Certainly that is not the tax that is oppressing the people of Saskatchewan.

Then there is a tax on "Travelling Shows," amounting to about \$10,000 a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the member for Maple Creek, when he takes part in this debate, to name from these estimates the taxes which a C.C.F. Government has imposed and which are driving the farmers out of business.

I think I know what taxes most of the farmers think about when they think of taxes. They think about income taxes; they think about the taxes which they pay to the Federal Government. I have a farmer in my constituency who was put out of business by that tax.



What the Liberal speakers try to do, is to create the false impression in people's minds that the local municipal and school taxes are somehow imposed by the provincial Government. That is the impression that they deliberately try to foster. When the Leader of the Opposition talks about high taxes – about the C.C.F. Government taxing you to death – he generally has a tax receipt from some municipality, that he is waving in his hands and he is trying to create the impression that somehow or other the Provincial Government is in receipt of the Revenue from municipal and school taxation. He knows perfectly well that that is false – not only false, but it is a malicious falsehood.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is the hon. member saying that I say something that I know is false? I ask him to withdraw that. It is uncalled for and is absolutely untrue. He has no reason to say that whatever.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. Leader of the Opposition repudiates the statement that he has not used that, then the hon. member must withdraw.

**Mr. Walker:** — I accept the statement of the Leader of the Opposition, but I say this. I say that he knows perfectly well that the taxes which are levied by municipal and school districts, or the increases in those taxes, are not in any way the result of the policies of this Government. He knows .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I don't know anything of the sort. I do know that if this Government made proper grants to the municipalities they would not have to impose so much in the way of taxation. When the hon. member says I know perfectly well that what I said is untrue I ask him to withdraw that too.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member for Hanley is speaking and giving his own impression.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, what I am objecting to is this. The hon. member said I know perfectly well that what I said was untrue. Now then, of course, that is entirely unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, that is as much as to say that I am deliberately lying. Now he can't say that and get away with it in this House, Mr. Speaker, surely.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any imputation that the hon. Leader of the Opposition knew that that was untrue.

I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that these attempts to create in the mind of the public the mistaken belief that a higher mill rate in any municipality is the result of policies pursued by this Government, such an attempt is a most scurrilous attempt to deceive the people of this province. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are not fooled by that sort of propaganda. The people of Saskatchewan know – some of them are on municipal councils and on school unit boards, and they know that the reason for the increased taxation by those taxing authorities is because of the policies pursued by the Federal Government at Ottawa, the inflationary policies which they have followed.

However, I think it is the duty of every person of good will, every person who has a regard for public morality, to spend a little time pointing

**February 26, 1951**

out to the people of Saskatchewan that these local taxes are not in any way contributing to the enrichment of the C.C.F. Government at Regina, nor are they the result of policies followed by this Government. And so there you have, Mr. Speaker, the record of the tax levies proposed to be imposed in 1951, and you will find that there is no ground whatever for the allegation made by the hon. member for Arm River that this Government is the most 'greedy and grasping' government in Saskatchewan's history.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are, this year, to give some consideration to the proposal that the indirect tax field should be open to the provinces. I have been a little bit surprised by the statements that have been made by some of our propaganda organizations in eastern Canada, by our local Chambers of Commerce and by the editorial writers of the 'Star-Phoenix.' As a matter of fact, I was surprised to discover that the Chamber of Commerce has been against indirect taxation all these years. I thought that we were the only ones who were complaining about the Federal eight per cent sales tax being regressive and being an unfair burden on poor people. I find, much to my surprise that the Chamber of Commerce is also against indirect taxation. As a matter of fact, I was surprised about that for the reason that I remember the Retail Merchants' Association had been complaining for many many years and said, "The only thing we don't like about the Education Tax is the difficulty in collecting it penny by penny from the public; if you can just get away from that there will be no problem." Well, the proposal to get away from that has met with their opposition. The 'Star-Phoenix' has lent itself to that campaign in an editorial dated February 23, 1951. In that editorial they say: "An indirect tax of that magnitude levied on Saskatchewan business would be inflated by at least half in the process of reaching the consumer." They say that it would be inflated by at least half in the process of reaching the consumer, that the money would not get to the Government.

Well, that is their opinion. The 'Leader-Post' carried a news report under dateline, Ottawa, February 23, and in that report, we find that a deputation from the T. Eaton Company, the Retail Federation of Canada, the Simpson Company, Henry Morgan Company, Loblaws and half a dozen other leading retailers, attended upon the Federal Government, and I quote from the news report:

"The deputation pointed out the great difficulty that would be involved in tracing innumerable small retail agents to include a retail sales tax. It is claimed that the stores would find it impossible to pass along more than 2/3 of such a tax to the buyers, and that the balance would be absorbed out of their profits to a point where it would make business impossible."

Well now, I find it difficult to accept the statement made by the 'Star-Phoenix.' These are people who are in the retail business, who ought to know whether the 'Star-Phoenix' is right or not .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention that he is out of order, that he is anticipating in his speech, a motion that is already on the order paper.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to confine myself to the general principles involved in this, and I would just say, Mr. Speaker,

that the ways of the devil are strange. When they want to criticize the C.C.F. Government because of its present policy, they go ahead and they do it; and then, when we propose to do things a little differently, they criticize the proposal. You can't tell which side they are on, except that they are "agin" the C.C.F.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something more directly related to this budget. We are criticized by the member for Arm River in his address, last Thursday, when he said that the C.C.F. Government had carried out a reckless spending of the people's money – that is how it is quoted in the Leader-Post – "A reckless spending of the people's money"; and the 'Saskatoon Star' says, in the editorial to which I have already referred:

"Nowhere in his budget speech, this week, or in the estimates, did he place before the Legislature, or did we find any indication that C.C.F. taxing and spending has been shaped by events to come. This province is not pulling in its belt to make way for a Federal budget that must reflect the high cost of defence and armament. This province is taxing and spending at the same dizzy clip that it has in the last few years."

Then it goes on to say:

"We are not really cutting back our spending programme in Saskatchewan, as we, along with all the other provinces must do, to help stop inflation, to make room for a defence programme. We are by no means sure that if this Government has combed all the frills out of its administration, that a million or more might not be saved by economical administration in many departments".

That is the sort of criticism we get from the Opposition, and I am not surprised that it is applauded by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Arm River. Neither the 'Star-Phoenix' or the Opposition speakers have given us very much guidance, very much instruction or advice, on how that budget should be pared. I have taken the trouble, Mr. Speaker, to analyze the budget by breaking out of it those items which are mainly of a C.C.F. character – items which embrace those new programmes which have been introduced by this Government, and then, having taken those items out of the budget, I have taken what is left and have set it up parallel to what was done by the previous Liberal Government in the fiscal year, 1943-44.

The items which I have separated out from the budget are not all items which were originated by us, but they are items in which this Government has had quite an influence in developing and perfecting them. Sometimes they include a whole Department; often they include just a branch of a Department. I refer first to our highway construction programme. We have heard something about highway programmes in this province and in this Legislature. We have heard complaints from the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr), because they didn't get enough in their constituencies. Well, as a matter of fact, the constituency of Hanley is a good C.C.F. constituency, and the fact of the matter is – I'll be surprised if my hon. friend will tell the people of Hanley that it is not a good constituency. The constituency of Hanley, in

the seven years from 1942 to 1948 inclusive, in only one year did there appear any capital expenditures for highway reconstruction, construction, or surfacing. Out of those seven years, six showed no expenditure for those purposes. That sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, is inevitable in a well-planned and a well-designed, well-executed highway programme. Several years will go by when no work will be done in a particular constituency.

I may say that the municipal councils in Hanley constituency, — and I have had some contact with them — assure me that they have given up the obsolete idea that you have to take your road budget and divide it into six equal parts and spent 1/6th in each division. They have long since given that idea up because it retards the development of an overall road programme in the municipality. Here, too, it would not only be foolish and futile but it would be against the public interest to take the highways vote and give 1/50th of it to the member from Wilkie, 1/50th of it to each of the other members, and let them say where they would like to spend it. We would have a hodge-bodge of crooked, broken-up old roads like you had in the days when this Government came into power. It is, I think, to the credit of this Government, and to the Minister of Highways in particular that they have always had, in their minds, a vision of an overall programme for Saskatchewan, and that they have pursued that vision, that they are bringing it to realization. As a matter of fact, everybody, except my hon. friends, are willing to concede that, in Saskatchewan, we have now got a highway programme that brings merit to this province for the first time in this province's history.

I don't need to give you the figures — how many miles of highways have been built and rebuilt by this Government. Suffice it is to say that nearly half of the entire highway system has been reconstructed or resurfaced in the past six years. I say this, that if the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) will be patient for another six years, and the hon. member for Arm River will be patient for another six years, they likely won't have many roads left to complain to us about.

You know, it is rather amusing. A year or so ago we heard nothing but complaints from the member for Arm River: why, this terrible C.C.F. Government just wouldn't build a road in his constituency — and now that they are rebuilding two out of the four; now he is lamenting because the only roads we built are the roads that connect Cabinet Ministers' seats together. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, every road is either in a Cabinet Minister's seat, or has one end of it in a Cabinet Minister's seat. I don't think you can get away from it. Every road in the province probably passes through some Cabinet Minister's seat, somewhere.

That sort of picayune criticism is getting tiresome, not only to us in this House, but tiresome to the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan get around; they see what is being done. The hon. member from Arm River might not know anything except that little stretch of No. 2, No. 11, No. 15, and No. 19 that passes through his constituency; but when I go out in my constituency and talk to my constituents, I find that they have been all over the province, and they are able to tell me about work which has been done on roads in places I have never been, in Saskatchewan. I assure him that it is now generally known, even by some supporters of my hon. friends opposite; it is now generally known and recognized that this Government is following a sound and sensible highway construction programme.

We see here that the expenditures for highways from Revenue Account, increased from \$2,800,000 to \$6,400,000, and there is not a man in this House, Mr. Speaker, who would be rash enough to say that we are not getting more for our highway dollar, today, than we ever got before.

Then there is the matter of school grants. We have listened to hon. members opposite say that this Government was going to do something outstanding in the way of school grants. Well, Mr. Speaker, the previous government, in their last year of office, paid \$2 3/4 million in grants to schools; this Government is paying \$6 1/2 million in grants to schools – about 2 1/2 times as much. That is one of the things that ought to help the municipalities to retain low mill rates on rural property. As a matter of fact, that has resulted in an increase in the provincial share of the cost of education of from 24 per cent when my hon. friends were in power, to about 42 per cent at the present time.

Reference to school books: this Government was elected on the pledge that it would do something about providing free school textbooks. The last year the Liberals were in they spent \$20,000 on school readers; this year we are voting \$121,000 – six times as much for that particular purpose.

The previous Government did not have any branch compared to our present Conservation and Development Branch; there was no money spent. This Government is spending \$688,900 by its Conservation and Development Branch. Where is it going? Well, I would suggest that my hon. friend, when he takes his holidays in the summer, get around this province a little bit. I would suggest that he ask the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) if he can have one of those maps showing all the projects that have been started in this province. I know that in the particular constituency which I represent, there are a couple of townships in the Dundurn municipality, or parts of a couple of townships, which are now being brought under irrigation not because of anything that Jimmy Gardiner ever promised, but it is something that this Government took by the horns and did. It is going to bring about 12,000 acres under water when the project is completed.

That is the sort of thing that this Branch undertakes to do. That is the sort of thing that should have been done long since by a provincial government. In my opinion, the payment of \$1,600,000 in Public Revenue Tax is well justified and well warranted when the Government spends the money in developing the soil resources of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that that is a sound and sensible tax, if the revenue from it is going to be used to further develop agricultural production. And now, for the first time, revenue is going back to the municipalities, is being spent in this conservation and development work. The Lands Branch now — \$347,000.

I see an item in the vote – “assistance for training nurses, lab. technicians, etc., \$25,000” – there is nothing corresponding to that in the Public Accounts of 1943-44.

I see a vote for the Cancer Commission of \$610,000 compared with \$85,000 spent on research and related subjects by the Cancer Commission in 1943-44 – an increase of approximately eight-fold, Mr. Speaker. Is that one of the expenditures that the ‘Star-Phoenix’ and that my friends opposite

**February 26, 1951**

are criticizing? If it is I would like to hear from them. I would like to know, I think the House is entitled to know, which one of these they are critical of.

Grants to Regional Health Services — \$399,990, practically \$400,000; not a cent by the previous Government in 1943-44.

Psychiatric services — \$68,800; not a cent by the previous Government.

Air Ambulance service — \$136,000 this year being voted; not a cent by the previous Government. That is one of the things that my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition got up about, last year, and said: “Just because these things are a good thing, you think you are justified in spending any amount of money on them.” Well, the Leader of the Opposition didn’t say, and he has never said yet, whether he thinks we should cut out a part of that \$136,000 appropriation.

Assistance to Health Regions, to municipalities, to hospitals, etc., \$488,000; no corresponding vote in 1943-44; no expenditure in 1943-44 shown in Public Accounts corresponding to that item.

Payment to the hospital plan, payment of people’s hospital bills under the Hospital Services Scheme, voting \$6 million; nothing corresponding to that in the Public Accounts of 1943-44.

The expenditures for the maintenance of our mental hospitals — \$3 1/4 million in the vote, Mr. Speaker; and in 1943-44, \$1 1/2 million — now \$3,375,000. Does my hon. friend opposite suggest that that is a vote that should be cut? I may say that I have had people come to me in recent years, people who had relations, friends, in one of our Saskatchewan mental hospitals, and these people have said to me, “you know, it is just amazing what they do for those folks in there.” Well, I can remember the kind of comments I used to hear back in 1944. Why they used to say that these people are put in a nuisance hole there, a dungeon, a place where they would be kept in custody and out of sight of the rest of the community. Now people in Saskatchewan are proud of the kind of treatment the patients in the mental hospitals receive today.

The Saskatchewan Training School at Weyburn — \$857,000; nothing corresponding to that in the 1943-44 public accounts.

**Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member implying that the treatment given to the patients in the mental hospitals prior to 1944 was not proper?

**Mr. Walker:** — I will leave it to my hon. friend to say whether he thinks it was proper or not.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I’m asking you.

**Mr. Walker:** — There is another million dollars, Mr. Speaker, in the health services to our Old Age Pensioners, blind pensioners and recipients of mothers’ allowances — \$988,000 in the vote; nothing in the Public Accounts of 1943-44.

Then we come to the Department of Natural Resources. Fire Suppression – prevention of fires and general forestry management: I have spoken about that on another occasion, Mr. Speaker. It is something which, I think, no member of this House will be critical of – an increase from \$43,000 to \$334,000. That is the sort of thing which any progressive government must do if it is to establish the natural industries of this province on a sound basis. Forest inventories, forest conservation and control, are essential to sound conservation policies aimed to establish the lumber industry on a sustained yield basis.

The Mineral Resources Branch: no corresponding branch in 1943-44. Now there is an expenditure voted of \$266,000. I suppose it is no accident that under the Liberal Government there was no activity in mineral development in this province.

Then, Homes for the Aged. I realize that my friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) had one down there which cost the taxpayers \$44,000 in that year. This year, we are voting \$401,000 for homes for the aged and infirm – an increase of eight times what was spent by the previous government.

Then they had a Bureau of Labour. There were a few labour laws – archaic labour laws, on the statute books when the previous government was in power and they spent \$24,000 on enforcement of those labour laws under their Bureau of Labour — \$24,000 was their entire expenditure. Today, our Department of Labour, newly created by this Government, spends approximately \$211,000 in that field. I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that a substantial vote is included, this year, for enforcement of The Apprenticeship Act.

The Public Service Commission: They had a Public Service Commission – at least it appears in the Public Accounts in 1943-44. I don't know what their job was, but I suppose their job was to channel these little memos from Mr. McDaniel and Mr. Hogarth, the Liberal members for Regina, around to the proper department heads to see that the right Liberal got the job. At any rate, it cost \$8,400 for the administration of the Public Service Commission. Now, with a modern system of staff classification, and scientific .

**Mr. Tucker:** — The Minister of Health knows all about that.

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . placing of civil service positions, we have saved this province hundreds of thousands of dollars, Mr. Speaker, not only in greater efficiency from our public service, but in eliminating the roughshod graft and corruption that used to pollute the public service of this province; and that \$68,000, Mr. Speaker, that is being spent on the Public Service Commission, is one of the best investments that the people of Saskatchewan can make.

Then there is the Purchasing Agency: no similar vote by the Liberals; \$68,000 by this Government. You only need to attend the Public Accounts Committee; Mr. Speaker, and notice the public accounts of this province to realize how much money that Purchasing Agency is saving to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. I remember the old system where every Department and Branch head used to go out and buy his supplies of materials from some friend that he had in town, and in fact those little contracts and sub-contracts were so profitable and so nice that there were a lot of bad friends made about them.

**February 26, 1951**

The particular Branch head would pick out one dealer in preference to another, and he was always in hot water about it. Now, however, by submitting competing bids on the supply of all government equipment and government supplies, we have been able to get them at rock-bottom prices and eliminate these little petty grafts that developed under the old system.

And then, under the Co-operative Development Branch, the Liberals had an expenditure of \$23,000. They believed in co-operation to the extent of \$23,000. This Government is appropriating, this year, \$264,000 for assisting the development of the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan, an increase of approximately 11 times. Is there any farmer member on the opposite side, or any member, who is going to get up and criticize that increase in expenditure as being unjustified?

I suggest, that in adding up those items, you get some comparison. You get about \$10,600,000 spent by the Liberals on those particular services, and \$33,391,000 being spent by this Government on those particular services.

Now there we have accounted for an increase of \$23 million in the provincial expenditures as a result of the policies of this Government. I don't believe that even the editor of the 'Star-Phoenix' would say, as they suggest, that to curtail any of those expenditures would in any way further the national interest. I don't think that any member of the Opposition can, or will, be critical of the leadership that this province is giving in those respective fields, by those expenditures.

Well then, what have you got left, Mr. Speaker? If you take those items out of the Public Accounts of the various branches for the year 1943-44, and if you take them out of our estimates for 1951-52, you have what I consider to be the essential and basic services of government, which were recognized by us and which were recognized by the party opposite when they were in power, as being the basic and elementary requirements of government.

You have, first of all, service of the public debt. You have the Legislative and Executive Council; the administration of the Attorney-General's Department – there is a department which is relatively unchanged since 1943 to the present time, and that department, in 1943-44, the expenditures were \$847,000. Most of the expenditures in that department are wages and salaries, and if you adjust them to the cost of living you get \$1,220,000, which is very nearly approximately what is being spent in that department, today.

The Provincial Secretary's Department – the same story; there has been very little change.

The Provincial Treasurer's Department – there has been a reduction in the over-all expenditures by his department in the last six years, that is, in the administrative expenditures.

Public Works Department – there has been a reduction.

In the Department of Education, apart from school grants, there has been an increase, proportionately, to the cost of living – a little more than proportionately to the cost of living.



The Department of Agriculture has increased three-fold apart altogether from the Conservation Branch and from the Lands Branch.

The Department of Public Health: this may surprise you, Mr. Speaker, but the Department of Public Health, after taking out those items to which I have already referred, shows a reduction in expenditures from 1943 to 1951. In 1943-44 the expenditures in that department were \$1,216,000; that is, after taking out the items which I have already dealt with. At the present time, our vote, after leaving out those items, is only \$1,113,000, or a reduction of almost a quarter million dollars. This is for all the rest of the services the Department of Health provides.

Then there is the Department of Natural Resources and it has increased substantially since 1943-44 – nobody will complain about that.

The Department of Social Welfare has, too increased. The enforcement of The Insurance Act, King's Printer administration, Bureau of Publications, Superannuation payments, administration of estates of the mentally incompetent – those items, taken together, in 1943-44 amounted to \$14,912,000. Those were the services which were provided by the Liberal Government and which are continued, today, in much the same form – approximately \$15 million. By the way that figure, Mr. Speaker, does not include the service charges or the carrying charges of the public debt. If that figure of \$15 million is increased in proportion to the increase in the cost of living that has occurred since 1943-44, you would get a figure of \$21½ million.

Now I think it is a waste of time, Mr. Speaker, to talk in one breath about 1943 dollars and in the next breath about 1951 dollars. If you are going to make a comparison between 1943-44 and the next fiscal year, you need to adjust, to compensate, the figures in terms of the increase of cost of living, and if you increase that \$15 million by the proportion that the cost of living has increased in the same length of time, you get \$21 1/2 million. Now that was the expenditure of the Liberal Government in terms of present-day dollars in 1943-44 on those general services of administration. This Government is providing the same services, today, in terms of the same kind of dollars, for \$16,151,000, Mr. Speaker – a reduction altogether of \$4 1/2 million. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Arm River can snicker about that if they like, but the fact is .

**Mr. Tucker:** — We can't help it.

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . that if you take these items which I have referred to which were increased substantially by this Government out of both of those statements – and I have taken them out of both – you should have the same services being provided in the list which I have just read to you provided by the Liberal Government and by the C.C.F. Government. I have never heard anybody seriously allege that this Government has curtailed general services to the public.

And so, you have an economy, Mr. Speaker, resulting from careful and efficient management, of approximately \$4 1/2 million in the last six years, in those services which are continued basically in their present form, today, as they were in 1943-44.

**February 26, 1951**

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who criticize this Government for not having pared away inefficiency, for not having cut unnecessary costs to the bone, those people are just simply unrealistic.

Now, I want to have something to say about highway expenditures in my own constituency. Other members have done that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I advise the hon. member that it is just about six minutes to adjournment time.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks by saying that in Hanley constituency we have fared very fortunately under the present administration.

I will refer to one item only, and that is to market road grants paid to the municipalities in Hanley constituency in the last four years of Liberal Government. They amounted, in four years, to \$13,519. In the last four years — the four years immediately previous to this year — this Government has paid a total of \$33,300 in market road grants to those same municipalities — an increase of approximately  $2\frac{3}{4}$  times; and if you care to adjust that according to the changing value of the dollar, then you would find an increase of from \$20,000 to \$33,000 in the last four years. I may say that, in the four years 1941 to 1944, pretty nearly 50 per cent of the grant paid in that 4-year period was paid in the year 1944. I don't know if it was because there was a lot of rain and snow that year, or whether it was because of the election.

So I want to say that the municipal councils in the constituency of Hanley are well satisfied that they are being treated in a fair and just manner so far as municipal grants to market roads are concerned. Naturally they would like to see the amounts increased; but they realize that the amounts cannot be increased without an additional burden of taxation. They realize that they cannot ask that the amounts be increased, and at the same time urge the Provincial Government to remit the Public Revenue Tax.

I was going to say some more things, Mr. Speaker, but due to the fact that my time is almost exhausted, I would just like to make a very brief reference to the Crown Corporations.

We have reports, now, from all of the Crown Corporations, with the exception of five. I want to refer, particularly, to the ones which serve the people of northern Saskatchewan — that is, the Trading Division, the Saskatchewan Government Airways, the Fish Marketing Service, the Fur Marketing Service, the Saskatchewan Timber Board and the Box Factory.

I am pleased to notice, as I am sure are all other hon. members, that the Trading Division has come out of the red and is now in the black. The Saskatchewan Government Airways has come out of the red — in fact they have come out quite substantially. This year they have made six per cent on their invested capital, with a total net profit of \$23,000.

The Fish Marketing Service continues to show a small rate of surplus. The Fur Marketing Service is about the same as last year — \$37,000 net surplus.

The Timber Board – quite a substantial increase in their surplus, which is 5.3 per cent of the capital invested; and the Box Factory, to my hon. friend's pleasure, has reported an increase, or a surplus, of \$17,267. That surplus, Mr. Speaker, is sufficient to discharge all past deficits acquired by the Box Factory and to leave a total accumulated profit to date of \$3,837.55.

Taking that group of industries as a whole, Mr. Speaker, we have a net return of 5.6 per cent on the capital invested.

Now I know that the member for Arm River likes to do some funny calculations. In the course of his budget address, this year, he said, "why, you have only \$600,000 of revenue out of the Crown Corporations and then you voted \$515,000 or \$530,000 to wipe out the losses on the industries which have been discontinued." Well, I am sure that the hon. member for Arm River doesn't always count the money he loses, twice or three times. I am sure he will remember that, in the statements that were given and provided to the House and to the country, Mr. Speaker, those losses have already been acknowledged in the years in which they occurred, that the surpluses referred to in those years were stated to be the surpluses 'net', after deducting the losses of operations in those two or three industries which lost money and were wound up. So he can't fool us and he can't fool the people of Saskatchewan by subtracting that \$530,000 from the \$600,000. As a matter of fact, he can't go on fooling the people of Saskatchewan very much longer in any respect, but particularly in respect to Crown Corporation profits. To allege, Mr. Speaker, that \$600,000 represents the total income to the people of Saskatchewan from the Crown Corporations is to misrepresent the situation, because, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member farms for a year and sells a \$10,000 crop, and his expenses are \$7,000, but he buys a ¼-section of land for \$5,000, does he go around and represent to the Income Tax Department that he lost \$2,000 on that year's operation? I am sure that he has to acknowledge that he made \$3,000, even though he spent \$5,000 buying an additional ¼-section of land. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, those profits that are represented in the annual reports of these Crown Corporations are the true profits of the Crown Corporations, and any attempt to belittle or misrepresent those profits is doomed to failure and to being found out. Those profits, this year, amount to over \$3 ¾ million; last year, they amounted to over \$3,100,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detain the House any longer but I have a statement here – I knew I would get some applause from members opposite sooner or later – I have a statement here, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to submit as an appendix rather than take the time of the House to read it. If I have unanimous consent I shall do that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No!

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks by saying . . . Did I understand an hon. member to say that I should read this, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What did the hon. member ask?

**Mr. Walker:** — I asked leave, Mr. Speaker, to file this to be inserted in my address, setting out the particulars of Crown Corporation profits, for the year.

**February 26, 1951**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are the hon. members agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't think we can do that without the unanimous consent of the House.

**Mr. Walker:** — In that event, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by saying that I intend to support the motion of the Provincial Treasurer, most enthusiastically.

**Mr. Louis W. Larsen (Shellbrook):** — I beg leave to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.