

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
23rd Day

Monday, March 5, 1951

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Friday, March 2, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of hon. C.M. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate some of the members who have spoken before me. I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the very able manner in which he brought the budget down to this House. I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), who is the chief critic of the budget on our side of the House this year. I think that the criticism brought into the Chamber by the hon. member for Arm River probably is one of the best criticisms from the point of view of the layman ever delivered in this Chamber, at least as far as my experiences are concerned. I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I think that he delivered a very fine address here the other day and I think that he deserves credit for the manner of delivering that address, from both parts of this Chamber.

I find myself today somewhat in the same position as, perhaps, the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) found himself the other day, but I have a certain amount of time at my disposal and have also to get my touchdown in about 30 or 35 minutes. So, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into the main body of my address without further ado.

I would like, firstly, Mr. Speaker, to deal with Telephones. There has been considerable discussion in this House during this Session as to whether there has been an increase in the rate to the subscribers for telephone service in this province. I think it was my hon. friend, the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) (who first mentioned this in the House, and since that time many members on the Government side of the House have made various statements calling this increase an automatic adjustment or some other words meaning the same thing. I submit that this is not an automatic adjustment. When the telephone subscribers of the cities of Regina and Saskatoon have to pay 25 cents a month additional fee in order to have a telephone (which comes up the total of some \$3 a year), I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is a direct increase to the subscriber. The Minister of Labour dealt at some length with this very question, and he mentioned that there was also a hike in the rate at such places as Yorkton, Swift Current and North Battleford; but, Mr. Speaker, there has been an increase in the rate to every rural subscriber in the province of Saskatchewan. The connecting fees for the rural telephone companies used to be \$3; it has now been increased to \$5, and I submit that is a definite increase

March 5, 1951

to every owner of a telephone. This increase in rate was passed on to the rural telephone companies and I think we all agree that the big majority of rural telephone companies in this province are operating on a shoe-string as far as money is concerned, and any increase that they have to pay is directly passed on to the consumer, or to the individual who owns a telephone.

Further, Mr. Speaker, there has been another increase on top of this, and I think it is the most unfair hike of the lot. For instance, any new subscriber on a rural telephone today has to pay \$10 connecting fee the first year, instead of \$3 as he paid in the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we are all agreed that the new subscribers come from two classes of people, they are either people who in the past have not been able to afford a telephone or they are young people getting the telephone service for the first time. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not fair to charge either the people who found it impossible to have a telephone in the past due to financial circumstances, or young people starting out in a new home. I think we should give them the same privileges as people who have had telephones for a number of years.

I would also like to mention a few things with regard to rural electrification. I mentioned, in an earlier debate this Session, two things about rural electrification, and I would like to repeat them at this time. This past season, in the area which I represent, we have had the automatic telephones installed, that is, in a portion of that area. I think the reason for installing the automatic system was because they found that the old system was overcrowded, congested, could not handle the number of telephones. I think that points out, Mr. Speaker, that we are a thickly populated area and an area which rural electrification would serve very well, profitably to the Crown Corporation, and would serve a goodly number of people in that area with a very small capital outlay.

In the Moosomin seat we have an old folk's home, which is run by the Catholic Sisters at St. Hubert's Mission. This is a Mission about 230 miles south of the town of Whitewood. I think the Minister of Social Services, if he were in his seat, would agree with me when I say that this institution is doing a wonderful job. They are taking a burden off the Department of Social Welfare. They are relieving a burden to the people of this province, in that they are supplying care for the old folks without any financial help from the Provincial Government. I think that is a good thing, and I think it is something to be encouraged. But, Mr. Speaker, the thing that the Sisters at St. Hubert's Mission are most interested in is electricity and power. They have their own power plant there; that is they generate their own electricity, and they are finding it very costly. I think probably there is a responsibility there in the Department of Social Welfare and also a responsibility as far as the Crown Corporations are concerned, on the Minister in charge, the Hon. Mr. Darling. So I sincerely hope that something can be done in the near future to supply electricity to this home. The electricity could probably be taken from Whitewood south and, in going down to the Mission, I am sure that it would be very profitable to serve electricity to a lot of good farms in that area, and consequently we would be doing two jobs at once.

I noted the other day when the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) was speaking, that he said something to the effect that no matter where you

go in this province today, you drove along power lines. Well, a few days after he delivered his address in this Chamber I had the occasion to drive down into Manitoba (there is a distance of some 175 miles from Regina to the Manitoba border), and I would like to tell him that from here to the Manitoba border I do not think that there is over a mile of power line running along the highway, and you do not see any sign of rural electrification until you are approaching the Manitoba border. It so happens that, within the last two years, the Manitoba Power Commission have installed rural electrification along the boundary between Manitoba and Saskatchewan; and I would like to say now that it is a wonderful thing to approach an area that has rural electrification, and more so when it is an area where the cost is so negligible, as it is in Manitoba. For instance, that area of Manitoba, in the dead of night, is lit up almost like you were approaching a large city. Electricity is very cheap there, as we know, and I can assure you that a goodly percentage of the farmers there have a yard light that burns night and day. We often hear the Premier and other members on that side of the House talking about Saskatchewan being on the verge of tremendous industrial development, tremendous oil development. Well, I never had that same feeling except when I happened to be driving out of Saskatchewan into Manitoba, then I feel I am “on the verge”, because I can see the results of electricity — at night; and we have even got two or three oil wells down there, something that we have not got in Saskatchewan.

When I spoke in an earlier debate, Mr. Speaker, you will probably recall that I had something to say with regard to highways. Well today I want to say something further in that regard. I was prompted to do this after listening to the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) the other night, when he went on his — well I do not know just what you would call it; but he had quite a time for himself, touring around this province with a map in his hand trying to show what had been done with regard to highways by the present administration. He was using a map, I think of the 1943 vintage. Well, I have this same map, and I would like to compare the seat which I happen to represent and which I have drawn out on this map, and compare the two years, 1943 and 1950. This is the oldest map I could get and this is the newest — 1943 and 1950. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the Moosomin seat, there is not a road that is changed from 1943 to 1950. There has been no construction work done, that is from the year 1943 to year 1950. There has been about 30 miles of gravelling done, that is, new gravelling. In 1943 we had a lot of good roads in Moosomin. Mr. Speaker, you can see by this map that numbers 1, 8, 9 and 16 were all good gravel highways in 1943. Today, or in 1950 I should say, we have the same roads drawn on this map, they are also marked in red ink, but, Mr. Speaker, red ink does not make a good road. The roads in the Moosomin seat have deteriorated practically out of existence since this party came into power, and I defy anybody to show me anything different to that. We had good roads there, Mr. Speaker, in 1943, and today we have poor ones, and I think anybody who resides in the Moosomin seat will go along with me when I say that. The Minister of Highways (Hon. J. T. Douglas), I know, he is chirping away over there, but if he wants to make a speech on highways the best place to make it would be in my seat.

There is something to be considered, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about highways, other than the actual Provincial highways. We have

March 5, 1951

a lot of municipal roads, and we have a lot of bridges. Bridges might even be more prominent in the part of the province which myself and Mr. McCarthy and other members represent, that is the eastern portion of this province. We know that down there the land is very rolling; we have a lot of ravines, a lot of small rivers and streams and, consequently, there is a tremendous responsibility for the maintenance and construction of bridges and municipal roads, because in that country you not only have the ravines, streams and small rivers, you have a tremendous number of sloughs, which constitutes a big problem which it comes to building roads, because you have to draw the dirt a long way and build high grades. There are many municipalities, Mr. Speaker, in that area, who find it almost impossible to carry on with the road—building programme to give the residents of the municipality any sort of a road at all to get in to their shopping centres. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a larger grant coming to these municipalities than they are getting today. I know that our problem, for instance, compared to the problem on the Regina Plains, is terrific; and the same with bridge building.

There has been considerable discussion in this House about where the responsibility lies for bridges in the municipalities. I think we all agree that the responsibility, prior to this Government coming into office, for building bridges, lay with the municipalities. However, all governments who preceded this present administration never enforced that Act and when I say that I mean that the governments who happened to be in power previous to this Government did build a lot of bridges and they paid for them and the responsibility was not left with the municipalities.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — They did not build them.

Mr. McDonald: — Now, this Government, I think it was last year, said they were changing this and that they were going to bear half the responsibility for bridges. I am not complaining about changing the Act as it existed on the statute books, but I am complaining when you ask any municipality which has the number of bridges that municipalities do have in our area, to pay 50 per cent of the responsibility, it is utterly impossible, they cannot do it. There are lots of municipalities in that area which could not finance 10 per cent of the total bridge building programme which they should carry on in the next four or five years.

There is one particular case, Mr. Speaker, in the Moosomin seat, that I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Highways and of the Minister of Education. I have a letter here from a councillor in a municipality there. I am not going to read it — if any of the hon. members would like to see it they are perfectly welcome to do so; but this gentleman has asked me to do whatever I could to get him (I think it is) two miles of road across a muskeg. Now, this muskeg is situated between a goodly number of school children and their school. The school is situated on the north side of the muskeg, and I believe the majority of the school children live on the south side of the muskeg. This road that runs across the muskeg has been under water, I think, every year since 1945 from the spring break—up until some time in July. Lots of times there is from 2 to 2 1/2 feet of water over this road, and I think that that is a poor situation when children have to go through 2 1/2 feet of water to get to school. A lot of them, consequently, cannot get to school. Much of this land is submarginal.

The municipality is not in the financial position to build a road through this muskeg, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Highways should get together and see if there could not be some grant given to this municipality to help them out. It is not only to serve the community as far as getting into the local towns is concerned, but it is a tremendous problem for getting the children to school.

I also made a statement in this House, Mr. Speaker, that I considered that money had been wasted in the construction of the Trans—Canada Highway in my area. I would like to quote from my speech at that time, Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege made by the Minister of Highways, when he said:

“A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Winters’ engineers were prepared to pass that piece of road, I was not.”

What I am trying to get at is, Mr. Speaker, that the summer before last — that is, in the season of 1949 — the Minister started construction of a new highway in my seat; that is what is now the beginning of the Trans-Canada Highway.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — I thought you told me a minute ago there was not any building going on down there.

Mr. McDonald: — He built about 12 miles of road — or undertook to build it; I do not think the contract was completed, due to bad weather. But he undertook to build about 12 miles of road. A goodly portion of this road was supposedly completed; the top had been levelled off and it was a pretty fair road, I will admit. Mr. Speaker. Then, in the spring of 1950, the Minister said that he would not pass the road. I do not doubt that at all, but anyway, the same construction crew came back and rebuilt the same road. They did not just drain the water off along the ditches, as the Hon. Minister tried to tell us here the other day, because, Mr. Speaker, they . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I made no such statement. I simply said that was one of the things that had to be done. The second thing, we had to bring it up to the standard called for in the Trans-Canada Agreement.

Mr. McDonald: — That is not what the Minister told me the other day. He told me that Mr. Winter’s engineers were prepared to pass this piece of road, “I was not.” That is exactly what he said.

They came in there and drained the water off the side of the road, which was a good thing. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, they cut a foot on each side of the road, widened it out a foot on each side to a total of two feet. They also took several feet off the high ground or the knolls on the road and they put it into the hollows. In other words, they levelled the road out a lot. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when a road has been built and completed and then you turn around and come back and do it over again, the next year, that you are wasting money.

March 5, 1951

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Who said it was completed?

Mr. McDonald: — The same thing — this Chamber has been decorated, and I admit that if we go around over it and do it again next week that we are wasting money; the exact same thing happened in the construction of the Trans—Canada Highway in that area.

When I was running through this address of the Minister of Highways, I happened to notice something that I did not hear when he was delivering the address. This was a few remarks made by the Premier, and I am quoting; the Premier said this:

“Well, the fellow does not know whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, how would he expect to know anything.”

Well now, it is rather peculiar how some people who live in glass houses are the first to throw stones. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a photostatic copy of some bills which appeared in a certain constituency back in the year 1935. The first one says, “Don’t split your vote. A vote for Beischel is a vote for Young; a vote for Fletcher is a vote thrown away. Fletcher is not endorsed by Social Credit — Vote Douglas.” Then I have a follow-up to that, Mr. Speaker. This one says; “Fletcher is not a Social Credit candidate,” and that is signed by H.W. Arnold, Social Credit Provincial Organizer, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. There is also a telegram here — C.P.R. Telegram, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, September 30, 1935, and it is addressed to the Rev. T.G. Douglas, Weyburn, Saskatchewan. I think that is the same man who is now Premier of Saskatchewan, and it says this:

“This will confirm endorsement of conversation held Weyburn on the 28th of you as Social Credit candidate.”

And it has, on the bottom, “Vote Douglas,” Well, now, I may be a hybrid but I have friends in this Legislature who are also hybrids.

Mr. McCormack: — Tim Buck would support Douglas, too.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a few things in regard to agriculture. Agriculture in this province, as we all know, is our basic industry. Today, out of a budget of some \$60 million there are some \$4 millions being spent on agriculture. I am not complaining there, Mr. Speaker. I think any province that is supported practically entirely by agriculture is entitled to at least \$4 million and probably more. But there is one thing that I cannot agree with, Mr. Speaker, and that is, the distribution of this \$4 million. I have had people in my area come to me and ask, “What does the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan do?” and, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to answer them, because they do not do very much. They may do some good in some portions of this province. The Provincial Treasurer is going into ecstasies, but I will defy him to tell the people of my area what the Department of Agriculture is doing for Saskatchewan. They help in the election, yes; there is that about it.

Mr. Speaker, our particular area could do with many things from the Department of Agriculture. We would like to have community pastures. The only community pastures that serve that area, to the best of my knowledge are situated in the province of Manitoba, you supply the money, and you will just be surprised at how quickly you can buy land.

We note that there is a lot of money being spent in the control of grasshoppers, I have no complaint with that, and I do not think the people that I represent have any complaint, for we know that the grasshoppers are a menace to this province and if they are not controlled at the source — where they breed, then they will definitely spread and probably some day cover the entire province of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a plague in our area which has probably cost us more money than even grasshoppers have cost other parts of the province.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Socialists.

Mr. McDonald: — I hear one of my friends say “Socialists.” Well, that is one thing; but I am not going to lay that all on the shoulders of the Department of Agriculture. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to stem rust. Some well—known agriculturists have referred to stem rust as the world’s worst food thief. Now what is the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture done in this regard? I think that there is a field there that they can definitely operate in, and I, for one, would be all in favour of them voting some money to some organization which is already trying to combat this terrible scourge.

I have a letter here, written by a well-known agriculturist, and one of the sub-headings in this letter is, “The Responsibility.” With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a paragraph from this letter, and this is what he says:

The serious rust epidemic of 1950 emphasizes the following important fact. If in future years the grain growers of Western Canada are to be protected against the scourge of rust, the fullest use must be made now of all our scientific forces. Plant scientists must be given the tools to do the important job of breeding rust—resistant grain varieties: more money, more facilities, more fundamental research, more trained help, more greenhouses and more land. In plain words, the immediate and urgent need is for increased appropriations for rust research and control. It is up to the farmers, the grain merchants, the business men and the people of Western Canada to see to it at once that the necessary financial support is provided for an expanded programme on rust research.”

This letter, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say that rust, in the year 1950, claimed some 8,000,000 bushels of wheat in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota and Minnesota. I might also say that it claimed a lot of wheat, and lowered the grade of a lot of wheat, in the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan in this past year. This new race of rust,

March 5, 1951

namely type 15B, is a race that we have no protection against at the moment. All known varieties of wheat that have proved to be resistant to rust in the past, namely Thatcher, Redman, Apex and Regent, are, or have become, susceptible to this new rust. I do not think these wheats have degenerated at all but that this new type of rust is more vicious than any type of rust we ever had in the past. Therefore, I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will see fit to do everything possible to create a new wheat for Western Canada which will be protection to the farmers against this terrible menace.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McDonald: — No, I want to finish, I will just be a minute. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to support the budget, not necessarily because I think that it is too large — I would not say that; but the reason I'm not going to support it is because I cannot agree with the manner in which it is distributed among the people of this province. I cannot agree that we are getting the services in this province which a budget the size we have today should give us. I believe that if this budget were administered in a more businesslike fashion, it would provide more and better services for this province. Mr. Speaker, I will not support the budget.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the members who have taken part in the debate, previously, and particularly the member who has just spoken.

I would also like to congratulate you, Sir, on your trip to New Zealand and the very fine report you gave us earlier this Session as to the people you met and the wonderful experiences you must have had there.

It is also, apparently, the custom when a member rises in one of these debates for him to wait till the end before he announces whether he is going to support the motion or not. Well, perhaps there have been some cases, in this House, and maybe in previous Houses, when there has been some doubt as to what the hon. member who was speaking intended to do, and just in order to relieve any anxiety or any doubts that the hon. gentlemen opposite may have, or the Provincial Treasurer may have, I can assure them and him, at the outset, that I am not going to support the motion.

It is also customary, I believe (I don't know where the custom originated) to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on his presentation of the budget, and I can honestly congratulate him, and sincerely do so, because he did it in a very deft and able manner. I might say the dialogue was much the same as in the two previous years I have been here, but the act is certainly getting much better. I think he is to be really congratulated, Sir, on the way he was skating around this socialist pond that he has, and his pirouettes and gyrations and leaps over the private enterprise islands would bring, probably, blushes to the cheeks of Barbara Ann Scott.

Before I get into the main part of my speech, Sir, I would like to pay tribute to a former member of this House who passed away early this

year, and to whom a formal tribute was paid by this Legislature. Mr. W. O. Fraser of Oxbow, who served as a member of this Legislature, had an exceptional record of public service in his community. He was a loyal supporter and active worker in his church and in the Red Cross, and in fact, an active worker in any project for the betterment of his fellowmen. He was the mayor and a councillor of the town of Oxbow for a great number of years. I am quite sure that his loss is going to be deeply felt by the community, and I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to the family and to the widow of this very fine man who gave so unselfishly of himself in the public service.

Last year Mr. Speaker, I raised at one time the question of the advisability of the broadcasting of the proceedings of this House. In my opinion I don't think there is any question but that the people of this province are entitled to hear what is going on here, and what we are doing, and in general to hear how the members of the Legislature are behaving themselves, or otherwise, while they are up here in Regina. I do submit, though, Sir, in all seriousness, that if we are going to broadcast a portion of the proceedings of the House, a larger portion should be broadcast so that a better idea of what we are actually doing may be made available to the general public. The portion of the debates that are broadcast here, I contend, do not give a true picture of the actual work done by the members of the Legislature. Unfortunately, many sections of the public think that we do very little, that we sit back here for six or eight weeks and heckle each other. While there is a certain amount of that goes on, a lot of it in a very good-natured way, I think that the general public should be given more of an insight into the work that is done in the Public Accounts Committee, in the Crown Corporations committee, and when we are preparing legislation or passing legislation, and on the estimates.

I think, this year, Sir, that most of the members have possibly conducted themselves with a little more dignity and decorum than they have in previous years — you might not agree with me, Mr. Speaker, on that point; but I think this is a very desirable objective, and particularly in times like these when there are certain elements in our society, unfortunately, who are only too pleased to see the present system of government that we all support, ridiculed and brought into disrepute. I think that at all times all of us, as members of the Legislature — and this applies to both sides of the House — should conduct ourselves in a manner which will bring respect to this Assembly. It may be presumptuous of me to say so, Sir, but during the recent times in this Chamber, we have had moving picture cameras, klieg lights, and sometimes highly amused and rather appreciative galleries to the people who were speaking, and I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that we shouldn't get too far away from the cherished traditions of the British Parliamentary system.

Now, I would like in passing to say a kind word or two about some of the unsung heroes of the Session of the Legislature — those people who have to earn their living by listening to what we have to say here, and trying to report it in a factual manner so that it makes sense when it is read in the paper. I mean by that, the members of the press gallery; and I think it is rather unfortunate that some of them, at times, have been subjected to such severe criticism by members particularly on the Government side of the House, particularly Cabinet members and Cabinet Ministers.

March 5, 1951

I am sure these gentlemen and young ladies report what they see and hear honestly and intelligently, and that they try to present it to the reading public in as factual a manner as possible. I will say that, on occasions, I myself have not been entirely satisfied with the way some things have been reported or the way that a chance remark has been made into something much larger than it was intended to be; but I think, on the whole, that these people are to be congratulated. They certainly work hard and long hours, and I am sure I will get their enthusiastic support if I say that they are not getting over-paid. However, I do think it is rather silly sometimes when some members get up and say that they are “tools of the capitalistic press” and a lot of other nonsense like that. I think that should be kept out of the speeches in this House.

While I am on this subject, I would like to refer to some remarks made by the Minister of Public Health about the editor of the “Estevan Mercury.” Apparently, because the editor wrote an editorial that the Minister did not agree with, he went as far as to say that he had either deliberately lied, or that he should be in one of the institutions that comes under the supervision of the Minister’s Department. And the Premier went, I think, a little further and made a remark which I don’t think was entirely justified. I would like to tell this House that the editor of that paper is a very fine upstanding conscientious citizen of this province, and his family are very highly respected in the Estevan community. I don’t think that it is fitting to the dignity of the high office of the two gentlemen who made these remarks that such remarks should be made in the Legislature. We can disagree with people, but I don’t think words should be applied to them, or terms applied to them, which cause only a lot of hard feelings and a lot of bitterness that could properly be left out of our deliberations here.

While I am still in the parliament buildings, those of us who live in the coal-fields and who are getting part, at least, of our daily bread from the activities of the coal-fields down there, were rather shocked and not a little surprised to hear, last year, that the Government intended to install oil-burning equipment in the parliament buildings in Regina, and in other public buildings. The first intimation we had that this was going to be done was when it was announced that tenders had been advertised for to install this equipment. Now it would appear to me, Sir, that this was a very strange attitude for a government to take, which had been in the past at least, or had made the pretext of being, interested in the development of our own industries and natural resources. I understand that matter has, temporarily at least, been shelved. However, I would like to have an assurance some time during this Session from the Minister of Public Works or from the Government that this step will not be taken. I submit seriously that the example of the Provincial Government in the province of Saskatchewan would affect the coal industry of this province, should such a step be taken.

It is probably not known, Mr. Speaker, that the Estevan - Bienfait - Taylorton coal-fields produce about 1/10th of the total tonnage of coal produced in Canada. There is about 2,000,000 tons of coal produced from the field every year, and a major part of the sales market for this coal is in the province of Manitoba. If the Provincial Government in this province by its action gives the impression to the general public and to potential purchasers of this coal that it is more practical to burn, at least at the present time, Alberta oil than it is to burn Souris-Estevan lignite coal,

it would have a detrimental effect on the coal sales from this field. Not only in the province but in the very large market which now exists in the province of Manitoba, any decrease in the production and sale of lignite coal could only result in men being forced to seek other employment in other industries in this province where they certainly cannot receive wages comparable to those being paid in the type of mining that is being undertaken down there, today. The welfare of the men and the welfare of the industry could be seriously jeopardized by what may be a seemingly innocent action of the Government.

Even if we were to assume, Mr. Speaker, that a saving could be made by a costly conversion to oil—burning equipment, for example, in the buildings here, I think the Government would be taking a step which, if it was carried to its logical conclusion in similar institutions and in manufacturing and industrial plants, would have the effect of seriously jeopardizing an industry which employs directly about 450 men, and which pays wages ranging from about 25 to 50 per cent higher than any of the wages paid by the Government Crown Corporations in this province. I said before at the time I heard of this, and I think it is not too far from the mark, that I don't think the Government is so much interested in the cost per heating unit of the fuel as it is in trying to wiggle out from under some of its own labour and minimum wage regulations.

Now I would like to take up a subject which has been of great interest particularly in the town of Estevan during the past two or three weeks. There have been some comments passed in this House about the statement made by the hon. member from The Battlefords (Mr. Maher) to the effect that he would throw the Crown Corporations out of the window. Now, with all due deference to some of the gentlemen who have spoken and picked out a few isolated sentences from his speech, this was not the statement which the hon. member made. The hon. member said that he was in favour of keeping the Crown Corporations which were public utilities, such as the Power corporation, the Telephone corporation, and the Bus Lines and similar corporations, whose main function was for the service of the public of Saskatchewan, and he also said, at that time, he was not in favour of keeping Crown Corporations which were not public utilities and which were constantly losing money. Unfortunately however, the gentlemen opposite, in their sometimes usual manner, picked up an isolated sentence and tried to make it appear that he was referring to all the Crown Corporations.

Now, my own opinion (and I think it represents the opinion of most of us at least on this side of the House) is that there is good reason for the Government to be in the business of operating public utilities, such as the Power Corporation and the Telephone Corporation — and I might say that these two were previously operated by a Liberal Government. The name applies with respect to corporations such as the Air Lines in the north, and the Bus Lines. Those are corporations which to my mind perform a public service, and my opinion, in other fields the Government can be in public ownership where the public interest can be served without too much loss to the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly in fields where they are not competing with private business in an unfair manner. In these industries I have no objection whatsoever to the Government being in business. The Government went into the tannery and boot manufacturing business and it turned out to be rather a dismal failure. I think possibly some of the members opposite will agree with me that the main reason why it failed was the fact that a proper investigation was not made of the plant and equipment

March 5, 1951

that was eventually going to turn out the boots and shoes. Now the Government has seen fit to close this business out entirely, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, they haven't thrown it out the window, they have, rather, buried it somewhere down the basement.

Then we have the woollen mill which has been operating at a loss for some time, and I cannot tell you what the policy of the Government is going to be. I think that they will probably discontinue it, unless it can be shown that it is establishing an essential service for the people of the province, or if it can show some improvement in its financial and operating position. Now, in my own constituency, in the town of Estevan, the C.C.F., after getting late power in 1944 and probably a little flushed with victory, and in over-zealousness to get the people of the province into the business of producing bricks, purchases decrepit, tumble-down and outmoded old plant, and any one which had not been in active operation for many years. Now, I think any five-or-six-year old child with average intelligence could have purchased it from its then owners prior to 1944, for about \$25,000; but the so-called experts and advisers to the Government at that time induced them to pay \$155,000 of the taxpayers' money for it.

Now to the end of 1949 — and that is the latest report we have on the brick plant — it has been advanced about \$400,000 by the Provincial Treasurer, and in the last year that we have the report for it showed a loss of nearly \$41,000 on its year's operations. The Premier referred to this plant as one of the Government's "problem children". I would suggest to the Premier that it wasn't a problem child, but rather a broken—down old reprobate which had just been kept alive by expensive transfusions of the Government's money. They don't have to throw the brick plant, in its original form, out of the window — it never even got in the door in the first place. The Government has now buried it entirely — that is the plant in its original form; and on the site of where the old plant was, they have now built an entirely new plant which is going to cost about another \$400,000 and which we understand will be in full operation by this spring.

The Provincial Treasurer in his budget speech referred to the decision taken by the Government to replace and modernize this plant, and that decision was taken last spring. Now, anyone who saw the old plant and saw it in operation realized that the original plant as it stood could never be operated and be made financially solvent, and I wish to commend the Government for realizing this fact eventually, and for throwing the original plant (shall we say) out the window. But I want it to be realized that the plant that is now being built at Estevan and is almost completed is an entirely new plant, and while it is on the same location as the old plant, there is very little of the old plant that can be used or which forms any part of the new plant. And I would like to make the suggestion to the Government that, in order to give this new-born babe a chance to live, they should not saddle it with the sins and debts of the decrepit old gent of whom I don't think it could even be called a relative. I think it would be much better to chop the dog's tail off all at once, rather than an inch at a time. I think they should admit that they have lost about \$400,000 on this plant, and get it over all at once: don't saddle the debt on to the operation of the new plant. I think the plant should be started up as an entirely new corporation and given a chance to live.

I had the privilege of inspecting the partially completed plant during the winter, and from what I was able to learn at that time there is

no reason which this new plant should not enjoy a high measure of success. One of the main faults, apart from the obsolescence of the old plant, is the fact that the management, prior to the present manager, didn't know very much about the manufacturing of clay products in the province of Saskatchewan. They had one "genius" down there; he was hired by the Government. His name was Roberts or something — he has gone back to the southern states now. He was down there at about \$150 a week and expenses, and he unfortunately did not know that it froze here in the wintertime — a little to the sorrow of the present Minister in charge of the plant and the taxpayers of this province.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is in charge of this plant at the present time, that he was not the Minister in charge at the time the plant was purchased — the old plant; and that it is only quite recently that he took over the chairmanship of the Board of directors of Saskatchewan Minerals. And, last spring, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (he is a gentleman for whom I have a considerable amount of affection, despite his present political affiliations, at least) came down to Estevan and held a public meeting which was attended by representatives of the town of Estevan, the Board of Trade, the employees of the plant that was in operation at that time, and generally many citizens who were interested in the welfare of the town and the district. Mr. McIntosh at that time was commendably frank, and he laid the cards on the table and said the Government was seriously considering the advisability of keeping the old plant going and if they didn't think that it was advisable to continue the operation in view of the losses they were having, and that they were seriously debating the advisability of building the new plant. The general feeling at the meeting, I might say, was that the plant provided employment for a considerable number of men in the Estevan area, and the meeting, I think, recommended almost unanimously that, if possible, the Government should proceed with the building of the new plant.

Now, at that time — I was at the meeting - I stated that, while I did not necessarily approve of all the Government's ventures into business, and particularly where they were competing unfairly with private investors, there was no actual competition as far as I could see in clay products in the province of Saskatchewan. I also pointed out at that time that in the development of our industries in this province, it was not a new thing for the Government to do experimental work in order to establish an industry which might turn out to be of benefit to all the people of the province of Saskatchewan. At that time, I cited the case of the briquetting industry in southeastern Saskatchewan. As some hon. members opposite have made this House aware, the Governments of the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the Dominion Government invested, I think about \$1 1/4 million in experimental work in trying to establish the briquetting industry. At that time, I might say, there was not too much known about the burning qualities of lignite coal either in its natural form or in the compressed form in which it comes in briquettes, and there was not too much known as to what amount of binder and other materials had to be put in to keep this lignite coal together so that it could be shipped and sold in distant points. The outcome of the experiment has been very satisfactory, because now there is a briquette plant which is privately-owned, and which gives steady employment to about 60 or 70 men who enjoy comparatively good wages and comparatively good working conditions.

March 5, 1951

I might say, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot from many of our hon. friends opposite about the fact that the briquette plant was sold to a private company for \$1. Now, this is not the whole story, and my friends opposite either unwittingly or deliberately are passing on some information which is not correct. I haven't time to go into the full details of the history of the briquette industry in the Bienfait area, but when the plant was finally turned over to a private company there had been a great deal of money invested in it by private capital trying to operate it, and when it was turned over by the Government of the time, who had invested the original experimental money in it, it was turned over on the understanding that a further substantial amount of money was to be put into it for research and expansion by the company that took it over and that the private company would agree to operate it on a win, lose or draw basis, for a certain number of years. And I would suggest that there is a considerable similarity between that and the present situation that this Government is in with respect to the brick plant at Estevan. They have gone in there and done a considerable amount of experimental work; now they are in the position where the old plant is entirely worthless, and they have had to build an entirely new plant on the site where it was before, and I can sincerely hope that this new plant will be a success. It is a very vital link in the economy of the southeastern part of the province, particularly the town of Estevan, and I can assure the Government, as I have already assured the Minister in charge of this corporation, of my wholehearted co-operation in this effort. I am sure that all the citizens of that part of the country will agree with me in that attitude. I can assure that, if this new plant can be successfully operated (and there is really no reason why it shouldn't be) it will be an industry which in serving the public and providing employment and being able to keep its head above water, will not need to be thrown out the window, as some of my hon. friends would like to infer.

I am rather amused at statements made sometimes by responsible Ministers and lesser lights of the C.C.F. Party who try to leave a 'holier than thou' impression, to the effect that there is no patronage in the C.C.F., and they are constantly referring to the fact that other political parties, particularly the Liberals I guess, reward their friends and ex-candidates and ex-members with political appointments. Now, I don't necessarily believe that because a person has had the misfortune — I think it is probably more of a misfortune — to get into the political arena, he should be forever de-barred from getting a job if he is capable of handling one, with any government . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCormack: — . . . but in view of some of the pious statements, Mr. Minister, of some of the members opposite I think I should bring to the attention of the House, very shortly, the record that the C.C.F. have, in the few very short years, that they have been in office. Now I am not going to mention any names . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Please do!

Mr. McCormack: — I have them, but I am not going to mention them. I know it has been done in this House before — I don't say that the Provincial Treasurer has done it, but other members have done it; but I think that while the radio is on we should refrain from mentioning the names of people who are in the public service. I think I can refer to them inferentially

without probably causing them a great deal of embarrassment by naming them specifically. We have our friend, the hon. Minister of Public Health. After he got chucked out in the 1947 Federal election, he came into Regina here as a director of staff training or courtesy, or soft words and fishy handshakes or something like that — I don't know; but it wasn't an existing job but it had been created to make the civil service courteous and apparently to make them be a little more appreciative of the fact that it was a C.C.F. Government that was giving them their paycheques. Now, of course, when he got elected in the by-election and took on the duties of Minister of Public Health, they had to find somebody else to take this job and they got an ex-Federal member of parliament to take the job over from him.

A former C.C.F. member from up Humboldt way is now in the newly-created job as public relations officer for the Power Corporation, and we have another ex-C.C.F. M.P. who is the civil defence officer in the province. One of them is on the local Government Board; one of them is the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and one of them is the chairman of the Mediation Board. There is even one lady who had the dubious distinction of being on the board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Wool Products, but there are people like that, there are people who have got jobs. I don't say that these men aren't capable but I wish these gentlemen opposite would quit making all these pious and high-sounding Sunday-morning statements that they don't do things like that, because they do — and they have only been in office a little over six years. How many would they have if they had been in office about 40 years? They would have half the Socialist Government of Britain out here. Even my opponent in the last provincial election — I know he won't mind my mentioning his name — “Charlie” Cummings — after he got a whirl at organizing the C.C.F. for a while, they made him the sheriff of the judicial district of Estevan. Now, I haven't any objection, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Cummings getting this appointment. He is rather an amiable gentleman, and I kind of hoped that the C.C.F. would keep him around for the next election so he could run as a candidate again. He has certain responsibilities there and I think he is trying to handle them to the best of his ability.

I was rather surprised, though, that the friend of the Premier and myself — Mr. McCullough — hadn't got called to his reward here someplace. The Premier tried very hard to have him elected in the 1949 election; he had been the member in the Assinoboia seat now known as the Moose Mountain seat, and he was beaten and then he ran against my good friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) who sits in this House on our side, and he was beaten there, despite the promises and the assurances that they were going to get \$800,000 worth of roads up there. I was wondering why such a valiant effort was made by the Premier to elect this gentleman, because when they were down at Estevan one time, apparently the two of them couldn't agree as to whether the Atlantic pact was a good thing for the Dominion of Canada or not. The Premier said it was, and Mr. McCullough said he wasn't too sure; but I am sure he and the Premier, today, wouldn't have too much difficulty in agreeing on the foreign policy of the C.C.F. Party, as enunciated in this House. Anyway I haven't been able to find out that he has been around these buildings here in anything other than just the capacity of a visitor.

I was rather surprised however, last summer, to pick up a press clipping dated July 27, 1950. My good friend Charlie, down there in Estevan, who was appointed to the position of sheriff of the judicial district of

March 5, 1951

Estevan, clerk of the court, local registrar, and director of Saskatchewan Minerals — I think he was that before; but he was appointed on the 1st of July, and here on the 27th of July, 1950, this statement appeared in the paper, under the heading “Will repair Highway No. 18”:

“Charles Cummings, C.C.F. council member for the Souris-Estevan constituency announced Tuesday, the Government has decided, as soon as equipment is procured, to go ahead with the project of rebuilding 15 miles of Highway No. 18 west from Glen Ewen.”

Now this was on the 27th of July, Mr. Speaker. “This project”, he added, “had been dropped from the Government programme for this year due to lack of funds, but at the request of the C.C.F. constituency executive the Government had decided to put this project back on their programme. Now that the water on the highway had dried up sufficiently on July 27, it is to be expected the work will be started in the very near future”.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but I would think that this gentleman's duties should have kept him sufficiently occupied without also taking over the problems of the Minister of Highways to announce the decisions as to what was going to be built. I would also say that I am afraid the liaison between the C.C.F. Council and the Department of Highways is not as good as it might be, because there has certainly been nothing tangible done since the 27th of July last year to rebuild any portion of this highway. I would be only too pleased if my friend Charlie, or the Minister or anybody on the Government side of the House, would announce in the not too-distant future that something was really going to be done on this highway.

I am not going to take up the time of this Legislature, today, to bring to the attention of the Minister of Highways the situation in my constituency with regard to highways. I am sure that the Minister himself is well aware of the deplorable condition of the highways down there, and if he is not aware, I will remind him about Highways Nos. 8, 9, 18, 50 and 47, when his estimates comes up in the House.

In our part of the country, Mr. Speaker, we are rather excited about the prospect of oil being discovered. We are pretty close to the Manitoba boundary and we are pretty close to the American boundary and every farmer and land-owner down there has been anxiously examining his title to find out whether he owns the minerals or not. As we know, a large portion of the privately-owned land in Saskatchewan does not give the surface owner the ownership of the minerals rights; nevertheless, in cases of this nature — that is where the farmer owns his land but he doesn't own the minerals — I think where valuable minerals, oil or other discoveries are made, that it would only seem fair that the surface owners of the land should receive some adequate consideration. I know the present government regulations protect them only with respect to the damage to the surface or the area of the surface that is utilized in developing and operating the production of sub-surface or mineral possibilities. I think, Mr. Minister, that every owner of land, where the mineral rights are not included in his title, should be entitled to some of the share of the royalties earned out of the minerals that are taken out of the ground. In other words, I think he should be adequately compensated for the damage done to his land, and he should be entitled to a small percentage, at least, of the value of the minerals or oil or petroleum or natural gas, or what have you, that is produced.

Many farmers in our area, who own their own minerals, lease them for a paltry 10 cents per acre per year under these leases, and many of them may have handed over a small fortune to some company or some smart operator who is running around purchasing leases. I submit that a great many of these farmers and land-owners were more easily induced to lease their minerals because of the three cent per acre mineral tax, and many of them thought that they would lose their minerals if they didn't pay the tax, and these gentlemen went around and said, "Well, we will pay the tax for you and we will give you 10 cents an acre per year" (which in my opinion is peanuts) "for the potential value of what minerals there may be." I think that a fellow should gamble on the thing himself rather than let somebody else do it, and these gentlemen, anyway, were more easily induced to part with their mineral rights or a substantial part of these rights. I would just like to point out, at this time, that the Liberal convention in Saskatoon, last November, passed a resolution advocating the exemption of farmers' land from the 3-cents per acre mineral tax, and a return to the farmers of any mineral rights which may have been taken away from them by the C.C.F. Government.

I would like to turn for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to a question which I submit greatly concerns all of us, and that is the industrial development (or possibly the lack of it) in this province. Now all of us depend for our living here, directly or indirectly, on agriculture, and about 85 per cent of our wealth, I guess, in this province comes from the farmers; but I submit, in order to provide a more balanced economy, we need more industries, and the lack of these industries in this province is probably one of the main reasons why we are not having a population increase as we should have. The latest census estimates, according to an article I was reading the other day, apparently are going to show that Saskatchewan is the only province in the Dominion of Canada that has shown a population decrease in the last decade. Alberta, it is understood, has shown an increase of nearly 15 per cent since 1941, and Manitoba, 11 per cent.

We know that the dry years and mechanized farming and the lure of war industries during the early part of the '40's, contributed to a substantial drop in our population; even today I still think we are losing substantial numbers of our young people to other provinces. I think all of us, on both sides of the House, will realize that this is a serious situation. In every community in Saskatchewan there are young men and women who have left that community because there are not the same opportunities for employment here, possibly, as there are in other provinces. Now our greatest asset, we have been told (and I believe it) is our young people. They are the greatest assets any community has, and we are in the rather unhappy position of having to bear the cost and the burden of their education, and then deliver them to other parts of Canada, because we can't offer them the same facilities here. I think it is a well-known fact that the boys and girls from the farming communities, because of their initiative and background and training, are second to none when they get away from the farms and into other industries and other endeavours.

I would submit that much of the responsibility for this decrease in population is due to the policies of the gentlemen opposite. Now the C.C.F., on many occasions, are desperately anxious to refute any responsibility that their socialistic policies have prevented this province from experiencing the industrial expansion to which it should be entitled. I think, however, that most of the facts are against them. You notice that

March 5, 1951

the C.C.F. very often, quite often in fact, clutch at single isolated facts when they are telling the story about the great expansion we are supposed to be having in this province and this year. I noticed in the budget speech that the Province Treasurer said this:

“During the year 1950, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics’ estimate of the value of the mineral production in the province climbed to an all—time high of more than \$36 million.”

Now the value of Saskatchewan’s mineral production including the million barrels of oil that the Provincial Treasurer referred to, was, in 1950, therefore, \$36 million, but I wonder if that figure proves anything. It sounds like a lot. In the same year, I would like to point out, the value of Alberta’s mineral production was \$134½ million, or almost \$100 million more than that of the province of Saskatchewan. I submit that it does not look as if the Provincial Treasurer has too much to boast about, because all the provinces across Canada have had increased mineral production, and in most of them the percentage increase has been greater than that of the province of Saskatchewan. In 1945 to 1950 the value of mineral production increased in Alberta by approximately 160 per cent; in Manitoba by 127 per cent; in Saskatchewan, by only 62 per cent. Now these figures indicate, I think, that the development in Saskatchewan is lagging behind that of our neighbouring provinces.

Then the Provincial Treasurer referred to the flow of investment capital into the province, and in this I think we are also lagging behind the other two provinces. He used a rather isolated figure again, there. He said this:

“The preliminary forecast for capital and repair expenditure in the province, in 1950, as measured by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, reached a record high of \$282 million.”

Now the same report from which he obtained his figures of \$282 or \$283 million for Saskatchewan gives a corresponding figure of \$312 million for the province of Manitoba, and \$494 million for the province of Alberta. I think that the statistics that we have on new manufacturing enterprises tell much the same story. From 1946 to 1950, the numbers of new manufacturing industries established were 61 for Manitoba, 28 for Alberta and only 12 in Saskatchewan, and these new manufacturing industries employ 1785 persons in Manitoba, 1256 in Alberta and only 393 in Saskatchewan. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan under the shadow of Socialism is not sharing adequately in the industrial expansion which is enjoyed by our neighbouring provinces. I think that some of this C.C.F. legislation which gives the Government power to seize and expropriate business enterprises in the province, and the Premier’s and the other C.C.F.’ers speeches in which they talk about the glories of the Regina Manifesto and of eradicating capitalists and down with this and down with that in their usual soap—box way, are responsible for most of this situation.

I would like and I think most of us would like to see the province move ahead in the industrial manner in which it should move ahead, but I am very much afraid that many people, including our Saskatchewan farmers, today have come to realize that you can’t trust a socialist government no matter what assurances they give.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources, the other night, said that if we in the Opposition voted against the budget we would be voting against all the things the budget provided for. I think even the Minister of Natural Resources knows better than that: it would be just as silly for me to say that when he was in the Opposition in this House and voted against the motion to go into committee of supply, he was voting against all the provisions in those budgets providing for services for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I don't think even he would like to get that silly on the floor of the House. Or he might even say that the C.C.F. members down in Ottawa when voting against the budget down there are voting against the amounts to look after old-age pensioners, and health, and family allowances and P.F.R.A., and all the rest of it.

What I am voting against, Mr. Speaker, is not so much the amount of money that is to be spent on essential services for the people of the province of Saskatchewan, but the extravagant and inefficient manner in which the money is being spent by this C.C.F. Government, and I am voting against this army of so-called experts and planners that they have continually running around the country, who have been hired, apparently purposely, to dissipate the money that has been taken out of the taxpayers' pockets, money which should rightfully be going towards social and other essential services for the benefit of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. No one objects to paying for services if he is getting value out of his money; but nobody has yet been able to convince me, Mr. Speaker, that it should take almost twice as many employees of the government to spend twice the amount of money. I don't think they need to have all the automobiles that they are operating, that they can take the whole civil service out for a ride at once on Sunday afternoon. I really don't object to the amount of money that is being spent but I do object to the careless, inefficient and carefree way in which the money is being spent.

As I announced at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — In rising to take part in this debate, I would like to extend the customary compliments to the people who have taken part in this debate previous to me. I would especially like to commend members who have just spoken previously to me. I intend in my remarks to confine myself largely to the subject of highways, bridges and that sort of thing as they affect us in the constituency of Cannington, and in discussing these things I would like to say that I recognize the tremendous problem that highways are in this province, owing to our large mileage and our sparse population. But that is not a new situation. It has always been with us and I suppose it always will be, I don't suppose there was ever a municipal council in this province which had all the money it would like to spend on municipal roads. Similarly, I don't suppose there has been, or ever will be, a Minister of Highways who had all the money he would like to spend on that sort of thing. That is something that our province, with our sparse population and large milage, imposed on us, so we can't do anything about it. That being the case, the only thing we can do is kind of make as equal a distribution as possible of the moneys we do have to spend, and spend it where it will do the most good to the greatest number of people. While tourist roads are necessary

March 5, 1951

and desirable, it should not be forgotten that the people of this province are the people who pay for most of the roads and when roads are being built they should receive their consideration.

I was rather surprised the other day to hear the member for Wadena (Mr. F.A. Dewhurst) making some comparisons of his constituency to the constituency of Cannington, and trying to say that Cannington was getting a fair deal in highways. I made some study of these figures and other figures, and I can assure you that those figures do not justify the conclusion drawn by the member for Wadena. Let us take a look at the highway maintenance figures for 1950 in the Public Accounts — and he was talking about maintenance. This money was just for maintenance and had nothing to do with the construction costs of highways. In Wadena that year, according to the 1950 Public Accounts, they spent \$46,000 in maintenance in Wadena; in Cannington they spent over \$72,000. Now, what do those figures indicate? Simply this: The roads in Cannington are worn out and require a lot more maintenance than they do in Wadena. It is possible to get a road in such a shape that it is cheaper to rebuilt it than it is to maintain it, and that is the condition that the roads in Cannington are in now. They are costing too much to maintain. Everyone knows that maintenance costs bear a direct relation to the condition of the road to be maintained and the volume of traffic carried. And the fact that they spent that amount in Cannington in maintenance proves that the roads down there are in much worse shape than they are in Wadena, or else they carry more traffic than they do in Wadena.

I will go a little further and point this out. There are only five constituencies that have spent more in maintenance than they did in Cannington, and they are Lumsden, Melville, Swift Current, Souris-Estevan and Gull Lake. I don't know what the condition is in Gull Lake — there may be a reason for the \$100,000 spent there in maintenance. I am not criticizing it. I don't know what the score is; but I would like to point out that the other four, Lumsden, Melville, Swift Current and Souris-Estevan, are all tributaries of the cities. That is the reason for the greater maintenance, because they have greater traffic. I am not criticizing those expenditures, but it just goes to prove that the volume of traffic is relative to maintenance costs. For the member for Wadena to make the statements he did in the House, the other day, means either one of two things: either he doesn't know what he is talking about, or he is trying to create impression in this House that is not borne out by facts.

Well, now, let us take a look at the construction expenditures as shown in the 1950 Public Accounts, charged to revenues. This is the money the Government allots to different constituencies and it differs from maintenance, which is more or less static — that is, if you have a given number of miles of provincial highway you have got to do a certain amount of maintenance on them all or you can't use them; but the construction money is spent wherever the Government sees fit to spend it, and it is the allocation of these moneys that I am critical of. So, let us look at Wadena constituency. Construction costs, as reported in the 1950 Public Accounts — and it shows the policy this Government has followed right down the years since it took office in regard to construction expenditures in the C.C.F. constituencies: In 1950 they spent in the constituency of Wadena, \$154,897 — nearly \$155,000 for construction in that one constituency in one year as against \$15,000 in Cannington. The member for Wadena, the other day, very conveniently forgot to mention those figures, where in this political democracy they talk about, if we examine these figures for the \$15,000 again, we find that there

was little or no money spent in Cannington last year for construction, although \$15,000 does appear in the accounts. I asked some questions about that the other day in the Public Accounts Committee and this is what I found out. About \$12,000 of it was back payment to contractors for work done on No. 9 two or three years ago; \$2,700 of it was to pay for surveys that were carried out in the Fall of 1949. We had a by-election down there in 1949; we also had a lot of survey work done in 1949, and some talk of an \$800,000 expenditure on highways in Cannington in 1949. Well, I want to say here now, that \$800,000 is the amount that should have been spent in Cannington if Cannington got its fair share of the public accounts' money spent on highways since this Government took office. That is about what they should have got, and, while this \$15,000 appears in the Public Accounts, there was actually no construction done in Cannington in 1950. I think the last and only construction done in Cannington since this Government took office was done three years ago.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what I object to: the unfair distribution of public moneys for highway construction. I have said before, and I repeat again, that political consideration, and not the need, appears to be the yardstick for the spending of public money by this Government. There were so many members on the other side of the House who criticized us for wanting to spend more money on a smaller budget. That is not what we said at all. I say we are spending now all we can afford to spend, and probably more than we can afford to spend if times get tough; but I would like to see a more equal distribution of money spent, that we are spending, and cut out a lot of nonsensical expenditure this Government in making now.

Now, to get back to Highways I do not think that anyone will object to this Government, or any government, building a north-and-south blacktop highway from the border to our northland. That is absolutely necessary; but when this Government, for political purposes, starts to construct two of these highways about 40 miles apart, the people of this province in outlying districts do object and do object most strenuously. I am sure my friend of Arm River cannot be accused of being a Socialist, but I am also sure that it is not on his account that there have been some highways built through his constituency. Circumstances placed this Government in a position where it cannot do otherwise. For these three Ministers and two other members of the C.C.F. political future depends on these two blacktop roads being constructed. If the Attorney-General sits for Moose Jaw, the Minister of Public Works sits for Watrous and the Minister of Social Services sits for Saskatoon — these three Ministers', as well as the two private members' political life depends entirely on the completion of these two roads. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I object to — the unnecessary expenditure of public moneys on two blacktop roads that parallel one another 40 miles apart, for political purposes, and then leaving the other constituencies to wallow in the mud. It should not be forgotten that for every mile of this blacktop they construct, they could have constructed about three miles of the good gravel highway where it is much more needed.

Now, to get back to Cannington — even the C.C.F. down there are getting alarmed about the road policies of this Government. They got up a petition, last summer, and this is quite a document, this petition. And it was got up and hung in all the little stores in these two towns and I am just going to read it to you:

“We, the C.C.F. and C.Y.M. Clubs in the towns of Carlyle and Arcola, are disturbed over the condition of Highways 13 and 9 in our respective areas.”

March 5, 1951

They are disturbed they put it mildly.

“And whereas,”

Well, here’s another thing — this was in the thing they had hanging up in these stores:

“And whereas there has been no request made to our Government in the Legislature, we therefore appeal that they have the highway conditions improved in our areas. A petition of all citizens there should be sent to our Government asking for action in the regrading and regravelling of Highway 13 from Carlyle west to Arcola and the regrading and regravelling of No. 9 from Junction 13 five miles north to Morrison’s hill.

That is the petition that hung up down in those two towns. Well, now, wait till I get through, I will tell you all about the figures. As far as I’m concerned, Mr. Speaker, they have two things wrong with that petition. The first thing is that they did not go far enough. They ask for a piece between Carlyle and Arcola and a piece up to the Lakes. Well, there are our good C.C.F. friends who love their neighbours and don’t hate anybody and are looking forward to getting us all on the ball and spreading it around. Well, I’ll tell them (and a lot of other people will tell them the same thing) that that particular strip of road isn’t any worse than the whole road of No. 13 highway. It is all in the same condition. It isn’t any worse than the east half of No. 16 Highway. That is in the same condition as this little bit they were talking about. But all they could see was the little bit around their backdoor, and made their petition to the Government. Well, all right!

The next thing wrong with this petition is when they say that there was no request made to our Government by our member of the Legislature. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to use language that is not permissible, but I think you all know what I mean. That shows you what the C.C.F. down there think about it.

I would just like to say a few words about this No. 13 Highway, I just want to say a few words about it. I do not know if all the members are familiar with where No. 13 Highway runs. I suppose they are not; I am not too familiar with some of them up in the North. I have a map here, No. 13 Highway enters this province from Manitoba at Antler, and it goes out way over here at Senate, away over here at the Alberta boundary, and it goes straight across the province. It is the most direct east-and-west highway that we have in this province. It runs almost midway between No. 1 and parallel to the international boundary. It is a very important highway; carries a lot of traffic of the southern half of this province.

I know that the Minister of Highways, whenever I have spoken of this, has generally shouted across that it is a “Liberal” highway. Sure it is a Liberal highway, built by the Liberals. We recognize that. It was built with horses, too. It was built with sledge scrapers, and there has never been anything done to it since they did build it. That is another thing. And in those days when that highway was built we did not have the standard of highways we have today; nobody did. This was a good highway when

it was built, but it was never built to carry the traffic it is carrying now. This was built in the early '20s, with horses, and I think it must have been a pretty good road or it would not be there at all. A lot of places it is not there; you cannot see it as a matter of fact; it is a canal. It is a rather significant fact that our No. 13 Highway where it goes into Manitoba is well built. It is a good highway. The people of Manitoba consider it of sufficient importance to build a good highway there. It goes through Cannington into Weyburn, and when you get into Weyburn it is not too bad a highway. I would not say it was too good, but it is a fair highway to Weyburn, passable, and No. 13 Highway has not been passable in Cannington very much of the time this summer.

I have some figures here. They must consider it a fairly important road in Weyburn, because I asked for some figures in the House about it, the other day, and this is what I found out. I asked how much money has been spent for construction on No. 13 Highway in the Weyburn constituency since this Government took office. Well, I got an answer to that, and it said this: that they paid \$75,317 for construction of No. 13 Highway in Weyburn since this Government took office. I asked what was spent in Cannington, the same time, and the answer was \$2,000 and something. Well, I checked that down and I came to find out that there was our surveying of 1949 again. Here it popped up again as construction costs. I think we should charge it to election expenses in Cannington. Now, we would have had probably a bigger expenditure in Weyburn but for the fact they ran afoul of an inexperienced contractor with a bunch of old equipment, and he could not finish his job. That \$75,000 might possibly have been \$150,000. I point this out to show that in Weyburn they consider No. 13 a fairly important highway. They consider it a fairly important highway in Manitoba; but when it gets on to the Saskatchewan side, for some reason or another our Minister of Highways does not know we are down there. Now, I cannot hear what you are saying over there, but I guess it is all right anyway.

The east half of No. 16 Highway is in exactly the same position as No. 13 Highway; that is when you take that portion of No. 16 that runs from the Lakes to the Manitoba border. We had a Liberal picnic down there, one day this summer, and a lot of the boys could not get to the picnic. Why? There was eight inches of water going across the highway a few places between the Lake and Walpole. That is the condition that our highways get in down there. And that did not happen once, it happened a lot of times, and a friend of mine who lives down near the Manitoba boundary told me that he did not think there was one week in this year that he had not pulled cars out of No. 13 highway near his place. He told me that, and I believe he was correct. I know that the Minister has had quite a few delegations, C.C.F. delegations as a matter of fact, up here to see about No. 13 Highway. I do not know how well they succeeded or how big a representation they made, but I want to say that 10 miles of No. 13 Highway is peanuts compared to what we should have and what we are entitled to. I leave it to the fair gentlemen, any member on the other side of the House, to go down and drive down No. 13 Highway and dispute these facts. There has been no money spent on it for years. I cannot remember of any money being put on it since it was built. I'm not sure if there was, but I cannot remember any. Certainly there has been no money spent on it in recent years and none by this Government, except for stakes. Now, I hope that when the Minister is considering this and that he will take the whole situation into consideration, and be fair. I don't

March 5, 1951

want for Cannington anything Cannington isn't entitled to; but I do want for Cannington what Cannington is entitled to, and \$800,000 wasn't too far out. Now, this is all I'm going to say about that.

I would like for a few minutes to talk about the bridge situation in this province. I think hon. members will recall that I brought this matter to the attention of the House last year, and some of the members were rather inclined to make light of some of the submissions that I made at that time. Some of them even said I didn't know what I was talking about; but it is a rather significant fact that the Britnell Committee deemed it fit to devote some two whole pages of their report to this very thing that I was talking about, and they said almost identically what I said last year, and I am just going to read that report to show you what they did say. Now, this is what the Britnell report said. These, remember, were non-political men who brought in this report, after considering all the facts and here is what they said:

“The Special Problem of Timber Bridges.”

And these bridges aren't the bridges on highways, they are municipal bridges they are talking about:

“Timber bridges on municipal roads offer a special problem. Though most of these bridges were originally built by the Province” . . .

And I want the Minister of Highways to remember that . . .

“. . . the arrangement was an ad hoc one arising from the fact that in the early days municipalities had neither the equipment nor the financial strength to undertake the construction.”

That is quite true today. Now, here's one for the Minister of Highways. I can see him smile.

”Legally they have never been the responsibility of the provincial government” . . .

We all know that.

Hon. Mr. Douglas (Rosetown): — You never said that!

Mr. McCarthy: — Yes, I did. I said it was there, but never used.

There are now approximately 2100 timber bridges, 170 with steel spans on pile abutments and 140 of concrete and steel, on municipal roads. About 1140 of these bridges were constructed prior to 1929 and should be replaced. Many of them are in a dangerous condition. To meet the need, Highway Department officials suggest that these bridges be rebuilt over a six—year period, that is, 190 each year for the next six years. In addition, a further accumulation of necessary replacements would result each year — those built in 1930 should be replaced in 1950, etc.

For the construction years 1950 to 1959 the number of bridges that should be built would be as follows:”

And I would like the Minister of Highways to listen to this:

“In 1950, they should have built 190.”

That is the amount we should construct every year.

Hon. Mr. Douglas (Rosetown): — You’re reading my speech of last year.

Mr. McCarthy: — No, no, I am reading from the Britnell report. I think they were all written by the same man. They say that every year there should be 190 built. That didn’t develop this year; that was six years ago when you took office, and in addition 168 that were built in 1930, making a total of 358 bridges that should have been built this year. Now, it goes on and says how many should be built every year for the next five years to get our bridges back into shape. And I think they are right.

“The size of this task presents a staggering problem. The Department of Highways has now five bridge crews at work. In the 1947 construction season 39 bridges were replaced . . .”

If that is all the work they claim — you should have put 350; and you constructed 39; you are doing all right.

“In 1948 season 35 were constructed”

And in that year you should have constructed 300 or so.

“And in the 1949 season plans again called for the construction of 35 bridges.

And they say you should have been constructing 300 or so.

“A large expansion of the bridge construction activities of the Department will be necessary to make any real start on tackling this backlog of work. Obviously the Provincial Government cannot be expected to accept complete responsibility for the replacement of these bridges.”

Well, that is a debatable point there. I can’t agree with them. I don’t think it is obvious at all; but I will come to that a little later on. I just want to mention that they say ‘obviously they cannot be expected’ . . . well, I am not going to agree with that, I will come to that a little later on.

“Some sharing of their cost by the municipalities will be necessary if an adequate programme is to be carried through. It is suggested that municipalities be responsible for all culverts and bridges of less than 16 feet span, that the Provincial Government contribute 50 per cent of the cost of construction of all bridges over 16

March 5, 1951

feet and less than 100 feet span, these bridges to be built by municipalities with engineering assistance from the Department of Highways.”

Well, I don't agree with that either, and I'll come to that in a minute.

“And that all bridges over 100 feet be built and the total cost of their construction be borne by the Province. Maintenance of all bridges of less than 200 feet span should be the responsibility of this municipality with the provincial Government contributing 50 per cent of the cost of major repairs (over \$500) for bridges over 16 feet and less than 200 feet; bridges over 200 feet in length to be maintained by the Province. It appears that some such clarification of responsibility for these bridges is required.”

Well, I can say ‘Hear, hear’ to that.

Now, let us take a look at this thing in the light of this report; let's see what there is. I disagree with that report where it says that these bridges should be built by the municipalities with engineering assistance from the Department, and I will tell you why. These bridges are built with pile machines. These pile machines are expensive and they require expensive and trained crews to run them, and the Province has a much better chance to provide that than the municipalities have. I can't for a minute imagine our municipalities having enough money to invest in a pile-driver, for instance. If they had a pile-driver, I can't see where they would get the personnel to run it; so I disagree with that. If these bridges are ever going to be built, if we are ever going to get anywhere, the Government will have to furnish the pile-drivers. That is also true with regard to the material that goes in, the special material that has to be specially ordered, and the municipal councils aren't in the shape to do that. That is a function that should be carried on by the Government.

Now, I would like to say a few words with regard to sharing the cost by the municipalities, of these bridges, and I would like to find out — and all during this session and last session the Government has contended that the senior government at Ottawa is not giving them enough money. In this case the boot is on the other foot. This Government is the senior government and they are putting the squeeze on the municipalities to build these bridges, to assume a cost that they have never been called on to assume before. Regardless of where the legal responsibility rests, the fact still remains that the Provincial Government has, in the past, always built these bridges without cost to the municipalities. There is a tremendous backlog of these bridges to be built.

Gov't Member: — What about 1944?

Mr. McCarthy: — Just a minute. I am coming to those figures now. Do not get in a hurry and I will tell you all about what happened. I will give you the history of it right down through.

Ever since we have been discussing these bridges, the Minister has taken the position that previous Liberal governments were responsible for

this backlog. Well, certainly, those governments should accept some responsibility for that backlog, but there was a good reason for their failure to keep up with replacements, and here is what the Britnell report says about that — and it is altogether different to what the Minister is trying to tell us:

“We believe, though, any consideration of the realities of the situation compels these conclusions. These realities are: First, a very extensive highway responsibility of the Provincial Government; second, the tremendous backlog which had accumulated during the depression and war years.”

Now that is why there was a backlog in 1944 — not what the Minister tells us.

Let us now look at the record of this Government with regard to these bridge replacements. According to the Britnell report they should have built 190 bridges every year to take care of the necessary replacements, ordinary replacements. In the six years since they took office that would have been 1144 bridges which should have been built, but they only built 300; so in six years this C.C.F. Government has contributed 800 bridges to that backlog. That is a much worse record than the previous governments had in depression years. In the two years, 1930 and 1931, the Provincial Government built 300 bridges — in nearly two years; and the C.C.F. Government has only built 300 bridges in six years, in the most prosperous times this province has even seen. Yet the Minister of Highways attempts to blame this situation on the previous government.

Now, let us go back to Cannington. We have, in Cannington, 122 of these bridges, out of a total of 2100 in the province; that is, we have in Cannington about six per cent of all the bridges in the province. We replaced, in 1950, one bridge in Cannington, so, with six per cent of the bridges in the province, we get 1/50th of the replacements. I would suggest to this Government that when they start their replacement programme they do not do it on a constituency basis, that they do not take (as they have done in the past) the bridge population of a constituency into consideration, and that the replacements should be made on that basis. If the Minister is going to compel the municipalities to share the cost of these bridges, he should work out a different formula than he has now. He surely has not given much thought to this problem, or consulted the rural municipal men on it. We could have, and do have, some rural municipalities with very low assessment and a large number of bridges. These rural municipalities with very low assessment and a large number of bridges, if they are compelled to pay 50 per cent of the cost of these bridges, either one of two things will happen: either it will break that municipality, or they will not be able to replace their bridges. I am sure that the Minister does not want to get those municipalities in that position.

Just another word about this Britnell report. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, speaking in the House the other day, said he was going to submit this report to the municipal convention that meets here in Regina next week, for their approval. This report is a very thorough study of provincial-municipal relations and contains from two to three hundred pages, and, as far as I know, these reports have not been made available to municipal councillors or reeves yet. I submit to you that it is most unfair to ask a convention to express an opinion on this very important matter when

March 5, 1951

they have not had an opportunity to study this report. If this report is to come before the convention, a copy of the report should have been sent to the councillors and reeves two or three months ago, so that they could have studied and discussed it in their council meetings. I received my copy of this report last November, and I have read it over quite a few times. Of course I may be dumber than some of these fellows are, but every time I read it over I see something else in it that I did not notice before; and to expect these men to go up there and pass an opinion on this report when they have not had it in their hands is — well, I do not know, it is not just cricket. Well, that is all I am going to say about that.

I was rather interested in some of the things that the hon. member for Estevan (Mr. McCormack) had to say about party politics and partisan actions of this Government, and I had a little incident down in my constituency, this year, that I would just like to bring to the attention of the Government, and I would like the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) to listen to it. He gave us a nice talk, the other day, on the lily—white condition of the C.C.F. with regard to party politics, and I would like him to listen to this one; there were two or three more of them — I forget who they are but they can all listen.

Down in my constituency we have a little town by the name of Bellegarde — a nice little place, but it happens to be off the railroad. There is no railroad into it. It is an inland town with, I imagine, roughly, a population of 100 people, and they have a credit union store there and quite a nice town, but they haven't any commissioner of oaths. Now, in the ordinary course of events, in these little towns, every elevator man is commissioner of oaths, and if you want something done you can just go to the elevator for it and get your oath witnessed; but these people don't have an elevator, so they are five miles from the nearest commissioner of oaths and that is just an elevator man and he is not always there; sometimes they have to go to Redvers, which is about 12 to 15 miles to get one of these oaths signed. Now I am sorry the Attorney—General isn't in his seat over there, because this affects his Department, and I really don't like talking about a Minister's department if he isn't there, but still I won't have an opportunity to bring it up again, I don't know when I could bring it up, as a matter of fact, that he would be here, because my observation is that he comes in to pass his Bill and gets right out again; but anyway, this comes under the Department . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should explain — the Attorney-General has been suffering from a very bad attack of influenza and had a relapse, as some other members have had in the House, and I am sure my hon. friend didn't want to make any slighting reference to the fact that he is not in his seat.

Mr. McCarthy: — I appreciate that, and anything I have said in that regard I didn't mean personally; but it is a fact, since I have been in the House, he is in his seat less than anybody else. I think you will admit that. But if the hon. member is sick, I am sorry I mentioned it; but I would rather he was here because he has knowledge of this. Well, anyway, last spring, they decided they wanted a commissioner of oaths down there. Now a commissioner of oaths, of course, in a small town, especially if he is a businessman, he does the work as a public service; he doesn't make any money. They induced a chap to send in his application, with his \$5, to be appointed as a commissioner of oaths for that little town, and, after quite awhile, he got a letter back that reads like this:

“Referring to your letter of the 27th making application for appointment as commissioner of oaths to and for Saskatchewan, I have to inform you that the appointments, as such, are made only where considered necessary in the public interests, and as your appointment is not considered necessary in the public interests at the present time, you are therefore not being appointed.

“Under the circumstances I am sending you the \$5 back which you sent.”

Well now, that is about the first that I knew about it. These chaps came to me and said: “What is the matter with this thing? Why isn’t it in the public interest to have this chap appointed?” I want to say that this particular man had been on the municipal council for 24 years continuously, that he is at present the reeve of the municipality; so there was no reflection on his personal integrity as to why he should not be appointed, it is another reason altogether. Well I got hold of this thing and I came up here. I carried it around in my pocket for a long time and then when I was in Regina (and I am in very often) I tried to get hold of the Attorney-General but couldn’t get hold of him — he was never in his office. Finally I went up to the office, and I said, “Here, why isn’t it in the public interest to appoint this man?” Well, nobody knew. Nobody knew. I couldn’t get anything on it; I couldn’t get hold of the Attorney-General at that time, but after doing a lot of digging around, it was suggested to me that if I would have another name submitted that they might be able to appoint him, so I did that. I went back down to that town and we rounded up another chap who stuck his neck out and said he would take it, and he sent in his \$5. They kept it for about a month and he got identically the same answer back. It wasn’t in the public interest, so he wasn’t being appointed. Well, what I tried to find out was why it wasn’t in the public interest to have these men appointed, and apparently the unseen hand said it wasn’t — and I couldn’t catch up with it; it was surrounded by a little iron curtain. I am going to tell this House what my opinion is as to why it wasn’t in the public interest — because they were Liberals!

I said to the Attorney-General, and I will say it to you, that I don’t care who you appoint down there. You can appoint a C.C.F. You can appoint a Liberal. You can appoint a Tory. You can appoint a Social Credit, so long as you appoint somebody — but, you will have quite a job finding a C.C.F. down there. That’s the rub. In that little place down there they have very few C.C.F.’ers and they aren’t very proud of it and they don’t know who they are. So that’s the rub; but there is an unseen hand, and I don’t think that that decision was made in that office. I don’t think it was. I will leave that with you. I don’t very often ask favours of the C.C.F., but I am going to ask the Premier now to use his good influence to see that there is a commissioner of oaths appointed down in Bellegarde, and I don’t care, as I said, whether he appoints a C.C.F. or Social Credit, or Liberal, or who he appoints; but I think that it isn’t quite British justice to say to these people, because they all voted Liberal, that they can’t have a public service that this Government controls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a lot longer than I intended to. I am not going to support the budget for the same reason that my friend from Estevan (Mr. McCormack) isn’t — not because it is too big, but for the reasons I have given here: I don’t think we are getting economical expenditure of all the money we are spending.

March 5, 1951

Hon. L. F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, unquestionably this afternoon's debate, taking place March 5, 1951, will go down in the annals of the history of this Legislature. I question very much if, in the 45 years since the province entered Confederation there was ever a time when four "Mac's" spoke on a budget debate on the same day. Unfortunately, however, I believe that two of them claim Irish ancestry. It would be almost perfect if they could claim ancestry from the "hielands" of Scotland.

I was extremely interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Cannington regarding Highway No. 13. It seems to be an unfortunate number to attach not only to highways but to many other things. Unquestionably that number was given to that highway when the former Premier of this Province was representing the constituency of Cannington. He represented that constituency, Mr. Speaker, up to two years ago and I am at somewhat of a loss to know why the roads in that particular section of the province have deteriorated to the degree to which the hon. member from Cannington tells this House that they have.

It was rather interesting also to note, this afternoon, that it is not the size of the budget that is being criticized by the members to your left. They are quite agreed that this budget is probably necessary to give to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan the services which they require. But the difficulty arises now as to the distribution of the expenditures of the moneys mentioned in the budget, and the extravagance of the administration of those responsible for the expenditure of this money. Unquestionably when the Leader of the Opposition speaks in this debate he will clarify the suggestions made by the members who have spoken here this afternoon.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have made some progress in the Province of Saskatchewan in the field of development of our resources. You see, we had a terrific handicap to overcome. Forty years of stagnation through former administration cannot be overcome in a short period of some few years, and I believe we will all agree that some progress has been made during the past few years of the present Government's administration.

May I correct a statement made by the hon. member from Souris-Estevan when he was dealing with the sum of money involved in the machinery and equipment at the brick plant. If he looks up the 1949 financial statement he will note that the sum of money invested in machinery and equipment is not \$400,000 but \$146,000, of which a large percentage cannot be used in the new, modern plant.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I said the Government Finance Office had advanced \$400,000 to the corporation.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Thanks for the correction. If the hon. member from Souris-Estevan would look up the last financial statement, he will probably see that the sum is some \$50,000 or \$60,000 less than the figure mentioned. There is another slight correction. In this Province, two brick plants are in operation in addition to the one at Estevan, one at Claybank and one at Bruno. I wish to deal a little later on, in more detail, with the operations at Estevan; also at Chaplin.

Sitting here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I could not help letting my mind wander back to the days when the members opposite, led by the Crown

Prince of the West, fresh from the hustings of the 1948 election, took their seats in this Assembly. The down—town office of Tammany Hall, staffed with political experts, went to work. This being the first session of the Eleventh Legislature, it was felt by the Liberal Party that they should attack on a broad front. Agriculture came in for its share of criticism; Larger School Units of the administration were underfire; the Department of Natural Resources and Crown Corporations. That was the broad field covered by criticism of the members opposite in the first session of the Eleventh Legislature. I believe, when the Legislature prorogued, the members opposite left this Chamber somewhat sadder but probably much wiser, and as they toured the province during the following summer, I think they gained the impression that they had created no sensation at that session of the Legislature.

In the second session of the Legislature the field somewhat narrowed down. Criticisms were levelled against the lack of rural electrification and grants to rural municipalities, oil and mineral development and Crown Companies. At this session of the Legislature, I am still at a loss to know what the Government has done that it should not have done, and what it has not done that it should have done. Undoubtedly when the Leader of the Opposition rises to take part in this debate we will have that question clarified.

I would like to congratulate the member from Athabasca (Mr. Marion) on the stand which he took. After all, the member from Athabasca was raised in the Far North. He was raised among the people of the northern part of this province. He has some conception of their problems, and some conception of their ambitions and of their desires. My first visit into the Northern part of Saskatchewan was in the summer of 1944, Mr. Speaker, and in conversation with a trapper, he said to me, “Our greatest need here in the North is educational facilities. Why,” he said, “do you know that my two sons left this North, went to Prince Albert, offered their services to King and Country, passed medical category ‘A’ but were rejected because they had no education?” He said, “Do you know, my daughter is now raising a family, she has never been inside of a school. In our settlement, in our trapper and fishermen’s settlement, there are 28 children of school age and no school.”

Mr. Speaker, that was here in the province of Saskatchewan. It was not in China, nor was it in India, Africa or Japan. That was right here in the province of Saskatchewan. I have a great deal of empathy for the remarks of the hon. member from Athabasca when he laid a great deal of stress upon the need of education and expressed his appreciation for what has been done in the field of education in that part of the province where he resides.

I believe there has been a clarification of the policy from the members opposite respecting Crown Companies; and the member from Souris-Estevan was quite correct in quoting the member from The Battlefords (Mr. Maher). It was my understanding that he had stated that, insofar as the public utilities (such as Power, Telephones and Transportation) were concerned, he felt that was a proper function of government and should be operated as a service and not entirely as a means of making profit. The member for The Battlefords in dealing with other Crown Corporations specifically mentioned the sodium sulphate plant and the brick plant at Estevan. In his opinion there were two operations that should go “out the window.”

March 5, 1951

We have a statement on file, signed by a chemical engineer, dated October 15, 1947, estimating that there were sufficient intermitting crystals in Lake Chaplin to give 40 years' production on the basis of 100,000 tons per year. That plant went into operation with its first line of production on May 7, 1944. On October 4th of the same year there were four lines of production in operation.

Now, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton), in his speech on the budget, set himself up as somewhat of an authority or an expert on salts. He stated, in effect, that he could cast his eye over the huge stock pile, look over the banks of the reservoirs (and they are only a thousand feet across), and come up with the exact answer as to the tons of salt in stock. I understood him to say, also, that a firm offered to construct this plant for \$500,000. He further stated that it cost \$1,500,000 and was equipped with old and worn—out machinery. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Saltcoats is wrong on all three counts. He further stated that there were four plants operating in Saskatchewan and no need for additional capacity.

I would like to take a moment or two to review the markets into which salt cake is moving from the Chaplin plant. There are a total of 20 Kraft pulp paper customers of the sodium sulphate plant in the United States of America. There are 15 in Canada. The salt produced at Chaplin is going to the deep South, along the Gulf of Mexico, into the State of Florida, into the Virginias, the Great Lakes States, Eastern Canada and the Pacific Coast. A few weeks ago, it was decided to enlarge the capacity of that plant. Today the total capacity of the present structure, plus the addition, is completely sold out for 1951 and 1952. It is true that there are four plants in operation in the province of Saskatchewan, but it is also true that the sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin, during the year 1950, brought into the province of Saskatchewan new capital to the extent of \$655,000; new capital from the Pacific Coast, new capital from Eastern Canada, new capital from the States of the Union.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, extracts from some letters received from some of the customers. This paper company said that they wanted us to increase their order some 500 tons per month. We were not in a position to give them a guarantee that we could take care of the additional business, but we suggested to them that we could probably take care of an additional 200 tons per month. They immediately wired: "Do your utmost to secure for us from your Chaplin plant the additional requirements of 500 tons a month." Here are extracts from a letter from a paper company in Canada:

"We wish to thank you for the first three cars of salt cake from Chaplin. Our technical director has completed his analysis of the first two cars and we are very pleased with the result. In our opinion these two cars of salt cake are the best we have received from Saskatchewan. We are very pleased and wish to congratulate you and your associates on your fine development at Chaplin and the excellent quality of salt cake you are producing."

Further, this company states; "Our contract with you is for 3,000 tons. We are so pleased with your salt cake you are shipping we would appreciate receiving approval to change the quantity to 5,000 tons." And note, since then, they have asked us to increase that 3,000 ton order to 7,000 tons

per annum. They go on to say:

“We wish to ensure you that in view of the splendid quality of your salt cake, Saskatchewan Minerals will always have full consideration in any additional quantities we may require in the future. Thanking you for an early reply and wishing you continued success in the development of the natural resources of your great province.”

From a company that placed an order for 20,000 tons per annum with the Chaplin plant:

“We have completed and tested every car you have shipped us. You have delivered exactly as you said you would. The pulp mill could not want better salt cake.”

And yet the hon. member from Saltcoats expressed an opinion that this was not of any value to the Province of Saskatchewan. This is one of those plants that would go “out the window.” Mr. Speaker, may I read to this House a telegram received? It is addressed to myself as chairman of the Board of Saskatchewan Minerals under date of March 1st:

“Concerning statements made regarding the disbanding of the Chaplin sodium plant, the undersigned would call your attention to the fact that this plant is a great asset to the Province and this district in particular. At the present time nearly 130 men from all parts of Saskatchewan are employed, quite a number of whom would be on relief today. For these reasons, we strongly protest any suggestion of the closing of this plant at Chaplin.”

That is signed by Mr. A.E. Rudd, Overseer of the Village of Chaplin, J. Earl Kennedy, Reeve for R. M. 164 and Thomas Mason, President of the Sodium Sulphate Workers' Union.

I was rather pleased and appreciative of the complimentary remarks of the hon. member for Souris-Estevan in connection with the operations of the ceramic industry situated a short distance from the town of Estevan. The brick plant, as mentioned by the hon. member is being modernized. An article appearing in the “Western Construction and Building Magazine,” February issue, says:

“The new \$400,000 brick and tile plant of Saskatchewan Clay Products at Estevan is expected to be in operation by April 1st with a capacity of 20,000 tons production a year, much higher quality product and one of the speediest clay production lines in Canada. The new plant at Estevan boasts the only tunnel kiln on the prairies and will operate the year round, compared to a maximum of 8 months' operation per year for the old plant. When completed, the new plant will consist of three main connecting buildings, a 110 by 140 foot

March 5, 1951

storage building of steel construction will be built this spring, this building will hold 10 thousand tons of clay and will make year-round factory operations independent of weather. A new crushing building was constructed. This is a wooden frame, 16 by 24 by 48 feet high and connects the storage building to the main manufacturing building. The main manufacturing building is an L-shaped structure 340 feet by 55 feet with a 40 by 60 foot wing for the manufacturing area. Production will be doubled from 10 to 20 thousand tons of clay. The time required to turn out a single batch of bricks, from manufacturing machine to the box car has been cut from one month to 44 hours, a great improvement in quality of brick, harder and denser with less porosity, truer in shape, more uniform in colour and size and are expected to meet the exacting standards required in the construction field. Less loss through breakage and even burning, longer production season for old drying and burning equipment as long it is kept in operation because of the clay storage facilities.”

Finally, it says;

“Although there is a ready market in the United States, most of the plant’s production goes to points in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the main market area for the factory extends from Swift Current on the West to Lloydminster on the North and Fort William, Ontario on the East. The greatest single market is Winnipeg.”

And then they put in an ad. to which private industry and government attach their signature.

By the time the remarks that have been made in this House this afternoon reach the streets tomorrow morning, the brick plant at Estevan will be in operation, using a portion of the new structure and the old. So long as the demand remains as it is, Mr. Speaker, the old and the new will both be into production by approximately April 20th.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to analyze the wishes of the members opposite. All three who spoke this afternoon suggested they were not opposing the budget in principle but were voting against it because of inequality in the distribution of the expenditure and also the extravagance of the administration. The hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) stated the other day in the course of the debate that he was not opposing the budget but he was opposing the C.C.F. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the city fathers who, because of pressure from their citizens, saw fit to make an investigation and then decided to close up an east-end roadhouse: no other course for the proprietor to follow but to put his goods and wares up for sale by auction. There were ready bidders for the equipment of this place, with the sole exception of a parrot. The local minister’s boy, being extremely fond of pets, asked his father if he could

bring the parrot home, because the proprietor had offered to give it to him. Finally, his father consented and the lad and his family and the parrot got along well. One Sunday he asked his father if he might be permitted to take the parrot to church. He father weakened under the constant pleas and the son rushed off to church one Sunday with the parrot under his arm. The choir filed in and the parrot looked up and he said, "Oh, new chorus girls." Pretty soon the minister took his place behind the pulpit and the parrot said, "A new master of ceremonies." As he looked around the congregation he said, "But the same old faces with the same old arguments." I believe that that is the position which we find the members opposite taking in respect to the debates that have been going on for some few days.

When we compare the percentage increase of the budget here in Saskatchewan with the percentage increase of the budgets in the neighbouring provinces, we will find that their percentage increase is much higher than the percentage increase here in Saskatchewan. I heard it stated the other day that the interest charges on the Dominion debt is now greater than the cost of all Federal Government services in 1939. I believe the people of the United States, through their Government, are speaking of a budget that ranges into several billions of dollars. I sometime wonder what will happen to our economy when the artificial production and distribution for the preparation of war ends.

Here in our own province we are very happy to note great progress being made by the people in the co-operative scene. It is interesting to note that the credit union movement since its inception has loaned to the membership some \$36 millions. It is interesting to note that they have assets now of something over \$13 million. It was also interesting to have attended the annual meeting of the Sherwood Co-operative Association held recently and to note that the total savings since its inception twenty years ago to their members is \$1,275,000. I am very happy that the people of this province, through their own effort, through their co-operative effort, channelled in the business year just ended some \$300 millions of purchasing power through co-operative business enterprises. In my own opinion there is no doubt that the destiny of mankind rests in the field of co-operative endeavour. Capitalism and Communism will pass from the centre of the stage and co-operation will decide the destiny of man.

I would like now to deal with my own Department, Mr. Speaker, but may I ask you to call it 6 o'clock.

The sitting was resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh (continuing): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House while I return once more to the question of brick. You know, bricks and sewer pipe might be very important during the next 18 months to two years and I wish to say that I appreciate the remarks made by the member for Souris-Estevan and his interpretation of the public meeting held in Estevan to which he referred. I would like at this time to place upon the records, a telegram received from Estevan under date of March 2nd addressed to myself as chairman of the board of the mineral corporation:

Mr. McCormack: — Better read it. You had a hard time getting it.

March 5, 1951

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — “In your answer to the debate on Crown Corporations by Liberal members, we strongly demand that the brick plant should not be throw out the window. We are sure this is the opinion of the majority in the district.

This is signed by the Clay Products Workers’ Union.

Under date of March 3rd, I had a letter under the signature of Mayor H. Nicholson:

“It would appear from the press reports that the Saskatchewan Government is receiving some criticism in regard to the operation of the Estevan brick plant. I am of the same opinion about the brick plant as I expressed at a public meeting held in Estevan some time ago when you outlined a proposal to remodel the brick plant. I believe the citizens of Estevan are quite satisfied with the programme that has been carried on in the remodelling of the plant, and there is no doubt that Estevan will have one of the most up-to-date brick plants in the west in operation this year. Wishing you every success in this undertaking.” Signed “H. Nicholson” Mayor of the Town of Estevan.

I could not help but wonder if the hon. member for Cannington, in the event of not securing No. 13 Highway up to standard, would be interested in settling for one or two Crown Corporations in his constituency.

Mr. McCarthy: — I would like to know what they are first.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the Department over which I have the honour to preside, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), the “Lancashire Lad”, on his stand for peace. I happened to have the privilege of visiting Great Britain in the late fall of 1944 and travelled from the North of Scotland to the South of England, during which time I had the privilege of visiting many of the factories of Britain. I had an opportunity to examine Britain’s war effort, and I want to say to this House that if ever one witnessed a total war effort it was evident in every corner of Britain. Its factories were producing war materials; its consumer goods for civilian purposes were curtailed to the minimum. On arriving in London one Saturday evening from Manchester I was taken to my hotel and I was asked by the host if I had anything that I would especially like to do the following day. I expressed a wish to see some of the bomb damage in London.

That evening, while talking to an officer of the Canadian armed services in the lobby of the hotel, we heard an explosion, felt the vibration, noticed some of the guests filing out of the hotel. I casually said to this armed services person, “How would it be if you and I step out to see what is taking place.” When we got out on the Strand we stepped into glass, and as we walked up the Strand there were thousands of British people moving to and fro as if nothing had happened. The following morning about 8 o’clock, I felt another vibration through the hotel, and the report later that day

were that a V-2 had dropped somewhere in the vicinity of London on the Saturday night and again on the Sunday morning. We spent from 10 o'clock Sunday morning until 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon viewing some of the bomb damage suffered by the people of London. We also had the pleasure of witnessing the home defence army stepping down.

Later on, in the early summer of 1946, while again in the United Kingdom, I spent a few hours in Coventry, a few hours in Bristol, Birmingham, and again saw evidence of the damage suffered by the people of the United Kingdom. When the member for Swift Current is addressing the Assembly here, I cannot help but feel that he, having experienced some of the bitterness of war, feels that, insofar as we as civilians in Canada are concerned and insofar as the population of the United States is concerned, we have not experienced the bitterness of war. I cannot help but admire the hon. member's stand on peace.

I was speaking to a prominent business man who visited the United Kingdom in 1948, the first time he had been back home since 1937. He was always rather critical of the people of Britain, but he told me that when the ship set sail from Liverpool he walked up on the deck and took off his hat in reverence to the people of Great Britain.

I would like at this time to make a slight correction in some figures that I gave here the other day, with your permission, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned that in the U. K. - Canadian wheat agreement, in the third year they paid \$1.55 a bushel and in the fourth year \$2.00 a bushel. The contract reads: "Not less than \$1.25 a bushel in the third year and not less than \$1.00 a bushel in the fourth year." I now find that \$2.00 a bushel was paid in both the third and the fourth year, plus six cents a bushel carrying charge, or a total of \$2.06 a bushel. So, in place of the figure that I gave, being \$182 million in excess of the figure mentioned in the contract, the figure should read \$261,800,000.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, could I have that figure again, please? Since the members opposite have undertaken to correct us very often, might I point out to the Minister who has just spoken that those figures given for the third and fourth years he should know are minimum figures. It was definitely provided that the actual price should be fixed by agreement, and when he pretends that the British Government has overpaid what they owed under that agreement he has done no service to the farmers of this country and he has stated what is not true.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the other day, when I was dealing with this subject, that the figures in the third and fourth years were the minimum figures in the contract, \$1.25 and \$1.00. The figures that I am giving you now are the actual figures paid under that contract.

Now, a great deal has been said in connection with the Britnell report and the treatment that this Government has given to municipal governments in this province. A great deal of thought and study has been given to the question of provincial—municipal relations. I have here a report, "The Reorganization of Provincial-Municipal Relations in the Province of Nova Scotia" which brings out the tremendous increase in municipal expenditures in that province. In 1930, the increase was \$285 million and in 1948 it was \$402 million. Then I looked over the Judge Report for the Province of Alberta, 1948, and I noted the Judge Report made 26 recommendations to

March 5, 1951

the Alberta Government in respect to provincial municipal relations. Eighteen of the 26 are now in effect in the province of Saskatchewan.

Then we pick up the Jacoby report, presented to the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan in 1936, and we turn to page 176, where they are dealing with the Public Revenue Tax, and it says here:

“One proposal to which the Commission has given most careful consideration is that the public revenue tax of 2 mills on the equalized ratable assessment of the province be retained, but designated as an educational tax, the proceeds of which would be used exclusively for the purpose of increasing present grants to rural and urban schools. Supporters of this measure believe that increasing the scale of school grants by this means would reduce, to an equivalent extent, the school taxes.” And so on.

A little further down, they say;

“Admittedly, this proposal has substantial merit, it has received consistent support from a minority of the Commission. The Commission’s recommendation, then is this: A majority of the Commission, therefore, recommends elimination of ad valorem taxation of property by the Provincial Government for any purpose whatever; only in the event that such taxation is continued, would the Commission recommend, in the alternative, that it be converted into an educational tax.”

This report was presented to the Provincial Government in 1936. Then in the Journals of the Session of 1937, and in the Speech from the Throne, the following occurs:

“Following requests made by municipal and other organizations, my Government, last year, appointed an independent Commission to investigate and report upon the question of the incidence of provincial and municipal taxation in Saskatchewan. This Commission was headed by Mr. Neil H. Jacoby, a former resident of this province and a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. With him were associated representatives of the rural and urban municipal associations, the various trustees’ and teachers’ organizations and one member representing the province at large. For this service rendered by the members of the Commission, my Government wishes to express its sincere thanks.”

And, in the same Speech from the Throne, it goes on to state;

“Legislation will be submitted to provide for the real of the public revenue tax and the substitution therefor of an education tax which, with the income of the school lands fund, will be especially earmarked for educational purposes.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It has been gone for 14 years!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I hope that the members opposite . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What are you reading from? Will you tell us again what you are reading from?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — The Journals of 1937 and the Throne Speech. Looking around I note that some of the hon. members opposite were members of the Government of that day. Some members of the Opposition at this moment, of course, feel that this Public Revenue Tax should be abandoned immediately, today and not tomorrow.

Now, in the Department of Municipal Affairs, we are going to ask the Legislature to give consideration to voting \$710,000, an additional sum of \$165,000 chargeable to capital, for clearing and breaking. Of the \$710,000, we will be asking the House to consider \$285,000 for general municipal purposes and \$424,000, in round figures, for the administration of local improvement districts. And might I, for the information of the House, state that there are, or were, as at March 31, 1950, 153 employees in the Department of Municipal Affairs. Now, in case some of the members opposite feel that we might be dictating to the municipalities, might I quote from the "Free Press", July 7th, a statement made by Mayor George C. McLean of St. Boniface — Mayor McLean was the president of the Dominion Association of Municipal Mayors. It says:

"He gave the welcome address to the 17th annual meeting of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and he said 'I have made no provision — no province in Canada gives less financial aid to her citizens and municipalities than the Province of Manitoba. I have made this statement on several occasions and I have never been challenged yet,' stated the Mayor, who charged that the Provincial Government was not playing fair with the citizens and the municipalities of Manitoba."

Then I note here, from the "Star-Phoenix", December 1, 1950, quoting Murray Fisher, Deputy Commissioner for the Manitoba Government. He is addressing the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and he said, in part:

"When you took office, you undertook to carry out the law and do a good job. Whether you like it or not, you are going to dispense that responsibility properly or the opportunity will be taken away from you."

Not a murmur from the members opposite.

Mr. Tucker: — What did that prove?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I would first like to deal with the Assessment Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs. The Assessment Branch of the Department is, I believe, in the opinion of the municipal administrators of this province, one of the very important and vital branches of municipal service. They have completed their re-assessment of all the rural municipalities, local improvement districts and towns and cities of

March 5, 1951

under 15,000 population. In the reorganization of the Assessment Branch, in order to maintain a constant review of changed valuations, we have set up 13 assessment districts in the province, with a man in charge of each district and, in some of the districts, an assistant. During the year under review, there was re-inspection for assessment purposes in 156 different municipal units, a total of 6,697 parcels of land. Now the total overall assessment in all of the municipalities in the province for taxation purposes, is \$896 million.

The Assessment Branch is paid out of Provincial funds and none of the reassessing that they are doing is charged back to the municipalities. The Province has accepted the responsibility of financing the work done by the Assessment Branch.

Municipal Auditing and Accounting is also considered to be rather an important branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs. This particular branch, small though it is, is constantly reviewing financial statements of all the municipalities, watching their debenture issues and their collections, and attempting to give them directions in an effort to maintain sound municipal financing throughout the province.

It is interesting to note that, in 1944, for example, rural municipalities collected 161 per cent of one year's tax levy, villages 117 per cent; towns 144, and cities 102. That was the first indication that tax arrears were being paid in the province. In 1949 we reached a period in municipal administration when most of the tax arrears had been paid. In that year the rural municipalities collected 93.35 per cent of one year's levy; villages, 93.59; towns, 92.91 — and the cities, 94.75 per cent of one year's tax levy. In dealing with the accumulated arrears of taxes, which includes tax sales certificates, in the rural municipalities of this province, in 1929 the arrears of taxes and (as I stated) tax sales certificates amounted to \$22 million; in 1936, \$62 millions; in 1944, \$34 millions, and in 1949, \$20 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, might I just suggest here that municipalities must of necessity rely upon the economy of their ratepayers in order that they may secure the necessary funds to execute their responsibilities as municipal administrators. The overall provincial agricultural policy is commencing to play an important part in laying a firmer economic foundation under agriculture in this province. The loan and debenture picture during the year under review did not change a great deal from the previous year. In villages it was practically unchanged, somewhat increased in the cities and decreased in the towns and the rural municipalities. It is interesting to note that in the year under review 471 municipal units did not borrow money, and that 308 municipalities reduced loan debentures in the same year. In our province we have an overall average mill rate for municipal and school purposes averaging 30.4 mills; and might I just say again that in the province of Alberta it is 44.68 mills and in the province of Manitoba 49.13 mills.

The Community Planning Branch: very little is heard of this Branch, and to the hon. members opposite, who do not believe in too much planning, might I hasten to say that this branch was set up by, I believe, a Liberal Government. As the years rolled by, however, this particular Branch found that its work constantly increased. It has the problem of

adjusting boundaries both in rural and in urban municipalities. It has the problem of assisting in proper community planning. It has the problem, also, of dealing with the maps when there is any alteration in the boundaries of municipalities. Then there is the question of the "fringe area" development which has grown up particularly around the city of Regina. The City of Regina and Rural Municipality No. 159 were faced with a bit of a problem with respect to the development of the fringe area outside of the boundaries of the city. Saskatoon and the municipality surrounding that city are also faced with a little problem. Weyburn and Yorkton are also faced with a fringe development problem around their boundaries. We have dealt with boundaries in Foam Lake, Lloydminster, Meadow Lake, Kamsack and Tisdale during the year under review, and from the villages have come inquiries for assistance from the Community Planning Branch.

Then, we have an Inspection Service. Municipal inspectors, five in number, carry out inspection and other work in all of the municipalities in the province, excluding the cities but covering some 304 rurals, 395 villages, five summer resorts and 84 towns. They have a total of 788 municipalities in which they carry out inspection work, give assistance and guidance to the officials of those municipalities. During the year under review, some 694 inspections were made. Last spring, we curtailed the routine inspection and asked the inspectors to devote more time to assisting and advising municipal councils. So a great deal of the time during the summer was spent with the elected representatives of the rural municipalities and we have received a large number of letters commending the Department on this change of policy and expressions of gratitude for the services rendered by the five municipal inspectors who are covering the province of Saskatchewan.

In this year under review, 24 hamlets were organized under Section 21 of The Rural Municipal Act. That section makes provisions for a hamlet to set up a committee and that committee works in conjunction with the elected rural municipal council, giving guidance and direction to the developments and expenditures within the hamlet. So 24 hamlets were organized in the year under review. Some 304 by-laws were submitted to the Department and approved of. By-laws under the various municipal Acts are submitted to the Department of Municipal Affairs for final approval.

Also, in the year under review, there was a work-and-wage programme that covered some 52 municipal units. Some \$110,000 work was authorized of which the Provincial Government's share was \$58,000. The work-and-wage programme took place in those municipal units where, because of crop conditions and other economic factors, it was felt that work-and-wage programmes would be of beneficial assistance to the ratepayers: this, in comparison with the work-and-wage programme in some 15 municipal units in the year 1948.

Municipal boundaries were drafted on a map and the ratepayers residing within those boundaries were free to organize self-government. The area consisted of some nine townships. So today, we find quite a change taking place. We find, for example, that the population in a nine-township municipality or the standard rural municipality varies from 383 to a maximum of 4,710; so we have that variation in total population within municipalities. May I again repeat — from a minimum of 383 to a maximum of 4,710 of a population within the boundaries of the municipal units. We find, also, that the

March 5, 1951

assessment varies considerably from a minimum of \$455,000 to a maximum of \$8,333,000. This is the variation in the agreement for taxation purposes and may I again repeat — from a minimum of \$455,000 to a maximum of \$8,333,000. The mill rates levied by these municipalities also show a great variation from a minimum of 6 mills to a maximum of 33 mills for municipal purposes.

When you are considering the municipal Estimates, you will be asked to give consideration to voting a small sum for re-organization work and alteration in boundaries. During the year under review, orders have been issued, after full consultation and endorsement, whereby Rural Municipalities Nos. 142 and 172 amalgamated, excluding the lower three townships, namely the south townships on No. 142. Rural Municipalities Nos. 347 and 348 have amalgamated. Rural Municipalities Nos. 464, 465 and 466 have joined. Municipality No. 465, which had been under an administrator for at least 15 years, disappeared and amalgamated with Nos. 464 and 466. Local improvement district units 488, 489, 517, 518 and 519, organized into a municipality becoming one of the largest municipal units that we have in the Province of Saskatchewan today. Local improvement district unit 523 joined with Rural Municipality No. 493. That was the field of amalgamation that took place within the year under review.

Consideration is being given by the ratepayers in local improvement district No. 227 to amalgamate with the two adjoining municipalities, Rural Municipalities Nos. 12, 18, 132, 426 and 495 are discussing the question of their municipal boundaries. Also, a group of 15 municipalities and 13 the local improvement units in the south-west corner are giving consideration to a re-organization in order that they may better meet the conditions which they are faced with at the present time. Then, in the Canwood-Spiritwood-Leoville area discussions are taking place relative to a change in the municipal boundaries in that particular area of the province. Action has also been mentioned by Rural Municipalities Nos. 225, 226, 255 and 256, Municipalities Nos. 276 and 306, Rural Municipalities Nos. 290 and 260, Local Improvement Districts 361 and 365, and Local Improvement District 588 and the surrounding territory. That is an indication of the interest that is now taken by rural municipalities and the residents of local improvement districts in order that they might improve their economic and financial positions. In order that they may better cope with the increasing demands for services that arise from time to time. They are giving consideration to building for themselves an economic unit of local administration. As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, the House will be asked to give consideration to a small vote to assist these municipalities to arrive at a conclusion in respect to alteration of boundaries.

In the Local Improvement Districts of the province, we have, for administration purposes, 22 Local Improvement Districts. These L.I.D.s cover an area equal in size to 78 ordinary municipalities. It is estimated that we have a population of some 40,000 people in local improvement districts. We levy a tax, strange as it may seem to the members opposite. In one year's levy, taxes for municipal purposes in this vast area were about \$316,000. The mill rate ranges from 10 to 14 mills. In the year 1950, up to December 31st, we collected 92.89 per cent of one year's levy. Also, chiefly in that area, in order to assist the settlers, the Government has advanced during the past five years some \$572,000 for a clearing and breaking programme. I am happy to report that up to the end of 1950, 63,000 acres have been cleared and broken under this programme. The policy set out was first to take those

that had less than 40 acres under cultivation. It was increased to 60, then to 70 and then to 100 acres. Those that had less than that figure under cultivation were eligible for assistance under this programme, with a limit of 20 acres to each individual unit. We suggested to those people that they pay back out of the land broken under this programme, one-third of the crop raised on that land until their obligations have been discharged.

The work of the local improvement district consists practically of the same type of work that is carried on by our municipal governments — the destruction of coyotes and noxious weeds, health and sanitation, nuisance grounds, fire prevention, grasshopper control, maintenance of roads and bridges, construction of roads and so on. Broadly speaking the work carried on by the Local Improvement District Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs is similar in nature to the services rendered by a local municipal government.

We have what we consider rather an interesting project in the local improvement district known as the Green Lake Project. In the Green Lake district, Mr. Speaker, we have somewhere between 600 and 700 Metis settlers, and we try to develop a work-and-wage programme that will give to these settlers a reasonable standard of living. There is certain seasonal work. For example, in the winter months there is logging, lumbering and trapping. Many of the local Metis are sought after by logging contractors and lumbering contractors in the northern part of the province. Then, in the spring of the year, there is casual farm work — clearing land, picking root, working for farmers in other districts and working on the central farm that is located in the Green Lake district. In the summer months there is work for other employers; there is work at the sawmill, and blueberry picking. Then there is the building and repair work. In the fall, many of the Metis go out harvesting; some of them harvest on the central farm of the Green Lake district.

May I just mention here that the Metis in the Green Lake settlement are recognized as very good employees and are sought after by the employers of labour. I would like to state further that no social aid to employable Metis at Green Lake has been granted for the past five years. We have been able, under the careful guidance of Mr. Elliott and “Scotty” Bruce, who is the Manager of the central farm, to give these people work and wages. And when I speak of work and wages, I speak of a wage ranging from 70 cents to \$1.25 an hour, and from \$65 to \$220 a month if they work on a monthly salary. At the present time we have 1,000 acres of that very heavy bush land under cultivation. There are 31 Metis families that have been allocated plots. On these plots 375 acres are broken and ready for seeding this coming spring. On the central farm 625 acres are under cultivation, of which 200 acres are seeded to forage. On the central farm are 80 head of cattle, and a flock of 400 poultry. Many of the Metis work on that farm, get their training and experience in preparation for going on their own local plots. Might I say for the information of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the little hamlet of Green Lake has electric lights and electric power (we sometimes refer to it as the Green Lake Power Commission) supplied by the Local Improvement District. We have picture shows there, organized co-operatively by the people of that district. They have their own hall, their own picture projector and they have organized a co-operative to operate it. They also have tennis courts for summer recreation; they skate and curl. All is organized on a community basis, with the Metis taking a very active part in conducting their business.

March 5, 1951

I would like to take this opportunity of complimenting the staff, particularly the inspector, Mr. Elliott and the farm manager, Mr. Bruce, for the very excellent job they are doing in connection with the operations of the Green Lake Metis projects.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think anything further that needs to be said in connection with the operation of the Department of Municipal Affairs can be said when the estimates are before the Assembly for consideration; but, for the information of some of the hon. members opposite, the amount of road work done in the year under review may be of some interest. The local improvement district is the owner of road building machinery. In other words the machinery for road building is owned by the Department, and it is used in the various local improvement districts throughout the province. In 1949 we built 412 miles of new grade in local improvement districts in this province. We re-graded 134 miles; we maintained 3,683 miles of road; we put in 603 culverts and, for the information of the hon. member from Cannington, we built 70 new bridges and repaired 67 other bridges. That, in the main, was the public works programme carried on in 1949 by the local improvement district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I am confident that there will be no difficulty in getting the estimates through this House, particularly in view of the fact that the hon. members opposite are not worried about the size of the budget, they are only worried about a satisfactory distribution of the moneys they are going to vote. I trust that the information I have been able to give will assist them materially in coming to a sound and sane judgment in respect to the expenditures of this Department.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by congratulating the Provincial Treasurer on a very excellent budget, a budget that is within the means and the ability of the people of this province to pay. I want to congratulate those on this side of the House who have take part in the budget debate, feeling confident that it is a budget that our people can meet, and that the expenditures are distributed among the various departments in such a way that the greatest good will be done to the greatest number. I will regret, of course, if No. 13 is not brought up to a very high standard. It will be rather regrettable if the highways in the provincial constituency of Humboldt will not meet the exacting demands of the representative from that constituency, but you can rest assured that the moneys in the Highway Estimates will be spent in such a way that they will bring the greatest good to the greatest number.

I am going to be exceptionally happy, this year, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the budget.

Mr. L. S. Blanchard (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this budget debate I intend to confine myself to just two subjects — one is mining, and the other is roads. It is not my intention to hand out a lot of problems, and then turn around and criticize the Government for the things that they have done or they have not done. It is my intention to start speaking to you, for a few moments, about mining and the mining industry and its importance to the province of Saskatchewan.

Since coming in to the House here, I have heard considerable about the plant that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company are building at the present time at Flin Flon. I have heard it spoken of as an expansion programme, and I have also heard that it was built in Saskatchewan. Now maybe I can straighten this out a little bit for you. Having lived up there for 14 years and worked for the Company for 12 years I do happen to know a little of the workings of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. This new plant that they are building, at the present time is called a “fuming” plant. I don’t suppose the word “fuming” means anything to most of us, and to explain the object of this plant or why the Company should spend \$9 million to build a fuming plant, I would have to go back a few years.

When the late Thomas Creighton and his associates first located the ore body at Flin Flon, they realized the fact that they had a very large body of ore and they also realized the fact that it was a very low-grade ore. At that particular time, copper did not have a great deal of value, so they realized that they had to establish some ways and means of extracting the valuable metal out of this low-grade ore. After considerable experimenting in both the United States and Canada, they finally arrived at a process which is called the “flotation” process. Now it is not my idea to attempt to explain the flotation process to you, it would take considerable time to do it; but I will go so far as to say that the ore is pulverized into a flour and it is mixed with water and after that, by use of different formulas, different metals of different values are collected from this solution while still in suspension.

The Company after they had inaugurated this system and arrived at a decision to use the flotation process, started erecting their plant. When they put it into operation, they realized the fact that there was a certain amount of zinc, a small portion of gold and some other valuable metals, in much lesser quantities, but it was the zinc that they were after; they realized the fact that they weren’t collecting all the value out of this ore. When I went to work for them 14 years ago, they were experimenting at that time on some means by which they could reclaim all the value that is left in this ore.

I might explain to you that the process that they had at that particular time left a residue which they called a ‘zinc’ residue. Now the only way I can explain that to you is to say that it is just about the same consistency as putty, and it was sort of a rust colour — very peculiar in a way because it would never freeze and it would never dry out. So, over 20-odd years, each day the accumulation of this residue kept piling up and piling up until they had mountains of it. Finally, after about 10 years of experimenting they did arrive at a process whereby this zinc could be reclaimed and that process is known as the fuming process. This zinc residue with a certain amount of crushed slag is put into a large furnace and, you might say, it is practically burned up. Now I know you people are familiar with what happens to zinc when you get it a little bit too hot — it practically goes up in smoke, you might say; it is sort of a grayish substance and it is feathery and light, and this zinc residue mixed with the slag is put in this large furnace and practically burned out so that particles go up into a drum by a suction pipe. I suppose all members are quite familiar with woodworking shops. On the top of the woodworking shop you will see a large galvanized container and all the sawdust all goes up there — it is separated, and the sawdust goes down a chute the air passing out the other side. Well, very

March 5, 1951

much this same process is used. It all goes in to this separator and the zinc then comes out in the soldering form and later is made into little ingots for shipping.

I think myself that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company are due for a lot of credit; they are not exploiting the wealth of the north but they are spending \$9 million making it possible to reclaim this mine residue.

I have told you that this was not necessarily an expansion problem, nor is it in Saskatchewan. It is built on the Manitoba—Saskatchewan border. That is the only place they had. They had no choice; they could not do otherwise. As this zinc residue has been accumulating over the years, it is quite likely that the Saskatchewan zone will get a fairly substantial amount for royalties from this new plant that is being put up at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, may I ask the location of this plant? I got my information from the solicitor of the company. I didn't know whether it was on the border, or all in Saskatchewan. I heard the member mentioning the location . . .

Mr. Blanchard: — I want to explain why it is half in Saskatchewan. Years ago when the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company first started to install their plant up there, I really think they thought they were in Saskatchewan — or in Manitoba I should say; but due to the fact that where the plant is built is the correction line — as you know, the farther north you go, the closer these correction lines come; but some years ago they struck a new line and they found out that part of the plant was in Saskatchewan.

Now, the point I want to bring out — and it is rather peculiar — is that that mistake has made it possible for this Government to receive a very substantial royalty from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. I think, as far as this Government is concerned, that that amount of money is just banded to them on a platter. Let me explain that to you. In the early days they sank a couple of experimental shafts, and finally, they arrived at what they call No. 3 shaft. They worked in this shaft for a great many years, but the deeper they went, as they started putting drifts off in all directions, it was found that the farther down they went and the farther south they went, the more value there was in the ore that they took out. So after a few years they realized the fact that “By golly! We are under Saskatchewan. We are taking this ore out of Saskatchewan now.” Well you will notice, if you care to look at the Annual Report of the Department of Natural Resources, if you turn to page 38, it gives there a table of the minerals that were taken out from 1940 to 1949. All you have to do is look over that table and you can see how, this last 10 years, there has been much more ore taken from Saskatchewan than there has been from the Manitoba side.

What I want to point out is that it is doubtful if this Government of ours has ever done anything towards developing the natural resources in the north as far as minerals is concerned — that is, metals, particularly base metals. Very few people realize the important of base metals. I don't think we have any occasion to worry about the uranium. If the occasion demands that we are going to need uranium in large quantities, there is no doubt in my mind at all but that the Federal Government, or possibly the United States

government, would step in and develop it — if it is required. We hope it isn't; but if they have to, I think it would only be a few short months until the thing could really be put in development in that uranium field.

I want to speak a little while on the importance of copper. Have you ever stopped to realize just what copper means to us? What would we do today without copper? We would have to go back at least 50 years, and I don't think any of us would like that idea. Telephones, telegraphs — that would be out altogether without copper; automobiles, electric motors, washing machines, radios, radar, even the food would suffer from the lack of copper. Tons and tons of copper are used every year in the form of copper sulphate for our refrigeration.

Another valuable metal we couldn't do without, today, is zinc. A lot of intricate castings are made by the use of zinc; they are what we call die-casts — these little gadgets on here — if you have ever noticed they are made out of zinc die-casts and they are perfect, they require no machining. Zinc is the only metal that we have that could make that possible.

Then too, there is nickel which for a good many years was known as a devil's metal — something else we can't get away from. If it weren't possible for us to use nickel as an alloy, with some of our many varieties of steels, everything that we have would be so large and cumbersome that it would be practically useless to us. We would have to have too much power to even push them over the roads. Our aeroplanes wouldn't have power enough to get up off the ground. They called nickel the devil's metal for a good many years — couldn't find out how to use it. They mixed it with other steels and they found out that it did add to the toughness of the steel — to a great extent, in fact; but it also made it so hard that they couldn't machine it. Then they finally found other alloys that could be added, whereby they finally got rid of the hardness. That means that, today, a piece of steel that had the potential strength of 68,000 pounds per square inch, has more than twice that by the use of other alloys. So you can just figure the importance of the proper use of zinc and nickel, and we have both here in Saskatchewan.

I would like to tell you, for a moment or two, about what Manitoba is doing. Manitoba seems very anxious to develop her north country. There is property up at Snow Lake that will be coming into production very shortly, and we expect Mid Lake to start into production this coming spring; they are practically all set now. Two weeks ago 20 C.N.R. surveyors landed at a place called Sherridon to survey a site for a railroad between Sherridon — that is the location of the Sherritt-Gordon mines, and Lynn Lake. Now they have 20 surveyors in there and they must mean business as they are hauling in some houses by caterpillar from the town of Sherridon. I might also mention the United States government has entered into a contract with them to take their entire output of nickel. The Manitoba Government is also thinking very seriously of appointing a northern advisor to study and make recommendations on Northern Manitoba development.

Now what are we doing? What are we doing about the development of our northern country as far as minerals are concerned? The fish and furs seem to be pretty well under control, and possibly the lumber development is pretty well under control; but to get right down to brass tacks, what are we

March 5, 1951

doing about developing our minerals up there — copper, zinc, nickel, and there are other metals up there in lesser quantities that are even more valuable. We are not worried about gold.

You know I could tell you a little yarn here that would make you all take notes. I don't know whether I should mention this here or not, but I don't see any harm in it. If it weren't for the fact that the United States and the Canadian Governments 30 years ago suppressed a patent that originated in Seattle, Washington, today copper would be more valuable than gold. Now that is rather a big statement, isn't it? You can look it up — it is a fact. If you want to dig into some papers away back in 1920-21, it is possible that you can read it.

I see you all refer to the "Leader Post". However that is a paper we very seldom get up where I come from, but while I am in the city here I read it. There is one little article to which I want to make reference, written about the address of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources when speaking to the People's Forum two or three Sundays ago. At the conclusion of his remarks some interested persons made inquiries, and told him that they didn't think that this Government was doing enough toward the development of mining claims in the north country. Mr. Brockelbank's reply was something like this:

"that the amount of money required was so great and the job was so risky that the Government could not finance and develop the claims."

He goes on to say that "if a prospector has a good claim he should be able to gather the finances necessary to develop it."

Well now it takes lot more than one claim to do any good. You have to have a lot of them and they have to be in a group. I don't want you to think that I am advocating giving away the wealth of the north or giving away our natural resources, but until such time as this Government or some other government grants out concessions to mining corporations which have the money and the personnel and the equipment and the knowledge to come into our country and develop, we are not going to get any place. I am not suggesting to this Government what to do other than that some concessions have got to be granted. I might point out that the Manitoba Government did grant the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company the right to operate their mines for a period of 20 years free of paying any royalties. They also went good for bonds. They backed bonds to the Dominion Government to the extent of \$500,000 for the building of the railway from The Pas to Flin Flon. I am glad to say that when it was completed it turned out to be successful from the start and the Manitoba Government were not called upon to go good for any part of that \$500,000 bond. I am firmly of the opinion that if this Government would grant some sort of a concession, some sort of inducement, that at least two of the large mining companies would come in and start developing in our immediate neighbourhood. As I say, I am not concerned so much about the uranium. If it becomes a necessity, the Federal Government and possibly the United State Government will take over. I feel quite sure it will only be a very short time, if these concessions were granted, that mining corporations would also come in and it would only be a very short time before we would have another Trail, another Sudbury, and it would be in Saskatchewan.

I put more time in there than I had intended but I see that the Minister of Highways is in his chair tonight, and I am going to switch to roads. I would ask the Minister of Highways to build and blacktop four miles of road. I do not think that is a very big undertaking — four miles; and if I point out the necessity for this road it might do some good. One and one-half miles of this four miles I speak of is road leading from the town of Flin Flon to a little summer resort, a children's playground, which we call Phantom Lake. I do not know but I dare say some of the members on the other side of the House have been at Phantom Lake and it is really a very nice little summer resort. It is within a mile and a half of the town of Flin Flon, and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company has spent large sums of money on beautifying the place, building a sand beach — but it would take quite a little time to describe it, which I will not attempt to do. The other two miles and a half, making a complete four miles, branches off this Phantom Lake road which I just mentioned, about three-quarters of a mile from the town of Flin Flon and it passes through a settlement called Creighton, where I happen to live. This road is in a very bad condition and it has been for a long long time. It is both narrow and rough and very crooked. The people up there would be about one and hundred and forty. They work for the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company and they depend on their bus for transportation. And this road is so rough they break axles, driveshafts and springs very often and the price on the upkeep of these business is something tremendous. We pay twelve and one-half cents fare and I know for a fact the bus company is operating at a loss.

Now there is another point I would like to mention. I believe in 1947 or 1948 the Department of Highways surveyed this route.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — 1948.

Mr. Blanchard: — Yes, I believe it was 1948, but it was our understanding they were going to widen this road from 66 feet to 100 feet. There are a great many homes along both sides of this highway, and until such time as this road is completed none of the residents on either side of this highway will be able to make any improvements. There are several curves on this highway that were supposed to be taken out, and I might mention too we have 147 children walking this road every day back and forth to school. The road being very crooked and with dense underbrush on both sides it is very dangerous for the children. Visibility is very short. We have had some very narrow escapes. We have just been lucky.

I could go on and talk for an hour about why this road should be built but I will tell you as briefly as I can. Oftentimes these buses are not able to be right on time and furthermore the men are working underground. It is quite a hardship on them in this respect that they only take down working crews twice a day. A crew is taken down at 8 o'clock in the morning and if the day crew is not there then they just do not get down and they have to turn around and go home and they lose that shift. They usually work in shifts and it is awkward for those shifts working underground. Now, owing to the fact we have 93 trucks, 142 cars, 31 taxis and four buses all carrying Saskatchewan licence plates and Saskatchewan Government Insurance — one operator of a garage there tells me that he alone has paid this Government \$10,206.30 in the past twelve months — we figure the revenue derived just from my own neighbourhood would be something like \$22,000. We also figure that the road could be built and paid for from the local revenue in a period of four years. Now we may be up a little in our figures but we think it is quite possible.

March 5, 1951

We know, too, that at the present time the town of Flin Flon is going to blacktop seven miles of their bus route; as a matter of fact all their bus route is only seven miles. They are buying their own equipment and intend to do their own blacktopping. Now it may just be possible that the government, if they do not wish to undertake this, could get the town of Flin Flon to blacktop this four miles of road.

Now I won't be but a moment or two longer. I would like to say that I hope the Government has not giving up entirely the idea of the Nipawin-Flin Flon road. I do not intend to go at any great lengths about this road. I daresay members on both sides of the House know the importance of it, the amount of farm land it would open up. It would even mean a lot to the north country, and it might be possibly a necessity. It would also help tremendously in the development of the north. It may not be generally known that we have a deposit of marble up there and to my knowledge two samples have been taken out of this deposit and sent out for polishing and the reports on it indicate the marble is of high quality. We also have a great amount of flagstone. We have an abundance of clay and we have asbestos within eight miles of the town of Flin Flon. Now it would be possible to start a cement factory up there, and I can see no reason why we should not. They bring the cement in there in carloads and it is a long haul, about 600 miles, and with the ever-rising freight rates it is quite a proposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken considerably more time than I intended. I do not want to dwell on this any more; but in January there was a motorcade of cars from Flin Flon to Carrot River. The whole scheme was to promote a highway from The Pas to Carrot River. I daresay, too, from a write-up in the Saskatoon "Star-Phoenix" that they are after our Minister of Highways to build a highway from The Pas to Carrot River. A few days after I saw an article under the heading "Highway Minister defends his Highway Policy in Northern Saskatchewan," which goes on to say that he spent over \$5,000,000 in Northern Saskatchewan. Five million dollars is a lot of money. I do not know whether you have checked to see where the dividing line was between North and South Saskatchewan. I looked it up, due to mild curiosity, and found that the 54th parallel is really the dividing line between the north and the south, and the best I can find is about 225 miles in the entire north-half of this province. Yet he said he spent \$5 million on it, and he said he spent almost another \$2 million to bring it up to almost \$7 million.

I have no objection to the size of our budget but if any of you gentlemen have the time look up page 38 here, table 18 and compare the figures there, see the revenue you are getting from the constituency which I represent, and then also turn to the back of your Public Accounts book and see where we made some other contributions. I am not going to mention them, but just look them up for yourself and you will see the contribution which we are making to your budget, and then just figure out for yourself just how much of that we get back and how much more could be derived from that same territory up there if this Government would only do something about the development of the resources we have in the north.

Now, Mr. Speaker I cannot support the budget.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Before the hon. member sits down, I would like to ask him a question. He mentioned both the Carrot—

River and The Pas proposed road and the Nipawin-Flin Flon road. Would the hon. member care to say which one should have priority?

Mr. Blanchard: — That is kind of putting me on the spot, but I will answer that. I think, myself that the Nipawin-Flin Flon Highway will open up just as much valuable farm land as the Carrot River road, and the Carrot River road will not do any good insofar as developing the north is concerned. There is a possibility, however, and a good possibility — and I could have mentioned when on my feet before, that we at Flin Flon have one of the nicest Co-op stores there is in this province, or any other province. It happens to be just across the border only about one thousand yards, but we have to buy all our stuff from Winnipeg, very nearly 600 miles away. If this good highway were opened it would not be quite 400 miles to Regina here, and not very much farther from the Co-op. Wholesale at Saskatoon. I do not want to burden you with the part I took in promoting this Co-op store at Flin Flon, but I did participate. I do not know if this answers the question or not, Mr. Minister but I certainly do favour the Nipawin-Flin Flon highway in preference to the Carrot River road, and I know there is a lot of low land on The Pas end of that Carrot River road.

Mr. H. R. Heming (Moose Jaw City): — I would commend our Provincial Treasurer on his budget, Mr. Speaker, not because of the \$960,00 earmarked for the “Friendly City” nor because of the magnificent buildings which have been constructed by this Government in recent years within our city. Neither would I especially commend him on account of the Hospitalization or the Rental Control or for the Automobile Insurance, which is all magnificent legislation. The thing which has struck us in Moose Jaw has been that for forty years we have applied to this Regina government for consideration for building in the city of Moose Jaw. Forty-five years ago we had more people in Moose Jaw than we had in Regina, and under Liberal administration here you built a big city here and let Moose Jaw go; but this Government now has started to give consideration to our city of Moose Jaw and we are starting a little come-back. We’re very grateful to the Government in Regina. We had some magnificent blacktop down from Crestwynd to Moose Jaw and Moose Jaw to Tuxford and if this Government sees fit to spend some more money to blacktop from the American border to Crestwynd and from Tuxford up to Chamberlain, I will bet you there would not be one Liberal in that area who would vote against it — not a single one. And any time they are ready and willing to do that we are ready to agree with the Government because we want progress in that way.

Two questions have come up in this House which I would like to augment. One was in connection with the report of the Minister of Labour regarding the Fire Commissioner’s report which was laid on the table here some time ago. It appears that the biggest culprit in fires in this province and in every other province is the common cigarette, and, Mr. Speaker, the amount of damage that has been done by fires every day, and you can see where there is \$500,000 worth of fires, \$100,000 worth is due to cigarettes. There were 17 deaths by fire in the first six months of 1950, and next to the 303 fires from this cause, there were 277 fires in the year 1949 from an unknown origin, and we presume, too, they would include some fires from these cigarettes.

March 5, 1951

Now the cigarette itself is presumed to have some burning agency and applied only to the machine or the "tailor-made" cigarette. The ordinary tobacco with which you "roll your own", pipe tobacco and cigars are exempt from the accusation and our Fire Commissioners of Saskatchewan and every other province meet annually with the Fire Commissioner of Canada and annually they have presented a petition to the Federal Government through the Fire Commissioner of Canada asking the Government to have an examination made of the contents of cigarettes so as to prevent fires and loss of property. The report shows 542 deaths from fire and \$54 millions damage done by fires, in 1949, and in the same year 300,000,000 feet of timber was destroyed by fires, of which they estimate 17 per cent was due to electric current or lightning and the balance of unknown origin or from cigarettes and other causes.

There is no question that fire is a very bad menace as far as we in Canada are concerned; but that is not the only thing, Mr. Speaker. When you search into this ingredient, this free-burning agency in cigarettes, we find later on the picture in a report issued by the House Services Review of December, 1949, which points out that an increasing number of cases of cancer of the lung is appearing annually in North America. This report was issued by Dr. Everett A. Graham, Professor of Surgery at Washington University School of Medicine, and was made at the request of a group belonging to the American Medical Association. Dr. Graham said that of 100 cases of this lung cancer examined every instance was due to men smoking excessively of cigarettes which were impregnated either with some type of insecticide on the tobacco or some type of free-burning agency in the paper, or something in the tobacco which caused the irritation in the lung and causes cancer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my local paper in February, 1951, there was a photograph of Rev. Dan McIvor, Liberal Member of Parliament for Fort William, taking a lot of ribbing from fellow-members for trying vainly to have a committee formed to study effects of tobacco. Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that if all these millions of dollars can be shown as the loss attributable to the free-burning agency in cigarettes, then this cigarette question should be examined because not only is it a menace to property but it is also a menace to health. It would not necessarily mean that the cigarettes would have to be eliminated from the machine but it would mean the elimination of the poisons used with the tobacco in order to make it free-burning, so that they would burn of their own volition in order there might be more profit in the manufacture of cigarettes.

There was one other thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is in connection with a remark of the hon. member for Saltcoats. He said, the other day, that every six minutes last year there was a house constructed in Canada. I think according to the numbers I read this was about right, but he inferred or the inference was there in his remarks, that that was adequate and fine. I would like to add to that statement of his by saying that of our 350,000 new population each year, less our deaths of around 125,000, plus our immigration around 100,000 — and this year they expect immigration of 150,000 — minus our emigrants, that is people who leave Canada, possibly 20,000 to 30,000 we have 350,000 to 360,000 new Canadians every year, and that, added to say the demolition of houses that are already ready to fall down, means that we need a house constructed every three minutes for the

next five years in order to take up the slack of housing which we have in Canada today, which is suggested as 700,000 units.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words and with the permission of the House I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Automobile Insurance Act, 1947.

Hon. G. M Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — In moving Second reading of this Bill, I would like to give a little background so that this Bill can be compared with our previous Act of the last year. I want to do that because before I am through you will see that we are going to be very greatly extending the provisions of The Automobile Insurance Act. So I think we should put those against the background of the Act as it has operated in the past.

Hon. members will remember that The Automobile Insurance Act was introduced in 1946. At that time it was described by the former member for Moosomin as the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon the people of Saskatchewan. Well, in those days we had a flat rate — everybody paid the same. Everybody paid \$5 with their licences, regardless of the value or the age of the car. We had the one rate. We provided only for personal injury and death benefits. That was the only thing that was provided in that year. Now, from time to time each year we have increased the benefits. The next year, for example, we added to it the collision insurance. We made an adjustment in the rates and added benefits to the persons whose automobiles were actually damaged. Then, we went a step further. We added the public liability and theft insurance, so that today we have under the compulsory Automobile Insurance Act not only the standard 5—point policy, but something that is much more important, perhaps, than any of these individual points, and that is the personal accident clause.

I want hon. members on both sides of the House to realize just how important that is. I know it has been stated over and over again in and outside this Chamber that personal injury coverage does not amount to very much. I should just like to remind hon. members of that tragic accident to the family of one of the employees of the Minister of Social Welfare's department, a week ago yesterday. As a result of that accident we will be paying in benefits to those surviving kiddies a total of \$11,625. We shall also be paying to the Department the damage to the automobile. We shall also be paying the funeral expenses. We shall also be paying any hospital bills, or doctor bills in connection with the accident. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are important things. I would just like to say at this time that from April, 1946, up to the end of 1950 a total of 8,000 person injured and the dependents of over 350 persons killed received benefits of over \$1½ million.

Public liability and property damage has meant the saving of a great deal of money to many individuals in Saskatchewan. More than 2,000 motorists have benefited to the extent of \$600,000 since 1948. Then, in 1949

March 5, 1951

we added fire and theft coverages; 477 motorists have collected under this and have received a total of \$175,000. The feature that has been the most expensive, the most costly, of course, is the collision feature, which was introduced approximately four years ago in 1947. During the elapsed period of time there has been a total of over 21,000 claims on which we have paid over \$3½ million in losses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mention these to show you that the Act has been providing increasing protection year by year, and we have not had to raise the rates. Despite the ever—increasing number of accidents on the highways, the ever—increasing price of motor vehicles and the ever increasing price of repairs for motor vehicles, we have still been able to provide the service without raising our rates. Yet I should like to remind the hon. members of the House that on either side of us, both in Alberta and in Manitoba, rates went up again this year. Automobile insurance rates went up and have been going up steadily. Practically every year rates have gone up in British Columbia and Ontario.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, the rates that we set were based on the costs of 1949. Since that time there has been a tremendous amount of inflation in the country, with the result we have had to pay much greater amounts to motorists out of this fund than otherwise would have been the case. For example, you take an ordinary little grille that gets smashed up. To get it repaired, we used to pay about \$40; today it costs about \$60 — about a 50 per cent increase just for that. The same is true with practically any kind of an accident that we may have. Well, during the year we have paid out more than we have taken in. We have paid out approximately \$188,000 more than we have received. The result is that the surplus in the fund has been reduced to just over \$800,000. I don't think, however, that we should be too downhearted about that, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that with the increased educational campaign that we are conducting and the increased number of traffic officers, we are going to conquer the dread accident rate that there is at the present time. I feel confident that we can cut down the number of accidents very greatly. I feel confident, too, that we will be able to weather the storm until such time as the inflationary tendencies which have been so noticeable in the last few years have been stopped. I see that Mr. Drew is now supporting price controls — well, when you make that much progress I don't think it will be long till the Liberal Party at Ottawa have to step in. And so, if we get price controls and we get this inflation stopped, it is going to have a wonderful effect on The Automobile Accident Insurance Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the principle of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act is one which is gaining strength all over the world. I should like to quote from Supreme Court Justice Hofstader of New York. He is an eminent authority, probably one of the greatest authorities in the world on this subject, and here is what he said as quoted in the "New York Times" of December 14, 1950:

“Existing insurance laws in the United States are inadequate because they leave the first victim of any driver unprotected and consequently about one car out of eight in service can kill or injure with no assurance of the ability of the driver to pay. In 93 per cent of fatal accidents where insurance is lacking no compensation whatever is received.”

Mr. Speaker, 93 per cent of the cases where there is no insurance the owner of the car is unable to obtain any compensation whatever. Judge Hofstader urged that compulsory automobile insurance be enacted at once. The report said further:

“Opposition to compulsory insurance was attributed by him to certain quarters that fear the whole field of automobile liability may be preempted by a state fund. But thousands of uncompensated victims of traffic accidents pay too high a price to assuage this apprehension, which is doubtless ill—founded.”

In other words, this eminent judge is advocating a plan similar in principle to the one we have here in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take time somewhere but am not going, tonight to deal in detail with the report of the North Dakota Committee. I do hope that when we get into Crown Corporations Committee, the hon. members on both sides of the House will make me account for the report of the North Dakota State Legislature Committee. I want to say that I would welcome that opportunity. I hope that hon. members have all read that report, and if they have read it they will find that the report puts the insurance companies on trial and states very definitely that if the companies do not get their rates reduced, that there is no alternative but to go into some plan such as we have here in Saskatchewan.

Some people say that our rates are unfair to certain groups of vehicle owners. Well, of course they are. You can't have rates that are going to be fair to everybody, just as you can't have a system of licencing automobiles that is going to be fair to everybody. Here is one man, for example, who never takes his car out of the garage except on Sundays and probably takes his family out for a bit of a drive, who uses his 20 or 30 miles a week, yet he pays exactly the same licence fee as the fellow who drives probably an average of from 1200 to 1500 miles a week. Is that fair? I don't think there is anything fair about it; but what can you do about it? The same I true in automobile records. We might say, for example, that doctors have probably the worst record of accident, and from my experience I think that is just about right. I think doctors have one of the worst records of accidents, therefore, we should have a very high insurance rate for doctors. On the other hand school teachers have a very low rate of automobile accidents . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — They can't afford cars.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, even those who have cars have a very low accident rate because, of course, they have been taught to be careful and observant all through their training. Well, Mr. Speaker, should we give them special rates because they have a low accident rate? Now, the thing is that you can carry this thing to an absurdity. We are trying here to be reasonably fair to everybody. At one time in this province we had one rate for all people — \$5 regardless of the age of the car, regardless of the kind of car. We have changed the rates twice since then. Today we have rates varying from \$4.50 to \$10. It still isn't a wide enough range. I still agree that the people with a brand new 1951 Buick or Pontiac or Cadillac or any other expensive car should not be getting that insurance for \$10 when a fellow with

March 5, 1951

a 1948 Ford is paying \$10. But, how many rates can we have? Are we going to set aside a rate for every car, every make of car for every year? We have adopted the principle of having four rates — \$4.50, \$6., \$8. and \$10. We are keeping very careful records and if through these statistics we find that those rates are getting out of line, we shall not hesitate at all to change them for a fourth time — we have changed them already for a third time.

We did not get anything out of this report from North Dakota that we did not know already, but, as I say I am not going to attempt to go into the reports tonight. I do hope, though, that we will have an opportunity later on because of the very inadequate way in which this was handled in the press. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am one who loves the press — I never say nasty things about them; but I must say that on this particular occasion the press erred and erred very badly. I am not blaming the local press, because they get their news reports from the Canadian Press in Winnipeg, and some of those Canadian Press reports were really pretty bad.

I would like to say, in fairness to our North Dakota friends, that the quotations that were attributed to them were not the opinions of the Committee. The press deliberately tried to leave the impression throughout the length and breadth of Canada that those opinions were the opinions of the Committee. Actually, these opinions were gathered, during the visit of the Committee last November, from an adjusting firm, from some lawyers. One in Regina, who was a former member of the Legislature, I know gave them a lot of information as did the managing—director of an opposition company and others who were politically opposed to the Saskatchewan Government and opposed to The Automobile Insurance plan. As a matter of fact, all you need to do is read the report and they tell you right in the report that they visited all of these people. The report has made that quite clear, but unfortunately, the press didn't.

My hon. friend from Milestone (Mr. Erb) the other night referred to some kind of a curtain around Saskatchewan, I think it was an iron curtain. Well, that might be another good use for copper — to put a curtain around. This report was issued in Winnipeg through the Canadian Press and the story was used in 21 papers. These 21 papers have a circulation of 1,100,000. Here we saw the typical headlines “Compulsory Insurance Liquidates Itself by a Loss” — “Insurance Plan Makes Profit on Business Cars” — “Car Insurance in Saskatchewan Sees a Heavy Loss” says the “Hamilton Spectator” — “Expert Fits the C.C.F. Automobile Insurance” — that's what the “Vancouver Sun” said. A general statement on the plan is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Since the hon. member is now explaining Bill No. 50 it seems he is pretty much out of order.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, it is most essential that the hon. members know that what I am going to propose in this Bill is going to cost this fund more money, and if the contentions of the North Dakota report are right and the statements or stories that have gone around this province, then I think they are all justified in voting against it. I, therefore, must break down the feeling they may have that there is any truth to it. That is what I am trying to do, and I hope you will call me to order again, Mr. Speaker, if I get out of line; but that is my purpose in referring to this.

Now, I just wanted to point out that on January 20th there was a statement made in six papers with a total circulation of 115,000, then another one came up on January 22nd — “More information on the 1950 operations of the Plan”. Five papers with a circulation of 194,000 used that. Then here is a story regarding political influence in the administration of the Act. Six papers with a circulation of 604,000 used the North Dakota statement and my reply to them. One of the most important stories which I issued was that there was an \$800,000 surplus in the fund. A total of 25 papers used that with over 1,400,000 circulation. But, because of the way this story was set up — and there I am afraid I must cast some criticism on my friends in the “Leader—Post”, for whom I have the highest regard usually; because of the way this story was set out, the headlines read in nearly every case “Saskatchewan Loses \$200,000” or “C.C.F. Loses on Insurance Plan” or as the “Vancouver Province” had it, “Saskatchewan Loses on Automobile Insurance”. Only one paper in the Dominion of Canada had it correctly — the ‘Star Phoenix’ . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must confine himself to the Bill. After the expression that he wasn’t going to explain this he has done pretty well.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I am trying to convince you that the press reports are not correct and that the state of our fund is not such as these erroneous press reports indicate. Now, if I have convinced you and have convinced the other members, I can very well leave that point.

Now, if I have persuaded everybody that the fund is solvent, that we still have over \$800,000 on hand, notwithstanding all these reports that would lead us to believe that we are on the verge of bankruptcy, I shall now proceed to outline . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer a question? Isn’t it true that the fund did fall back \$200,000 in operation?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That’s right.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that is all I understood from the headlines you just read. I don’t know why you get so excited about them.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, my hon. friend must have read the ‘Star—Phoenix’ — I pointed out that they had interpreted it correctly. That is the only paper he reads evidently, because all the rest had it the other way around. No, I said that, that we had gone back \$188,000 this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time we are going to improve the Automobile Insurance Plan. Once again Saskatchewan motorists are going to receive additional benefits in The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. The continued success of the Automobile Insurance Plan and our desire to give the people of the province wide basic insurance protection at low cost has resulted in the introduction in this province of what we call “comprehensive insurance”. The new comprehensive insurance is a combination of collision, fire and theft insurance which motorists have had up to the present time, plus a number of extra coverages. These additional benefits, which I shall outline in a moment or two, will give motorists protection from practically

March 5, 1951

any type of accident or loss, and it is a feature that is going to be of great value to Saskatchewan motorists. Again, Saskatchewan leads the way in offering motorists wide insurance protection at no increase in cost. As I pointed out before, in spite of very heavy accidents here and despite increasing inflationary conditions in Canada, it has been decided to make no change in rates for the coming year. It is provided with the same rates. I would just say that this term “comprehensive coverage” provides insurance against direct loss and against accident loss of or damage to a vehicle and its equipment, including the radio, something that we didn’t have before — it is body coverage that is provided in the present Act.

Now, I would just like to outline how this comprehensive coverage actually will work. If a motor vehicle is involved in a collision, “upset or any other kind of accident”. You will notice that is much broader. Previously collision was definitely limited, but now it makes provision “for any other kind of accident”, in addition to collision or upset. Or, if a vehicle is destroyed or damaged by fire or by lightning — previously a vehicle is destroyed or damaged by fire or by lightning — previously a motor vehicle is struck by lightning wasn’t protected under the standard 5—point policy, but here it is. If a vehicle is stolen, of course it is covered, as is damage to a vehicle caused by a windstorm, by cyclone, by an earthquake, by hail or explosion. For example, many Saskatchewan motorists go out to the West Coast. They might be in an area where an earthquake occurred. We know in Saskatchewan there are many hailstorms. My hon. friend, I am sure, from Qu’Appelle-Wolseley has seen hailstones as big as an egg, as big as an apple that can really hurt a car, really damage it pretty badly . . .

Mr. Tucker: — He doesn’t get in that condition.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, now they are going to be protected. We have had a number of instances this past year where automobiles have been damaged by hail and where we haven’t been able to pay the claim. Now, under this new comprehensive coverage, those automobiles will be covered. They will also be covered in case of riot or civil commotion. Now I don’t expect there is going to be a riot. They only possible time there could be a riot or civil commotion that I can see is if in the case of an election this Government should be defeated, and if the Liberal Party is elected it might ruin a lot of cars. I don’t think that is a possibility but we are making provisions for it. Falling aircraft is something that doesn’t happen often, yet every year, in some part of the world one or more automobiles get smashed up through falling aircraft. Now they will be protected under this comprehensive coverage. Or rising water — for example, last spring in Winnipeg, there was a terrific amount of damage. I had the privilege of going down to Winnipeg and was taken out by the Fire Chief in his boat. All through the Riverview area we went in a boat in between the houses, and there you could see, in many cases the top of cars just sticking up out of the water. In some instances you couldn’t even see the tops, they were completely submerged in the water. It is estimated that there was thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars damage done to automobiles in Winnipeg, for which there was no compensation from the insurance companies. Now there will be here, in Saskatchewan if anybody should be unfortunate enough to have his automobile damaged by flood. And when a vehicle is on any conveyance on land or water which is stranded or sunk, in a collision, burnt or derailed. For example, on some of our Saskatchewan ferries . . . I don’t know what condition those ferries are in.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — Very good.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — If anything should happen today that a car went over a ferry and was destroyed or lost or damaged there would be no insurance, but under this new comprehensive insurance it is protected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the new benefits that we are adding, giving to the people of Saskatchewan the greatest coverage that has been provided, a greater variety of coverage than you will find in any insurance company in the world. I don't think you will find anything like it, no matter where you go. The \$100 deductible provision will continue to be applicable to private passenger cars on all of these comprehensive coverages. This means, of course, that the motorist is responsible for the first \$100 damage, but after that, this plan will look after it. I feel confident that we will be able to meet all the claims and will be able to end up the year — we may have a slight loss during the year, I am not going to say at this time that I anticipate a surplus this year. We may have a slight loss, but even if we did have as big a loss as we had last year, we could still carry on for five years, and surely by that time we will have a Government in Ottawa that will put the price controls in, put prices back to where they were and then . . .

Mr. McCormack: — What do you estimate the approximate cost of giving this additional insurance per car?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, it is something that is entirely new. We won't know for a year what it is going to cost. We can't anticipate through that it will add more than \$200,000 this year. We hope not. But it depends — if, for example, we had a serious flood situation in the City of Saskatoon or if the Moose Jaw Creek overflowed and caused a lot of damage, well, we don't know; or the Souris river at Estevan — you can't tell. But we hope it won't be more than a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. McCormack: — You have no estimate, then of the approximate cost?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — There is no way we can estimate. I asked the same question. There is no way we can estimate it.

The question being put on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, it was agreed to and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned without question put at 11 o'clock p.m.