

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Monday, March 5, 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. D. H. R. Heming (Continuing): — Continuing on from last evening when I adjourned the debate before the House, I would like today to possibly specialize upon the point of duty I hold myself as an organized labourer of 43 years' standing within the province of Saskatchewan. As possibly you know, Sir, most English-speaking nations have what are known as organizations of unions. In the United Kingdom, with fifty million people there are nine million organized labourers, or twenty per cent of the population. In the United States of America with 146 million people, 15,600,000 or eleven per cent of the population are organized labourers. In Australia the population is seven million - seven, with 1,400,000 organized labourers or fourteen percent. In New Zealand with a population of 1.7 million, 247,000 are organized labourers, or a percentage of sixteen per cent. In Canada with a population of close to fourteen million, we have a little over one million of organized labourers, or a percentage of eight per cent.

I cannot say at this time, Mr. Speaker, except that we possibly may be a newer country than these other countries which I have mentioned, but it has seemed to me that all through the years there has been some force which has prevented or deterred the organization of working men. Thirty years ago in this province I earned the same money for the work which I performed as a railwayman as they earned in Chicago or Minneapolis. In the last twenty-five years or so through straight bargaining with the company I serve, and under the influence of Government, I have lost to the extent of thirty per cent of the proportionate wage they earn in the States and here. I may say too, similarly, Mr. Speaker, that the farms have lost proportionately from years ago to the present day in their spending power.

Mr. Speaker, I see in a local issue of "Time Magazine" where Mr. Abbott, quoting to the press at Whitefield, New Haven, said that the national production of Canada had climbed from \$5½ billion in 1939 to \$17 billion in 1950. Two billion dollars of that, Sir, was agricultural products. But here's where the wonderful part of it comes in. Ten billion dollars of manufacturing was done by Canada in the last year and this work was done by those million union labourers, plus 2,600,000 other workers who are paid by the hour in this Dominion, and during this last ten years, Mr. Abbott said Canada has invested \$4.7 billion from outside the Dominion and also has received in the Dominion an additional \$1.5 billion of investments, and a total of \$8.5 billion is now invested by foreign interests within our Dominion.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question but that men who live in this country, who slave arduously and raise families, hope that success will

pursue their efforts. There is no question that they are proud of the production Canada is achieving in these days, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they sometimes question whether they are getting their rightful share of the production, because in 1900, for a man, wife and three children it cost \$9.37 per week for food, fuel and rent; in 1938-39 the same amount of food, thirty-six or thirty-seven articles, cost \$17.41 per week, and since that time, Mr. Minister, the cost of living has gone up to 175 today, making \$36.40 per week for a Canadian man to live on a Canadian standard of living with a wife and between two and three children. That only allows for food, fuel and rent. The average weekly wage today throughout the whole of Canada is \$41.50, and in those areas which are strictly manufacturing it is \$46. When you buy clothes, when you pay insurance, when you pay the hospital, when you pay all these things incidental to living which are coincident to living, the chances of a man living as he should in this Dominion of ours is very small, very remote.

But, Mr. Speaker, we did have a hope, last summer. In June a strange thing happened. One of our Senators at Ottawa, Senator Roebuck, introduced a motion advocating that the Dominion of Canada should establish a 'Declaration of Human Rights.' It asserted that it was within the framework of our Federal Government to enact this declaration, stating at the same time it was not yet opportune by reason of constitutional difficulties to establish it as a National Bill of Rights within Canadian constitution at this time. So we who search for programs watched it pretty closely and we found, Mr. Speaker, that this declaration stated the right of everyone in Canada to life, liberty and personal security; the right of equal treatment before the law to fair trial, to free him from arbitrary interference in one's privacy, to home, family and correspondence; to freedom of movement, to nationality, to own and enjoy property, to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; to freedom of opinion and expression; to peaceful assembly and association; to take part in the government of the country either directly or through representation chosen periodically under equal franchise, equal suffrage.

Mr. Speaker, the report ends up: "What is required in Canada is one grand comprehensive affirmation or re-affirmation of human rights; equality before the law and security as a pillar and foundation of our nationhood."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you recollect, Mrs. Roosevelt spoke in this Chamber here, a session or so back, telling us what difficulties she had in persuading the other nations of the world to agree to a universal declaration of human rights. So I searched through the records, Mr. Speaker, and this declaration which Senator Roebuck had laid on the table of the Senate had missed very essential parts of the original declaration that organized labour wanted. And here they are, Sir. Article 22:

"Everyone as a member of society has a right to social security and entitled to a realization through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each state of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality."

Article 23:

“Everyone has a right to work and to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. Everyone without any discrimination has a right to equal pay for equal work. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration which will give him and his family an existence worthy of human dignity and supplemented if necessary by other means of social protection. Everyone has a right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests.”

Article 24:

“Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including a reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.”

Article 25:

“Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care, and necessary social services, and the right to secure, in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood due to circumstances beyond his control”

Article 26:

“Everyone has the right to education . . .”

and so forth, indicating, Mr. Speaker, that the very essentials that organized labour wanted – to be assured that the promise of their Magna Charta, and the Four Freedoms which were granted us after the last War and promised to all the peoples of the world; the very things which we demanded, Mr. Speaker, were not present in this resolution as laid down in the Senate. I presume the Senate will lift it off the table and it will be passed over to the House of Commons where, I presume, it will be placed on the archives with possibly the Haggerty Report, the Sirois Report and possibly the plans for the Saskatchewan dam and various other projects which we have heard of in the past.

When we look to find the reason why there has not been a more equal distribution of this country's wealth – and mind you we are making a great deal of money for some people who by rights of labour are not earning that portion they receive, and it applies Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the line; but it seems to affect us more here than it does on the American side, for some reason or other, I presume, in connection with Federal policies of both countries. A press report here emanating

March 6, 1951

from my Union's magazine a month or so ago says the average profits run 51 per cent higher in 1950 over 1949. Again the profits of eighteen metal corporations were 280 per cent, twenty-four textile firms made 238 increase in profits, twelve coal companies made 117 per cent, steel companies 72 per cent, twenty-three oil companies 63 per cent, railroads 62 per cent, and so forth.

That was on the American side, Mr. Speaker, but on the Canadian side here is the comparison I have between 1946 and 1950. The Aluminum Company of Canada in 1946 enjoyed profits of \$11,500,000; in 1950, \$24,485,000. The Imperial Oil had profits of \$17,300,000 in 1946, and \$23,900,000 in 1950; Dominion Steel and Coal, \$847,500 in 1946, and \$5,000,000 in 1950; the Mercury Paper Company, \$853,000 in 1946, and \$2,400,000 in 1950. And so the picture goes on Mr. Speaker. Twenty-five or thirty of the big production firms of Canada are enjoying profits today which are extraordinarily high, and there is no reason why at least the primary demands of Canadian labour in the way of social security and various other medical and health reforms should not be agreed to, because, Sir – and this is where the difference shows again between Canada and the United States. As unionists we always compare ourselves with the United States of America insofar as wages are concerned. At the present time, in the United States of America, in the manufacturing branch, they are earning \$59.02 a week; in Canada at the present time, \$44.26 a week, with a cost of living of exactly the same amount in both countries. It seems to indicate that there is some need somewhere along the line for reformation so far as organized labour is concerned; and I am glad to say, sir, that I belong to a party that, were we in power at Ottawa, would see to it shortly that both the farmer and the labourer of this great country of ours would receive greater recognition than they have received in the past.

I have in my hand here, too, a report issued by the Canadian Bank of Commerce stating the general agricultural production, and I am somewhat concerned not at the production of wheat this year, 461 million bushels, or of oats, 420 million bushels, and other grain products proportionately; but I am concerned, Sir, with the milk production, the creamery butter, cheddar cheese, and so forth, the sidelines of farming as it were. Our total milk production, the average for 1944-48, was 1,436 million pounds, in 1950, 1,396 million pounds; creamery butter, 24 million pounds the average in 1944-48, in 1950, 22.5 million pounds; cheddar cheese, the average in 1944-48, 12 million pounds, in 1950, 8 million pounds; egg production, average in 1944-48, 29.8 million dozen, in 1950, 26.4 million dozen. And our livestock holdings, Mr. Speaker, the average in 1944-48 were 9,900,000, in 1950, 8,900,000. It seems, Sir, that that type of farming industry is gradually creeping out of the picture, and it seems, too, that the inability of the young man to take his place on the farm, the heavy expense involved in buying not so much the land as the machinery necessary to go along with the large unit which is required these days in order to make a living; it seems that no young man of his own initiative could ever hope to own a fully-equipped farm these days with the money which he can earn ordinarily under average wages.

Similarly too, Mr. Speaker, there is no young urban man can ever hope, under average wages, to build himself a home, which should be

one of the first essentials he should have under the economy of every country – the right to build his own home, to have his own furniture, to raise his own family and be a little king in his own castle. It is getting, under our National administration for some reason or other, that the young farmer and the young working man are in a position where they have no power or no authority; and this will lead, if governments continue their way, in a few short years, to where we shall have in this province and in other provinces, a series of huge farms rented possibly to selected tenants here and there, in order to work for a big rich man here and there dotted throughout the prairies, and the individual farm would be a thing of the past. There may be a few ranches here and there, but there will not be the raising of cows and of chickens and of turkeys and things like that which have been associated with farming in the past.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the whole idea of living in this Saskatchewan should be that we should give incentive to our young folks so that they can hope to live here and not wish to leave. Averagely, there emigrate from Canada 35,000 or 40,000 people a year, but we find in Saskatchewan that the attractiveness of higher wages and greater security of employment elsewhere makes our young people leave here and go to other provinces as well as to the United States of America. We have a responsibility, and that responsibility cannot, as I see it be fulfilled unless we instil into the hearts of those people who are our governors certain facts and certain truths that they should understand. It seems that we are, at all times, in a state of movement. The whole world is moving at all times and there is a state of flux going on forever and ever. Nothing is stationary except those rich men who are sitting down in plush seats in the eastern part of this Dominion of ours who want the status quo to be maintained no matter what the odds or what the costs.

I seem to lack the power of expression as to what I would like to say, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if I could read what Charles Dickens wrote many years ago:

“‘Let well enough alone’, the high priest said, ‘Let well enough alone’, the rich man cried. ‘Are not our temples blended in their pride, our houses great, our fields widespread? What if some unkempt thousands cry for bread, shall we the wisdom of our gods deride, tamper with institutions old and tried and bring about us anarchy instead?’ And so they babbled on, their logic spent, vowing that all was well with every breath, all speaking ‘agitator’, ‘malcontent’, to Him who came to them from Nazareth. ‘Leave us alone’, they cried, but Jesus went on His way to Calvary and death.”

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Hon. J. A. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the best contribution a Minister can make to the budget debate is to give an adequate report of the operations of his own department. By doing so, he justifies or otherwise, the appropriation which is allotted to him. I believe this budget

March 6, 1951

of \$58 million is accorded pretty general acceptance insofar as its size is concerned, and I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. L. F. McIntosh), was right, yesterday, when he said that the main concern of the Opposition was that it should be distributed according to their wishes rather than according to the best judgment of the Government.

Now, I was present at a good many sessions when this budget was under preparation. Most of us on this side of the House, perhaps all of us, have had some part to play in the discussions which accompanies the preparation of this budget, and we know the care that was exercised to make sure that every possible economy was practiced, that every improvement of administration was suggested or proposed, in order that the greatest value could be achieved for the expenditure of this \$58 million; and that established services might continue to the people of Saskatchewan. I know those things, and knowing them, I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. C. M. Fines) on his work in preparing this budget, in piloting it through the mill which it had to pass before it gained acceptance on this side of the House; and I also want to congratulate him upon the presentation of it to the Legislature. I think he has done, as he has always done, a very fine job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works: it is a service department. It is like the engines in a steamship. It is what makes things go; but it does not show very much on the surface. Its function is to provide the physical facilities which enable other departments of government to function. It builds the buildings – office buildings, institutions – makes repairs, maintenance and so forth of those buildings, and it provides almost everything, even down to the smallest article of furniture which those buildings contain. Sometimes we feel that we would like to get a little more recognition that we do. We built a Boys' School back of the buildings here that is quite a creditable building and it is a fine achievement of the Department of Social Welfare. We have under construction at Moose Jaw a training school for mental defectives. I am sure it is going to be a very fine institution and that the Department of Public Health will receive a great many congratulations. On the University campus there is under construction a building, the University Hospital, connected as it is to the Medical College there, in which I take a great deal of pleasure every time I visit Saskatoon. It is taking form; and I predict – I think we will all agree – that when it is completed it will be one of the most outstanding buildings both as to structure and architectural beauty, in Western Canada. The Department of Public Works is quite content that the University shall be proud of it, that the Province shall be proud of it, and that the Department of Public Health will be able to claim a very fine achievement.

Mr. Speaker, we do some things, however. We redecorated this Chamber. There have been a number of quite complimentary comments with respect to that work. I might say that our own painters on the staff of Public Works did the painting, and anyone who was in this building in the late fall or early winter would have found that it was completely filled with scaffolding right from the floor to the skylights and all over the entire Chamber, and our painter crew (and some of them are not boys any

longer) were lost to view among all that scaffolding, doing that work for a long time. I used to wonder whether they were working or not; but when they took down the scaffolding there was what we found. I think that credit is due to those men who did that work and also to Miss Margaret Messer, Director of Art at Balfour Technical School, for the colour scheme. She made several drawings and submitted them to us for approval. I think that last year I promised the Leader of the Opposition that I would have an elevator for him so that he would not have to climb the stairs during this Session. The elevator is there, and I hope that he is enjoying it. It runs very smoothly, and I can assure him that the Department of Public Works is proud to be the author of any elevating influence to which he will submit himself, even though it should be a purely physical one.

Mr. Speaker, I have, during the past two sessions, endeavoured to give a fairly comprehensive report on the operations of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Unless I have failed very materially, those records have been of interest to the members of the Assembly. I am encouraged, through the comments that have come to me, to believe that they are also of interest to the public generally. I therefore, propose to take up a great deal of the time, this afternoon, in following my previous custom.

Now, it is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that there is widespread interest in power development in Saskatchewan; there is widespread interest in power development everywhere. I was a little surprised to read the other day – we are accustomed to think we are a little behind in Canada; but I was surprised to read, the other day, that there are still two million farms in the United States not served with electrical power. Two million farms seems to me a great many. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that statement, but I did read it in a more or less dependable journal. In Saskatchewan, we are making some progress.

You know, we do not have to be very old to remember when our city streets were pretty dim and dismal places. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming) was quoting Dickens. I can remember very clearly when the streetlights in Edinburgh were gaslights and were lit by a lamplighter just as they were in Dickens' day. Nowadays, when we look down a city street and we see the almost Christmassy appearance which results from the neon signs that are on display there, we can appreciate, or I hope we take time to appreciate, the beauty which our city streets exhibit at this day as compared to those to which our fathers were accustomed. Now, the electrification of the larger urban centres is virtually completed insofar as Saskatchewan is concerned, insofar as most of this Continent is concerned; and we are turning our attention to the electrification of farms and hamlets. I am sure we all appreciate and sympathize with the urgent desire of rural residents to bring their homes and their businesses up to city standards.

The provision of electric light and power to urban centres was a simple matter from an economic point of view. The concentrated

March 6, 1951

load there enable generation and distribution to be done at a price to the consumer which was well within his reach to pay. The electrification of a sparsely populated rural area, however, presents a very different problem, and that problem varies with the extent of the area, the density of the farms and the type of agriculture that is followed. Nevertheless it can be done, and we are doing it. The advance in cultural standards which has taken place during the past half-century, has brought with it the need on the part of enlightened people for the refinements of living to which our forefathers were strangers. Social and economic conditions require that the work which was formerly done by many hands must now be done by a few. That is true on the farm. It is true in industry. It is true in the home, and the housewife by means of the assistance of electrical equipment is able to do, with much less effort that was formerly the case those duties which are here in the home. If Saskatchewan farmers are going to compete efficiently, produce as efficiently as farmers in other provinces, then they must have the benefit of electrical power. And the harnessing of electrical power to farm chores can make far more difference than most farmers realize. For anyone who has not been accustomed to working on an electrically-equipped farm, it would be well worth his time to go to one and see just how much work can be done without much effort and by very few hands.

Now, I want to say something about what we have accomplished during the past year. We have extended power service to 2,000 farms, I think that has already been said in the Chamber this Session; and we had as our objective 2,400 farms. We did not quite reach it; but I think we made fairly substantial progress. In addition to the 2,000 farms that we have completed, 400 others are in various stages of completion. We had 15 gangs working on construction work at the peak of the construction season, and we still have 12 gangs out doing farm electrification. The gangs that are working now do not have so many men in each gang as there were in the summer season, but there are 12 gangs out.

We were fortunate, last fall, in making good progress in pole setting and, of course, the digging of those holes in the frosty ground is one of the factors which makes power construction in the wintertime difficult, even in nice winter weather. But we were fortunate, last fall, in making good progress in pole setting, and the gangs are out now completing the job. I would not be surprised if nearly all of those 400 farms were completed by the time we complete this Session. We had, of course, a couple of factors that retarded progress, last season. It was an extremely wet season in some places where those lines were being constructed and that, of course, slowed down the work. Then again, the railway strike in August held up the delivery of poles, and again we experienced inconvenience and a slowing down of work. Nevertheless, I think we had a pretty good construction season.

Before I leave farm electrification, I would like to say something about our plans for the future. We are not entirely satisfied

with the manner in which we have developed rural electrification projects. That requires some clarification. We have had some difficulty, or we anticipate difficulty, in a fair allocation to farmers of their share in the cost of construction. Usually, in the initial project there is not much trouble. A project is planned and the farmers are signed up, the course that the lines will follow is laid out, and that project can be completed and the farmers connected. Under the terms of The Rural Electrification Act, the farmer knows what he is going to pay. He is told, before it starts, what it is going to cost him for his share in construction costs. So far, so good. The original project is completed to everyone's satisfaction, let us say, but it is not very long until some newcomers wish to become connected to that project. They may live anywhere in the proximity, perhaps right along the transmission line. All they need is a tap-off from the farm to that transmission line; but there are usually a number who, after they see their neighbours supplied with power, wish to be connected to the line.

Now, it would be obviously unfair to connect them to lines to which their neighbours had contributed, which had been built on a shared basis between their neighbours and the Power Corporation, without making them pay a similar charge toward the construction of those main lines, so that the Power Corporation has been assessing them on the same basis as the original signers, the original members of the group. Sometimes it has not cost that much to connect them, so that there accumulates a surplus which, in equity, ought to be distributed among all the members of that group. That equity may be very small. It usually has been very small, because we have not been very long doing this work; but in course of time it might amount to a great deal, so that we are planning a change. We are planning what we call "area development", and that would be done something like this: an area of appropriate dimensions would be surveyed, the farms mapped out and an estimate would then be made of the cost of serving that entire area, on the basis of a certain saturation, that is, a certain number of farms being connected in that area. We would not commence a project to serve an area until we had at least a 65 per cent sign-up of the farms in that area. Having secured the 65 per cent, or more, we would assess each of those farmers an equal share of the cost of electrifying the area. Originally it might be that the farmer would pay a little less than his actual share on the old basis, but as newcomers entered the project they would be assessed similarly, so that every member on every ultimate connection to that project would have paid the same price for his connection.

I cannot give you any more details than that at this time. We are trying out one area, a trial area, to see how that will work; but it should avoid the necessity of perpetual revision and rebates which would, in the course of time, become a very cumbersome operation for our head office.

Mention was made in the Speech from the Throne of the intention to assist certain farmers by means of loans for power extension purposes. It seems appropriate that I should indicate in very general terms what is intended. It will be remembered that The Rural Electrification Act provides that under certain conditions a power line levy may be placed

March 6, 1951

against the land adjacent to the power line, and in this way provision was made for credit to farmers. You will remember that before the project was started, under the terms of The Rural Electrification Act 75 per cent of the farmers' share of costs had to be collected. Then the other 25 per cent could be secured by means of a power line levy. Now, this portion of the Act proved very difficult to administer. We have not had to use it very much, fortunately, only in one project during 1950, and we are glad that we did not have to use it too much. There were substantial administrative difficulties in the way of making use of that in the Act. Fortunately, too, we were able to find projects in which all the farmers were able to pay, in cash, their full share of construction costs of the project. So we were able to go ahead without interruption and without making use to any material extend of the power line levy.

We are running into conditions now, however, where we feel a more simplified form of credit to farmers will be beneficial. In some cases, at least, the power project will be organized – the organization will proceed to the point that the farmers' share of costs are being collected, and then we may find that there are a few farmers in that area willing and anxious to take the power services and yet who find it impossible to pay their share of the costs. The result of this, sometimes, is that the project falls down because it does not qualify on the basis of farms-per-mile of line. And a few farmers, temporarily embarrassed for funds, are the cause of their neighbours and all the other members of that project failing to secure power service. That must be a very uncomfortable position for the farmer himself, and also very disturbing to those who are able to pay yet who cannot receive power because of the temporary embarrassment of some of their neighbours.

Now, it is planned to overcome this situation. It is planned to give credit to a limited number of farmers. We don't propose to go out and give credit to all farmers in a project. I feel it would be a mistake to do that. I feel that if all farmers in an area require assistance in order to make their contribution towards construction costs, that project had better wait for a year until the farmers are in a little better financial position. Our plan is to provide credit to those few who, because of their temporary embarrassment, would cause a project to fall down. Now, the extent of the credit which would be provided them would be limited to two-thirds of an individual farmer's contribution, and we intend that it shall be secured against the farmer's land, and that it shall be repayable within a period of three years. That, very roughly, is the plan that we propose to put into effect.

I am very pleased indeed with the work of the Farm Electrification Branch of the Power Corporation. I think they have done a splendid job of going out and meeting the farmers and explaining to the farmers what is expected of them, the responsibilities which are theirs, and the responsibilities of the Power Corporation. I, unfortunately, did not hear one of the hon. members opposite, the other day. I am speaking of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. A. W. Loehr), but I am told that he said the farmers in his area had no reason to feel grateful or to express thanks to the Power Corporation for having connected their farms to the power lines. Now, Mr. Speaker, I haven't yet heard any member of the Power Corporation ask for thanks for doing the job of connecting power lines; but I would like to say that not all persons in the hon. member's constituency feel as he does, and when thanks do come, I can assure you – and you know, too, from your own experience – that hard-working men like to have a little word of thanks. I would like to read part of a letter which came to me. It is dated in Humboldt on January 15, 1951. I won't read it all, and since I have not got the authority of the gentleman who wrote it to me to give his name, I won't give his name, but I'll give it on my own responsibility:

“A year ago I wrote you to report my interest and my organizational work in the field of rural electrification. The high hopes I expressed at that time have practically all materialized. During the past year, as you well know, rural electrification has made great strides forward in the divisional superintendency under Mr. S.G. Shepherd, Humboldt. This area has been among the fortunate ones and in 1950 over 500 rurals have been connected to the network of the Power Corporation. In the name of these farmers I wish to extend to you our sincerest thanks. Up here, Mr. Shepherd and I will always continue to be interested”.

And then the final paragraph in the letter (— the body of the letter refers to a specific project);

“From all sides come expressions of appreciation and I want to pass them on to you. I once wrote Mr. Smith, Superintendent of Rural Electrification, that in my opinion one of the biggest points the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has scored lies in the entire avoidance of politics in the programme of expansion.

“In conclusion I wish to thank you again for all the good things the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has brought us and may it bring further blessings to many rurals in 1951.”

Mr. Speaker, that letter was, of course, unsolicited. But I want at this time to express appreciation to the people at Head Office who go down to the office in the evenings, on Saturdays, on Sundays and on holidays, any time when their presence there can help to expedite this matter of rural electrification.

Expansion of our town and village programme brought service to 33 additional towns, villages and hamlets during the past year. Some 435 cities, towns, villages and hamlets are now served, and the number of our customers has increased from 57,855 to over 63,600. I think that that is a fairly satisfactory contribution to the town and village programme.

It is a simple matter, Mr. Speaker, to reel off a pile of figures that is difficult to assimilate. It is difficult to appreciate just what has been done. Sometimes an illustration will do more than all the figures that can be quoted. I would like the members of the Assembly to imagine that, instead of distributing those power lines all over Saskatchewan, we had built them in one straight line and that we started from the City of Regina and built them eastward, end to end. In that case the last pole might be set in the streets of Montreal. That is not just stringing wire, Mr. Speaker! That is digging holes and putting up poles. We have used 37,000 poles and, in addition to many small shipments of material, we have used over 350 carload lots of material in our construction programme.

We have done something, too, to brighten up our towns and villages. Some 107 towns and villages have added street lights during the past year, and modernization of street lighting systems have been begun, and some of them finished, in Yorkton, Watrous, Nipawin, Moosomin, Humboldt, Kindersley, Unity and Wilkie. I think perhaps too little attention has been paid in the

March 6, 1951

past to good street lighting. I have in my office two pictures of the main street in the town of Watrous. In one picture, taken before the modernization was put into effect, it is barely possible to see the buildings on either side of the street under the old system of lights going down the centre of the street. In the other, taken after the street lighting had been modernized, it is possible to see the licence plates on the cars parked along the side of the street; that is, on those that are closest to the camera. You can't read the numbers – I won't go so far as to say that; but you can see the licences.

It would be interesting to the Assembly, I am sure, to know that we are trying to run the Power Corporation as a fully modern operation, and we have instituted aerial patrol of our power lines. We plan that this will be done twice annually. An aeroplane flying low over power lines, I am told, can discover faults and potential trouble spots that are not discernible from an observer on the ground. And that is being done. When a trouble spot is discovered, its location is reported to the district operator, and he goes out and fixes it up. That is probably one reason why we have been able to give a pretty good standard of service over our network.

The Power Corporation came under a certain amount of criticism, last year, particularly in the City of Saskatoon during the railway strike, because there was what might have been considered an inadequate fuel supply to make certain that the plant would not run into difficulties. It was a rather difficult position for the Power Corporation to be in. If we had known how long the railway strike was going to last, we would have been able to say whether or not there was a shortage of fuel. We felt that the situation was not too critical. The difficulty there was that part of our fuel yard was occupied by construction material and consequently our stockpile was lower than usual. Now, with the type of coal which we use in our boilers, spontaneous combustion is almost certain to occur if coal is piled in too great bulk. Consequently, you cannot just pile it high and expect that to be satisfactory. It has to be spread out, and it is true that our coal yard was not as fully stocked as it would have been under normal circumstances. Nevertheless, we did have 250,000 gallons of oil in a tank there that was never touched. Our present policy is to have a stockpile of a different type of coal – a different type that is not subject to spontaneous combustion – and also to keep well stocked with oil.

Increases to our generating capacity were made to keep pace with increased demands for power during the past year. The principal improvement made to the largest generating stations was in the increased generating capacity of Estevan, Prince Albert and Saskatoon. New boiler capacity totalling 420,000 pounds per hour was installed at those plants. The new boilers at Prince Albert and Saskatoon are equipped to burn either coal or oil. We have been using oil from the skimming plant located near our plant there, but the recent increases in the cost of crude oil may make it desirable to increase the percentage of coal that is used. The 15,000 K.W. turbo-generator ordered in 1948 for the plant at Estevan is installed now, and will be in operation very soon. The 25,000 K.W. turbo-generator that was ordered for Saskatoon is in process of construction and it is coming forward as scheduled. We are installing a 10,000 K.W. unit at Prince Albert this year which, together with an interconnecting transmission line, will ensure adequate supply of power for both Saskatoon and Prince Albert. At Unity, the only point

where we generate from natural gas, we have added a 1,200 h.p. gas diesel to the plant which increases the capacity of that plant by 50 per cent. There is some possibility that in the Lone Rock area there may be quantities of gas available, which will make it possible for us to establish a gas generating station there. We are carrying on investigations, but my last word was that the matter had not been finally decided.

In addition to 300 miles of transmission lines built to serve our town and village programme and 1,500-odd miles of arm lines, there were many miles of heavy transmission lines built to relieve overloaded facilities. Construction of these heavy transmission lines has served to render unnecessary the operation of some costly diesel plants. It is significant that as a result of construction of these high voltage transmission lines, we have been able, this year, to transfer the generation of 6,000,000 K.W.H.s from diesel plants to steam plants. The Prince Albert-Melfort-Tisdale line will transmit power at 69,000 volts, and it was built suitable for 115,000 volts operation when the loads increase. A heavy 33,000-volt line was built from Saskatoon to Rosetown, and also to serve Biggar and Perdue. Biggar, Perdue and Rosetown were formerly served by diesel plants. In all we have closed five diesel plants and reduced the operating hours of a good many others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about rates. Rates have been already mentioned in the Assembly this Session and, after all, what the customer has to pay for his power is of very great importance to him. One achievement of the Power Commission – I say Power Commission before the Power Corporation was set up – was to effect very substantial rate reductions in Saskatchewan. There were four successive rate reductions and while our present rates are not the lowest in the west by any means, nevertheless they are substantially lower than can be provided by small plants, municipally or privately owned. That, of course, is the reason for our transmission line service.

A factor in the high cost of power in Saskatchewan is the low average consumption in this province. Of course, we have to expect low average consumption because so many of our customers are new customers. It is nevertheless true that the average consumption of the Saskatchewan farmer, in 1950, was only 95 K.W.H. per month. This compares with 208 K.W.H. per month by the Manitoba farmer and 180 K.W.H. per month by the Alberta farmer. The Saskatchewan farmer, being a new user of electrical energy, has not yet developed to the point where he is making full use of the utility.

I suppose that most hon. members are aware of what the rates are to the farmers of Saskatchewan. First of all, there is a demand charge of \$2.00. The \$2.00 demand charge is expected to cover the carrying charges on the extra capital required to serve farms. Then there is a block of 30 K.W.H. at 8 cents and another block of 20 K.W.H. at 6 cents, with a run-off rate of 3 cents per K.W.H. It is obvious, then, that the cost per K.W.H. is very much lower to the farmer when he can find uses for a substantially increased consumption of electrical energy. I will try to illustrate that. The average cost per K.W.H. to a Saskatchewan farmer who uses 100 K.W.H. per month

March 6, 1951

is 7.1 cents, but if he will supply himself with some more equipment so that he uses more power, profitably of course – he should only supply himself with equipment and appliances which he can use probably, but if he can use 150 K.W.H., he gets it for an average cost of 5.7 cents, and if he gets up to 250 K.W.H. the cost to him is 4.6 cents per K.W.H. That is a reduction for the man who uses 100 K.W.H. from 7.1 cents to 4.6 cents once he gets into using power in a large way. On the basis of the present coverage consumption of 95 K.W.H. per month the Saskatchewan farmer pays 7.3 cents per K.W.H.

The rate structure is a highly scientific study, one Power Corporation Officials are employed in this study at the present time. Members of the Assembly will remember that the last Session there was an amendment of agreements with towns and villages, subject of the approval of the Local Government Board. That no revision of rates has been affected up to this time is because an economic survey of the entire Power Corporation system, in all its aspects, has been carried on this summer, and it was necessary to give that economic survey precedence. The rate study is going on now, as I say. Our objective must be to encourage and promote greater consumption, and to provide power at the lowest possible run-off rates.

It is obvious from our experience – in fact we can tell it without experience – that transmission of power to farms for light and convenience in the home alone is not practical. Farm electrification spans a tremendous field for the sale of appliance and farm electrical equipment. In Manitoba, the farmer is required to buy five appliances as a condition of getting service. He has to buy the five appliances before the Manitoba Power Commission will give him service, and the Manitoba Power Corporation sells the appliances direct to the farmer at a reduced price. In Alberta there are two utilities there – the Canadian Utilities and the Calgary Power. Now, they do something there to promote sales. I believe one of them engages in merchandising electrical appliances, but I don't know which of them it is. In Saskatchewan at the present time, the Power Corporation is seeking the co-operation of dealers without active participation by the Corporation itself. We are trying to persuade dealers to put on a drive, where electrification has been installed, to sell appliances. If this isn't effective, then, perhaps, it will be necessary to consider further steps.

Now, I have heard several people say that we are not going fast enough in our development of our electrical system in Saskatchewan. I am not much impressed by those arguments, and I would like the House to recall that, in 1948, the budget for power was \$2,400,000. In 1949, that was stepped up to \$3,600,000, and then a supplementary increased that figure to \$4,100,000. The total expended in 1950 on power development in the province approached \$6,000,000 and, in addition to this, \$1,000,000 was spent on the purchase of material required in the 1951 programme. Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason that exceeds the appropriation was that farmers made a contribution towards the construction line, and that was included in addition to the appropriation. But it takes a lot of organization. It takes a lot of building-up of organization, both in the field and

in Head Office to come from \$2,400,000 expenditure up to \$6,000,000, and this year, if we are fortunate enough to secure the materials we need – and we have been a little uneasy in some respects with regard to material supplies – there will be spent in this province, this year, on farm extensions pretty close to \$8,000,000. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to step up, let us say, from \$4,000,000 to \$8,000,000 in a single year. We would not have the organization to handle such an expanded programme, and I think we have gone forward in quite substantial steps from \$2,400,000 in 1948 to \$8,000,000 in 1951.

Now, I want to say a little about load growth. The demand for further extensions to our power system goes on unabated. I think I mentioned earlier that there was an economic survey by the Power Corporation into the entire system, and this included estimates of the load growth which can be expected to Saskatchewan for some years to come. The load growth is attributable to three factors: (1) The extension into new towns and villages, and farm connections; (2) New installations in communities already served; (3) The increased use through the acquisition of appliances by our customers.

The House will be interested to know that in 1948, the consumption increased 15 per cent over 1947; in 1949, consumption increased 17 per cent over 1948; and in 1950, consumption increased 21 per cent over 1949. Now there, you will notice, are compounded increases; and in total we can see that the use of electricity 21 per cent over 1949. Now these, you will notice, are compounded increases; and in total we can see that the use of electricity in Saskatchewan has more than doubled in the past five years. We can expect continued increases in consumption. For one thing, as I pointed out a little while ago, a great many farmers are going to have received electrical power on their farms, they are going to be buying equipment, and they are going to be using more than the average of 95 K.W.H. per month that they are using now. The same is true in towns and villages. Because of the low saturation of appliances in Saskatchewan, we can expect that the kilowatt hours of consumption per customer will very materially rise. Now, consumption in 1950 by Power Corporation customers total 236 million K.W.H. That is exclusive of Regina and Saskatoon, or Regina and Moose Jaw, which are the two major centres that would materially alter it if we were dealing with the provincial figure. The Power Corporation study to which I have referred indicates that, if there is no interruption in our anticipated expansion, consumption in Saskatchewan will have reached 900 million K.W.H. by 1940, or four times the present consumption. And if we include the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw, then Saskatchewan will be consuming 1100 million K.W.H. 10 years from now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that immediately gives us some idea of the time of the programme that lies ahead in keeping pace with that demand. At this time I think it is very timely that the Government and the Power Corporation have made this study so that we can look ahead. Too often it has been true in power development that very suddenly a crisis has had to be faced. We are not facing a crisis at this moment in Saskatchewan, but we can see that there must be very heavy capital expenditures over the next 10 years if we are going to keep pace with the anticipated demand. Now, of

March 6, 1951

course, the promise might be all wrong upon which those demands, or perspective demands, are estimated. You might have war; we might have depression. Either would make a very great difference in the realization of my estimates; but I think that, in such a matter as power development, it is safe to assume and be prepared for which is likely to transpire.

Now where, and by what means, are we going to effect this great increase in generating capacity: Our policy during the years immediately past has been to concentrate generation in the larger generating plants and to eliminate the small ones. Therefore, it is logical that we should proceed to expand our larger plants such as Estevan and Saskatoon, and at the same time give very serious thought to the development of such hydropower as is available to us in this province.

Our customers in the north-central part of Saskatchewan, which includes Saskatoon, North Battleford and Prince Albert, used 185,000,000 K.W.H. in 1950. Normal increases in this area, plus farm electrification, will result in the use of power in the order of 340,000,000 K.W.H. by 1955. Now, it appears obvious that the potential capacity of the power plant at Fort a la Corne could be utilized by that time, or the year after, 1956.

The H. G. Acres 1947 report Fort a la Corne indicated that the site was feasible when the power consumption within a reasonable distance of the site reached 370,000,000 K.W.H. I have said that the estimates of the Power Corporation people indicated that by 1955 there will be a demand for 400,000,000 K.W.H. The load growth which can be anticipated in the central and southern parts of the province indicate that a power plan located at the proposed dam at Coteau Creek on the South Saskatchewan River could be utilized at full capacity at the earliest possible moment that it could be built if it were started today. I am very much discouraged and disappointed to note that the Federal Government had decreased their appropriation for that project by a million dollars. There is a great need, from the standpoint of power development in this province, that we should make progress with the construction of the Coteau Creek dam on the South Saskatchewan River.

In order to distribute the power generated at these plants and greatly expanded steam plants at Saskatoon and Estevan, many hundreds of miles of high voltage transmission lines must be built to feed our primary grid. It has been estimated that the Fort a la Corne development at the site will cost between \$17 million and \$18 million. At Coteau Creek – of course, the Federal Government is going to build the dam, all we will have is the power plant; at Coteau Creek the plant will cost the Government and the Power Corporation in the neighbor of \$8 million or 8½ million. The type of high voltage transmission lines which connects those plants and which will distribute their energy throughout our system, would cost \$6,000 to \$8,000 a mile. I will not attempt to say how great the present capacity will have to be increased several times over; and I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, not of the distant future but of the comparatively near future of power development in this province.

Now, I think if we could see a picture – I am only dreaming dreams, Mr. Speaker, at the moment – but suppose we would take a look at Saskatchewan in the future as it may be ten years from now. I would hope to see a power plant at Fort a la Corne connected by high voltage transmission line to a power plant at Coteau Creek and, from there, to Weyburn and down to Estevan; and I would expect to find that that system of high voltage transmission lines interconnecting all those plants would be, as it were, the backbone of the distribution system in the province of Saskatchewan.

We have to think in those terms, in terms of a power pool. A power pool for this province is as essential as a power pool has been in other parts of the world. Everyone knows that in Manitoba at the present time, the Manitoba Government is in process of bringing into being a power pool. In Britain the same thing was done. It is the most economical way in which power service can be utilized. It is the most economical way in which it can be developed. There are a number of benefits which come from the establishment of a power pool. One of them is, of course, continuity of service; if one plant breaks down it can draw from another, and we can have continuity of service. Another advantage is, of course, that each plant is relieved of the necessity of maintaining expensive stand-by units that are idle most of the time.

I want to read just a little bit from an article which appeared in the ‘Free Press’:

“The achievement of the central electricity board in Britain in creating a grid system and power pool is generally acknowledged as one of the most outstanding in electrical power development. In less than ten years the country was covered by a network of inter-connected transmission lines and a power pool had been set up that supplied Britain’s main electricity needs for many years at a saving to the country of millions of dollars.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, at least it is my hope, that we will revise our thinking a little bit in this province with respect to power development. It seems to me that we have been thinking too locally. One community has been thinking of power as it affects itself and the next as it affects its own particular environment. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before we can have a satisfactory power system in this province, we must think in terms of the province as a whole. Now, I am not too critical of people who are not yet caught up with that idea, and when I quote an editorial from the Saskatoon ‘Star-Phoenix’ I am not necessarily condemning the writer of that editorial, because I think that he simply reflects a type of thinking that is very common in the province and is certainly not peculiar to the Saskatoon ‘Star-Phoenix.’ The Power Corporation officials had some contact with the officials in Saskatoon and gave them some of the figures on prospective load growth and, immediately, the City of Saskatoon becomes conscious of the urgency in knowing where future supplies of electricity were coming to their city. Very natural; I have no fault to find with

that at all. But what our Power Corporation proposes is that they will build, as I said earlier in my talk, in the Prince Albert plant a 10,000 K.W. generator this year. Fortunately, we were able to get that generator from Edmonton; and we got it secondhand and very reasonably, and it is going into Prince Albert plant. It could be put in the Saskatoon plant, but if it were put there it would occupy space that would later on be better utilized for a larger unit such as a 25,000 K.W. unit. But we are putting it in Prince Albert and in this connection the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' says this:

"The Corporation suggests that Saskatoon can be carried over this year's peak consumption by equipment it proposes to install in Prince Albert this summer. By building additional high-tension lines some of Prince Albert's surplus can be put into Saskatoon district to relieve the local plant and bring the load down to manageable proportions. If this is the only solution that can be worked out, then we must have it, and presumably the City will have to bear its share of the cost by paying a rate to the Power Commission that will include the City's portion of the expenses it has been put to. But at best it is only an emergency solution and not entirely satisfactory to any of the parties involved."

Now, that is the point of view of the writer of that editorial, and what is really happening is this, Mr. Speaker. There was a 69,000 voltage transmission line built, last summer, from Prince Albert to Melfort to Tisdale. The transmission line, which will connect with Saskatoon, will leave that transmission line at a point nearest to the Port a la Corne site. It will come due south through Humboldt, and it will meet another high voltage transmission line which will be built from Saskatoon eastward to Wynyard. And there we see the integrated power system that will have taken form, this summer, in the north-central part of the province. The cities of Prince Albert, Humboldt, Saskatoon will all be interconnected by high voltage transmission lines. And Saskatoon is concerned because it doesn't view this as satisfactory, according to the writer of this editorial who feels that the plant should be in Saskatoon, that it should not be in Prince Albert, when in point of fact, Mr. Speaker, the City of Saskatoon is going to be the first beneficiary of an integrated power system in the province.

It seems to me I am taking a very long time, Mr. Minister, I hope I am not boring the House with this; but I did feel that I wanted to give, if possible, a clear picture of what lies ahead of us in this province. It appears to me that if we fail to profit from a study of what has happened and is happening in Manitoba, we will be making a serious mistake. As you know, the Manitoba Government is facing up to a crisis in power supply, and they are proposing to put into effect a modification of the Hogg report of three years ago in an effort to escape very serious difficulties in the very near future. Two years ago, the Manitoba Government began engineering work on the power development at Pine Falls. That is a plant which will cost the Manitoba Government something over \$20,000,000.

Now, one of the troubles with power is that you have got to be far-sighted. You have got to see a long way ahead. It takes three to four years from the time that plans are first conceived until a power project such as Pine Falls can be put into operation. It is two years since they began to plan for Pine Falls, and this won't be ready for some time; but Premier Campbell said, according to a press report:

“Unless further developments are underway meanwhile, our supply position will be worse on the day we finish Pine Falls than it was the day this project was started.

The Manitoba Government has accepted the principle of a power pool, a principle which I feel we are going to accept in this province of Saskatchewan. In order to bring this pool into being, it proposes to purchase the plant of the Winnipeg Electric Company and to require the City of Winnipeg plant to become incorporated in the pool. There is some disagreement, naturally enough, as to whether it is necessary to purchase the Winnipeg Electric Plant. The power pool can operate, in spite of the fact – the power pools are operating in some places irrespective of ownership of the plants; but apparently it is the intention of the Manitoba Government to purchase the Winnipeg Electric Company's plant. The Winnipeg 'Free Press' says this on the matter of the power pool in Manitoba and I will only quote it part:

“On the main point – that costs of producing power in this province must be pooled – there is no disagreement. As matters now stand there are four low cost sites on the Winnipeg River. Two of these plants – the Points du Bois and Slave Falls plants – are owned by the City Hydro, and the other two – Great Falls and Seven Sisters plants – by the Winnipeg Electric. The average cost of installing these plants was below \$100 per h.p. The Manitoba Government's new plant at Pine Falls will cost \$220 per h.p., and the cost of future installations, whether of steam or waterpower, will be much higher again. Clearly the averaging of all these costs, present and future, in a pool to be operated under provincial authority, is essential for the benefit of all the power users.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on giving you further data in connection with the reaction of the different people in Manitoba with respect to the proposed power pool. The reaction of the Winnipeg City Council to government proposals is interesting. Mayor Garnet Coulter indicated that the Council was in substantial agreement with the proposals as made by the Premier, and stated that – and I quote: “Council intended to co-operate with the Government to maintain a general level of rates for public service at least equal to that now enjoyed by the people of Greater Winnipeg.”

The Manitoba 'Free Press' in an editorial headed “The Right Solution” says this:

“Obviously no single community or group of communities, regardless of existing ownership and use, have the right

to take the cheap power and saddle the rest of the people of the province with the high cost power. Therefore it is essential that a power pool covering all of the province be created. Into this power pool all power – cheap and costly – must go. In the pool, the costs will be averaged and the average price will be charged to all distributors."

Mr. Speaker, again I want to refer to the editorial in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix', and again I might say that I am not surprised at the writer's point of view. It all too common in this province. We are not up-to-date in our thinking on power matters. But the last few sentences, the last few words, of the editorial are these:

"City consumers are not be expected to bear part of the cost of power in other cities or in rural districts."

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — That's an old fashioned one, Jim.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I should inflect any more of this on the House. I would like, however, to draw attention to one more fact.

Mr. Tucker: — Haven't you been talking to the Minister of Social Welfare about that?

Hon. Mr. Darling: — I am stating facts, they can fall where they please.

Mr. Tucker: — I think he and facts are foreign to one another.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Manitoba has announced a policy which he calls a 'no-diversion' policy. I am not qualified, it would be quite unfair for me to attempt on the very sketchy data I have on the Premier's policy, to discuss it; but I believe that he means that revenues from power should be directed into power expansion and should not be diverted anywhere else. I think when he has an opportunity to enlarge on statements that I have seen that that will be found to be his intentions. In the Province of Ontario that is true, and I would like to read you a section or two from the Ontario Power Commission Act. Section 95A provides for the manner in which a municipal corporation which received power from the Commission for distribution may utilize funds in its hands derived from the electrical utility. Any such funds, not required for current operating expenses or current working capital of the utility must be used for the following purposes and no others:

(a) Reduction of the indebtedness incurred with respect to the installation of works for the production or distribution of power; (b) the acquisition of a site and the erection of buildings for use by the municipal commission as offices for the other business purposes

subject to the approval of the Power Commission; (c) the renewal of such buildings; (d) the extension of works for production or distribution of power and so on; (e) the purchase of securities approved by the Power Corporation.”

Those are under Section 95A of the Ontario Power Commission Act, the purposes for which revenue surpluses derived from power distribution may be used. Under Section 96, if the municipal corporation or commission shows a surplus from its electric utility, after paying running expenses and any sums required to be paid on account of principal and interest of any debentures issued in respect of the utility, and providing for depreciation and other reserves approved by the Power Commission, the surplus is to be applied and disposed on in such a manner as the Power Commission pay direct:

- (a) In reconstruction or rebuilding its works for the production or distribution of power and so on.
- (b) In repaying to persons to whom power is being supplied by the municipal corporation or municipal commission, money paid by them for power supplied, such repayment to be made either directly or by a credit on bills for power.

Mr. Speaker, I won't read any further, but the whole practice in Ontario is to prevent the diversion of surpluses derived from the generation and distribution of power to any other purpose except the expansion of power. I present that simply to indicate that a very different pattern has developed in the province of Saskatchewan. I don't know whether that is good or bad. I don't intend to comment on it one way or the other; but as the Minister responsible to the Power Corporation I would like to point out that it is one more handicap added to the natural handicaps which we face in this province, which has been avoided in provinces where there are fewer natural handicaps to contend with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most people are tired listening to me, but I would like to say a word or two about Telephones. I am sure that Telephones won't object if I don't. It may be that in the Crown Corporations Committee I will have an opportunity to say those things in connection with Telephones that I would like to say here. I would like to say just a little at least in connection with the problem that we have been facing because of the tremendous increase in demand for telephones. We converted to automatic the telephone service at Biggar just before the opening of the Session. When we planned that conversion, there were 277 local lines and 25 rural lines in operation into the Biggar exchange. Well, 277 and 25, that is 302. We ordered 400 lines, expecting that that would be adequate; but when we went down there to open the exchange on the 23rd of January (I think it was) we found that there were 27 people waiting for service and our full 400 lines were taken up. That is our experience. It was true in Melville. It was true in Biggar. It is true almost everywhere where we open an exchange. There are a number of reasons for that. One thing, I think, is that people like to have a modern instrument in their home. They like to use the dial telephone, and they like the cradle

March 6, 1951

type telephone and, more than that, they like the monthly billing which we are putting into effect wherever dial telephones are installed.

Mr. Tucker: — Not if it is too big.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I will take an opportunity to go further into Telephones possibly under the questions which are asked in the Power Corporations Committee, but I want to say that the effort which has gone into meeting the demand by the public for telephone installation reflects the highest credit upon the staff of Saskatchewan Government Telephones. I want to say that never before have telephones been installed at so rapid a rate in this province, and we have had a great struggle in breaking the back of the waiting list which has been staring us in the face for the last two years. We have now reduced it to the point that there are 4,809 on the waiting list, whereas at this time last year, the figure was more than 8,000. In 1948, we installed 5,420 telephones; in 1949, 6138; in 1950, 7,587. Now, we have since 1948 added 21,000 circuit miles to our long distance lines, and 7,300 of those were installed, this year.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister resumes his seat I wonder — he mentioned the fact that some electricity was being generated by diesel, run by natural gas in the western part of the province. I wonder if he will tell the House just before he finishes, to round the picture out, as to what their experience was in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — You are referring, of course to the installation at Unity. Well, the experience was very satisfactory. Gas generation is a cheap form of generation.

Mr. Tucker: — How does it compare with coal? What I had in mind was the comparative cost. I read in an article the other day, that it has been found that it was cheaper to generate it that way than by some of the more recent installations in hydroelectric power. And when there is a possibility of so much natural gas available, I wondered that in his comprehensive survey the Minister had not included the western part of the province based upon natural gas.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Discovery of natural gas, of course, or any other cheap source of energy, would naturally affect our plans. The generation in Unity is the cheapest that we have in our system. I think I am correct in saying that now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been reminded that there has been a lot of talk across the floor about telephone rates. If anyone had asked me whether or not we had increased rural connecting fees I would have said “yes” and I would have been right. But when they ask me whether or not I have increased telephone rates I say “no”. There is a very great difference. So we come to talk about telephone rates and I have . . .

Mr. Tucker: — There should have been a lawyer here.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Mr. Speaker, a lawyer isn't in it with me when I know the facts.

Mr. Tucker: — I'm going to go after a lawyer. You can split a hair finer than he can.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Mr. Speaker, there is a strong feeling of fraternalism among telephone companies in Canada. They don't like to say unpleasant things about one another. They don't like to draw comparisons that are damaging one to the other. That is an unusual situation, perhaps. Some of those telephone companies are private companies; some of them are publicly-owned, and yet together they form the Trans-Canada Telephone Association, a loosely-bound group that never has any difficulty, apparently, in coming to agreement with respect to matters which concern them all. The Bell Telephone company, as everyone I think will know, made application, last July, to the Board of Transport Commission (I believe that is where they apply) for a 10 per cent increase in telephone rates. And they were granted that. Then they made a further application which will give them a 20 per cent increase in revenue. The British Columbia Telephone Company has done the same thing. They have got an increase of 18 per cent on telephone rates. Now, those are the rates, Mr. Speaker, that one pays for the telephone in the house. That is the rate we are talking about. If you have a telephone in your office, or a telephone in your house, you pay a rate for that telephone. Those have not been changed in Saskatchewan. With respect to the rural connecting fees, I should say this: They were formerly at their present level in 1935, but because of conditions of depression they were reduced to \$3. I remember rural companies did that too; It was less than a cost basis. The rural company of which I was a subscriber had a rental of \$7 a year; later, it was increased to \$10, but that was true all over the province. The lines were permitted to deteriorate and they just carried along at an extremely low rental. So the rural connecting fees were reduced to \$3. Now, they should have been increased long before they were. They should have been increased, because the \$3, Mr. Speaker, was below the cost of operation, and it became necessary to pay increased commissions to our agents throughout the province. And I might say that half our agents are rural telephone companies and those agents received 70 per cent of the increase so that when we collected \$2 extra on each telephone from a rural company in rural connection fees, where the company was our agent they got 70 per cent or \$1.40 of that back in addition to commissions to their office. The increase in rural connecting fees is a payment made by rural telephone companies to the Saskatchewan Government Telephones for the use of our switchboard, and our office equipment. It is not a rate for a telephone that you have on your desk. The increases in Swift Current and North Battleford that were mentioned, I believe, by the Minister of Labour were the result of a step up to a higher bracket based on number of lines in the Exchange. Now, that is not an increase. I might just as well say that if a fellow goes out and buys an old jalopy and gets a licence for \$10, and then trades it in and gets a better car and has to pay \$17, and trades that one in and gets a bigger one and pays \$25, it does not involve an increase in automobile licence fees. The same is true of telephone rates. As a community grows the subscriber has contact with more people without the payment of toll service. He gets the use of more exchange equipment.

March 6, 1951

I have some of the rates here – Nova Scotia Telephone Company, New Brunswick Telephone Company and the Bell Telephone Company, the B. C. Telephone Company, the Alberta Telephone Company – the practice is universal in Canada and I believe, in the United States, to graduate Telephone rates according to the number of lines connected to the exchange. There isn't any difference. Now those rates are there. When you qualify for a higher rate you get it; but the rates are not changed.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Better service and more of it.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Yes. Now, in the case of Swift Current and North Battleford, they stepped up to a different rating. They were given monthly billing and modern telephone equipment, and their higher rates came into effect on the first of this month, the first of March, and they are very pleased about it all. Now, Mr. Speaker, with that explanation . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What about Regina?

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Regina and Saskatoon qualified in the same way. They simply stepped up and are different rates. It was not the population; it was the number of telephones. Now, those rates have been there since . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. member permit another question?

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Certainly.

Mr. Tucker: — Have you any knowledge if any of the companies supplying telephone facilities have had to raise their rates to their subscribers as a result of having to pay the extra \$2 switching fee. How many have had to raise their rates?

Hon. Mr. Darling: — I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Tucker: — Don't they have to make their records?

Hon. Mr. Darling: — I have no knowledge of that. Mr. Speaker. I will support the motion.

Mr. J.R. Denike (Torch River): — Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Public Works expects us to spend a considerable amount of his appropriation in the Torch River constituency, during the coming season, I thought it was quite appropriate that he should spend some considerable time in discussing the work of his Department. As a matter of fact, the Minister has neglected us considerably during the past six years. I am glad that he mentioned the fact that the Power corporation had installed streetlights in the town of Nipawin. Otherwise the Department of Public Works has done very little in the Torch River constituency.

Plans, at the present time, are for the Power corporation to extend a line from Nipawin, or from White Fox to Smeaton; surveys have been made and this should progress during the coming season. Plans also have been made to install a new telephone exchange in the town of Nipawin,

but knowing the difficulties that accompany such an extensive project we are well prepared to wait until equipment is available.

The Minister of Public Works is perhaps the only one of the Ministers whose mark has not been made in my own particular constituency. The Minister of Public Health certainly has done an excellent job. The hospital plan introduced by the Saskatchewan Government has been of particular benefit in my own territory. The reason for that is because many of the people are homesteaders with small holdings and with not a great deal of cash behind them. Some of them, it is true, are quite wealthy and are located upon some of the best land in the province of Saskatchewan; but there are a large number of them who are just now getting on their feet, and for that reason they have appreciated very much during the past six years the efforts made by the Department of Public Health to alleviate their sufferings and to care for the great backlog of medical care which has piled up over the years.

I have been looking in vain for some member of the Opposition to answer the question of my seatmate for information as to what the Opposition means by 'decentralization'. The only answer that I have had has come through the medium of the "Leader-Post." Now the "Leader-Post" in making reference to the Alberta plan, said that Alberta had looked at the Saskatchewan Hospital Plan and the British Columbia Hospital Plan and had decided to inaugurate a system of municipal assistance. Now this plan has been tried out in the past and has been found wanting. Ontario has a similar plan, and in connection with the municipal plan as applied to the city of Toronto, it gives an indication as to what might happen, in Saskatchewan, if a decentralization plan should be followed.

Toronto hospitals lost more than \$500,000, last year, in deficits, through care for indigent patients. They still have \$700,000 outstanding after receiving provincial and municipal grants for 1948-49. The proposed new plan for grants has to come before the Cabinet and Legislature. Alberta has adopted the deterrent plan of \$1 a day per patient, and the remaining costs are divided between the municipality and the government.

I can't understand why the Opposition should leave it to the "Leader-Post" to answer a direct question, or perhaps we can understand – they are not prepared to take a definite stand, but they use the editor of the "Leader-Post" to 'fly a kite' for them.

The Torch River constituency tried out the Automobile Insurance Act very early after its inception. Files 3 and 4 in the Saskatchewan Government Insurance files indicate that two standing on a street in Nipawin were severely injured, necessitating a lengthy stay in hospital. Each one had a leg broken, and indemnity and medical expenses were paid. The total cost of caring for these men was something like \$800. The owner of the car- a 1931 coupe – certainly was not able to bear the cost of any expenses involved, nor to pay compensation. Now this accident, occurring so early in the course of the experiment with automobile accident insurance, put an end to any criticism that might have followed later, in connection with the plan. Since that time, nobody, in my hearing, has said anything in protest against the automobile insurance plan, and I notice that our hon. friends on the opposite side say very little about it. It is just another example of 'eating crow.' I think that this Legislature will go down in history as a crow feast for the Opposition, with Crown Corporations

as their principal dish – “in and out the window!” It was rather interesting to see one member of the Opposition sitting eating a special crow all by himself – the brick plant at Estevan . . .

Mr. McCormack: — Better than a dead duck anyway.

Mr. Denike: — Natural Resources, perhaps has been one of the most controversial of all the projects established by the Saskatchewan Government, and it seems that the Opposition haven't quite caught the idea yet. They still don't recognize the fact that the forests belong to the people of Saskatchewan. Now if the policies followed by former Liberal Governments had continued, forests, like the Torch River Provincial Forest, would by this time have been almost completely denuded, and consequently that would have been an end to the lumbering industry in that particular area. As it is, the forest at the present time is established so that a sustained yield will be carried on, and we can expect that in that area lumbering will be an industry for years and years to come.

Last year, for the first time, I heard criticism of Timber Board activities from some of my friends. Now, I shouldn't tell you this, but it is quite in keeping with recommendations that have been made by Opposition members. Some of them think that, just because a timber producer is given \$34 or thereabouts for producing a thousand feet of lumber, and the thousand feet of lumber finally reaches the consumer at a price of \$100, the intervening price – the amount between \$34 and \$100 – remains within the Timber Board.

Our hon. friends across the way, Mr. Speaker, evidently don't study their Crown corporation reports very well, and evidently they don't understand business practice very well, or they would know that there are many costs involved between the raw product and the consumer. The Timber Board had such a demand for their timber for the past season that piling yards ran short of supplies. The reason for that was because of such a crop in the northern part of Saskatchewan – of course all parts of Saskatchewan had a fairly good crop; but the people of north-eastern Saskatchewan had the advantage in that they can go to a local piling yard and obtain their supplies of lumber. The piling yards had maintained or had retained the usual supply of lumber necessary to supply the requirements of people in the area. However, the requirements were so great, during last fall, that the supply ran short. The people, then, were forced to go to the local lumber yards and purchase lumber at a very high rate – in the neighbourhood of \$100 per thousand feet. It was significant that, until the supply of lumber ran short in the piling yards, the price in the lumber yards remained somewhat near the piling-yard price. It goes to show, Mr. Speaker, just what socialized industry will do in maintaining and holding a price line.

People who came to me in criticism of the action of the Timber Board in not holding enough lumber for them, were told, that if they wished to ensure further supplies of lumber, a co-operative would be quite in order and the best plan for them. I propose to use that suggestion at any time that any one of these people comes to me suggesting that the piling yard should guarantee in perpetuity that there will be supplies of lumber for them. People have to do a certain amount of work for themselves, but I think that the whole situation was demonstrated very well to those people

that a co-operative would be the best method of handling lumber in that area.

I think that the Department of Education perhaps has made a greater contribution to that area than any other department. I have a statement here indicating the amount of building that was carried on in the Nipawin Larger School Unit during the past year. This list of building indicates clearly just what building was not done before this Saskatchewan Government came into power. This building was urgently required. First of all, completion of a six-room extension to the Carrot River School; completion of a four-room school at Garrick; a new six-room school at the village of Smeaton; a four-room extension to the two-room school at White Fox; and a new one-room modern rural school at Trail's End, and various other one-room schools.

There is also a summary of the work that has been accomplished by the Nipawin Larger School Unit since it was started: Fifty class rooms constructed, 15 to replace old buildings and the balance as additional class rooms; 15 new teacherages; 16 new barns; 1,150 new desks purchased and distributed; class room libraries have been methodically improved every year since the unit was established. This is just an indication as to the work that has been carried on by the Nipawin Larger Unit since it was started about 5 1/2 years ago.

It is significant, in connection with the Nipawin Larger Unit, that the town of Nipawin School Unit, has become part of the Nipawin Larger Unit. There is a definite reason why this should be so, and why the arrangement should be mutually satisfactory to both sides. The Federal Government has offered a \$50,000 grant to assist in the construction of a composite high school in Nipawin, but the town of Nipawin felt that that was beyond their means to handle, so that at the expiry of the probationary period of the Nipawin School Unit the Nipawin School Board and the Nipawin Large Unit combined forces and, as a result a composite school is in the progress of construction in the town of Nipawin. That is something that could not have been handled without co-operation between such an organization as the school unit and the school district of the town of Nipawin.

It is also significant that the Village of Aylsham hastened to make application to join the Nipawin Larger School Unit before a vote was taken in the Tisdale area. Aylsham is a village situated in one of the richest farming areas in the province of Saskatchewan and opponents of the larger school unit – I think these opponents have pretty well disappeared, we have not heard very much about the larger unit during this session; but opponents of the larger unit might wonder why people situated in such lucky circumstances would wish to join the unit. But it is in keeping with the spirit of co-operation that you will find in our particular part of Saskatchewan.

I was somewhat interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan in connection with the use of fuel oil as a method of heating in the Legislative Building. Now I can understand perfectly well why such a suggestion should have been made in the first case. I have a list here of the heavy oil burners installed in different buildings in

Regina and if the owners of these buildings and schools do not feel that oil is a cheaper method of heating than coal, they certainly would not have installed these oil burners. I am more or less in sympathy with the member for Souris-Estevan, and with the coalminers in the vicinity of Estevan, but it is significant that Alberta is faced with the same problem. The coal mines in Alberta are wondering just which way they are going at the present time. I have two or three editorial comments here, which I will not read; but it is a problem that is facing Alberta as well as Saskatchewan – Alberta more than in Saskatchewan. However, if the Minister of Public Works decides that it is not expedient to install heavy oil burners in the Legislature Building, we might then take that as a subsidization of the coalmines in the vicinity of Estevan.

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) spent some considerable time in the Legislature commenting on the situation that had occurred in connection with the American – Canadian Uranium Company in the State of New York, and he, apparently, was inclined to leave the impression that this company was the only one that had been in difficulty in the State of New York. I have an extract from the “Financial Post” which indicates what has been going on in the State of New York; how it all started. It all started about a month ago when the New York office of the Securities and Exchange Commission began warning individuals and New York brokers because there were financing agreements outstanding, and Anthony Lund, supervisor for this Commission, said that the United States was being flooded with dubious Canadian offerings of securities which have not been qualified for sale in the United States. The “Financial Post” did not make reference to American–Canadian Uranium, but selected Leduc-Calmar as a striking example of what can happen as a result of the action of these wildcat stock operators in the United States and on the New York Stock Exchange. On February 23rd and 24th, New York traders were buyers of perhaps 300,000 shares of Leduc-Calmar, a Calgary oil stock. The price rose from about 71 cents to \$1.02 a share over a few days. Then it was on or about February 23rd, so, no February 26th the New York brokers went to work to sell the 300,000 shares they had purchased. By February 27th the price was down to 62 cents a share. I am sorry that the member for Maple Creek is not here to hear what I have to say but perhaps he will, at some future date, comment upon this and assure the Legislature that he did not want to lead anybody astray.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard), made reference to the Flin Flon highway. I, also, am interested in the Flin Flon highway, but I do not think that the Flin Flon highway is going to satisfy the requirements of my own particular area at the present time. The Flin Flon highway is something that has to be looked at from a provincial standpoint and, therefore, it is advisable to leave it to be examined from a wider viewpoint. In our own particular area we have other projects which we think are much more important at the present time. We think that a highway directly east of Nipawin and leading to the co-op farms and on into the area which is to be developed by the Department of Agriculture would be much more feasible. I am not in favour of pushing highways through territory that is not going to be productive. I am not too enthusiastic about the Carrot River-The Pas highway just at the present time either,

for that reason. I would much prefer to see highways following development of agricultural land.

We have another problem facing us and that is the eventual rebuilding of No. 55 Highway, and that will have to be done in the not-too-distant future. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, what we are faced with in the Torch River constituency. We have four highways in project and we have to decide just which one we would prefer. My interests lie towards the east and I think that any highway that is built should be one that will serve an area that is settled and an area that deserves recognition. This area which deserves recognition – I am not quite sure why the hon. members are laughing, they apparently do not know what has taken place in the past; they do not know that that is a homestead area and that the people who moved into that area 20 years ago were just dropped in the bush by former Liberal Governments and left to work out their own salvation, have done so in the past, and now they have a Government that is going to see to it that some recognition is given to their claims.

The Department of Labour has been recognized in the towns of the Torch River Constituency as well as in other towns in Saskatchewan. I would like to take issue with the Minister of Labour on his statement that the business men, in general, are in opposition to the suggestions and the Acts passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature. Merchants in general recognize that workers have to have a decent standard of living, and merchants in general are becoming much more considerate of people around them than they were before. They know, as well as anybody else, that a wealthy farm community is all to the good, and they know that their workers will do a better job and be much more reliable if they are also given a decent wage. So The Hours of Work, The Holidays with Pay and The One Day's Rest in Seven are Acts that are well appreciated by the workers in my constituency.

One day's rest in seven brings something to my mind that had escaped it. For two years in succession I notice that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) has made reference to the very high wages paid in the mines in his constituency. He used that as a lever or as a club over the Government, perhaps, to pay greater wages in Crown Corporations, And last year, shortly after he made that reference, the Minister of Labour got up to speak, and he made reference to a case that had taken place in connection with the Assiniboia Club. One of the employees at the Assiniboia Club had been denied his one day's rest in seven. It just happened that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan has been a guest at this Club quite frequently. I was just wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether he would be willing to go to bat for that employee at the Assiniboia Club if he had a chance. Certainly, with his knowledge of labour relations and labour laws and labour disputes, he should have known what was going on there.

Mr. McCormack: — He was getting six-days' rest in seven.

Mr. Denike: — Nipawin is well known for its "firsts". I do not have to mention the famous auto bonspiel, and the Torch River constituency has also another first in that it has a large municipal unit composed of perhaps 20 townships. Now, the prologue to the organization of this municipal unit is, I think, quite interesting, Mr. Speaker. When

I became a member of the Legislature in 1948, I found that on the Statute Books there was an L. I. D. Act passed in 1946, and the purpose of this L. I. D. was to develop some sort of self-government in L. I. D.'s. I found that this had not been done, that the organization that was to be done had not taken place, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for inaction in that case must rest with the L. I. D. administrator of that time. Upon one occasion, in the Public Accounts Committee, I think it was in the first session of the present Legislature, the dismissal of that particular administrator was called in question. I did not happen to be in the House at the time, but if I had been there I would have been glad to substantiate the action of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in removing that gentleman from his post, because I found, when I came to check over the administration for the Act of 1946, that practically nothing had been done to implement the requirements. So I set out to organize these L. I. D.'s along the principles as outlined in the L. I. D. Act of 1946, and the councils so organized responded so well and took such an active part in administering their own affairs as far as they could go, that it was very easy to interest them in going further into a rural organization. As a result, the larger rural municipality of Torch River has been formed.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to give a report of the operation of the R. M. of Torch River, whether it is working out to the best advantage or not; but my impression is that that is the solution for rural municipalities. Each rural municipality which is out to do a job of administration and construction is going to be faced with a terrific capital investment in machinery, a capital investment that is beyond their power to carry. While revenues are buoyant, it can be done, perhaps; but the time is liable to come when it will be beyond their power.

In keeping with what I have just mentioned in connection with machinery costs in rural municipalities, I would like to make a comment on work that is being done by the Department of Co-operatives in investigating costs. I have here a table showing the results of statistics supplied by five large machine companies, and they suggest that on a 160-acre farm that the per-acre investment cost of a suitable line of machinery would be \$37.26, and the per-acre yearly investment cost would be \$3.91, whereas, on a 2,000 acres farm the per-acre investment would be \$8.29 and the per-acre yearly investment would be \$1.41. This points out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, the advantage of operating machinery co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan. That is an ideal machinery arrangement. It might not apply to all parts of Saskatchewan.

I am particularly interested in the park belt and here is what it would cost per cultivated acre to provide a satisfactory line of machinery on a farm of 100 to 240 acres under cultivation. The investment per cultivated acre would be \$27.66 and the yearly investment cost per cultivated acre would be \$2.76. On 240 to 400 acres under cultivation the investment would be about \$2.00 less per cultivated acre and the yearly investment cost per cultivated acre would be slightly higher, \$2.95. On a farm of 1,000 acres under cultivation, that is, in the Prince Albert area, the investment per cultivated acre would be \$14.75 and the yearly investment cost would be \$2.06, and on one co-operative farm involving 2,300 acres the investment per cultivated acre would be \$11.57 and the yearly investment cost

per cultivated acre \$1.96. Now these figures, I think show the advantage of operating on a co-operative basis, or at least on a machinery co-operative basis. This is something that is facing all farmers, particularly farmers in my own area. Many of them are on quarter-section units and for that reason they are faced with an intolerable machinery cost.

I have not made reference to the Department of Agriculture, but I think that I am equally interested in what is going to take place in connection with that Department as I am in the Department of Public Works and the Power Corporation. An appropriation to spend \$500,000 dollars in clearing, breaking and draining land in the area north-east of Nipawin and Carrot River is of great interest to the people of that area. It is also of great interest to the editor of the "Hudson Bay Post". The "Hudson Bay Post" says:

"It may come as a surprise to many of my listeners to learn that in north-eastern Saskatchewan there are about 2,000,000 virgin acres of the best type of farm land known. It is awaiting settlement and development. Now this fact has been virtually kept hidden from the people of Saskatchewan by the Douglas Government and the Socialist Minister who represents Tisdale Constituency in the Legislature."

We have not able to figure out, Mr. Speaker, just how in the world the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank could keep it hidden, but in any case, the news is out, and the editor of the "Hudson Bay Post" – by the way, you should know that the editor of the "Hudson Bay Post" has also been nominated as the Liberal candidate in the Tisdale constituency, and has always declared himself elected. He goes on to say:

"The undeveloped suitable agricultural area has a potential invested wealth of upwards of 100 million dollars. Now this could have been added to the economy of this province during the past six years, but it has been kept hidden by the C. C. F. and their member for Tisdale."

He also says,

"This development would have been an accomplished fact had Liberal settlement policies been in effect in Saskatchewan in the past six years."

I have some interesting information here in connection with Liberal land settlement policies, not within the last six years, certainly, Mr. Speaker, but dating back to 1926. The Minister of Agriculture has made reference to this particular land allocation project organized by the Liberal Party, but he did not know the half of it, Mr. Speaker. All that he could do was to count the number of quarter-sections allotted to one particular individual and say, "That is terrible." Well, it was terrible all right. He did not recognize the names of the people who had purchased land at sales held in the Moose Range area in 1926, 1927, 1928 and finally in 1937. Now

March 6, 1951

I am not going to mention any names here, with the exception of the John Deere Plow Company, which purchased a quarter of land and acquired title in 1932. I do not know how much they paid for it, but I doubt very much that the Minister of Agriculture would condescend to grant a quarter-section to the John Deere Plow Company under the present arrangement.

Mr. P. A. Howe (Kelvington): — Perhaps they needed rehabilitation.

Mr. Denike: — I would not be a bit surprised.

The list here is quite interesting, I find a bank manager acquired a couple of quarters and a druggist (a bachelor, by the way) acquired a couple of quarters, and a hardware store operator and automobile operator for a garage acquired another quarter. I do not think he bought it at the sale, I think he must have acquired it later on. That is something that would not occur under the arrangements suggested by the Minister of Agriculture. Another two quarters went to a clothing merchant, also we have twenty-odd quarters going to one gentleman who acquired some of them at the sale and others were acquired over a period of years. A hardware merchant and his partner in Prince Albert acquired about three quarters. But I also find that two lawyers acquired a couple of quarters.

Mr. McCormack: — Schumiachter?

Mr. Denike: — But the interesting part of this is that these two lawyers, by dint of working after hours and on Sundays and on holidays, I suppose, and by blisters on their hands, managed to arrive at the stage where they just owed a thousand dollars upon these two quarter-sections, so they applied to the Board of Revenue Commissioners for clemency – I suppose you would call it – and were granted titles to their quarters on the payment of a thousand dollars. Now that thousand-dollar payment cut off actually about \$1,300. When they applied for clemency they owed \$2,242, and they offered to put up a thousand dollars and call it square. So the Board of Revenue Commissioners decided to call it square, and the two lawyers acquired their titles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have said enough to show you that I am perfectly well satisfied with the record of the Saskatchewan Government during the past six years, that I am looking forward to continuation of their efforts and that, during the coming season, I expect a very definite manifestation of the work that is being done or will be done by the Department of Highways and the Department of Public Works. I support the Motion.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, if I may, for just a moment. I would like to correct an impression I think my friend has over something I said the other day – I did not like to interrupt him when he was speaking. It was the remark I made to the effect that some storekeepers are the enemies of this Government. I am afraid the member who has just spoken has taken it too all-inclusive and has thought I have referred to perhaps some in his home town, which was far from the case. I only referred to those who criticized our labour

legislation to their customers. Perhaps there are not very many, but certainly I had not the slightest intention of making any blanket accusation or anything of that kind. The type of merchant to which my friend has just referred are the very people we like, friends of our Department at least, and they are going to give their employees a break and we are very glad to see them have a successful business. Thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. J. W. Erb (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I feel rather like an after-dinner speaker at this time of the evening after having just finished a big meal downstairs. I trust that the big dinner the members had is not going to make them feel too sleepy. Probably some of the things that I am going to say tonight are going to have a tendency to wake them up. My speech is not going to be too long this evening, considering the other speakers that are still coming on. In any case, I do not think I could make a very long speech, I believe I would have to get on to the years that the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has attained, probably the size of the member from Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) and the wisdom of the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), I probably then could make a long speech.

I should first, of course, like to congratulate all members who have so far taken part in this debate which, to my mind, has been much like a good Broadway play that has been extended over its normal run. Well, Mr. Speaker, like a good drama, this debate has provided ample scope for the heroes and the villains. I can assure everyone that when this debate is over the villains will have gone down to sure defeat. Of course, it could not be otherwise; with all the shellacking and the double-and triple-whammies and the gazoopie-gazuppies they have taken, the outcome is almost predestined to be that way. I should like, specially, to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer on what I believe was one of the most outstanding addresses he has made so far in his career in this Legislature.

The budget of 1951, Mr. Speaker, has caused no small amount of consternation among our hon. friends in the Opposition and it is obvious, listening to their speeches, that a sort of frustration has set in. It seems to me that the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) is so frustrated that he even complained about the alcohol content of his whisky. It would appear that the present alcohol percentage is not sufficient to lull him into that state of mental inertia that he would like to have produced in order to make him forget about the awful budget. It would hardly be in good taste for the Provincial Treasurer to instruct the Liquor Board to adjust the specific gravity of alcohol according to the degrees of frustration of our hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

Like preceding budgets of the C. C. F. administration, Mr. Speaker, the 1951 budget is again a humanitarian budget, and I can say that, as long as budgets are brought down by a C. C. F. Government those budgets will be humanitarian budgets. Of course, my hon. friends have a tendency to snicker; they are unable to conceive apparently, what a humanitarian budget is. They were born and raised in the dog-eat-dog and devil-take-the hindmost atmosphere of the economic jungle. By their criticism of the budget, Mr. Speaker, I can only come to one conclusion which is that they have only one

March 6, 1951

objective; their own concern is to perpetuate a degenerate and debasing system of inequality and privilege. By opposing the budget, Mr. Speaker, they are opposing Socialism. By being opposed to Socialism they oppose the banding together of the common people in the pursuit of a common goal of social and economic and political justice.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, because it is a socialist government has widened the social and economic horizons of the people of Saskatchewan. By its legislation, this Government has made it possible for the people of Saskatchewan to do co-operatively what they in the past have not been able to do individually. By its legislation the C. C. F. Government has enabled the people to collectively give expression to man's noblest persuasion – that of bearing each other's burdens. And if my hon. friends across the floor think that is idealistic nonsense I want to tell them that that is why the people of Saskatchewan have put them on to the left of Mr. Speaker on two occasions. I can tell them too, Mr. Speaker, that if their performance in this House and on the hustings does not improve they are just going to be left.

I am confident that the people of Saskatchewan are as pleased with the budget that was just brought down as we are on this side of the House, because, Mr. Speaker, in spite of rising costs of living, no new taxes were necessary to provide the same amount of services that were provided last year, and at that, the budget is \$3 million higher. The outstanding contribution to the budget debate of our hon. friends of the Opposition has been the strange paradox that the budget is too large and too small at the same time. I should like to suggest to them, Mr. Speaker, that instead of using their heads as battering rams, they get down to some clear thinking, and I would suggest that they seriously consider why the 1951 budget is larger by \$3 million than last year's and still provides the same amount of services. And, having done so, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that they tell the people of Saskatchewan so. They would then be speaking in terms that the people not only of this province but all of Canada would understand.

What they would say would probably sound like this: 'We, of his Majesty's Loyal Opposition, after having carefully and conscientiously considered the 1950 budget, have come to the following conclusions: (a) that the 1950 budget meets, insofar as is possible, the social and economic demands of the people of Saskatchewan; (b) that we regret, due to the inflationary policies followed by the Federal Government at Ottawa, the costs of the provincial services have increased by \$3 million, and (c) that, having taken full cognizance of the hardships created by the above Federal policies on the people generally, we shall exercise full use of our party connections with the Federal Government at Ottawa in an effort to bring about a satisfactory solution to our regret of clause (b).'

Now, before going further, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Marion) on his speech last week. In that speech he gave credit to the extent that he believed this Government should have credit for the accomplishments it has made in these past years as the administration of Saskatchewan. I want to assure the hon. member that it was appreciated on this side of the House not alone for what he said, but because of the courage that he had to say it. And I should also like to make a remark about a comment that our good friend Peter McLintock

made, that, "if you give credit where credit is due, your criticism is going to sound a lot more valid."

Mr. Speaker, everyone I have been complimenting this evening is not here.

Now, is it, perhaps, because of the utterance of our hon. member for Athabasca or possibly what our good friend in the press had said that four members who spoke yesterday changed the somewhat usual tenor of their criticism of the budget? I was glad to hear them say, Mr. Speaker, that they are not opposed to the amount of money that this Government is spending. Well, I would say in that regard they are making progress. Might it not also be possible that insofar as my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) is concerned, a black top highway, the Estevan School Unit, the power generating plant, and, lastly, a modern brick plant, all in his constituency, have not also contributed to the progress he made yesterday? His chief criticism of the budget, Mr. Speaker, was then that he is not opposed to the amount of money that is being spent, but rather the wasteful manner in which it is being spent. And I remember he pointed out two things: first, that the number of staff is out of proportion in relation to the money being spent by the different departments; and, second, that the continuance of those Crown Corporations which have been losing money is unjustified.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to his criticism of the number of staff, I am reminded of an analogy of the ship of state and the battleship. Let us first look at the battleship anchored in the harbour. It has no duty to perform and lies idle in the harbour; only a few sailors may be observed on its deck for the purpose of simply keeping up the shop. But suddenly an emergency arises and what happens? Well, Mr. Speaker, there is activity wherever you look, right from the captain down to the lowliest seaman. The ship puts out to sea; it is going somewhere, Mr. Speaker, manned for action and every man trained for his specific duty. The ship of state of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1944, can be compared to the battleship laying at anchor in the harbour, idle and doing nothing. But in 1944 the people of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. McCormack: — Got into deep water!

Mr. Erb: — But in 1944 the people of Saskatchewan put a new captain in and a new crew on this ship of state, and since then, Mr. Minister, it has drawn anchor, is fully manned has pt to sea and there is action all around it. It is going places and doing things. Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, it costs money, of course, and it required more man-power, but I can assure my hon. friends across the floor that the people of Saskatchewan have full confidence in their captain and their crew.

Late last fall, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and I made a courtesy call on my good friend from Souris-Estevan in his law Office. We could not see him immediately because he was busy, so we sat down. And, while sitting, I let my gaze go around the office and I noticed that behind the counter there was bustling activity. There were four pretty girls as busy as bees, answering the telephone, typing, sorting files and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe a poor lawyer could do without a secretary, and I believe a fair lawyer probably would need one secretary, but when a

lawyer has three or four secretaries or stenographers he does not employ them just for their good looks; no, they are engaged to do a job.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Of course he is a handsome young lawyer.

Mr. Erb: — So I finally came to the conclusion that my good friend from Souris-Estevan must be going places and doing things – not with the girls but with his law office.

Now it is true that this Government has increased its staff, and it is also true that it has greatly expanded its services. Never in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker, have the people had such services on such a scale, and it requires a staff commensurate with those services which are being rendered. My hon. friend, of course, is entitled to his opinion about the number of staff in relation to the services rendered; but what I want to say is that, when we compare the number of Government staff today and what they are doing, to the number of staff under the Liberal administration and what they were doing, I am quite sure that our observations would be quite striking. Now, I do not like to make comparisons. It has been said in the House that comparisons are odious. There was a time when I did not know what the word “odious” meant. After I found out I know that it was a polite way of saying that something stinks. But, certainly, going over some of these things and making the comparison, while it might seem odious, the fact is that the thing also might reveal that something was rotten in Denmark.

In respect to that argument, I would like to point out to my hon. friend about the increase in staff that, for instance, in Highways, when I say that a staff has to be commensurate with the amount of money being spent we have the figures to prove it. In 1950 we spent 89,392,000 on highways whereas the administration in 1943-44 spent \$2,918,000. It is quite inconceivable that the same number of men could do this \$9 million job as did do a \$2 million job. The same thing is true in Power. Last year, this administration spent \$5 million on power, compared to \$297,000 by the administration in 1943-44; and certainly they are not going to tell us for one moment that the same number of employees they had in 1943-44 are going to do the same type of job that we are doing in the Power Corporation, in 1950, with all the expansion going on over the Province, as was so ably detailed by the Minister of the Department concerned this afternoon. On Telephones, he spent \$4,160,000 compared to \$215,000. Now, certainly, with all the new installations that we heard about this afternoon and the phenomenal growth of the Telephone Corporation, we have to have an increase in staff. In Agriculture, for instance, in 1943-44 the administration then had 21 agricultural representatives; in 1949-50 this Government had 36. When we speak about developing land and self-help projects, cattle testing for Bang's disease, acres classified for re-settlement, all through, there was absolutely no activity.

That gives credence to the picture that I have tried to paint, Mr. Speaker, of that battleship anchored at sea, full of barnacles and doing nothing. Certainly you did not have to have a staff to do nothing – at least you should not have had. The fact is the previous administration did not do any of these things and, therefore, a large staff was not justified. But, in 1949-50, for instance, testing cattle for Bang's

disease, we tested 34,074 cattle compared to none tested before. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no ordinary man can go out and test cattle for Bang's disease; you have to have laboratory technicians and veterinarians to do that kind of work. So, in the ever-expanding programme of social services that we have had, the economic aid given to agriculture and the like, we have had to expand our staff.

His other criticism, Mr. Speaker, was that the Crown Corporations which are losing money should be closed. And again he is entitled to his opinion. But, Mr. Minister, I am quite sure that the hon. member from Souris-Estevan was not very anxious at any time to see the brick plant closed, even before the time this Government had decided to renovate or modernize the brick plant at Estevan. I am inclined to believe, Mr. Speaker, that if any of those constituencies in which we have one of the very few losing Crown Corporations we had a Liberal member, they would not be nearly so voluble about closing the corporations and saying that they are losing so much money.

The erstwhile criticism of the Opposition, of Government in business is markedly different now from what it was. Now they say that the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, the Government Airways, the medium sulphate plant, Power and Telephones and so on, are performing a service, and I quite agree with them. And I want to say that I believe that even those Crown Corporations which they would like to "toss out the window" with such dispatch now, will in the not-too-distant future be as acceptable to them as the corporations which they feel are acceptable to them now. These Crown Corporations, Mr. Speaker, are also rendering a service, and they are employing Saskatchewan people who would otherwise have to seek for work outside the confines of this province. And we need only look at the report of the various Crown Corporations, of the number of people employed. I am not going to weary the hon. members this evening by going through the whole list. As a matter of fact, they can find this out for themselves. I know when I went to school and I asked the teacher something, he could have told me the answer, of course; but he said, "You look it up, and, having looked it up you will remember it much better". They just need to look up these figures, Mr. Speaker; they have access to them.

What I do want to point out is that the Saskatchewan Government Airways employ 53 people; and the Saskatchewan Clay Products of Estevan employ 92 people; sodium sulphate, 63 people; Government Finance Office, 10; Saskatchewan Government Telephone, 1,598; Saskatchewan Transportation Company, 276; the Wool Products, 68. We total all those up, Mr. Speaker, there are 3,532 people employed just about the size of the town of Estevan. These employed people, Mr. Speaker, are making a fair wage, and almost all the money that is being earned by these people stays within the province. It is providing homes, health, education for these people who would otherwise have to seek beyond the confines of this province for work.

I cannot give the total figure of the annual payroll of all these people; but I would like to point out that we have some specific instances of what a certain industry has paid. For instance, the Box Factory in 1950 employed 124 people and had a payroll of \$243,000. That is a lot of money in Prince Albert. It would be a lot of people for the city of Prince Albert to look after to find jobs. It would cause considerable disruption,

March 6, 1951

Mr. Speaker, to have 124 people move out of town to seek work elsewhere. Certainly these corporations are justified.

Premier Douglas: — I think the total payroll is something over \$6 million.

Mr. Erb: — For all the corporations, over \$6 million, that is a mighty lot of money, and it is helping to provide, as I said,, for those people, a living, everything that is associated with a living.

I would like to consider specifically the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. That is a thing that the Government thought should be in the hands of the people, and we must commend the C.C.F. Government for having the courage and the foresight to take over the transportation of the province of Saskatchewan. On January 29, 1946, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company was formed for the purpose of operating, on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan, a motor vehicle and communication system. Even prior to that the Government felt that it had a responsibility to people who needed bus service. You will remember that, in 1945, when veterans who had come home from overseas were unable to find adequate housing in Regina, they were able to find adequate housing at Regina Beach. They were employed in the city of Regina; they had to commute between Regina Beach and Regina. What happened? The Government put in a bus service in order that these veterans might be transported back and forth to their work. We might look upon this as being an emergency, and this Government, Mr. Speaker, has never shirked its responsibility wherever an emergency has existed. We remember the great fire we had here in 1947, when a great portion of the transportation system of this city was burned. Without the help of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, I am quite convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the transportation problems in this city would have been very grave indeed.

The Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation was formed, as I said, in 1946. Mr. W. T. Bunn, the Director of Transportation, was given the responsibility of organizing it, and I think we should commend him for the excellent work he has done. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government is to be commended for its ability in choosing people with ability to organize and direct its Crown Corporations. The success that we have had in these Crown Corporations has been largely due to the excellent personnel this Government has been able to choose. There was a lot of argument, of course, when the Transportation Company came into being. Oh, it was another “thin edge of the wedge of Socialism” taking over everything, Mr. Speaker! Our friends forget how closely government touches their lives every day – Federal government or any government; how closely Socialism touches their lives every day. They need only to get on the Regina bus, the City bus, and they are riding on a socialized transportation service. They need only to switch on their light and they have socialized power. They get on a C.N.R. train and they are riding on a socialist train. And they go to sleep and eat in a socialized hotel. They mail a letter in a socialized postal service. And they are so opposed to Socialism, Mr. Speaker, when expediency demands! The telephone and the radio – I could be here half an hour telling them how they are members of a socialist society.

The reason we took over the bus service of this province, Mr. Speaker, was not because we had an axe to grind with private enterprise, but because private enterprise had failed to deliver the type of service that the people of Saskatchewan required. The private companies could never

give the type of service that this Government is giving. The Greyhound and other associated lines run only on the lucrative lines, where they could make a profit, and I do not blame them. If I were in the bus business I could not afford it either, because I could not function on just breaking even, because I have to make a living. But government is the only body that is able to bring the type of service to everybody, because government is the people.

The mileage that was being served by the independent bus companies when we took over was 3,199 miles, and year after year, Mr. Speaker, we have increased that mileage until today we are transporting passengers and mail and freight over 4,367 miles, or an increase of 1,148 miles over what the service was before. The actual mileage, in 1950, was 3,156,645 miles. I do not know how many trips to the moon and back that would make. Sixty-five buses travelled an average of 10,000 miles daily. That is indeed a great record I remember, Mr. Speaker, when the bus first came into being, they would call it the “sunshine bus” because it only ran when the sun shone. But, with the excellent policies of the Government in regard to highways, we have now excellent roads over which these excellent buses travel, bringing this excellent service to the excellent people of Saskatchewan.

I want to say, that, before this increase of 1,148 in the bus lines, Mr. Speaker, many of the outlying areas had not any bus service at all. They had varying railroad service. They may have had a train twice a week, once a week, once a week or once in ten days. Today, by bus services many of these points are connected up to the metropolitan centres of this province; people are able to get in and out, and they appreciate it greatly. The fact that we are able to do this, Mr. Speaker – and only a socialized transportation company could do this – it is for the reason that we have the same lucrative runs that the Greyhound enjoyed, and the other associated lines. We are making a profit on those runs, but, like this Government gives the profits from the corporation back to the people of this province, we are taking the profit from the lucrative lines and putting it over into those areas to bring service to communities where actually we are losing money. That is socialism.

Mr. Danielson: — What a story!

Mr. Erb: — Don’t you like it? Well, after four years they should really be able to graduate.

The Saskatchewan Transportation Company, as I pointed out a moment ago, employ 273 people. The average monthly payroll was \$48,000; plus 300 agents receiving commissions. Now that is really spreading not only the service over the province; it is also spreading the money over the province, and I am sure my friends over there are interested in that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because this Government is interested in human welfare, we are going to continue to have Crown Corporations, and we are going to continue to have this as long as the Government places human welfare above the almighty dollar, as long as the Government makes the almighty dollar the servant of the people rather than their master. So long as this Government does that, Mr. Speaker, so long will it enjoy the trust and the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan. Crown Corporations, Mr. Speaker, like humanitarian budgets, are here to stay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is Education Week, I have been doing my best to educate, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You are optimistic.

Mr. Erb: — . . . “Problem children.” Now, a week such as this is, of course, to help renew the interest of the public generally in education and its responsibility toward it. We have, of course, different types of weeks – the Week for British Trade and the Community Chest and so on. All these weeks that are set aside are weeks in which we can rededicate ourselves to the principles that we believe in – like going to church every Sunday, where you rededicate yourself on Sunday to being a better boy during the week, and actually are. I trust that Education Week is going to serve the purpose for which it was intended. I think that even our friends across the floor admit, Mr. Speaker, that great strides have been made in education in this province, and I must commend the Minister of Education and his excellent staff for the fine achievements that they have made in the course of these past six years.

Undoubtedly one of the greatest achievements in education, Mr. Speaker, has been the school unit. There is probably no better example of the application of socialist principles than that of the school unit. And that is probably why my good friends over there do not have very much good to say about the unit. Last year, I remember one gentleman was making a speech about the school unit. “Now,” he said, “I am going to say some good things about it and I am going to say some bad things about it.” And when he got through he had said all the bad things about it but had forgotten to say the good things about it.

By the principle of equalization, Mr. Speaker, children today are receiving equal education opportunities. I am sure that my friends here even heard that expression so many times that they should be able to know it by heart now; they should have learned it by this time and learned to believe it. In some quarters, as we know, resistance to the school unit was fierce and tenacious, but today even some of our severest critics have become the unit’s greatest admirers and supporters. Wherever the unit has been set up; Mr. Speaker, it is there to stay.

Milestone Unit No. 12 covers the large area of Milestone Constituency. This unit was formed five years ago. In June it will have finished its trial period. During that time its progress, Mr. Speaker, has been remarkable, and I should like to review very briefly some of the achievements of this fine school unit. I would like to read here a little comment by one of the first trustees, who is the only original member of the board – Mr. Charles White. He writes this:

“After serving on a local school board for years and five years on a larger school unit board, I am convinced that the unit system is a decided improvement over the old set-up, although the other did serve its purpose. Our taxes have not increased in comparison to the increase of living expenses and material expenses. Our school facilities are very much improved, including libraries, other equipment and sporting goods. Teacher and janitor salaries are much higher, all of our operating schools are clean and well heated, most

of them have been painted outside and decorated inside. Our unit is pretty well off, pretty well out of debt and we have a very satisfactory surplus, after paying off many local school district debts and debentures. The majority of rate payers are well satisfied.”

Then, here is what the report shows has been done in Milestone Unit over these five years; 10 new classrooms built and a new five-room school at Pangman; 12 teacherages built or purchased; 13 schools have new caustic or septic toilets installed, also 22 new outdoor deep-pit toilets built; 33 schools reconditioned and repairs done to others; 8 basements placed under schools; 75 schools painted inside or out, or both; 30 schools insulated; debts nearly wiped out; 11 new stables and 15 new furnaces and 8 new stoves. That is quite a repair and building programme, Mr. Speaker.

I am not going to worry the House much about this, but I want to point out the excellent progress that has been made in education (this particularly being Education Week), and any of us who have ears to hear and eyes to see and who feel that the larger unit is doing a job, should get behind it and help in its administration, or if not in its administration, be a good supporter of the unit, because we are doing it for ourselves and for the generations of Canadians to come. Now, the president of the Milestone Superintendency Association (Mrs. Sylvia Burnsy) says this:

“We, in the Ogema School District had the advantage of seeing the Milestone School Unit being tested and tried, and as we became aware of the marks of continual progress the ratepayers realized that if our school were to serve Ogema and district efficiently we could not afford to stay out. We have been in the unit for a year now, we have a fully equipped home economics room and a room for shop mechanics, a projector, and access to the unit library. Therefore, I would strongly urge all trustees to help build a finer and stronger unit. Criticize if you must, but criticize constructively. Education is on the march, let us help our unit promote education.”

I think that is a fine tribute to education. And this is what the Chairman of the Larger Unit of Milestone writes:

“I think the Milestone Unit has helped education in many ways. We have helped get more pupils into the high schools and continued the high school work longer than in the past. We have looked after the children in closed rural school districts. We saw that they got to school where we could and, in a few cases where they were too far from another school we did the best we could by having them taught in their own homes. Under this system, the children all had the same chance to receive equal education. The superintendent has a better contact with his school through his sub-unit trustees, as well as the local board.” (Signed) “Chester Schwindt.”

That is the comment of the people who are responsible for making the unit the success that it is. And here is a note:

“There will be no increase in mill rate for 1951, regardless of the increase in teacher’s salaries and higher cost of materials. The unit has had a surplus every year and, with the lessening need for repairs, the unit board expects to balance its budget in 1951 without any raise in taxes. In 1950, Milestone Unit had the second lowest mill rate in the Province.”

And then this, Mr. Speaker, I thought was the pay-off. We have heard so much criticism about the unit being responsible for the rise in taxes. Indeed, our friends across the floor have tried on many occasions – I have heard them Mr. Speaker – leave the impression that this Government has been responsible for the increase in the mill rate in the municipalities and in the school districts where we have a large unit. They did succeed in making a lot of people believe that. I was at a meeting one night in my constituency and a man got up griping about the high taxes that he has to pay in the school unit. We asked him for his land number and it transpired that he farmed just outside the unit. He did not even belong in the unit. He thought he did, because he was paying higher taxes. He thought he lived in our unit, but he lived in the Regina Unit, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to tell you something about the Regina Unit.

The Regina Rural Superintendency has an assessment of about \$27 million and 102 school districts. The average assessment per district is \$264,706. Now, Milestone Unit, up to 1950, had an assessment of nearly \$18 million – mark you, \$18 million, that is exactly \$9 million less than the Regina superintendency; and it had 87 districts, 15 districts less. The average assessment of the Milestone district was \$206,896 compared to \$264,706 in Regina. Now, during the four years compared, Milestone Unit spent 2.4 times as much as Regina Rural on buildings, repairs and equipment, more than twice as much on libraries, and teachers’ salaries increased 45.6 per cent in Milestone Unit compared with 17.6 in Regina Rural. At the same time the Regina Rural mill rate went up 31 per cent and Milestone 25 per cent. Then, in 1950, the Milestone mill rate dropped down to 20 per cent, and Milestone has built up a substantial surplus.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Regina is not an organized unit.

Mr. Erb: — No, it is not an organized unit. 2.4 times as much in buildings and repairs, Mr. Speaker, and equipment, more than twice as much on libraries, teachers’ salaries increased almost three times as much, or I should say about three times the percentage, 45 per cent compared to their 17 per cent, and at the same time the Regina unorganized district went up to a 31 mill rate and ours only to 25, and ours dropped back, in 1950, to 20.

That should squelch for all time, Mr. Speaker, the argument that the larger unit increases taxes. As a matter of fact, it does the opposite. It is demonstrated that here we have a unit and a non-unit on the Regina Plains, the same type of land and about the same type of assessment, and this is the record. Now, either the Regina Rural District is building up

a huge surplus (we are building up one, too), or else their system is very inefficient. That is the only conclusion I can come to. And, that is the story, Mr. Speaker, of the Milestone Unit. In June of this year, 1951, its trial period will be up, and I am quite confident that the Milestone Unit is going to be sustained by an overwhelming majority approval by the ratepayers of Milestone Unit.

I want to congratulate all those who had a part in the great progress of this fine school unit. I am sure that they feel proud and happy in the knowledge that by their efforts Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard" does not apply, when Gray says:

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear,
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

That used to happen, Mr. Speaker. It used to happen in Saskatchewan, not so very long ago; and it would happen right now, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the large unit in those areas which have suffered failure after failure. With the shortage of teachers, the law of supply and demand would rule out the equal education opportunities that the children of Saskatchewan are receiving today. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are other units in Saskatchewan which have had an equally good record as Milestone, and I reiterate what I said in a preceding speech, that the day is not far distant when all education is going to be brought under the administration of the larger unit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we members of the Legislature are here, gathered together in this Assembly, of different race and creed and so on, but we are all good Canadians, I am sure we are all good Canadians. But that does not matter so much. What does matter is that we, as a legislative body become of a kindred spirit – of a kindred spirit in the approach toward solving the hunger and the poverty and the inequalities that are rampant today. We may not have the grimmest manifestations of hunger and need in this province that we find elsewhere in the world, but we have many problems that are akin to these, and what we do conscientiously toward relieving those problems here will be a beaconlight to others that democracy can and will achieve the hopes and aspirations of all people.

The 1951 budget, I believe, goes a long way to meeting the social and economic problems of our Province. As our resources increase the people of Saskatchewan under a C.C.F. administration can look forward with confidence and hope that the services they receive now will be further enhanced and enlarged. No government or individual can remain static, Mr. Speaker, they either go forward or back. I am often reminded, thinking on these things, of the great inspirational thought I learned at school and later taught; and I think this is something that the great poet had in mind about moving on, building bigger and better, when he said:

"Build thee more stately mansions, oh my soul, as the swift seasons roll 'neath thy low-vaulted pass. Let each new dome more noble than the last shut thee from heaven till thou at length art free, leaving thine out-grown shell by life's unresting sea."

I shall, Mr. Speaker, as has been probably already gathered, support the motion.

Mr. B. L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I am very thankful that I was given an opportunity to say a few words in regard to the budget that was presented to us by the Provincial Treasurer. I am sorry to see that the Government members have taken so much of our time this afternoon and tonight that it will be almost impossible to cover all the ground that they covered; but I will try to be as brief as possible and cover whatever I intended to say.

It is customary, as I notice, to congratulate all the speakers who have taken part in this debate, and I think that I shall do likewise. I would like to extend my congratulations to all those who have taken part in this debate. I think they have all said what they considered was best, and I think that we have heard from both sides some very good ideas. Since this budget debate is nearing its end, I think that pretty well everything has been said that could be said — quite often it is just a matter of repeating something that someone else has said. I thought, however, it would not be fair to the people whom I represent if I did not arise in this House and present their requirements in that constituency.

Before I deal with the constituency of Redberry, I would like to deal with some of the things that were said, this afternoon, especially by the hon. member from Torch River. The others will come under my general talk, so I will not deal separately with them. This particular speaker was mentioning something about the larger rural municipalities, and I was curious to hear about that. I thought the idea of larger rural municipalities was not to be introduced and I hear, now, that they are starting to introduce it in his constituency. I don't agree with that idea at all. I think it was debated by the rural municipalities in quite a few places, and I think that they were against it.

Then, the hon. member tried to reply to some of the things that were said by the hon. member from Maple Creek in connection with natural resources, and I think that confused the issue more than ever. We so far have failed to get any explanation or any proper reply to some of the questions asked by hon. member from Maple Creek and the people of Saskatchewan are still waiting for an answer. I know that the Minister himself got up, that evening, and he seemed to be quite excited and flustered about some of the things that were said. Instead of clarifying the situation, however, he engaged in a very peculiar tactic. The only thing I can say about that speech is that it had very little in common with his Department and had very little explanation. He tried to prove to us that we were voting against the budget and we were voting against the hospitals. He said that if I voted against the budget I voted against the hospitalization and it was very amusing to me. That was a kind of twisting speech. I think of that speech as like a piece of rope: it was twisted around and around; you don't know where it lands or where it goes, but it is going. I am not satisfied that there was an answer or an explanation in it to what the hon. member for Maple Creek had asked.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege. The speech wasn't "twisting", but the members of the Opposition were just going in circles.

Mr. Korchinski: — The member from Torch River also said something about the Lord's Day Act, and it sounded, from him, as if the Government,

or the C.C.F. Party were the ones to take credit for it. I notice that this Act as in force in 1940. It was called "An Act to provide for One Day's Rest in Seven, for Certain Employees"; but as usual, they tried to take credit for something they had not done. To him, I think it sounded as if it was something new, but I think this is a very old Act, . . .

Mr. Denike: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I don't think the hon. member for Redberry has the matter straight. I was referring to The Hours of Work Act which provided for one day's rest in seven; he is referring to the Lord's Day Act, which is something else, entirely.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, The Hours of Work Act does not provide for one day's rest out of seven. It is a special act, and he was talking about One Day's Rest out of Seven. Anyway, the other speakers from the Government side since the time the budget debate started, will be treated as I go along with this talk. I have made sort of an outline and so you may have an idea of what is coming, I have it under six headings: (1) constituency; (2) snow plows; (3) Crown Corporations; (4) budget; (5) Socialists and C.C.F. tactics . . .

Govt. Member: — What about Korea?

Mr. Korchinski: — The last one is the most interesting, and I left it purposely because there may be some fireworks when I get to that one. I am starting with the simple matters. I know that it is very important . . . I am going to get to my friend from Hanley (Mr. Walker) yet, so don't get so excited.

I heard during this debate one of the members, I think it was the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. Brown) say that if we got up here in this House and said anything, or put in any requests for our constituents, that we were selfish men. I would like to know why we were elected, if it wasn't for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I have often wondered that, too.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am going to get to the Social Welfare Department in my speech, too, so hold yourself together, I think that it is quite natural that we should present the requests of our people.

Now, the constituency of Redberry had some requests, last year, and I have to come down here and repeat them. We need power; we need electrification. There is a place called Krydor in that seat. Krydor is a very prosperous village; it is now 40 miles from power at Hafford and about 10 miles from power at Blaine Lake. It is very essential that these people should be given that connection. It would not only help them, but it would also complete the loop that would connect the Saskatoon line with the Battleford line. On the way from Hafford to Krydor or from Krydor to Blaine Lake, the district is quite thickly populated, and I am sure that the rural electrification programme would be appreciated in that area.

Then we have Alticane and Keatley and Mayfair, Redfield, Whitkow and Mullingar that require electrification. These places are in the north of the constituency. They are in a mixed-farming area, the farms are quite

productive, in fact, some of the soil around Keatley, north of Speers, is very productive. It is supposed to be some of the best soil in Saskatchewan. Now these people are anxiously waiting for power connections. Besides these villages and hamlets, we have many farmers who are very anxious to have rural electrification, so that I would be very grateful if the Minister of Public Works would see fit to advise the Power Corporation to go into that particular area.

Besides the power, we need roads. Last year I explained to you, Mr. Speaker, how the people along Highway No. 40 have no way of getting to the Highway No. 5, unless they go to Prince Albert or North Battleford. Now the centre of the seat is about 72 miles from Saskatoon, and when I was talking about the roads, I don't think that I am talking selfishly about the people from Redberry; this also includes the people from Shellbrook seat and those from Meadow Lake seat, and it also, in a way, takes in Saskatoon. I think that I should get strong support for this project from the Saskatoon members because it is for the good of the city of Saskatoon that they should have these roads leading to Saskatoon.

This No. 40 Highway runs from North Battleford to Prince Albert. We have a road that runs east and west, but we lack roads running south and north. Very many of our people go to Saskatoon to do their business. They like to go there – they like the city, and they like to go there because it is a larger city than Prince Albert or North Battleford. They do a lot business in Prince Albert and a lot in North Battleford, but there are certain establishments in Saskatoon that you cannot find in North Battleford, and so there are very many of our people who go to Saskatoon. To get to Saskatoon from, say, Krydor during winter months you have to go to North Battleford. In summer, it is 65 miles to Saskatoon from Krydor, but in winter it is 160. That means that they have to go an extra 95 miles to get to Saskatoon, or 180 miles round trip, extra, and I don't think that is fair, because these people pay licence fees, they pay gasoline tax, they are subject to all levies of this Government, and I think they should be given this consideration.

Hafford is 72 miles from Saskatoon in summer; but to get there in winter, you have to make 145 miles. Speers is 80 miles by summer roads; in winter, 135 miles. If there was a road built from No. 40 to No. 5 – only one road is necessary, a matter of some 20 miles – then all these people would have that advantage of visiting Saskatoon more often and of saving a lot of their money.

Then there is the problem of the highway from No. 40 to No. 12. Blaine Lake is 65 miles away from Saskatoon – if they can cross the river by the ferry and take a short-cut, as they do in summer. But if they want to go to Saskatoon in winter, they have to make 170 miles. Now that is 105 miles more, and they do that. I quite often see people going through Hafford down to Battleford and on to Saskatoon. Now I don't think it is just or right that these people should be required to go that far to get to Saskatoon. If this particular road was built to connect No. 40 with No. 12, it would serve not only people from Blaine Lake, but it would also include the largest part of the Shellbrook seat. It would take in Marcelin, Leask, Kilwinning, Parkside, and even Shellbrook itself. It would also serve all the people and all the villages along Highway No. 55, and I am really surprised that this road has not been built yet. I may say that this road was promised. It was understood before the election that there

was going to be a road there. There was even a bulldozer from some road machinery working along this particular place, but when the election was over, everything stopped, and then . . .

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must know that that work was completed.

Mr. Korchinski: — It is correct, and I know it, that there was pressure from the people in Blaine Lake, and especially from, I think, - at least that is the way the talk went around town there - the campaign manager of the Government candidate there. He was really flabbergasted with these tactics, and finally, they did scratch up this road a little bit. But, in fact, people in Blaine Lake told me that they ruined the road, and I'll tell you how: I am not trying to run the Department down, but I'll just tell you what happened. This road runs through about five miles of alkali flats and there was a road there covered with gravel on these alkali flats. Now then this road was built up and cut up and alkali salt was brought to the surface, and then it rained, and you couldn't pass over that road no matter how you tried.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — There was no gravel left in 1948.

Mr. Korchinski: — There was gravel all the way to Petrofke ferry - I know because I travelled it quite often. There is no use talking to me about it, because I know; no use denying it or trying to say anything about it, because that is the way it was and that is the way it stands, and people are dissatisfied. There should be a road built up there; there should be gravel and they should have a road that they can use summer or winter, and it would serve many people, not only Blaine Lake people, but all these other people that I have mentioned. Now that is a matter of about 40 miles so far.

Then there is the matter of roads leading from No. 40 north to No. 55. There was a road started from No. 40 north, just before the election. It was supposed to be a provincial highway, as far as we understood, and it was to go from between Speers and Hafford north through Keatley, Alticane, Mayfair, and then, I believe to Mullingar and on to 55. Well, it stopped near Mayfair. It stopped there in 1948 and it is still there. That road is in bad shape now because it was not gravelled, and I think it should have been gravelled because it was a pretty good road. It was built up high, but in these wet days and years, heavy trucks went over that road and cut it up and it is really too bad that that road has not been covered with gravel. We hoped that that road was going to be continued, and finished, because the people in that part of the constituency need this road very badly. The people of Mullingar and Mayfair and further north are in great need of that road. There are very many who think that road is in the wrong place, but it can't be helped now; we hope that road will be completed.

Besides these three particular projects, we need roads north of Hafford into what is known as the Oscar Lake district. They are very poor roads there, and I think that the Department should help with the municipality with extra grants. You have to go 26 miles to get to Oscar Lake. Now you should try this road and you would see what I mean; there is very little there in the way of roads. Then there is another area like that north of Krydor, in what is known as the Moon Hills. When you go into Moon Hills,

March 6, 1951

you usually see the tail light of your own car, when you start going around those hills – there is very little in the way of roads there. Then there is quite a productive area around the Redberry Lake on the east side of us – it is called the Great Deer area. Now people in Great Deer area are 22 miles from town, either from Borden or from Krydor or from Blaine Lake, or from Hafford. It is a place that is very far away from everywhere and they need roads very badly. I made it a point to ask you for those things because those are the things that are needed. They are needed by those people there, and they hope that those roads and the power will be given to them.

If anyone wishes to secure everlasting gratitude of northern farmers, let him look to the snow plows of that area, because today the problem of snow removal on the country roads is problem No. 1 in there. Now, I don't think that this Government has realized what has happened in the last six or seven years. They think that, perhaps, I am kidding when I say they are still in the horse-and-buggy days as far as their administration in our rural area is concerned, but it is just a plain fact. There is a tremendous change that has taken place in the country out there, but I don't think that the Government realizes what has happened. Before the war, that country was based on the horse-and-buggy economy. Fieldwork was done by horses; transportation was carried on by horses. During the war times became better, machinery was improved and money was saved, and so, as soon as equipment was available, most of the farmers had secured power equipment for their farms. They sold horses and they bought tractors; they bought trucks, and they bought cars.

That is what happened in that country in these post-war years, and I think it is generally the case in most of our province here that farming has changed radically in the last seven years, but the Government has not kept pace with this change. What happens now? The farmer now expects to go to town using his car, and he wants to do it summer and winter; but there are the roads impassable, so what do the farmers do? Well they band together to help themselves. You see, my idea of the purpose of a government is to help people when they can't help themselves, not to get into making bricks or shoes – then abandon the idea of making shoes – I am going to talk about that some more and it is not going to be very funny either. I don't think that government should get into those businesses that people had established here before; I think it is nonsense. They have enough to do if they can look after the needs of the people who are actually within their sphere of government. I think that these other things are outside the government. Now then, here is an item that you may, perhaps, be interested to hear. This is a quotation from the "Prince Albert Herald" newspaper, and it says as follows:

"Snow-Plow Clubs keep Roads Open"

Not the C.C.F. Government – but the snow plow clubs keep roads open . . .

"Snowplow Clubs are providing an answer to the north Saskatchewan perennial problem of blocked roads and meagre transportation. Clubs are formed, plows bought with money donated by members. The majority of the snowplows in operation in this region were made by J. R. Leech and Son Limited in

Prince Albert. In the past three years Leech Tractor has sold over a thousand snowplows in the province.”

Now that is not a local problem. That is not a Speers problem, or a Hafford problem – it is a provincial problem. If Leech sells a thousand snowplows in Saskatchewan, well then there are other manufacturers who sell perhaps hundreds or thousands of snowplows. How do these clubs form? I am a member of one of those clubs. You see we are a mile from the provincial highway. Speers, where I live, is a mile from No. 40 highway, and there is a mile there that blocks up, and in the years past, we had to get all the men from the town, all the school children and all the women available, take our shovels and dig our way through. Well, then, one of the garages got wise and the owner said he was going to make a snowplow, and he made a contraption out of heavy beams of iron and he used that thing to push the snow apart, but it didn't work very well. Then we got together and we bought two snowplows from Macleods, and today we have two snowplow clubs in Speers – one north of Speers, in the Alticane area, and there is one right here in town, and we contribute every year, and those of us in town have a mile. Now the boys, this year, got wise to the whole thing – I don't know how they are making out after this storm, but they were very successful up to before I left. They ridged up snow on both sides far out in the fields with this push snowplow and there was no snow on the road when I left, although there had been several blizzards up to then.

This other snowplow, in the north, keeps miles and miles of road open. It is a rotary, and our people come to town – we have a curling club there and they were very anxious to come and curl. They were very anxious to come and do business in town, and they want to come by car because very few of them have horses left, and that is the problem. They don't want to move to town, though some of them did; but the majority of them have wonderful homes. One farmer has a grain elevator in his yard – a big grain elevator like those you see in the small villages, and how is he going to move to town? He can't leave that set-up; his whole yard looks like one of the small hamlets. He wants to stay there; he wants to raise stock, and his problem, today, is to keep that road from his place to Speers (which is 12 miles) open during 12 months of the year. Now there are six months of the year it is closed, unless he does something about it, so he joined this club. How much does it cost him? Well, he put in \$200. Most of the members put in either \$100 or \$200 to buy the plow, which cost something like \$1,100, and then they pay for the operation of the plow. It costs quite a bit. That is just one instance. There is a club at Hafford, and I think that it is quite true to say that in almost every hamlet, every village, and in areas far away, there are plows. I think the hon. Speaker will bear me out on this; I know there are several clubs in his own constituency of Touchwood. I know of one particular road from Balcarres to Ituna that is used very much, and there are several plows there operating.

Now, since the people are helping themselves, perhaps the Government should not step in, because they are doing a fairly good job; but there is something in this particular set-up that is not satisfactory, and I would like to explain this particular thing. There are people – I don't know if they are socialists or if they are free enterprisers or who they are; but there are people who live along the road who will not join the club and who will not contribute, and yet they use the road.

March 6, 1951

What are you going to do with them? Now I know, in fact, that there are people on one particular road who, as soon as the road is opened, are out on the road with their cars, and they won't contribute.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — They are free enterprisers . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Since you mention it, I have reasons to believe that they are just the opposite. They are the fellows who have their hands out and say, "gimme, gimme, gimme!" It is the fellows who are in the club that are the free enterprisers. There should be help coming to these projects.

Mr. Kuziak: — Who's asking for the 'gimme'?

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am asking for the 'gimme'; I am proud of it. I am talking for the people of Saskatchewan. Now, I wish the people of Saskatchewan — those that go and dig the roads open with their shovels — had heard you fellows laugh about them. I wish they had heard it. I don't think there would be any use of showing yourselves before them, because this is a problem — when you get cold, when you get frozen, when you are digging snow off the road, it really hurts, and no talk in the press of the C.C.F. and their socialist ideas, of helping a man who is really cold and he is trying to get to town.

My reasons for asking for this help are these: These people need this help. There are a thousand plows sold by Leech — not one, not ten, but a thousand. It concerns all the people in general, not a few people; that is the second reason why they should be helped — it includes all the people. It takes in, also, those who use the roads when the snowplows open them, those who use the roads who won't pay in to the club and won't contribute to keep the road open, and there is no way that the club can stop them from using the roads. And another reason, and perhaps the most important reason is — this will help to keep the farmer on the land. Keep the road open for them, and there are many farmers who will stay on the land.

The members and the Ministers from the other side come in with this idea that the Opposition is never suggesting anything — "never telling us what to do; they just get up and criticize us." Well, I am giving you a suggestion and I am telling you that this is a suggestion and it is a complete one, and I want you to do something about it, or there is going to be somebody who will do something about it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Would the hon. member permit a question; I am very interested in this. Does he mean that he wants the Government to assist in keeping all the roads in the country open? — all the side roads so that everybody can get to the various towns, and if so, has he worked out any idea at all of the cost of it?

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — He couldn't work it out.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Has he worked out any idea at all of the cost of this?

Mr. Korchinski: — I supposed the Minister was going to . . . He looks very hurt — as you know that is his technique. He looks so hurt when I say something about help. Now you don't have to be so touchy about it. It sure would cost a lot of money. I haven't worked out how much it would cost. I haven't the slightest idea what it would cost.

It would be up to the Provincial Treasurer to work that out. He has a Planning Board; he has a budget bureau; he has all kinds of planners. I don't know what it would cost, but people in Saskatchewan, today, are solving the problem in spite of the Government. In spite of the Government they are solving this with 1,000 plows sold by the Leech Company. They didn't get a cent from you – I don't think they did, so I don't know what it would cost, but I think that they can pay for it; and the suggestion is this: Do something about it! (Interruption) . . . I'll tell you. When we get over there, which is not going to be very long, we are going to solve the problem, but it is not up to me to tell you how to solve it. It is up to you to find out yourself how to solve it. I read an extract from that wonderful man Winston Churchill, and Socialists over there were always attacking him like you fellows are attacking us, saying that we are criticizing, doing this and that, but not telling you what to do. Churchill said, "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition is not to tell the Government what to do". Now, he should know. We are to criticize you and you should find your way out of it; It is up to you to find an answer. Now that comes from an authority – from the man who has been a member of the British parliament from before many of us were born. I want to mention again – do something about these thousands and thousands of snowplows, because if you don't it is not going to be very funny – I don't think it is going to be very funny.

Now then we will go on to the Crown Corporations. It made the members opposite very happy; they have seized upon the statements "throw them out the window" and "caboodle". They like these words so they are very happy that they have got them. You say you never get anything from this side – well, you got these words. I am going to give you some more new words to use. You have nothing else to use so you are happy with "caboodle" and "window" and stuff like that.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. member a question. Since he has evidenced to the House that he is so very very efficient with a shovel, why doesn't he keep the roads of the province clear of snow?

Mr. Korchinski: — Is that "Just Mary" or "Kindergarten of the Air"? It is a peculiar question for the Minister of Social Welfare to ask.

Anyway, with regard to the Crown Corporations – this is in all seriousness. I am not laying here the policy of the Liberal Party. I am giving a personal opinion, but personal opinions make up public opinion, and about these Crown Corporations, you have mixed them all up, I think they should have been classified. I think they should have been classified as utilities, as manufacturing establishments, and as merchandising businesses, and I think they should have been kept under different names instead of calling them all Crown Corporations. I don't think they all should have been called Crown Corporations, but that is beside the point. I don't believe that the Government should go into the business of merchandising, nor manufacturing, unless it is absolutely necessary.

Now, about these corporations, you asked me what I would do about, say, the brick plant in Estevan. Well, it cannot be "thrown out

the window”; that is just an expression. I think what the hon. member for the Battlefords (Mr. Maher) meant was that the Government should dispose of it, and I think that is what should be done – it should not be kept in the hands of the Government. Now should you dispose of it? Well, I would say, give it to the workers. If it is making money, (which you claim it is), if it is making profits, try to recover the money that was invested by the province. Let every employee and the managers, or whoever is there, pay in say \$10 a month or \$10 a year, or \$1 a year, whatever they are making and let them keep some of the profits, but I think that should be wound up that way.

Don't try to frighten the people of Estevan that they are going to lose their plant if the Liberals get into power. I think that is nonsense. Don't try to tell the people around the Sodium Sulphate plant that they are going to lose that, that somebody is going to jack it up and move it somewhere. Impossible! It is going to stay there. Our money is invested in there, and we are interested in that money. Don't you fool yourself. We want to see that that money returns to the province. We want to see that that money is back where it belongs, and if people who send wires are anxious that that plant operate there – and I think they are, I don't see why they shouldn't be – they will get behind the plant, they will make money and they will own the plant – right there, and they will see that that plant is not only producing what it is producing today, but it will improve very much because they will feel that they own it, they will feel that they have an interest in it and they will work that much harder in it. And wouldn't they be glad if they could feel that they had a share in that particular plant? The workers who are there now – I don't know how many work there; but I don't think that is beyond possibility that we should give that plant to them. I suppose there could be some arrangement made that we could recover the money gradually because you say the plant is going to be making big profits. I am not going to be jealous if they own that plant. I am not going to say that we should take it away from them, and I think that that is the way that this manufacturing plant should be disposed of. I will tell you why. I don't believe in the Crown Corporations, and I will tell you why I don't believe in them – because of the people of Saskatchewan, through their lack of representatives, cannot keep track of what is going on in those Crown Corporations or those manufacturing establishments. We come here and we get a card that they are going to have a Crown Corporations committee meeting. Now, what can you examine in these few hours?

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — You have a whole year ahead of you.

Mr. Korchinski: — All you get is what is behind the story, what is the background. If I had my way I would say that if we had to have the Crown Corporations (which I don't think we do) I think the Government should provide enough money for the Opposition to hire a counsel who would be authorized to go through the business of those Crown Corporations; to check the bills, to check everything that is going on there, so that we would know what is going on. And I think that the Committee sittings should be held where the plants are located, and we should be able to call witnesses, if necessary, to see what is going on. I think that there should be a full report given – this balance sheet that we are getting is just a waste of time.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, may I just clarify a point here? The hon. member is not casting any aspersions on the auditor, I trust. The auditor does represent the members of the Opposition, just as such as he represents the members of the Government, and you do have a full-fledged chartered accountant . . . I think the hon. gentleman should correct that insinuation.

Mr. Korchinski: — That was, Mr. Speaker, uncalled for.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — But I don't mind it. I didn't say anything about the auditors. I didn't mention them. I say I would like to hire myself an auditor to go through the Timber Board, and to see what is at the end of it. I would like to do that. If you like your auditor, fine and good.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, he is yours as much as he is mine.

Mr. Korchinski: — I think that, to get out of all this — we didn't have to do all this, because it isn't in my opinion the business of the Government to get into that kind of a situation where you have to do all this checking — and, by the way . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What are you being paid for?

Mr. Korchinski: — I think that there is a sort of a . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — You are getting paid for it, too.

Mr. Korchinski: — I think that they are trying to wear us out. You see, you got up here at 10:30; this morning I was here at 10 o'clock. I went to bed at half past eleven last night. There is hardly any chance to do anything — you have to be here all the time. I would suggest that the Crown Corporations buy us some beds so we can sleep here. It is really getting to be very bad. I would like to get back home as soon as possible because every day that I am here it costs me a certain amount of money; but yet with all these Crown Corporations, we at least have to go through the motions of checking them, and it takes all of our time — and that is one of my personal complaints, . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Can't you take it?

Mr. Korchinski: — Oh, I can take it. I can stick it out, even if it is pretty tough. I think I will keep up with you, you don't have to worry about that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It won't be long now.

Mr. Korchinski: — Anyway, the Crown Corporations are a mess the Government got into and it is going to be quite a job to get out of it. I can see that.

Now then, the Budget. You know, Mr. Speaker, I should have congratulated the Provincial Treasurer on the budget. I know that everyone has been doing that. I don't know what to congratulate him on. If I was going to congratulate him on his reading of the speech, well I would say that he

March 6, 1951

did it very well, very fluently. He expressed the proper words, especially those that had any propaganda value. He put in a few digs to hurt us, but as far as telling us what this is all about, there was nothing about it. There was just a political speech in here, and it ends with \$58 million. You will have to excuse me if we can't offer very much constructive criticism to this budget because there is nothing in this speech to signify what is going to be done with this \$58 million. That is coming, I think, on the estimates, and I think you will hear all about it then. So I think that we are expected to criticize his speech – well, I read it over and over and over again. That is no fooling – I did, and here is what I find: I find contradictions, political digs and a lot of padding with words to fill up pages, and I came across something that I am going to talk about in a moment. I want to prove from the budget itself what I mean by contradictions. I will have to quote and show that the thing is right in there. “Strengthening Demand for Food” – now just listen to this and carefully weigh it:

“In contrast to the grain situation, cash income from the marketing of livestock increased in 1950 despite an over-all decline in volume. The strong demand for beef from the United States has been the dynamic factor which has reacted upon the whole price structure in the animal products market. It is expected that current high price levels will be more than maintained” (now notice that – ‘will be more than maintained’) “in the year ahead and farmers may be expected to increase production in these lines. But as most of the hon. members will be aware, the output of beef cattle or even hogs cannot be increased or decreased at will.” (I think that's wrong, you have to have will to raise cattle and hogs – he says ‘it can't be done at will’ – I think it could. That is just a side issue, that is not the question I am getting at.)

Now listen to this – I want you to listen, because he made a mistake in here:

“The necessary expansion in production can only be achieved when a strong basic industry with stable markets and adequate prices has been solidly established.”

“The same problem of an unstable . . .”

That is a continuation – “unstable” – now here it is – “levels will be more than maintained”, and here it has become unstable already; in a few lines, the same problem of unstable markets. He was talking about stable markets – “the levels will be maintained”; and here it is becoming “unstable”:

“... market situation raising the continual threat of unmarketable surpluses was raised last spring in regard to a variety of other farm products.”

Then there is another paragraph, just continuing that:

“The detailed comparative figures on volume and value of production, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, are again being tabled as an appendix.”

And there is the table here – and the value of that table, I think, is zero, absolutely zero, because he has got the price of crops and other products for 1949 and 1950, and then later on he says that all the crop has not been marketed. Well then, the figures are not complete. Then why talk about them? He says, in that same paragraph:

“The preliminary estimate of cash income of Saskatchewan farmers for 1950 is now placed at \$405 million, a drop of about 27 per cent below the previous year.”

And, at the end of that paragraph it says:

“However, a very rough estimate of the gross value of our total agricultural output in the 1950-51 crop year, which takes into account the additional income yet to be received, approximates \$690 million, possibly an all-time high.”

Notice first, there is a drop, and then possibly an all-time high. I say that is a contradiction.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, might I just ask the hon. gentleman to read what was in between so that . . . I wonder whether he read it at all or not. It is so silly.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well I think that actually it is silly. There was quite a bit of propaganda in this budget speech – on page 17:

“This year’s budget, then, reflects the ‘humanity first’ policies undertaken during our past six years in office.”

“Humanity first” – that is just one man’s opinion, or maybe the opinion of the C.C.F. I don’t think that this budget reflects any such thing as humanity first. That is just a matter of propaganda. Then he says, in another place, in the same paragraph:

“For it is this Government’s announced intention, having made tremendous strides . . .”

Who told you that you have made tremendous strides? That is just talk – tremendous strides in propaganda, perhaps but not in what the people of Saskatchewan expect. They judge you by your actions, so don’t tell them you have made tremendous strides. They have a good opportunity to observe, and they don’t go by words, they go by deeds. And so that was actually another propaganda word inserted there just to confuse, because there was nothing else to say in this budget speech. There is something interesting coming now, however. He talks about three forms of enterprise. You see, last year, the members of the Government side got up and voted and said that they were socialists, in and out. They were behind the Regina Manifesto, but now we have the Provincial Treasurer getting up and admitting that there are three forms of enterprise in Saskatchewan: there is the public, co-operative and private enterprise. This, Mr. Speaker, is a socialist retreat, and I want to discuss this socialist retreat, because it may sound peculiar to you, but, nevertheless, it is a fact that we have a parallel to this kind of a tactic in the U.S.S.R. Now I know when I mention the

U. S. S. R. the Government members either feel uncomfortable or they laugh about it; but I can't help it, because there are so many similarities. I can't help it, because you are socialists – you voted, you elected, you admitted, you confessed you are socialists, and those men behind the iron curtain are socialists also. Now then, there is right now in Saskatchewan, a socialist retreat – and why? Because, in 1948, the socialists just about got kicked out. Saskatchewan people would not swallow this socialist idea, so the Government got in as you all know, by the skin of their teeth. There is no question about that – you can't contradict facts. So “what are we going to do now?” they ask. “We are going to back out. First, we were going to socialize the whole works; we were going to eradicate the capitalist system” – to eradicate anything means to turn everything with the roots upside down. It comes from the latin word “radix” and radix means root, and to eradicate capitalism! But the people of Saskatchewan said ‘no’ – just a minute – hold your horses – we think that it is not right; and so what do we have now? We have the socialist retreat. Now, that is exactly what happened in the U. S. S. R. I want to read you a quotation here . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Did you buy another book?

Mr. Korchinski: — Oh, I have lots of them here. This is from a book which is entitled “The Verdict of Three Decades”, and if anyone wants to know what happened and what is happening in the U. S. S. R. they should read that book.

Quoting from this book:

“In 1921 the Kremlin, in an effort to recover from the general and bitter discontent that had brought the regime close to downfall, turned its back for the moment – a long and extraordinarily revealing moment, on Communism. To give the country a chance at survival Lenin embarked on a strategic retreat. Later he admitted, ‘if we had not transformed our economic policy, we should not have lasted many months longer’”.

And so what did they do? The new programme, Lenin explained, meant a transition to the restoration of capitalism in no small degree. Private trade and small productive enterprises were allowed again. The restrictions on individual craftsmen were lifted, and so on and so on; and this whole thing was called the “New Economic Policy” or “N.E.P.” They retreated and they kept in retreat until Stalin took over. Now then, during the years when joining farming collectives was voluntary, less than two per cent of the present number became collectives, when it was voluntary. Now we have a parallel, here in Saskatchewan. We have collective farms promoted, and we have land socialized. I don't know what percentage of land is socialized now – that is the Crown land, but it is socialized. We have a very good parallel here. We have a “NEP” in Saskatchewan at the present time, and the Minister in charge of the Treasury has admitted it. But let us not be misled by the tactics, because I believe that, if the C. C. F. Party had the chance, they would try to eradicate capitalism. They have retreated because the people of Saskatchewan turned them back.

I think that should be enough about the budget. We are going to have quite a bit to say about the budget when we get to considering the estimates, because I think that is the only place where we can say anything about how this budget should be spent. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the budget is too large for what we are getting for it. I am one of those who says it in a different way – but I am saying that it is too large for what we are getting; for value received, it is too large.

Now then, this should take a little time. This is about Socialism. I wanted to deal with Socialism because I haven't heard any of the Government members on the other side explain Socialism, so I have to take it upon myself to explain it to them. It is not funny, because I don't think that the biggest percentage of you people on the other side understand what is meant by Socialism, and therefore I am going to talk about Socialism now.

You see, it is important that we know what philosophy is underlining our Government, and on what basis and what foundation our Government is constituted. Now our Saskatchewan Government is built on Socialism, and we have to understand that, because, whatever they do – no matter how it looks or what they say – at the foundation of the thing there is still Socialism, and therefore, we want to discuss Socialism.

Now there has been very little said about it. I know that the hon. member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) – and I admire him for the wonderful nature he possesses; I know he called me names, but I won't call him names; I think that he is a Lancashire man, and he said that he was a socialist. Well, he can say that, but I don't believe he is a socialist.

Mr. Gibbs: — Yes, I am.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, that is fine. I didn't hear everything that he had to say, I had to go out for a while; but I enjoyed his speech, and we are going to be very sorry, after next election, to lose him.

Now then, we have, in Saskatchewan, a socialist government. They have said that they are socialists; they say that they stand behind the Regina Manifesto; they voted for it last year; and therefore, we have socialists here – there is no question about it. If I was going to count the numbers – I don't want to embarrass them, but if I was going to start counting them, I could tell you who are socialists, in my opinion. It may not be the correct opinion, because it is very difficult to judge every person; but you can judge people from what they say, from what they think, and from what they do, and from what a lot of people say about them. If you studied characters in Shakespeare, you ask your students to watch what the characters say, what they think, what other characters say about them, and what they do. Now then, I have been here for three sessions and I have watched the Government side – the members individually, and the Ministers – and I have formed an opinion about them, and I have formed an opinion as to who are socialists and who are not. There is no question that there are enough non-socialists there, and if they were sincere, and sane, they should cross here to this side, and it would not be necessary to hold an election to drive them out. I know, for a certainty, that there are enough members on the other side that are not socialists and that if they did not follow this idea of the C.C. F. this Government would be upset without any trouble. Well anyway I will spare them the embarrassment of naming them, but I would say that with

the exception of one or two Minister, I consider that most of the Ministers are socialists, and I would say that, with the exception of one or two private members on the Government side, all the private members are non-socialists. That is my judgement. They can call themselves socialists, they can call themselves anything; but by their actions, by what they have said, and what they are doing today, I can say that they are not socialists. For example, the hon. member from Lumsden (Mr. Thair), I can say that he is not a socialist, and I can say that without any reservation.

Mr. Thair: — Why pick on me?

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I just thought you are very pleasant looking and a sensible man, and I said, well he is not a socialist. And I don't think the hon. member from Morse (Mr. Gibson) is a socialist.

Mr. Gibson: — I certainly am; have been for years.

Mr. Korchinski: — But where did that Socialism originate? It is as old as the hills, and as far as I could trace it (and I have read and studied as much as I could on this thing) it goes back to Asia, away back in history.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — How far are we going back tonight?

Mr. Korchinski: — Well now, we are not going to go very far in explaining its origin, but it was connected with these large states in Asia. Socialism originally was what you could call 'Statism'; everything was held in common. Remember that Socialism is based on the same ideas as a swarm of bees; everybody works for the common wealth of each one separately – everybody working together. Now, that is the basic idea, you work together for every individual – everybody working for every individual – I think that is the theory. Well, anyway, it is an old story, but modern Socialism is a recent idea, and I don't think you can contradict me when I say that it was the result of the industrial revolution. It arose as a result of the injustices that existed in the factories, that existed in slums. There were people who thought that they could remedy the conditions that were brought about by industrial revolution and so they began to introduce Socialism; but if you study carefully you find that it most was perpetrated and organized by intellectuals. As a rule they were university professors who were cranks and who had an axe to grind; they wanted to take revenge on society for the economic condition which they were suffering, and as they began to revive this old idea of Statism and called it "Modern Scientific Socialism".

The fathers of modern Scientific Socialism are people like the Webbs, Marx, Engels and Lenin – those are the people who laid the foundation and then expanded Socialism. I may say, in passing that we should watch where this thing originated. As I said, very many professors of the universities had a hand in it, very many intellectuals, very many writers, and that is why our teachers in Saskatchewan should be well paid and paid much more, because to a very large extent the teachers of Saskatchewan brought Socialism upon Saskatchewan. That is why I say teachers should be paid so that they would not have any cause to take revenge on society for the treatment they are getting, because I think that the teachers are underpaid and I think that there has no improvement since the C. C. F. got in. I don't think there has been any improvement at all. I think that the teachers should

be paid so that they would have no cause for studying Socialism.

Now then, as I said, if you want to know Socialism, you have to read Marx and Engels and Stalin and Lenin and the Webbs, and so the other side of it, read Professors Jewkes – read these others, read both sides. I am not telling you to read Professor Hayek and Professor Jewkes, alone, I am telling you to read both sides and then see if you can come to some conclusion about the thing. I was interested in Socialism long ago, like very many of the people on the other side, and if there is anyone in this House who has any reason to be a socialist, it should be me, because, as far as I can see, I have nothing to lose by becoming a socialist. I have no big farms, I have no big factories, I possess very little personal property, and I should be the first one to join the socialist party, and to eradicate and upset everything upside down, and to get in with those big farmers that drive big shiny cars, and to get in with those capitalists that drew juicy salaries. I should be an anarchist, but my name tells me and my good judgment tells me that it is not right that it is wrong to be a socialist because that thing has been tried. Socialism has been tried and in no place in the world where it has been tried has it every succeeded; so why try it again if it has never succeeded any place.

Did you read “Ordeal by Planning” by Professor Jewkes of Manchester University? It is in the Library here and I didn’t order it, but I read it, and this man explained he is an Englishman; I don’t know if he is Lancashire man or whether he is Cockney or what he is; but he put a lot of good sense in that book. He says that the British people are going through an ordeal by planning. You see there was ‘ordeal by water’, ‘ordeal by fire’ in the old days; now they have ‘ordeal by planning’ . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — We are having a real ordeal right now!

Mr. Korchinski: — Oh, yes, that is right; you are right. We are subjected to the ordeal of Socialism, that was explained to you. What is Socialism? You can image a utopia in the minds of university cranks, and out of the minds of these disgruntled intelligentsia who have an axe to grind and who want to get even with society for the economic condition in which they find themselves, and the gist of it is this: the state is the omnipotent, the almighty thing; we all work for the state, we all work for the common good; we all work for common weal. Those are the catchwords of Socialism. The State is the main thing – the individual is subordinate . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You don’t know what you are talking about.

Mr. Korchinski: — Now that is where we differ and where our roads part. We on this side say that the State is secondary to the individual, that the individual is first on this earth, and then comes the family and then the State. We say that the individual is the important thing. We say that the family is important. We say that the State is organized by the individuals to serve themselves in places where they cannot help themselves. They say that the State is the important thing – we say that the individual is. That is the difference. The ideals of Socialism are golden, shiny and bright, but when they are applied they become a dismal failure. It has failed wherever it has been tried. It has failed in the U. S. S. R. We have no Socialism in the U. S. S. R. today, we have Stalinism; we have no Communism

March 6, 1951

in Russia today, we have Stalinism, we have worship of Stalin. We have worship of a dictator who by terror, by secret police, holds this great nation in bondage. It was tried in Australia, and failed. It was tried in New Zealand and it failed; it is being tried in England and it has failed, and it was tried in Saskatchewan, and it failed.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What about the Scandinavian countries?

Mr. Korchinski: — In England I saw a report of a Gallup poll, the other day, and it said there that they asked the people what they thought of Socialism in England, who would vote for it again – and there was 38 per cent that would vote for Socialism.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That was a Tory paper that said that.

Mr. Korchinski: — No, it was not a Tory paper, it was a capitalist paper. It was, as our Premier says, not a paper that I would call a progressive paper. It is “Time Magazine” which he doesn’t consider progressive. I am going to get to what is meant by “Progressive” later on.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Oh dear!

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . It was tried in Italy in another shape, and it failed. And so Socialism in practice, is a dismal failure . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How stupid can you get?

Mr. Korchinski: — Don’t try to insult me, because by trying to insult me, you insult yourself. So, what is Socialism? It is the road to serfdom: it is the god that failed. Now “Road to Serfdom” is written by Professor Hayek – read it and you will find out that he proved it; and “The God that Failed” is a book in which six specialists confess why they have turned against Socialism – and they are all outstanding people; they are not common jokers, they are outstanding people. There is Koestler; and the most of them are great writers and they confess that this thing doesn’t work, and they call this book “The God that Failed”. Read that book.

So, as you notice, Mr. Speaker, there are various brands of Socialism, too. Now I wouldn’t say that our S. C. F. Socialism in Saskatchewan is the same as U. S. S. R. Socialism in Russia. I would say that there are many similarities, but it isn’t the same. I would not say that the Socialism in Saskatchewan is the same as they had in Germany – there are many similarities in both instances; the State is glorified, in both instances the State used propaganda to perpetuate itself in power, but I will not say that it is the same thing – it is a different brand – a different brand of Socialism. The unfortunate thing about it is that the socialists have throughout these years, tried continually to change, to radically invert the vocabulary used by people. They have continually tried to get on the bandwagon of some certain words, and so, today, we have to be very careful when we begin using words; we have to think, first – what does that word mean? Now, for example, Russia, today, talks about peace. What does Russia mean? Russia means war. Russia talks

about the “peoples’ democracy.” What does Russia mean? It means Stalin dictatorship. And so we have these words with us today. Progressive – what does the word “progressive” mean? It means reactionary. These words are continually being twisted around. I am not accusing the C. C. F. of Saskatchewan for doing so, but they have their own share and they have to take part of the blame themselves. They are in the soup.

Our brand of Socialism in Saskatchewan is the utopian brand; they call it “scientific” brand. How did it originate here, how did it get into Saskatchewan? Why did people vote for it? Well, it was based on promises of such men as Woodsworth and Coldwell and our present members of the Government and other minor party people who went from end to end in Saskatchewan when the times were hard, when people were hungry, and appealed to peoples’ stomachs and said that they were going to cure all. So the people of Saskatchewan put their trust in these men and, as soon as they got in – I told you that before, but it doesn’t hurt to repeat it again – they subjected us to a psychological warfare. They organized their propaganda very efficiently, and they began to say how wonderful they were and what they had accomplished, and that brings me down to the last part of my talk – the C. C. F. tactics. How they got it, and how they keep themselves in power.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I actually forgot one thing. Do you people find Professor Hayek’s book very difficult to read? I might say it is very difficult and very dry, but the arguments are irrefutable. I read “The Road to Reaction” – I had the two books on the table, side by side, and I studied and compared “The Road to Reaction,” which is the answer to Professor Hayek by a socialist. Well I didn’t find any answer, like I didn’t find any answer to the speech that was made by my hon. seat-mate here. There is no answer to it yet, so “The Road to Reaction” is not an answer to Professor Hayek’s book. But if you find it too difficult to read, then there is a simpler book and it is called “Animal Farm” by Orwell. Now this book can be understood and you don’t have to strain yourself to read it. Now this “Animal Farm”, Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting set-up. It happened in England – I think it was in Lancashire. There was a farm that was called the Manor Farm. The owner was Mr. Jones a rather shiftless character, who liked his liquor and I think he was a bachelor. He had quite a bunch of animals on this farm; there were hogs and pigs, horses, cows, chickens, turkeys and pigeons, sheep and mules and so on. There were all kinds of animals there, and there was one old hog there that continually talked about Animalism”. He said that there was going to be a day when the animals were going to start a revolution – the great rebellion – and that they were going to kick Jones out and take over the farm. Now then, that really took place – strange as it may seem. Jones went away on a spree and got drunk, and the animals got together and got ready for him, and when he came back to the farm they kicked him out. They took over the farm and they established ‘Animalism’ on this farm. They took down the notice, “Manor Farm” and they put up “Animal Farm”. Two hogs – Napoleon and Snowball – were the leaders. Now then, there was a horse called Boxer and another called Mabel and – well, in a way it is funny; but, like Aesop’s Fables, sometimes to simple people you have to use simple stories to put anything across to them – and I would recommend this book strongly, to the members opposite. Well, anyway, to make a long story short, Snowball and Napoleon were in charge; all the other animals were to work and their objective was to put up a mill, to electrify the farm, and that mill was going to bring to future generations all the benefits of the “animalist” paradise. What happened was

this. They wrote on the barn wall their seven commandments and among the commandments that I can remember was one, “all animals are equal”, and another commandment was “Four feet, good; two feet, bad”; anything that walked on four feet was good, and anything that walked on two feet was bad, and there were other commandments. As time went on there friction started between Snowball and Napoleon. You see, Snowball was drawing the plans for the mill on the floor of the blacksmith shop with chalk, and Napoleon didn’t say very much, but among the other animals he used to say that that was not the right plan.

Time went on. It was firstly, a rule that no animals could live in the house that was occupied by Jones, but little by little, Napoleon and the pigs went and stayed in the house, and they began to work on this mill, and most of the work was carried on by Boxer – a big strong horse. Boxer could not learn to read. Most of the animals, that is the higher animals like the pigs, they learned to read; but some of the lower animals like the sheep and the horses and the mules, they couldn’t learn to read. The only thing that Boxer could learn was ‘A’. He could make ‘A’ with his hoof in the sand, and he used to worry and worry about this, but he said, “well, I think I had better work harder”. So he really put out every ounce of energy in him to see that that mill was successfully built. Well, as the time went on, the pigs in the house began to acquire more and more control over the other animals, and so the other animals began to be suspicious, and they began to complain. Anyway among the pigs in the house and there were quite a few now – there was one called the ‘Squealer’. Now the Squealer was a great orator. He had a special way of standing on the stage and shifting to the side, and twisting his tail and he could explain anything. Well now, it was the Squealer’s aim to explain everything that the leadership in the house wished, and so as time went on there were many things that the pigs in the house began to do that were not right and the animals saw it, but the Squealer explained everything.

Now the sheep were not very smart and they couldn’t learn to read, but they memorized a song; they memorized one of the commandments. They used to repeat, in unison; “Four legs, good; two legs, bad”. Now whenever the Squealer would get up to explain anything the sheep would shout: “Four legs, good; two legs, bad”. Well, as the time went on, the mill went up quite high and Boxer put more work into that mill than anybody else; but somehow or other something happened and the mill collapsed. In the meantime the friction between Snowball and Napoleon became so great that Snowball was finally kicked out of the farm – exiled. Anyway – this is what happened at the end – the pigs in the house, when they were criticized because they had started drinking alcohol said that they needed this for their brains, because they were doing a lot of thinking. When they were asked why there were so many of them there working and so few animals out in the field – well, Squealer said, “you see, we do a lot of thinking” . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don’t know whether I am lax in my duty but it seems to me that the member who is speaking is not adding anything to the dignity of this House at all. If he wishes to bring an allegory I think he could do it in a lot fewer words, and maybe not something which I think may subject this House to ridicule.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I am not changing the text of that book at all and that book is quite a well-known book, read by many people.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to draw to the attention of the member that it is more like a vaudeville show than a discussion in the legislature.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that there has been a show in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member would like to bring his allegory to a close . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Yes, I will do that. You see what happened was this — that those who were in the house, little by little, changed the commandments, and this is what happened at the very end. Now listen carefully, this is important. “All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others”. Do you get that? And when the pigs started walking on two legs — and they did that — and started drinking liquor, well, the sheep were taken into a corner of the pasture and they were taught to say: “Four legs, good; two legs, better”. Instead of two legs, bad; they said they were better. Well, I would recommend that book, since I cannot elaborate on it and I don’t think I should. I would recommend that book to all people who are interested in this allegory, and I think it would do them good.

Well, anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention something about the tactics of the C. C. F. then I will close. You see, these are some of the tactics that they use. We had a very good demonstration, tonight. They seize upon catch-words; they say “peoples’ budget”; they say “progressive budget”; they say “great strides”; they say, for example, “people own the lumbering industry”. That is one thing that they say and there is a purpose in that. Another thing that they do, that I don’t approve of — and I don’t think very many people in Saskatchewan approve of it; they engage in name-calling. Now, in this Legislature, I was called names several times, last year, this year; and not only me but other members on this side. I don’t think that is the proper thing, and I think that they should be called to order when they do that, because if you don’t agree with our politics, you do not have to engage in calling names, because what I expect next after name-calling maybe something worse. I am afraid that maybe some of the members will start making faces at us and showing their tongues, because here are some of the names: “Missing link”, “fossils”, “refugee from Lower Slobovia”, “clown prince”, “cry-baby” . . .

Mr. Gibbs: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I challenge the member from Redberry. I never mentioned any names in regard to any of the Opposition members as the ‘missing link’. I challenge him for that. If you like to take it that way, all right.

Mr. Korchinski: — How am I supposed to answer that challenge?

Mr. Egnatoff: — He said missing link in Redberry.

Mr. Speaker: — Order ! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I didn’t say that you said it, did I?

Mr. Gibbs: — You said I said that . . .

March 6, 1951

Mr. Korchinski: — No, I didn't say that you said it. Mr. Speaker, the member from Swift Current is accusing me of something that I didn't say. I did not say that the member from Swift Current said anything of the sort, but he seems to be guilty of something — I don't know what. His conscience is bothering him.

Mr. Gibbs: — You said I was calling you names. I wasn't calling you names. You made that assertion yourself.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I said in one place that I admired the member. I like his jokes and I like the Lancashire way of talking — the way he says, “we was” and not using “ing”. I like that, and I hope that he continues in good health for many years; but I don't think that it is a good thing to call names anyway. I am against that. And you know there are little jokes that are cracked just to hurt you, personally, and I don't think that is a good idea. You hear those quite often too — to hurt somebody personally either about his looks or about his hair, or about his personal appearance. I think we should just talk politics and not use personalities. I think it is degrading and I would like to see that the members don't do that again, because it is not nice.

There is another thing that they say, you know. For example, I can almost predict that the hon. Treasurer will get up tomorrow and say that we haven't said anything worthwhile about his budget; we haven't suggested anything, and the fact is he will say we haven't said anything. Now isn't it true that they get up, one after the other, and say that the Opposition hasn't said anything? Here we talk for hours and hours and they say we have not said anything.

Premier Douglas: — Well, you certainly haven't!

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I would like to know why the Ministers have cleared out of the House. I am having a good time. I really feel sorry for the Premier . . .

Premier Douglas: — I am sorry for myself.

Mr. Korchinski: — You see, once upon a time he though he was the only smart-aleck in the province, but those days are gone . . .

Premier Douglas: — I thought you didn't like calling names.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That was just a statement of fact.

Mr. Korchinski: — For example, there is one famous propaganda stunt that they pull off, and it was repeated tonight. It was repeated over and over throughout the province on the platform, and it has been improved upon by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. “The Liberals, for the last 40 years, haven't done anything”, that is, nothing was done until the C. C. F. came into power. That has been repeated over and over. They say we had 40 years of stagnation — it used to be 34, but now it is 40; and that is a thing that they repeat over and over and over again.

Now I am not here, Mr. Speaker, to the cause of what the Liberal

Party did up to 1944. I think I could well do it — I think I could recount it to you, Mr. Speaker, but it would take days and days to enumerate all they did. I will tell you one thing they didn't do; they did not engage in propaganda, and it is too bad for them that they did not tell the people of Saskatchewan what they were doing, because they were doing wonderful things. Now this group comes in and that is the first thing they do — out of a little molehill they make a mountain; a squeak is magnified to a roar; and Mr. Speaker, believe me, if these men sit here for another while, they will have everybody convinced that they were the fellows who built this Legislative Building. You see, they painted the walls; and did you hear the talk about it? They just painted the walls, they just coloured the walls, and I could bet anything that in a few years they will be saying that they built the whole thing.

Now what did the Liberals do? I can't explain everything that they did, but just look around this Legislature — these wonderful Legislative Buildings — those wonderful marble columns and those wonderful steps, and they are really marvellous. I think it was built by the Liberals and I don't think that anybody across the House can deny that. I think that in Saskatchewan the roads, the telephones, those things were built by the Liberals. The poor Liberals did not talk about what they were doing — they were working. These fellows spend half of the people's money or a very large part of it, telling people what they are doing, using propaganda. I think the people of Saskatchewan are getting sick and tired of hearing that the Liberals didn't do anything, and I think that the C.C.F. members should bring to an end repeating that phrase over and over again, that the Liberals never did anything, that the Liberals were scoundrels, that they had political "heelers". There is no difference. I know there are political "heelers" in this Government and they cannot deny it. They were the ones who said there would be no political "heelers." I know that there is patronage, party patronage in this Government, and they cannot deny it. In fact it is worse than it ever was, and they cannot deny it; and I challenge them to come up and deny it. I know that this Government has done the things they accuse the Liberals of — they are doing it themselves, so what is the use of telling people across the province about these things. They know the Liberals were human beings — there were all kinds of mistakes made, there is no question about it; but to say and to repeat over and over in various variations that they didn't do anything, is to deny the truth itself. The idea behind this is to put across the big lie that the Liberals did not do anything. That is a big lie; if anyone says that, he is lying. If anybody repeats that over and over again — it isn't true; because, as I say, here is this Legislature that was built by them. This Government painted it and they are taking credit in the province here about a coat of paint inside. I think it is a wonderful building, and going from this building out into the streets, out in the roads, and into the very corners of Saskatchewan, you will see the monuments to the pioneers, the Liberals of this province, and so don't say that they didn't do anything, because that is getting worn out and tiresome.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I should close by saying that I am not going to vote for the budget because there are all kinds of contradictions and political propaganda in the budget speech, and there are "digs" at the Opposition, because the Government acts as if it was the Opposition attacking the Liberals all the time. And because the budget is too large for the value we are getting, I am going to vote against it.

Mr. L. L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, there is a certain advantage on being what is known as the 'graveyard shift,' I guess, in this Assembly. The hon. members across from us are more docile at this hour of the night, and the only thing is that we have to divide up the next two hours, but we are going to be a little short of time.

I wish, Sir, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the budget that he has presented, and the fact that he needs no new taxes is quite nice; but the money is coming in so fast he can not spend it, and I guess that is the reason. The thing that I note about the budget is that when it comes in, it is just an old deflated 50-cent dollar, or inflated 50-cent dollar, but when it goes out, why it is a 100 per cent good dollar.

I will say about the Provincial Treasurer, that I regard him as a very congenial fellow and a man who is easy to get along with in House, and I will say that his Department, which is one of the largest departments in this Government, is courteous and business like and you can get a reply, if you write a letter in there, within a reasonable time, and I can not say that about all the other departments of this Government.

I would like to say a word or two, Sir, about the policy in regard to land, the 33-year lease, and the fact that people can not get a hold of land, to own, very easy any more in this province, any land, anyway, that the Department has. This is what I would naturally expect of a Socialist government. It is part of their original policy, 20 years old. They never dropped it; they sidetracked it a little bit, but it is still there. They never repudiated it, and it seems to be working pretty good, right today. I am sorry that a great many of the people who take on this kind of a deal would find themselves with no estate to leave, and that seems to be very interesting to most of the people who would like to leave an estate, in land, to their heirs. Up in the northern part of my constituency there are large areas that have never been settled, and there is some very good land there — quite a large area of very good land. I know that, in the Pierceland and Goodsoil districts, representations have been made to open up some of that land for settlement. Representations have been made by some of their very good Government supporters, too, and they have shown no disposition to open it up. But if they do not do it, I will use the best influence that I can on the Liberal Party to see that they will do something about it, if they get into power in this province.

In the matter of highways, I am not very enthused about the performance in the Turtleford seat; there has been no new construction whatsoever, in the past year. There was some gravel put on No. 26 and No. 55, but those were what you might call 'election' highways, and they have been lying there so long that it was cheaper to gravel them than it was to keep rebuilding them every spring when they washed out, I suspect. If there is any well-oiled political machine in the C.C.F. Party, I am sure it is in the Department of Highways. When the programme of this department is made up (and I expect there is something made up right now), no member on this side can find out what it is, as far as his constituency

is concerned; but when the Minister decides that it is just about right to make an announcement, he comes out and calls a little meeting and tells them all about it. Now I really believe that the elected members who represent those constituencies would like to know what is going on out there – but as far as we are concerned, on this side, we never find anything out about it.

I did write the Minister a letter on the 1st of June, 1949, and I know he was pretty busy because the Federal election was boiling at that time; but it took me till August 29th to get an answer, and that seems to have taken quite a little time, too.

Now with regard to Crown Corporations – these are under investigation, at the present time, in the Committee; and there are some things that we will find out about them, I expect, before the Committees are over; but I would recommend this. My idea would be that the Government put in a non-political board of businessmen at the head of these Crown corporations and see what can be done with them. The politicians are really not the proper people to run them.

Now, in regards to hospitals, I am sure, as they say, this scheme is being abused. The scheme, anyway, in some ways, is inefficient and extravagant, and it leaves the local people with a load of debt all out of proportion to what they really should carry. We know. We have been advised that a 20-bed hospital should cost, these days, about \$160,000. This Province donates the magnificent sum of \$20,000 to that, and the Federal Government, \$20,000, leaving the province, in this case, with a debt of \$120,000. That is an intolerable debt which has to be carried for a period of 20 years before they get it paid off, and by 20-years' time the chances are that these hospitals will be obsolete and you will have to have another one. Outside of that, they pay the hospital tax, and, generally, deficits on operations, and the Education and hospital tax also helps to support this, and the debenture tax which comes on their land, and really, there is no one in this Government who can say they have given the people anything in the way of hospitals, because it is the people that have given themselves whatever they have got, or at least the very greatest part of it. This is what you might call, Mr. Speaker, a white elephant, and there is no doubt about that.

Now, there are another couple of matters that I would like to refer to, and one is the speech of the hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) on the 2nd of March, and I will refer particularly to the part concerning political patronage. And reading from the speech, here are some of the parts. It seems that a postmistress in Fort Qu'Appelle, who had had that post office for some time, got pretty old and she was visiting around here and there and had been gone for months at a time, and the Department offered her to retire and give her a pension, which she accepted. She was not, personally, in charge of the post office, and perhaps did not give just the service that was required. Now the Minister went into that in considerable detail, telling about the record of her husband who had been an old veteran and he died and she succeeded him. Then, of course, there were some boys in the family too – five boys and four of them were in the services and the youngest one was there helping his mother run this post office, or running it himself. He says that the record of the family was good, and it was good; but more of the veteran sons wanted this job. He says that the youngest boy was helping his mother, and was 'frozen' to his job by the postal authorities.

March 6, 1951

That is not true. He was not frozen to his job by the postal authorities. The office is what is known as a revenue office and has an income of over \$3,000 a year, and it is the duty of the postmistress to hire her assistants, which she did (she hired him in this case), and he was in no way frozen to this work at the post office. He wanted to enlist but they would not let him. I do not know who would not let him. It was not the postal authorities, I am sure.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Trippe: — No, I haven't got any time.

Mr. Tucker: — You talked the other day.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, I would like to know from the hon. member the authority he quotes, in which he states that man was not 'frozen' to his job.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — That is not a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I am entitled to know this.

Mr. Trippe: — I am reading from your speech "Because a Liberal 'big-shot' in Fort Qu'Appelle, the wealthiest man in the valley, wanted a job for his son, that widow was fired from the job". That was not true. Both statements are untrue there; and then he says, "Well, I do not know . . ."

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have stated that that woman was fired from her job.

Mr. Trippe: — "Well, I do not know . . ." And that is true, sure enough . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — . . . and replaced, February . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Trippe: — That is factual. She was made a proposition and she accepted it. Then he says: "A petition was circulated and over 500 signed the petition that the widow be re-instated". Well, Mr. Speaker, the petition did not require that she was to be re-instated at all. It was not for that purpose. The petition was that her son get the post office. That was the petition, and he did not have a chance. He did not have a chance because the law, in regard to the successors in these post offices, gives preference to veterans, and, unfortunately, the boy was not a veteran. The Legion in this country has been fighting for a long long time to get this preference for veterans, and in the year 1927, they did succeed in getting some legislation put on the books. That legislation in the statutes of 1927, beginning with Chapter 26, requires that in this class of a post office, among other things that competitive examinations must be held by the Commission; and in

this case this was done. It requires that appointments of civil servants who have left their jobs for active war service will receive consideration. That did not apply in this case, and it requires that after an examination has been done, that a list of the successful competitors be posted, and this was done. They are having regard there – first, to persons who are in receipt of a pension attributable to war service and have not been successfully re-established in their job and desire to be placed on such a list, and this was complied with. A young man by the name of McNeill took this examination, qualified on account of his service, and obtained the highest marks, and was placed, according to the law. The record of service of McNeill was that he served in the R.C.A.F.; that his plane was shot down in enemy action, at which time he suffered frozen feet, and he was taken a prisoner, and he was, therefore, entitled to soldiers' preference, and also disability preference, and he was in receipt of a disability pension at the time. The young man is very well thought of in the district of Fort Qu'Appelle, because, since that time, he has been elected president of the local branch of the Canadian Legion, and I believe that they are right behind him, and very glad that he has got this.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. This man has not been elected president of the Legion since this incident occurred.

Mr. Trippe: — He was elected president of the Legion, last year, and he is president of the Legion right now.

But there is another statement here made by the Minister in his speech, which was that the Legion wrote in. Nothing was done. I have been in communication, over the telephone, with the man who was president of the Legion at that time, a man by the name of R. W. Box, and he tells me that the petition, this inspired petition, was presented to him with a covering letter which he refused to sign, and it was not sent in, according to the best of his knowledge; and he has been president of this Legion branch right up to the time that Mr. McNeill was elected president.

Mr. Tucker: — Working against the veterans.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Again, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that resolution was sent . . .

Mr. Trippe: — I'm telling the story the way I have it . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — . . . in from the secretary of the Legion there . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Trippe: — You told your story and now I am telling mine. "The Legion wrote in. Nothing was done". That is not true. "As far as the people of the valley are concerned, they are not going to rest until this woman is replaced in her job." There was no petition for the woman to be replaced in her job; I do not think she wants the job. Everybody seems to be satisfied except the Minister, and I submit that this is a gross misstatement, misleading and absolutely untrue. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the budget.

March 6, 1951

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, no single statement that I made was, in any major instance, incorrect. It may have been that the president of the Legion did not send in that petition, but certainly the secretary did.

Mr. Trippe: — You make your speech tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Moreover, four members of that widow's family were in the armed services; one of them is still in the armed services, and one was killed.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Trippe: — They did not apply for the job. None of the veterans sons applied for the job.

Mr. J. G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to speak for only a few minutes this evening and I want to assure you that I have no intention of taking up any time tomorrow until the Minister of Social Welfare made some of his uncalled for interjections, which consumed some of the time of this House.

I would like to say just a few words with regard to one major problem, this evening, which the Government of Saskatchewan is not solving in an adequate manner. As all hon. members know, this happens to be "Education Week". Therefore I wish to deal, just very briefly, with the Government's failure to solve the most pressing problem in the field of education, namely, the problem of teachers' supplies.

Hon. members of this House should realize that there are 57 per cent of our teachers who teach in rural schools. Now it so happens that, in Saskatchewan, only 13 per cent of all teachers have university degrees. There are five provinces ahead of Saskatchewan - Saskatchewan comes sixth in that list. The percentage of substandard teachers in this province, particularly in our one-room rural schools, is most appalling. In 1948, approximately one-third of all the teachers in our rural schools were substandard teachers. We should also realize that the teacher turnover in our rural schools is tremendous: 64 per cent of all the teachers who were in charge of one-room rural schools in 1947 were not in charge of those same schools in the following year. That means, Mr. Speaker, that two out of every three teachers in charge of our rural schools do not remain in those schools any more than one year. Now this is a very grave situation. Teaching and learning efficiency has been reduced to a minimum as a result of the teacher supply policies tolerated by the present C.C.F. Government. I think hon. members should realize that it takes even a well-trained teacher a considerable length of time to really understand each child in her classroom, to really know the abilities, the state of social and emotional development, the achievement level and in each of the fundamental skills, and the remedial requirements of each child. Hon. members should realize, too, that with the rapid turn-over of teachers in our rural schools, a condition which the C.C.F. Government is perpetuating, teachers cannot do the effective work they would be able to do if they remained in the same school for several years.

Now what is the situation in this province? According to an answer tabled in the House, this afternoon, by the Minister of Education, an answer to a question with regard to the certain certificated teachers, we have, out of a total of 7,262 teachers, 2,994 who are holders of conditional certificates – that means they have less than grade 12 academic standing – who are holders of 12T certificate, 24T, letters of authority, interim first or interim certificates of any other description. Now that simply means, Mr. Speaker, that more than 40 per cent of all the teachers in charge of classrooms in this province in 1949-50 were either holders of interim certificates or were persons inadequately trained for the complex and multifarious tasks of developing human personalities – and these figures, Mr. Speaker, do not include approximately 500 study supervisors who are placed in charge.

Apparently the C.C.F. Government regards the problems involved in raising hogs more important than the problems involved in guiding the education growth and development of our boys and girls. To advise farmers on raising hogs, to identify weeds, to organize agricultural committees, to show projector slides, the Government of Saskatchewan requires that you have a university degree before you are appointed as an Agricultural Representative; but to take charge of children in our classrooms, the C.C.F. Government doesn't even require that you complete your grade 12 standing, and Mr. Speaker, that is no reflection on the people in charge of our schools. They are doing the best that they can.

In my opinion, teaching is the most important of all professions. To it we should strive to attract the most capable of our young people and this is not being done in this province. And why is it, Mr. Speaker, that this is not being done in Saskatchewan? Why is it that only 13 per cent of our teachers have university degrees? I think the answer is simple; the salaries are simply inadequate. We find that the medium salary for all teachers in publicly-owned schools in this province in 1948, was \$1404. That means that half the teachers in the province were working at salaries below \$1404. British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, all these provinces were ahead of us with regard to the median salaries of teachers.

Now, frankly, I fail to see any real alleviation of the problem until our Provincial Government and our Federal Government assume a far greater proportion of the cost of education. I think that hon. members, particularly on your right, Mr. Speaker, should realize that, in 1944, they promised to the people of this province that if they were elected they would see that their government would assume the financial responsibility for Saskatchewan. I am sure that every hon. member on the other side will recall all their various speeches at that time, and they were all stressing that if the C.C.F. were ever elected, they would assume the full share of the cost of education. This they have not done, and because of that policy they are perpetuating a situation in this province whereby we cannot attract the calibre of personnel that is required to man our schools. I want to submit in all seriousness that the Minister of Education might be very well-advised to call a meeting of the Committee on Education of this Assembly to look into this entire problem of teacher supply. Incidentally, I would suggest to him that if his Department really wanted some advice on the revision of the elementary school curriculum, he should call a meeting of that Committee on Education of this Legislative Assembly. He says that his Department welcomes as wide a participation as possible in the revision

March 6, 1951

of the course of study, and yet, he is not utilizing one of the most representative groups that is available and at his disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the present Government is indulging in many wasteful expenditures – too many automobiles driving too many miles throughout this province at too great a cost to the people of this province. Moneys could be spent more wisely simply by eliminating a wasteful expenditure such as the Minister of Agriculture indulged in when he spent nearly \$5,000 of the people's money to send out a Christmas present in "The Road to Survival". He distributed those books, and wasted, in my opinion, nearly \$5,000 of the people's money. I maintain, that that item, together with hundreds of others one can find by going through the Public Accounts, could be used to pay the old-age pensioners of this province a supplemental allowance not of \$2.50 without a means test, not of \$5 without a means test – but a supplementary allowance of \$10 without a means test. Financial policies of that type pursued by this present C.C.F. administration, Mr. Speaker, make it impossible for me to support the motion that you do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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