

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, February 14, 1952

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 13, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Erb for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, “We respectfully submit to your Honour that Your Honour’s present advisers do not possess the confidence of the citizens of Saskatchewan”.

That is the amendment to the main Speech from the Throne, upon which we are going to debate now.

Yesterday, in the speech delivered by the Premier of this province, the Premier attempted to criticize the Leader of the Opposition for criticizing the Speech from the Throne — using as his arguments that there were no grounds for criticism — the fact that the Liberal press of this province was very favourably inclined towards the Speech from the Throne; and he then proceeded to quote from the press and from editorials and, as is usually the custom of our Premier, he quotes only things that are favourable to him and to the C.C.F. party, and omits stating the whole content of those editorials.

For example, he said the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, in its editorial, said “there was something for everyone in the Speech from the Throne”; and that is where he left it. He did not go to any extent to explain what this was all about. With your permission — to put the record straight — I want to elaborate a little on this editorial — “Something for Everyone.” This editorial tries to point out to the people of Saskatchewan — and rightly so — that the C.C.F. Speech from the Throne is meant to mean “all things to all men and women,” because it is a pre-election Speech from the Throne. And here is what the editorial says:

“For one of the distinguishing features of the new legislation programme is that there is something in it for almost every economic group in the province. That is the first feature. And the second distinguishing feature of the Throne Speech is its revelation of the remarkable antipathy which its authors appear to have for the Federal Government — be its foreign policy, or federal-provincial tax agreements, inflation, the price of wheat or farm loans.

February 14, 1952

Poor misguided Ottawa seems to do everything wrong. Now, even if we grant the fact that no government — including the Regina government — is perfect, it is difficult to accept this attitude in a document like the Speech from the Throne in the provincial legislature. The explanation (it is scarcely an excuse) is that the Address was intended to be — not an outline of a legislative programme — but a political campaign speech . . .”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: —

“ . . . masquerading under another name. From this it is not difficult to draw additional conclusions. The first is that the provincial government has made its final decision to call a general election this summer; and the second is that the provincial C.C.F. Party is sufficiently dubious about its chances of re-election that it has written its campaign platform into the proceedings of the legislature.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — The other editorials and extracts from the papers are to the same purport, but of course, the Premier just read the headings which favoured his speech.

That this Speech from the Throne is political propaganda there is no doubt, and a very large part of it is beamed at the farmers of Saskatchewan. They are trying to get the farmers coming their way, so in the Speech from the Throne they have mentioned the farmers in several places. It is very clear to them now that they have lost the support and the confidence of the farmers of this province on account of their stagnation and inactivity in the agricultural field. So now, lately, they are beginning to think of the farmers — in two places in the Speech from the Throne they are bemoaning the fact that the production costs of the farmers are rising; and the main aim of this seems to be to direct a little political propaganda at Ottawa. They do not mention any of the things for which they are responsible in regard to the farmers' increased costs of production. Nothing is said about the 3 per cent education and hospitalization tax on gas, oil, greases, etc., that the farmers have to use in their tractors and machinery to produce their crops. Nothing has been mentioned about the fact that farm truck licenses have been doubled and trebled; and that compulsory insurance was imposed; which all adds to the production costs of the farmer. The increased royalties on lumber, fence posts, pickets and other forest products are not mentioned in this Speech. The grazing fees — the increase in those; the hay cutting fees — the increase in those; — there is no mention of that. There are scores of fees and dues and licenses which have been increased, and the farmer has to pay those, and all that adds to the cost of production.

So, instead of talking about this cost of production, we would like to see the government do something about it and reduce it. Of course, what is there better for the election than to say to the farmers,

“we are going to give you something.” They make a promise to the farmers — but what a promise! In the Speech from the Throne they promise a Commission to study the farm problems. Why a Commission? What do we have an agricultural department for? Is that an admission from the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) that he does not know what the farm problems are?

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — Is that an admission that this government, after being in power for 7½ years, now comes to realize that there are some problems, but they do not know what they are so they are going to appoint a Commission to find out? We have come to a very sad state of affairs if that is the case — if the Minister of Agriculture, after hearing us for the last three years telling him what the problems were and he hee-hawed and laughed at us — and now he is going to appoint a Commission. Last year, I remember we were telling him that the farmers had modernized their production — that their tractors, trucks and machinery had not been there when these men got into power, but during their rule things had happened, changes had occurred; and new things must be done for the farmers. They thought it was a joke when we told them, that while the farmers were modernized, the government was still living in the horse and buggy days; and they thought it was a big laugh. But now they have come to realize it was true; what we said was true — there were great problems and those problems were not faced by this government — and so, now, they are going to appoint a Commission; and we know what is going to happen; we know what this may mean — a Commission — a lot of meetings, a lot of hearings — years of hearings; and after the Commission submits its report, some more meetings and some more hearings. I do not think that is necessary. I think what we should have is not a Commission — but action in the Agricultural department.

We know what happened to the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report; there is a very good example of how this government handles Commissions and reports. As you know, in 1948, there was a committee appointed to investigate certain problems of the municipalities of the province; and after two years of studies, and numerous hearings of various people — municipal men, farmers and so on; they presented a report, the so-called Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report. And what happened? Last summer there were some more meetings and they were discussing over and over again the thing that was already in the report — the thing that was first suggested by them and was put into the report. They were now discussing the thing over again. Now it seems to me that the plan is to keep the municipal men talking so that they would forget what actually should be done. But I do not think the municipal men can be misled that easily.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — Another thing that they promised to the farmers in the Speech from the Throne is that they are studying methods — just imagine — they are studying methods how those farmers, on whose land oil may be discovered, may be compensated in some way. When they got into power these people imposed a three cent per acre mineral tax, and at that time it was freely admitted by the Minister of Natural Resources and by the

February 14, 1952

C.C.F. 'Commonwealth' that the main purpose and result of this Act and this Law was to have the mineral rights revert to the province — so, at the very beginning, after trying to take away the mineral rights from the farmer, they now, before the election, come forth with the idea that they are studying methods as to how they are going to see that the farmer gets something if there is oil discovered on his property — but their real intent is seen in this Mineral Taxation Act.

In another place they are going to give consideration to municipal problems. Notice the word 'municipal'. Since when has this become a municipal problem? The Cronkite-Jacobs-Britnell report states on page 89 that the bridges that we have in Saskatchewan now were originally built by the Provincial Government. They are provincial bridges. They are not municipal bridges. But this government has made them municipal bridges. They tried to get that off their shoulders and push it on the shoulders of the municipal men. And so now they are considering studying the problem of municipal bridges. That is a very fine thing to do. I do not think the municipal men want any consideration of this problem. I think they want money. They want money for their bridges and want it right now and not in the distant future.

The Speech from the Throne, of course, boasts that the Crown Corporations had a very good year and that they are going to show very great surpluses. I do not know what those surpluses are going to be — we have not received their reports yet — but if the same pattern is followed as was last year — this is what happened last year. The Crown Corporations showed \$3,800,000 net profit, or at least that is what the C.C.F. Government tried to make us believe — that those were net profits. In these Crown Corporations we have power and the telephone which we call public utilities and which were started by the Liberal Government and we also have another group of monopolistic corporations such as the Timber Board, Insurance Office, the Fur Marketing Board, where there is no competition, And now we have a group of these what they call the problem children. Out of this \$3,800,000 profits the Power and the Telephones made \$3,300,000. And something under half a million was made by these others. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Power Corporation and the Telephone Corporation were set up originally to give service to the people and not to make profits. If they are making profits it means that they are overcharging someone. It is just another way of taxing people in a hidden way. So instead of boasting about these profits they should tell the people the facts — tell the people that they are overcharged for their telephones.

We all know, and it was admitted in this House, that the telephone charges were raised. There was not need for that. If the Telephone Corporation was making profits there was no need for that. Now, we heard yesterday that there was only one-quarter of a cent kilowatt charged and this was meant for expansion. It looks very small when you reduce it to one-quarter of a cent a kilowatt. But if you compare the profits that were made with the number of customers that are taking the service you will find that it comes out to more than one-quarter of a cent. It looks a little bigger and a little more important.

We have also in this group of Crown Corporations that are boasting about their profits the monopolistic groups and one of them is the Timber Board. Now, where does the Timber Board get its profits? It is very easy. This Government pays the lumberjack, the producer, the man that cuts the timber something around \$34 a thousand feet of lumber and

then when it comes to selling this lumber they charge the poor farmer, the poor labourer, who wants to build himself a home, around \$95 a thousand feet. There is where your profit comes in. Just like that. Pay \$34 — charge \$95. There is a way of making profits.

The same thing applies to the Insurance Office. It has its compulsory features and certainly will draw a lot of profits.

And, of course, they have not forgotten the women of this province and we hear in the Speech from the Throne that there is going to be legislation — an Act — to give the women for equal work, equal pay, as between the sexes. We are all for that. But how many people will this affect? I do not think that there are so very many women who are doing the work of men in this Province and I believe that this is just another one of those propaganda paragraphs so that they can go and say “Look what we have done for the women of this province. Look how good we are.”

And we heard from the Premier of this province quite a bit about the industrial progress that was made in this province. Oh, it is a wonderful thing. There was a complete stagnation in this Province before the C.C.F. got in, but after they got in, just like magic everything was going ahead. But what are the facts about this? Here is something which I would like to draw to your attention and I think that this generally applies to our Premier. This is about one of his radio broadcasts as reported in the Commonwealth of January 9th this year on page 6. There he was trying to elaborate how great an industrial progress was made in this Province and he said that the value of goods manufactured in Saskatchewan went from \$96 million in 1941 to \$221 million in 1948. “An increase of 130 per cent” he said. Now, he got those figures, I presume, — or maybe some of his planners got them for him — from this yellow book, “The Manufacturing Industries of Canada by Province, 1949.” That is the latest edition of it. And they say in this yellow book there are figures about Saskatchewan. And he picks out 1941 because there happens to be a small figure next to it. Why 1941? Why didn't he pick 1944 when the C.C.F. were getting into power? Why didn't he show from 1944 to 1949? — the increase. Do you know why? Because in 1944 it was not \$96 million — it was \$175 million and it looks quite a bit bigger. Why did he use '48 if the figures are available for '49? I will tell you why. Because in '49 the production was only 215 million instead of 221. You take out the figures that suit you. Why don't you disclose the facts to the people as they are?

There is something else very interesting about this whole thing. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that these figures do not show an increase in industrial production or expansion at all, but they are mainly due to the increased index of wholesale prices. If you correct that amount to the 100 per cent index this is what you will find. That in 1944 the production should amount to \$133 million and after this great expansion that he boasts about if you correct by the proper index which was that in 1949, 198.3 — if you correct by this index you will find that the industrial production in Saskatchewan is only \$107 million and it actually has decreased. Not an increase of 130 per cent, but a decrease of 12 per cent.

Now those are the facts, and those are the true facts. Those are not the figures that were picked from here and there — those are all the figures. Why ignore the essential figures? Why pick out just the figures that show you in favourable light? And the main figures, Mr. Speaker, are

February 14, 1952

the figures that affect the workers and affect the employment, and affect the pay-roll. Those are the real figures.

Now, of course, in the Speech from the Throne, our government tries to mention the workers — the poor workers on whose backs they originally got into power — through whose sweat, tears and blood, and through whose little dues they were able to open up a big propaganda to get into power; now they have to mention them in a Speech from the Throne too, and do you know what they say? They say: “You workers have reached a peak last year — you hit the ceiling. Actually you’ve had it, boys.” That is what they say to the workers: “You have to sit still and be satisfied now, because you’re got everything that is possible — you are not getting any more.” But what is the situation as far as the workers are concerned? Here is the situation: Instead of saying there was an industrial expansion in Saskatchewan, we should have been told that there was industrial contraction, because in 1944 there were 1,054 manufacturing establishments in Saskatchewan, and in 1949 there were only 962 — a loss of 92 manufacturing establishments — which is a loss of 9 per cent of our manufacturing establishments. Now, some may argue that perhaps some of the smaller establishments were consolidated so that perhaps we cannot go by that. But, then, we can judge by the workers. How many workers were employed? Well, in 1944 there were 12,361 workers in manufacturing, but in 1949 (after the great expansion) we have only 10,841 workers, or a drop of 1,520 workers in an industry — again a decrease of 9 per cent. Where is that great industrial expansion?

Comparing Saskatchewan with Saskatchewan does not give you a very good picture. Let us compare these other provinces with Saskatchewan. In Manitoba, at the time of 1944 there were 1290 manufacturing establishments, employing 40,000 — some 900 workers — and in 1949 there was an increase. There were 1500 manufacturing establishments, which shows a 16 per cent increase over 1944, and there was an increase in employment. There were 41,956 people employed, and in Alberta in 1944 there were 1165 manufacturing establishments, and these increased to 1685 in 1949 — a 50 per cent increase — not a drop like in Saskatchewan, but an increase.

In employment Alberta had 22,128 in 1944, and in 1949 there were 26,425 people employed in manufacturing industries. So there was a real increase in industrial expansion. Not in Saskatchewan — Saskatchewan had a decrease, so that after hearing our Leader of the Opposition quote various weekly earnings of the workers, the Premier was not satisfied. He said that just meant the manufacturing industries. He was ready now to give us the composite picture of all the labour in Saskatchewan. Well, I was interested in it too and I got this composite index also. It is contained in the Canadian Statistical Review for January, 1952, and in this book which I have before me on Page 18, you will find the figures that were quoted by the Premier, but he again compared Saskatchewan with Saskatchewan, and not Saskatchewan with Alberta, Manitoba, or any other provinces. He said: “Look at this. Our index of employment runs up to 157 points. What a wonderful thing.” Yes, it is a wonderful thing, but Manitoba at the same time went up to 178 points, and Alberta 211 points, Mr. Speaker — not 157, but 211 points.

Then he said: “Look at the aggregate pay-roll. Saskatchewan went up to 313 points.” Yes, but Manitoba went to 348 points and Alberta

to 441 points, Mr. Speaker. What are the weekly earnings from this composite picture? The Leader of the Opposition was quoting earnings for the Industrial worker, but this composite index gives you earnings of all the workers, and what are these figures? Well, here are the figures of weekly average earnings of the workers in various provinces: B.C. — \$57. a week; Ontario — \$54 per week; Alberta — \$53; Manitoba — \$50; Quebec — \$49, and Saskatchewan — \$48, Mr. Speaker — the lowest of them all except the Maritime Provinces.

It means that the worker in B.C. gets \$9 a week more; the one in Ontario \$6 more; the one in Alberta \$5 more; and in all the provinces they get more than in Saskatchewan, so Saskatchewan is not the workers' paradise, and we did not have this wonderful expansion that our Premier so wonderfully described for us yesterday. What we actually had was that the workers were moving away from this province. That was the actual effect of the C.C.F. policies in this province.

Now there has been quite a bit of talk about the mineral production, and in one of his speeches the Premier had said there was nothing that would equal the mineral production in Saskatchewan in the last few years. Well, this was just some more of their fantasies which they so enjoy.

In 1944, Saskatchewan produced \$22,292,000 worth of minerals, and in 1951, \$50,908,000. Manitoba produced \$13,630,000 worth of minerals and in 1951, \$28,397,000. Alberta in 1944 — \$51,670,000 and in 1951, \$173,231,000. There was real expansion in minerals. Actually, on the basis of the national production, Saskatchewan did not make any headway at all because in 1944 we were producing 4 per cent of the national production; in 1950 we went down (that was during the C.C.F. rule) to 3.4 per cent of the national production, and in 1951 went up again to 4 per cent. We are going up and down — travelling in a circle — not getting anywhere. But Alberta, in 1949 produced 12 per cent of the national production; and in 1951, 13 per cent; and in 1951, 14 per cent. They are forging ahead and we are going around in a circle.

There was quite a bit of boasting about the production of oil — crude oil in 1951. Well, we are glad of having oil brought in to this province and of its production, but again Saskatchewan was compared with Saskatchewan. There was in 1951 a production of 1¼ million barrels of oil. Now mind you, this was low-grade oil. In Alberta at the same time 48 million barrels of high-grade oil, and remember, Mr. Speaker, that geologists tell us that Alberta is just on the edge of this great lake of oil and we are right in the centre of it, and we just have 1¼ million barrels, and Alberta produced 48 million barrels — so there is nothing to boast about. Of course, our Premier glories in telling people these old stories. Do you know what he said? He said: "When we got into power we found no maps. There were no geographical maps of this province." That, of course, brought a wonderful laugh from the civil servants in the gallery. Do you know what he is going to tell the people next? He will say that: "Before we got into power there was not even a Bible in this province. We wrote the Bible." That is what is going to be next. They are wonderful fellows!

Of course, when he is talking to his own people he can get away with that kind of stuff, but he cannot get away with it in this legislature.

February 14, 1952

There was something reported in the Saskatchewan Star-Phoenix of July 19, 1951, when there was a great conflagration of the C.C.F. 'ers in Saskatoon: "Douglas Stating Election Issues":

"The issue of the next provincial election would hinge on the record of the C.C.F. Government to the Crown Corporations (a wonderful record) through the Crown Corporations, who have now opened the Natural Resources of Saskatchewan for the benefit and welfare of the people . . . (what people?) — that is what we would like to know. Rhubbra and Schumiatcher? What people?) . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, he is talking to the C.C.F. and they do not talk back to him; and in one place it says:

"One of the greatest periods of industrial expansion by any province in Canada in a comparative period of time."

Just imagine! He says that to the C.C.F. and they take it. I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, that the industrial expansion of Saskatchewan is behind and is going down. We are contracting. In another place it says something to this effect:

"Liberal speakers have made it clear that if returned to office the Crown Corporations would be broken up and tossed out of the window."

What a wonder phrase the Premier asserted!

"The issues of the next election will be whether the things we have worked for are to be tossed out of the window into the hands of the greedy corporations, or retained in the hands of the people of Saskatchewan for the benefit of the whole instead".

And enumerating the benefits to the people of Saskatchewan and the Crown Corporations, the Premier said:

"The bus company put \$120,000,000 into the treasury instead of it going to the Greyhound headquarters in Chicago."

What a wonderful story, and I wonder if they believed it! What are the facts, Mr. Speaker, about this whole thing — about the bus corporation — about this whole thing? Here are the facts. We have all the records here. Here are all the books about the bus corporation. I have nothing against the bus corporation. We are not going to throw this useful corporation out of the window.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Korchinski: — This is an idea that only the C.C.F. have. This is going to be one of the things that they are going to use in the election — trying to frighten people — trying to appeal, not to the brain and to the minds of the people, but to their stomachs, to their fears and their emotions, — so they are going to use fear.

Yesterday the Premier just about repeated the same thing. He said “they are going to throw the bus to the Greyhound — the Greyhound is going to be waiting there — they will just throw it to the Greyhound instead of the government.” I suppose that is going to be repeated over and over again. He said that the Leader of the Opposition was playing a record. Well I took pains to examine the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, and compared it with last year’s speech, but Mr. Speaker, it was not so. It was not so. It was not the same speech. But, Mr. Speaker, the truth remains always the same, and you have to repeat it. But if there is anyone who plays the record, it is the Premier of this province. Not only does he play a record, but he is the “master’s voice” and all his little C.C.F.’ers repeat it all over the province. They have the copies of his record. So he is trying to frighten the people that we are going to toss out all these things through the window, and I say that as far as I am concerned, — and I think that most sensible people would agree — that anything is useful is going to be retained.

But I will tell you what we are going to toss out of the window. We are going to toss this government out of the window. We are going to toss out all the C.C.F. heelers that have been hired by this government out of the window, as it was done in New Zealand, Australia, Great Britain and Ontario. These people realized the socialist ideas will not work, so they tossed them out of the window and that is what we are going to do after the next election. That is what the people of Saskatchewan are going to do.

Now, about this \$120,000 that was put into the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan through the bus corporation. As I said, I am not speaking to say that we should do away with the bus corporation now; since there is no other service, we shall have to keep it. But these are the facts, that they merely found one figure somewhere in these books and used it. That was the only figure that was favourable to him so he used it. But why not use all the figures and show the clear standing of this whole thing? Well, here are some of the figures. I have all these books; there is a yellow book here for 1949-50; a green book for 1948-49; and a blue book for 1947-48. The bus company in 1947-48 had a loss of \$14,000 according to the records in this book. But that is not really the clear loss — there was more than that because there was no interest allowed for the money advanced to the bus corporation. It should have been not \$14,000, but \$45,000 actually, after interest was added to it, which would have brought the whole thing up to \$59,000. We were in the red \$59,000 in that year.

Now the next year (and this is where we got that wonderful figure of \$120,000) — it was the year 1948-49 and the Premier used that figure. He searched around and found the best figure, so he used it and here is what it says:

“New profit for the year — \$120,000.”

February 14, 1952

Again, Mr. Speaker, there were no interest charges allowed which should have been at least \$70,000 and the money that went to the bus company — and besides that there are the lunch counters which added on to this profit. Of course they may claim that this is also a part of the bus operations. Well, let us grant that it is, but the actual bus operations, after they have taken away the lunch counter profits (and those were \$18,000) — and so actually the bus cleared in that year \$24,000 if you take out all these charges.

Now the next year 1949-50 there is a profit of \$35,000 claimed. Of course, again nothing is allowed for interest advanced by the people of this province to the bus corporation. There should have been \$70,000 interest charges, and also in this \$35,000 there is included the \$21,800 made by the lunch counters. So you will find that in this year's operations we were in the red \$66,000. So, if you add all these up over the three years, the profits and losses, you will come out with a loss of \$94,000. But if you include the \$31,500 that was made by the lunch counters, you will still have a loss of \$54,000, so there was no \$120,000 put into the pockets of the people by the bus company. The people of the province had to take out of their pockets and supply the necessary funds for this necessary service. Now I have nothing against it, but I would like to see the truth told about this whole thing.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier also told us that the C.C.F. made certain promises and these promises were carried out. He had some sort of a nine-point programme before him, he said, and he went point by point and showed that this was all done. Now each time he gets up to speak he has a different kind of programme and a different number of points. I would like to draw his attention to some of the promises of the C.C.F. which were made and never carried out, because he says these promises were carried out. I would like to contradict him on that.

In 1944 there was great security promised to all the people of Saskatchewan and now the Premier goes on to say that this security has been accomplished and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the real security the people of Saskatchewan have is not due to anything that the C.C.F. have done, but due to the prosperity that everyone is enjoying now and not due to the actions of this government. I also maintain that there was no security legislation introduced by this government that was new. All this legislation was in the books. There was no new security introduced, but still they go around the country boasting that they have provided the people of Saskatchewan with great security.

There were promises in 1944 — free, without charge — without cost, medical, dental, nursing and hospitalization care. Now where are those things? We are still waiting for them. I suppose they are going to be dusted up and brought out again and I suppose that in this connection the Federal Government is going to be blamed again that these are not being carried out because of some catch in the Federal Government.

We were all promised those things free, but what happened? Now we have to pay for them. They are not free. We have to pay for them out of our own pockets; we have to pay for the hospitalization from our own pockets and we have to pay for the deficit from the public treasury from our own pockets and I heard the other day that some people were even put into jail if they do not pay this.

And this is all supposed to be free — all supposed to be free — but now we have to pay for it, so we actually get what we pay for. It is not free. I do not see why the Government should take any credit for it. Mr. Speaker, there is one principle that I always go by and I think most of the people go by this principle too, and the government, the Premier, the cabinet ministers and all of us are servants of the people — are the servants of the people — sent here to do a certain kind of work, and as we are responsible for the people I do not think we should go and boast about what we have done. I do not think that a servant ought to boast before its master — boast about what he has done with the master's money — and in this case it is a very poor show anyway. There is nothing to boast about.

We were promised education equality in every field. We were going to have such a wonderful educational system — that teachers were going to be well-fixed — all the children were going to get such a wonderful education. It was going to be just like a paradise. What is the case now? I do not think any of the promises were carried out as far as education is concerned. If you took a look at the number of the “sitters” we have in our province instead of having qualified teachers — if you look at the places where the people, because there is no teacher, have to take their children miles and miles away to school — I think that the educational facilities in our province have deteriorated instead of improved. I do not think there is anything that we can say that this province has improved in educational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things which I would like to discuss about this yet, but since my time is up and my hon. friend from the seat of Melfort has a few words to say, I am going to close, but I may say this, that the speech — the wonderful speech that we heard yesterday, — was like any of the Premier's speeches. I may say it was a little weaker for some reason — there were none of the regular jokes — but I tried to count the jokes and there were not as many as formerly. I was listening to one of his speeches over the air once, which was much the same as the one yesterday, but for some reason the Premier ran out of time — he had about a minute left, and when his time was up the radio operator played: “Wonderful Dreamer, Awaken to Me.” I think that piece should have been played in the legislature yesterday — Beautiful Dreamer, Awaken to Me.” I think that is what it was yesterday — a beautiful dream.

From this, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you will consider that I am not going to support the Speech from the Throne, but I am going to vote for the amendment.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to congratulate my colleague, the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) for the manner in which he took apart the hon. Premier's speech of yesterday. I think he pointed out to all members of this House beyond any shadow of doubt that many of the figures the Premier is accustomed to using are merely those figures that seem to be to his own advantage and figures which do not tell the entire story. I think it is high time that in this legislature we did have a greater degree of political honesty. I do not expect the record of any government to be

February 14, 1952

absolutely perfect. All that I would expect of any government is for the members of that government to give the very best service that they possibly can. And wherein they fail I think they should be men enough, I think they should be honest enough, to admit their failures and to listen to some of the advice that is given by members in the Opposition from time to time as to ways and means of solving some of the problems which the government itself seems to be incapable of solving.

The hon. member for Redberry touched upon a problem which I consider to be of paramount importance throughout this country. He touched upon one of the biggest of big businesses of Canada; he touched upon everybody's business, namely education. When I say that this is a big business and that it is everybody's business, I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, the fact that in 1949-50 we had 2,700,000 pupils and students enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools and Universities and Colleges in Canada. And that we had over 100,000 teachers. Or if you look at it from a purely provincial level we find that in our own Province of Saskatchewan in the year 1949-50 we had enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools over 160,000 students and we employed during that period over 7,000 teachers. I believe that hon. members, regardless of where they happen to sit in this House, will agree that one of the most important things that the legislators of any province can do is to provide for the young people of that province the very best educational facilities that money can possibly provide.

Education has always been the main concern of our people. You can go back to the pioneer days and you find that a place of worship and a place of learning were two of the first institutions constructed in any community. And just as places of worship and places of learning constitute the first landmarks of our communities, the parents and the school boards, the local secretaries, I think have, in this province, done a better job than most of us are willing to admit. And I cannot help but pay tribute at this time to the hundreds of members of school boards and secretaries throughout this province who have given of their time and their energy and their ability to serve as best they could in providing the girls and boys with the best type of educational facilities that money could have provided at the time. I have in mind, for instance, men like Mr. R.J. Greaves, who is now chairman of the Melfort Larger Unit Board. There is a gentleman who served as a secretary of a small school district for over 25 years and it is to men such as he that I cannot help but say 'thank you' for the progress that has been made in education in this province today.

We are concerned today with providing for our young people even better facilities than have been provided heretofore. In the north-eastern part of the province you have only to go and visit the schools — one of the new schools built in the town of Tisdale — to see how interested the people in that community are in this business of education. Or, last Saturday you needed only to visit the official opening of a new composite collegiate in the town of Melfort. I think the Minister of Education will agree with me when I say that the institution opened up at Tisdale within the past year or so and the one recently opened at Melfort is an indication that the people in those communities, as in other communities throughout the province, are definitely concerned with providing our girls and boys

with the best types of schools that we possibly can. And, incidentally, some of those schools are built, we must bear in mind, as a result of federal grants to education, as a result of provincial grants to education and as a result of local taxation.

It seems to me that in our province there are two very major problems in education which the C.C.F. Government has utterly failed to do with. Those problems are, first of all, the catastrophic teacher shortage and secondly, the problem of providing adequate finances to operate the big business of education.

For a few moments, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with the problem of teacher shortage in this Province of Saskatchewan. I think all hon. members will agree with me when I say that the teacher is the most important single factor in the formal education of the child. The science of education has such a wealth of knowledge regarding the nature of the growth and development of our children, regarding the measurement of mental ability and special aptitudes, regarding sound methodology. Science of education, I say, has such a wealth of knowledge regarding the business of education that it requires far more than one year of training to become a skilful teacher and when I say this I am not casting any reflections on the many experienced teachers we have throughout this province who have grown professionally through the years and who are doing an excellent job. But what I wish to say in regard to this is that there is no reflection either on the experienced teachers of this province or on the younger teachers, because I do believe they are trying to render as efficient service as they can with the type and length of training that they have had.

A great deal is said about sitters who have been given the dignified name, by the Minister of Education, of Study Supervisors. I do not know why the Minister did not choose to call them Superintendents of Studies. He might just as well have gone the step further. I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that even these sitters are doing the very best job that they possibly can. Now, what is the situation with regard to teacher shortage in this Province of Saskatchewan? Let us take the year 1948-49 and examine the number of people holding various types of certificates given to people who at that time had attended Normal School for a period of 12 weeks, 354. 24T certificates, that is people who attended Normal School for a period of only 24 weeks, 879. Letters of authority, 335, and Study Supervisors, 224. The situation, Mr. Speaker, is this that in 1948-49 we had more than 2,000 teachers in those categories — out of a total of slightly more than 7,000. With regard to the people who were attending our Normal Schools we find that in 1949-50, as answered to a question in this House, there were 130 normal school students who had less than grade 12 education — 130, Mr. Speaker, of the normal school students in that year had not completed their grade 12. The situation today is grimmer than ever before and to the question that has just been answered in this House today regarding the number of study supervisors throughout the province, here is what we find. We find that as of January 31, 1952, there were 558 Study Supervisors. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It simply means that in 558 schools in this province the girls and boys are being denied the services of properly trained and properly certified teachers as a result of policies pursued by the C.C.F. Government.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. members, like the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) and the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Walker) realize the gravity of the situation, when they seem to praise their Government for great advances, so-called, in the field of education that has been made by the C.C.F. I wonder if those hon. members actually realize, Mr. Speaker, that last year more trained teachers left Saskatchewan than were graduated from the Moose Jaw Normal School. Where did they go, Mr. Speaker? They went west to the Province of British Columbia and to the Province of Alberta. And I ask you why? The reason is simple. I have in mind a very capable teacher who left our province just three years ago — a teacher with 10 years' experience in the Province of Saskatchewan — and she was receiving \$1800 a year at that time. A finer teacher you could not wish to ask for, Mr. Speaker. She went to the Province of British Columbia and last Xmas the salary she was getting was \$3420 a year. Can you blame the young lady for leaving this province and taking up teaching in the Province of British Columbia?

Let us just carry this comparison of teachers' salaries with other provinces a little further. The latest available figures I have are for the year 1949 as indicated in the D.B.S., Dominion Bureau of Statistics, publication on teachers' salaries in eight of the provinces in Canada. Here is what we find. The median salary for teachers, that is the salary, that is the figure above which you would find half the teachers receiving more and half the teachers receiving less. The median salary in the Province of Saskatchewan that year was 6th in place. There were five provinces ahead of Saskatchewan in the median salary paid to teachers. British Columbia had a median salary of \$2502. Alberta had a median salary of \$2163. Ontario came next with a median salary of \$1974. Manitoba had a median salary of \$1593. Even Nova Scotia where teachers today are dealing with the strike question as a means of attaining better salaries — even Nova Scotia had a higher median salary for its teachers than this Province of Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan's median salary in that year was only \$1514. Now, Mr. Speaker, when members on the other side of the House try to talk about the wonderful advances that have been made by the teachers as a result of C.C.F. educational legislation I ask them to become a little more politically honest and take into account some of these figures. After all, is it any wonder that teachers leave Saskatchewan? Is it any wonder that more trained and experienced teachers left Saskatchewan last year than we turned out of the Moose Jaw Normal School? The C.C.F. are prone to make teachers feel that there have been tremendous improvements in salaries. Actually, whether you compare teachers' salaries with the salaries of teachers in other provinces or whether you compare teachers' salaries in this Province today with teachers' salaries in their peak period, the situation looks very gloomy indeed for the government.

As a matter of fact, in 1921 — just 30 years ago — teachers were better paid in the Province of Saskatchewan than they are today when you take into consideration average salaries being paid. Take for example, in 1921 the average salary for men with first class certificates in our rural schools was \$1452. The average salary for urban school teachers holding first class certificate was \$2015. Now if we add to that salary of 1921 the 28 per cent increase in the cost of living that has taken place since 1921 up to the present time that would mean that the average salary for first class teachers ought to be today \$1861 and instead, according to Department of Education reports, in 1949-50 the average salary for rural male teachers was \$1600. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying

to make is this. That if we take into consideration the cost of living, our first class male teachers in our country schools are receiving \$200 a year less than they were in 1921. Is it any wonder that there is a teacher shortage? If we take into consideration our urban teachers, what is the situation? If you take into consideration the cost of living again, our urban teachers, on the average, are receiving more than \$600 less than they were getting in 1921. And then the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. Premier and the other hon. members on your right try to paint a picture of tremendous progress for the teaching profession during their term of office. Or, if you would like to compare teachers' salaries with those of other workers you get a similar picture. According to the Labour Gazette for November, 1951, what do we find? We find that the industrial composite weekly wage was \$50.14 as of August 1, 1951 — \$50.14 — and the teachers' weekly wage worked out to only \$37.14. You will find that in forestry people make more money a week than they do in teaching. In the manufacturing industries they make more money than they do in teaching. In transportation, storage and communications the same is true. In the operation of public utilities they make more money than they do in teaching. In trade, in finance, even in the insurance field they make more money than they do in teaching. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is one of the basic reasons why we have a teacher shortage in this Province at the present time.

And there is one of the basic reasons why we have fewer young people going into the teaching profession than ever before. And the total number of students who are being trained in our Normal Schools and in the College of Education you find that there is a considerable decline. In 1950-51 we had 896 students in the College of Education and in our two Normal Schools. In 1951-52 there was a decrease of approximately 150 — 150 less students — being trained to become teachers; that is, 150 less young people going into what I consider to be, indeed, the noblest of the professions. And the Government of Saskatchewan is not doing much about it. Why is there a teacher shortage? And I must admit that it is not just a problem that needs to be dealt with only in this Province. There are other provinces in Canada that have to cope with it. But the Canadian Education Association survey suggested long-term reasons for the teacher shortage, and I would like to enumerate them for the benefit of the hon. members of this House. Low salaries, few opportunities to advance, poorly equipped schools, unattractive rural living conditions, low prestige of the profession, inadequate pensions, little security, large and heavy teaching loads. And to eliminate these causes will require much more money that is being spent by the Provincial Government.

And that brings me to this question of finance. Let us remember that in the pre-election promises the Premier said that education by the British North America Act was made a responsibility of the Province and that if he and his party were ever elected to office his Government would assume a large share of the cost of education — one pledge that they certainly have not fulfilled. They have talked about equality of educational opportunity and what have we? In an answer that was tabled to a question in this House, today, what do we find about equalization grants, Mr. Speaker, for 1950-51? In the larger units the equalization grant per classroom on the average amounts to \$535. In schools that find themselves in non-unit areas the equalization grant amounts to \$307 per classroom. That means that the girls and boys that happen to be going to schools which are not

located in larger units today are being penalized by this Government that was going to provide them with educational opportunities. Do you think it is fair, Mr. Speaker, for one moment that just because a boy or girl happens to be attending a school which is located outside a larger unit that the girl or boy in that school should be penalized to the tune of \$228 a year, because that is the average discrimination between schools within units and non-units. I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education took hold of this problem of school grants and rectified this business of discriminating; not against school districts, not against trustees, but against the girls and boys who happen to be attending those schools.

I must admit quite readily that school grants have increased considerably in this province. I am quite prepared to admit that, but I also find that during the period of 1939 to 1940, 1943-44, the Liberal Governments had on the average devoted 9.92 per cent of their total expenditure on revenue account to education. And during the first four years of C.C.F. administration in office what do we find? We find that the percentage spent on education as compared with the total amount spent on revenue account has actually been reduced, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals were devoting during that 4-year period, as I said, 9.92 per cent of their revenue expenditure to education. The C.C.F. during that same period had devoted 9.83 per cent of their total expenditure on revenue accounts to education. As a matter of fact, the true story of our school grants in this province is this: that the C.C.F. Government has failed to increase school grants even in the same proportion as their revenue has been increased, through increases in education tax receipts.

Let us compare Provincial educational grants in Saskatchewan with those of other provinces. I think hon. members in this House who, on the other side, feel that they have done so much for education ought to be aware of the following facts. Let us take a period of for instance, 1946 to 1949. That is the period in which we had a C.C.F. Government in this province and compare the school grants in the province with the school grants in other provinces and then you will get a fuller appreciation of what has been taking place.

In the Province of British Columbia the school grants had increased from \$4,076,000 in 1946 to \$13½ million in 1949. In Alberta they had increased from \$3,200,000 in 1946 to \$6,400,000 in 1949. In Saskatchewan they had increased from \$3,800,000 (just taking round figures) to \$5,800,000 in 1949. In Manitoba they had increased from \$1,400,000 to \$4,200,000. In Nova Scotia they had increased from \$2½ million in 1946 to \$5,300,000 roughly in 1949. So if we compare the increase in grants in this province between 1946 and 1949, with the increases in grants with British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, we find that in British Columbia school grants had trebled during that time. In Alberta they had doubled. In Manitoba they had more than doubled. In Nova Scotia they had more than doubled. In Saskatchewan they had been increased from only \$3,800,000 to \$5,800,000. In assistance to school boards the rate of increase in school grants in this province has lagged far behind four other provinces in this country.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is quite a strong relationship between the amount of money spent on education on a per pupil capita basis and the quality of education received, and also the percentage of high school students who are dropping out. Let us compare Saskatchewan with

British Columbia. In 1948 the per pupil capita expenditure in B.C. was \$221. In Saskatchewan it was \$172. Unfortunately we have altogether too many of our young people leaving our schools at too early an age. In this regard an interesting study was carried out by the Canadian Research Committee on practical education. And it reveals that out of 100 boys who reach grade 7, 59 will be drop-outs before they complete their junior matriculation. The same study revealed that out of 100 girls who reach grade 7, 51 will be drop-outs before they complete junior matriculation. This same study attempted to find out why our young people were dropping out of school. Although there were many reasons given for children dropping out of school, such as lack of interest, a lack of ability, unsuitability of curriculum, the desire to earn money, family income, need of help at home, indifference of parents, and so on, the study found that reasons relating to the school were the most important. That is, lack of interest, unsuitability of curriculum, problems which the school should attempt to solve if it hopes to retain these young people in schools for a longer period of time.

My hon. friend, the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) stated the other day that we have more high school students attending high school today than we have ever had before. I would invite the hon. member to consult the annual reports of the Department of Education because these reports do not bear out such a categorical statement. As a matter of fact, the annual reports, and I think most of them will bear this out, I happen to have 1949-50 annual report of the Department of Education in my hand — these annual reports indicate that there are fewer numbers of students in grade 12 today than there have been since 1944. Where are all these high school students that you talk about going to high school — where is this increase that you are talking about? The reports of the Department of Education just do not bear that claim out.

This question of drop-outs is very important in our own province. Take the children who started school in 1939-40 by 1949-50 they would be in grade 11 and let them compare the enrolment. In 1939-40 we had 29,000 children in grade one — 29,259 to be exact. How many of those children reached grade 11, do you think, Mr. Speaker? Well, you might venture a guess of 10,000 — that would still be too big. For there were only 5,843 of those children in grade 11. That is a tremendous drop-out and I believe that that is one of the problems which our present government has failed to cope with in this field of education.

I say that in education it has failed to deal with two of the most pressing problems in this field. First of all it has failed to supply our schools with adequately trained teachers. Secondly, it has failed to place education on a sound financial basis. And thirdly, if you want a third one, it has failed to curb the number of drop-outs from our schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations concerning what was said by the Hon. Premier yesterday. I, for one, am happy to see the Hon. Premier looking as well as he does look after his Caribbean cruise. After all, we may differ politically, but I like to see the Hon. Premier regain his good health and have whatever holidays are necessary from time to time. I say that quite sincerely and I do hope that his cruise to the Caribbean will enable him to become less irritable — at me, for one — at times during this present session. Yesterday, when the Hon. Premier

February 14, 1952

spoke about the de-population of our province he made one very significant statement with which I wholeheartedly agree, for he said, "We must look at problems realistically and honestly."

Let us review some of the figures used yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition (which the Premier said he did not hear). I want to assure the Hon. Premier that if he did not hear them it was not because they were not uttered by the Leader of the Opposition; it was because he just did not happen to hear them, for the official records of this House will show the use that the hon. Leader of the Opposition made of those figures. First of all he dealt with the figures pertaining to depopulation, as revealed by the 1941 and '51 census, and this is what he said:

"Between the period of 1941 and '51 Alberta's population had increased by 143,332. During that same period Manitoba's population had increased by 46,797; and during that same period Saskatchewan's population decreased by 74, 264."

The Leader of the Opposition, I think in all fairness to the Hon. Premier and to the present government, took the figures of 1946 and 1951, because after all, during that period, the C.C.F. was the party in office, and it was during that period, 1946-51, that we had, right across the Dominion of Canada, unprecedented industrial development; and therefore, if we are going to make comparisons that will be realistic and honest, those are the dates we should take — 1946 and 1951. So we find that, during that period, the population in the Province of Alberta had increased by 136,171; the Province of Manitoba had an increase of 49,618; and Saskatchewan's population declined, during that same time by 960. Those were the figures used by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Now this depopulation figure for Saskatchewan does not include the natural increase of 77,872 for that very period. Hon. members know that natural increase is the difference between births and deaths. Therefore, taking our natural increase into account, our population declined, during the years 1946-1951 while the C.C.F. were in office, by 78,832. This depopulation is a serious matter, and one which members on all sides of the House ought to deal with realistically and honestly, because, Mr. Speaker, this present rate of depopulation of the Province of Saskatchewan means this: if we allow the trend of the last five years to carry on, we will in effect, be allowing the complete obliteration of a city the size of Prince Albert every year. Roughly speaking, the population as at the last census in the city of Prince Albert was 17,000. Just imagine, we have had so much industrial development in this province, the Premier told us yesterday, that our population was being depleted at the rate of wiping out the population of a city the size of Prince Albert every year, during that period of five years. That is a far too serious a problem for anyone to dismiss lightly.

I am going to say, in fairness to the government, that I am not one of those who says that the C.C.F. Government is to be blamed 100 per cent for this depopulation; but I do believe that the government must assume responsibility for not having taken effective measures which are within its jurisdiction, to curb this depopulation trend. Yesterday the Hon. Premier dealt with two aspects of his government's attempt to face the problem of depopulation — namely, he dealt with his government's attempt

to stabilize our agricultural economy; and secondly, he dealt with the attempts of his government to encourage industrial development in this province. Now, in dealing with the activities of the Department of Agriculture, he mentioned the land acreage that was brought under cultivation, the land that was brought under irrigation, the drainage projects, feed and fodder banks that have been established, the co-op farms, such as the Sturdy Co-op farm up in the Carrot River country . . .

Opposition Member: — Pretty small.

Mr. Egnatoff: — . . . but which, on the one hand the Hon. Premier was telling this House what a wonderful job his government had done in trying to stabilize agricultural economy — on the other hand, he admitted its utter failure to cope with agricultural problems, by his defence of the establishment of a royal commission on agriculture. Now that is precisely the position in which the Hon. Premier has placed himself and his government. On the one hand he is trying to say that his government has done such wonderful things to stabilize agricultural economy — on the other hand, in effect, he says, ‘we have made such a dismal failure in attending to the agricultural problems that we must appoint a Royal Commission.’ A Royal Commission — what for? Here are the words that the Hon. Premier used himself yesterday. He said:

“We must appoint a Royal Commission on agriculture to lay patterns as to the trends we ought to follow for the next quarter century.”

Just fancy that. A development of a 25-year plan. We have heard of 5-year plans; we have heard of 4-year plans; but here is the Premier’s master-mind that has concocted the idea of a 25-year plan. Why, Mr. Speaker, I do not think he need worry about any 25-year plan. I do not think he will have a chance . . .

Opposition Member: — A 25-day plan.

Mr. Egnatoff: — . . . Well, yes, as has been suggested by one of the hon. members here, perhaps a 25-day plan would be much more to the point. Mr. Speaker, a Royal Commission to lay patterns as to the trend the Hon. Premier ought to follow, in the theatre business, in the next quarter century would have been much more to the point — much more to the point. And perhaps a Royal Commission as to the trends to follow in borrowing money from the government insurance office might have been, again, much more to the point. What would be of far more value than to appoint a Royal Commission on agriculture would simply be to do a little soul searching, on the part of the government, to recognize the folly of its land allocation policy on that 33-year lease basis, because, after all, farmers want to own their land. I would like to refer again, as I did last year, and urge upon the government of this province to take immediate measures to open up a fairly large acreage of land in the Carrot River triangle. There is an appreciable acreage there. I am not prepared to say how many acres there are. Some people claim that, in that Carrot River triangle, there are at least 1¼ million acres of good arable land yet to be opened up — some estimates, more conservative, are that there are between 600 and 800 thousand acres that could be opened up there. It is true it will require some drainage projects, but instead of spending money on an agricultural commission I think it would have been much wiser to direct that money into some of the survey and drainage projects in the Carrot River triangle.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that not long ago I had the privilege of going on the motorcade from Carrot River to The Pas. That just takes in about 135 miles. A road is needed there very badly to the extent of about 60 or 60 some odd miles. I think it was very regrettable indeed that the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), who has represented that part of the country for some time, was not able to be on that trip. I was very disappointed to find that the hon. member for Torch River (Mr. Denike) was not able to go on that trip from Carrot River to The Pas. I think, even if he had seen the area on previous occasions, it would have done him good to have seen it again; and I am indeed sorry that there were not more members of this House on that trip because it was very interesting as to the nature of the land, as to the route over which the Carrot River — The Pas route association are proposing that the government build a highway; and you get an idea of the large commercial timber stands that are part of the country. I hope, if it is necessary to have a motorcade again, that more members of this House — on both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker — will avail themselves of the opportunity of seeing that wonderful land.

In regard to agricultural policy, the C.C.F. government, in my opinion, has lost the confidence of the people; because, in the first place, it has persisted in following its land allocation policy on a 33-year lease basis; secondly, because it has failed to open up the land in the northeastern part of our province. There are large areas that have not even been surveyed as yet because it has persisted in its policy of taking farmers off their land by not providing adequate municipal grants which are so necessary for the construction of market roads and bridges, and by not increasing the school grants sufficiently to make it possible for local authorities to meet the increased costs of education. But apparently the present government does not care to what extent it takes money from the people. I was astonished, just before Christmas, when I telephoned the Provincial Treasurer about a problem. The day before a farmer came to see me; he told me that he had been hauling Christmas trees once a year in an attempt to make a little extra money to provide some Christmas gifts for his family. This farmer happened to be living on sub-marginal land, and I really thought that a farmer should be able to haul Christmas trees to his own immediate town and dispose of them without necessarily having a commercial license. The day before he was stopped by the police and informed that he had to either get a commercial license or not sell any more Christmas trees that season; and it was on that account that I telephoned the Provincial Treasurer, and I told him of this case. I was shocked at the Provincial Treasurer's attitude. I told him this man had been hauling Christmas trees on his farm truck license and that he had been stopped by the police. This was the reply:

“The police stopped him? Good. I am glad they are catching up to him. The farmers are getting away with altogether too much.”

I was very, very surprised to hear such an attitude expressed by the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon Mr. Fines: — I want to deny that statement most categorically, in those words. What I told the hon. gentleman — and I have distinct recollection of it — if he will sit down I will tell him what I said.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman cannot make statements like that in here and get away with it. What I pointed out to him was that we had received many complaints from the truckers, in northern Saskatchewan, about farmers using their farm trucks and depriving the truckers of a means of making a livelihood; and that I was glad to see that our police were on their job . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That is the same thing.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it served the farmers right, the farmers were getting away with altogether too much.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is what you meant.

Mr. Fines: — Oh, no.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has corrected the hon. member who was speaking, with regard to the language he used, which he has the privilege of doing.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is fine, Mr. Speaker. I have not even finished the story. I just got nicely started with it. The conversation was not quite as short as the Provincial Treasurer seemed to indicate when he rose on that point of privilege. As a matter of fact, I pointed out to the Provincial Treasurer that, in that particular year, the man was not only living on sub-marginal land but he had not had the opportunity to take the crop off his land, and it was all the more important, therefore, for the farmer to be able to haul the trees to town and sell them, because it meant so much for his wife and children at that time of the year.

I say, again, that I was very much surprised. I think if the Provincial Treasurer will think this over — in addition to what he has just said transpired — he did make the statement that the farmers were getting away with altogether too much and that he was glad to see that the police were checking up on them. It is true that he . . .

Mr. Fines: — I must deny that again, most categorically, on a question of privilege. I said no such thing. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the truckers had been stating that we were allowing the farmers to get away with too much. The Truckers' Association have met me on more than one occasion, and I have had dozens of letters from truckers, and I think probably some of the truckers in Melfort that make their livelihood by trucking are among those who have complained.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer, at this time, is missing the point altogether. It was not a case of this farmer doing what commercial truckers were paying a special license for, nor competing with their business and taking away their livelihood . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Egnatoff: — It was not that at all. It was just a case of a farmer having a farm truck license, being required to purchase a commercial license under those very difficult circumstances in order that he could sell a few Christmas trees to provide his wife and family with the necessary Christmas spirit.

I submit it is that type of disregard for the rights and the feelings of people that has caused the people of this province to lose confidence in this government, which at one time proclaimed to be so concerned about humanity first. And fourthly, it has admitted its own failure to cope with agricultural problems, by proposing the establishment of a royal commission on agriculture.

Now I would like to deal, briefly, with the government's attempt to encourage industrial development. The socialist government has lost the confidence of the people for its lack of industrial development. All hon. members will agree that industrial development, in Saskatchewan would not only curb depopulation, but would greatly increase our population. The Premier says that we have had industrial development. What kind of industrial development have we had? Where is it? This is the type of industrial development that we have had in this province, Mr. Speaker. We have had an example of the Sherritt-Gordon mines; instead of establishing a plant in this province, they will now be shipping their raw materials right across the province of Saskatchewan for further refining in the Province of Alberta. I submit that if we had a government here which was on its toes, which was really interested in industrial development, that that firm would not have established its plant in the Province of Alberta because we would have had, long before that time, the necessary development to provide it with the resources that it required to establish a plant in this province.

If this government were to deal with depopulation realistically and honestly, from the point of view of industrial development, it would resign, calling an election and let the people decide whether they wanted industrial stagnation under socialism, or development under liberalism.

With regard to the development of oil in this province, the hon. Premier had one of his many categorical statements, that 'no one has had any special privilege' in obtaining leases or permits from the provincial government. If no one has had any special privileges, how did it come about that Rhubbra had secured permits on over 10 million acres of land at less than 1/10 of a cent per acre, while farmers have been required to pay a three cent per acre mineral tax to retain their rights? If no one has received special privileges, how come that a top level employee of the provincial government organized a uranium concern while he was still in the employ of the government? In this connection the hon. Premier threatened 'that before this Session was through some members will either put up or shut up.' I, for one, are not the least bit frightened by such threats, and do not intend to put up with what appears to be maladministration on the part of this socialist government — nor do I intend to shut up!

The hon. Premier had mentioned that some firm in the northern lumbering areas had not been visited by inspectors from 1934 to 1944. What a tremendous contract this is with present circumstances — because we are now being ridden to death by inspectors. For example, the Department of Social Welfare alone has 84 inspectors, some of whom are engaged in political activity . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member to name them.

Mr. Egnatoff: — If the Provincial Treasurer is so anxious to know, I have been told that the man in charge of public relations for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, on his visit to Melfort, had contacted the key C.C.F. workers and had discussed with them the state of the C.C.F. organization in that constituency.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — But that is not the Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. Egnatoff: — If the Provincial Treasurer wants to hear about someone in the Department of Social Welfare, I have been asked, on occasion, to interpret for one of the employees of the Department of Social Welfare, and that employee asked me to convey to the woman on whom we called, how much the C.C.F. government had been concerned with the placing of children in good foster homes.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of information, I would like to know more about that.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I would prefer not to mention the name of this employee on the floor of this House, and if the Minister of Social Welfare wishes to look into this case I shall be glad to discuss it with him in detail.

Would the Provincial Treasurer like some more instances of employees of the government being engaged in political activity?

The Department of Natural Resources even provides uniforms for its officers, and recent statements published in the 'Saskatchewan News' indicated that even more uniforms would be provided. Could this be so that people would readily recognize the multitude of C.C.F. officers and inspectors?

During the course of his address the Premier stated that, in 1944 the watchword of his party was 'Security' and that his government was given a mandate to provide security for the people of this province. In 1948, the watchword, according to the Premier, was 'Development'; and, in 1952, the election slogan will be 'Expansion'.

Expansion of what, Mr. Speaker? Expansion of socialism? The socialist balloon has already expanded so much, and has occupied so much space, that we have had no room for real industrial development in this province. In my opinion, socialism will not have an opportunity of expanding any further in Saskatchewan, after the next election.

The Premier seems to have forgotten the pledges on which his party sought the support of the people in 1944; and the pledges on which his party was elected in 1944. Social services were going to be supplied, free, to the people. We shall all remember the famous pamphlet entitled, 'Let There Be No Blackout of Health', in which the C.C.F. party promised complete medical and hospitalization services, without money and without price. All hon. members know that, today, hospitalization services are not provided to the people in accordance with their ability to pay. The rich and the poor pay the same amount, under the hospitalization tax.

February 14, 1952

Equal educational opportunities were going to be provided to the girls and boys in rural areas. They had pledged themselves to establish a so-called 'brave new world'. They pledged themselves to implement the promises set out in the Regina Manifesto, in which they promised not to rest content until they had eradicated capitalism from our midst.

To provide the many social services which the C.C.F. had promised, they were going to socialize the development of natural resources and big business. Here is what the present Minister of Natural Resources states, in a radio broadcast, on January 29, 1942:

“Let us suppose it is the year 1950 and we look at the ‘brave new world.’ The people of Saskatchewan have had eight years of C.C.F. government. They are secure in their homes; they are busy on their farms; in their factories; with their mines and their oil wells. Encouragement is given to everyone to increase production of all good things which means better living for all. Saskatchewan people know that they are sure to get the best available health services at all times regardless of their ability to pay individually when they are ill. They also know that their children will receive the best education to enable them to take places as good citizens and to live the good life.

“Though limitations exist as to extent to which a provincial government may go, there is much that can and should be done in Saskatchewan towards the building of this ‘Brave New World.’

“Saskatchewan can give security to its people in their homes. Much can be done towards providing productive labour, thus insuring the income of our people. Health services must be made available to all of our people; we cannot afford to continue otherwise. Education in the much greater degree must be within reach of all our youth.”

Again with regard to the development of natural resources, here is what Mr. A. Connon said, in 1944, as reported in the North Battleford News. That was during the election campaign of 1944. I am quoting from this report. Mr. Connon said:

“C.C.F. plans for public ownership of natural resources were detailed, and it was shown that a proper, publicly owned and controlled development of our natural resources could result in the bulk of the wealth of Saskatchewan being utilized for the benefit of the citizens of Saskatchewan. This would certainly be a welcome change from the past exploitation of its natural resources by outside interests.”

It is those type of statements, Mr. Speaker, upon which the government of Saskatchewan was elected; and now they, themselves, have turned around and have given large acreages for a pittance.

And what about the Premier? I am glad that the Premier is back here because, yesterday, he told us that he and his government were elected on the watchword of 'security', in 1944. Well, that certainly does not sound very much like the Premier's own statements in those days. I have a report here of an address by T.C. Douglas at Weyburn, on June 13, 1944, where Mr. Douglas suggested ways in which the C.C.F. proposed to get money to pay for its social services programme; and I want to ask the hon. Premier, today, to just go over these and check them off one by one and see if there is anything here that he has implemented in the past 7½ years.

Here is what he says:

1. "Saving considerable money by taking the civil service out of politics."

The civil service has been put into politics deeper than it has ever been before in the history of this province or in the history of any part of the Commonwealth. That is what Mr. Douglas said at that time — "saving considerable money by taking the civil service out of politics and by setting up purchasing boards to buy government supplies." He charged that daily papers were given large printing contracts as payment for propaganda fed to the people, and that taxes were used to keep a political machine.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but add that if there were ever a political machine in this province before the C.C.F. came into office, it was just a miniature compared to the bulldozer that we have today.

Again quoting from this report of the hon. Premier's speech of 1944, the second way they were going to raise money was by:

2. "Raising revenue by government engaging in revenue-producing business."

Shoe factory, I suppose, tannery, woollen mill, confiscating a box factory up at Prince Albert.

3. "Setting up commodity boards to sell goods now being sold by monopolies."

What is your answer to this one, today, Mr. hon. Premier? He suggested cement as a possible commodity that should be taken over by the government with the sole right to sell and distribute it.

I am coming to No. 4, the fourth way they were going to raise money, and I want to ask him to what extent he has implemented this pledge:

4. The taxing of interest payments to corporations outside the province. At present between

February 14, 1952

35 and 40 millions of dollars are going out of Saskatchewan in interest payments.”

How much of those interest payments that went outside of the province have you taxed? You know, Mr. Speaker, — none.

This is the fifth way he was going to raise money:

“5. Sponsoring the development of natural resources by public or co-operative ownership.”

He changed his song there.

“The establishment of secondary industries — starch, wheat, syrup . . .

How many starch factories have you? How many syrup factories have you?

“. . . synthetic rubber, plastics, glycol anti-freeze and linseed oil.”

Now there are the 5 ways in which the Premier of this province — when he was seeking election — was going to finance his programme of social security. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and then you hear all this talk about the Premier having kept his promises.

And lastly, again, a report of an address delivered by T.C. Douglas, June 1, 1944, and here is the report:

“Funds to do these things would come from taxation of large companies that have money, from additional liquor board profits, by development industries in Saskatchewan that would produce grain alcohol, synthetic rubber, plastics, syrup plants and linseed oil plants. Money would be saved . . .

and this is the reason I am reading this one,

“ . . . by doing away with the political machine in Saskatchewan, and by reducing government printing.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to know how much this latest piece of government propaganda that was distributed the other day, at public expense, namely, ‘Progress 1952’ which is an alleged report of the progress made by the C.C.F. government from 1944 to 1952. It will be interesting indeed to know the cost of the publication of that book and the extent to which that book will be distributed throughout this province in the coming election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion there is no doubt but that the government of Saskatchewan has lost the confidence of the people. It was elected by the skin of its teeth, in 1948 (we would rather have had the skin on this side) but they were elected by the skin of their teeth and the people of this province have now come to realize that our possibilities for development are unlimited — our mineral resources,

our oil and natural gas, our lakes in the great north land, our timber, our arable land in that part of the country, are yet to be developed. They realize that the only way in which we can curb the depopulation trend will be by bringing to this legislature men and women (and there will be at least one woman in this legislature after the next election) and they will want to bring to this legislature men and women who will form a government which will have policies which will be conducive to the development of this province, and it is for that reason that I shall vote for the amendment, and oppose the motion.

Mr. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I would like, first — (I am afraid my hon. friends are going to be very disappointed; I could not begin to be half so melodramatic as the speaker who has just preceded me) to congratulate the mover and the seconder of this Address. I was hoping that I would have some time to say considerable on my constituency tonight and for that reason I do not want to take up too much time dealing with what the last two speakers have dealt with, but there are one or two points that I want to take up.

I was very happy to know that the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) found such good reading in the Commonwealth, and that he read it so much; in fact it seems that, or something else, has kept him so busy that, in a 45 minute talk, he did not have time to talk about his own constituency.

He went on, Mr. Speaker, to tell us that the idea of tossing the Crown Corporations out of the window was our idea, intended to frighten the people of Saskatchewan against voting for the Liberal party in the next election. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it was our idea; I think it was their idea over there. Half of their speeches are taken up with running down the Crown Corporations and the hon. member, who went to great lengths to tell us, that they were not going to do anything of the kind, immediately proceeded to do everything he could to run down the corporations that they are going to keep. I could not help but think, when he was talking about keeping those corporations, it just came to my mind that when one of the important government measures came before this House, I think that was in 1946, Bill No. 11, the Automobile Insurance Act Bill came before this House for second reading, everyone of our friends across the way voted against it, every Liberal in the House.

Another thing that the hon. member for Redberry said was that there is no security under this government and then he went on to tell us that we have had to pay for all of those things that the government promised to give us free. Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member knows that the common people pay for all things and they pay for a lot of things that they do not get. They do not mind paying for social services that they do get but they do mind paying for high corporation profits which makes the Liberal dollar decline in value every day and those are the things that they do not like paying for.

The Hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) went on to tell us — I did not make too many notes of what he was saying because honestly it was a lot of repetition — it was mostly what the Hon. Leader of the

February 14, 1952

Opposition said the other day — but he told us that up in his part of the province, or all over the province, I forget which, that the people were almost ridden down with government inspectors. I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if any of them were popcorn inspectors. You remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal president of one of the constituencies of this province went out and told the people about this awful C.C.F. Government. That they had even got to a point where they sent inspectors into theatres to inspect the popcorn, or the tax that was being collected from the popcorn. And it finally turned out, Mr. Speaker, that the inspector referred to was an employee of the Federal Government.

Then the hon. member for Melfort went on to ask if we remembered the blackout of health, referring to health services in this province. Well, yes, I think most of us will remember it, Mr. Speaker, for we have very good reason to remember it and we know what the Liberals have done in this respect. Just a short few weeks ago, down in Ottawa, when the C.C.F. Government brought in a demand for health services which would include hospitalization, hospital accommodation, medical care and health insurance, every Liberal in the House voted against it.

Then the hon. member also told us about school units and grants and he tried to leave the inference that this Government was partial to school units to a point where the school units got larger equalization grants than the non-unit districts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go to great lengths with this because I am to be followed by the Minister of Education in this debate and he is more able to deal with it than I am. But the hon. member should know, and everyone in the Province should know, that that is not so. There are quite a number of units in this province, Mr. Speaker, at least a fair percentage of them that get less from the equalization grant than if they were not in the unit. And one of the reasons that he was able to quote the figures that he quoted, Mr. Speaker, is that he is quoting figures from units that happen to be established in areas where the assessment is low, and grants are paid in relation to assessment.

And then he went on to tell about giving away the mineral rights on 10 million acres for nothing. He knows very well that nothing like that took place, Mr. Speaker, and he knows very well that excellent reasons for that transaction have been given repeatedly in this House.

Then he went on to talk about the school teacher shortage. Well, the hon. member should know that the school teacher shortage is not peculiar to Saskatchewan. It is the same all over Canada. There is a decided shortage of teachers in Canada, Mr. Speaker, not enough to fill the positions . . .

Premier Douglas: — — There must be when they hire the member for Redberry.

Mr. J. Gibson: — — Just like the shortage of doctors, Mr. Speaker, not enough to provide the services that are required by the people of this country. And neither one of those shortages was brought about by the actions of this government.

Yes, and he went on to tell us, Mr. Speaker, that teachers are leaving this Province to go to B.C. to get better salaries than if they

teach in Saskatchewan. Well, I know a teacher with a permanent certificate who went to British Columbia, last year, Mr. Speaker, and she got a higher salary working in an office. She is not teaching school at all. And then, Mr. Speaker, he was referring to teachers' salaries and the comparisons he made went back to 1921 to make those comparisons especially after having told us about how we had been deliberately misled by comparisons that had been picked up from here and there.

That is all of this I intend to take up at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I was a bit worried when I got up to speak, I intended to say quite a little about my constituency and I was afraid, after what has been said in this debate, I might have to repeat myself to some extent. I am not so worried now, Mr. Speaker, because I am not going to repeat anybody's speech, as has been the case with the speakers this afternoon.

Excepting for a small area, Mr. Speaker, around the town of Chaplin where the crops were badly hailed, the crops in Morse constituency averaged from fairly good to excellent. But, in common with most other parts of the province, before we could get them harvested we experienced the most miserable harvest weather in the history of the province. As a result, thousands of acres of unthreshed grain lie out under the snow, and most of the grain threshed graded either tough or damp and thousands of bushels of it are lying in piles out in the fields or in open bins, and thousand of more bushels of it in granaries, Mr. Speaker. Some of this grain has already heated and spoiled, and what is going to happen to the balance of it when the warm weather hits it, I suppose, is anyone's guess, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is going to be considerably more of this grain spoil.

Now, no one that I know of, Mr. Speaker, blames the weather on any other agent but Mother Nature herself, but I can assure you that the farmers in the Morse constituency are highly incensed at the Federal Government for their failure — there I go, yes — this is a matter that I am going to deal with, Mr. Speaker, because it is a matter entirely in the field of Federal jurisdiction so I cannot very well go anywhere else to deal with it. They are highly incensed, Mr. Speaker, at the Federal Government for their failure to provide elevator space and cars so that as much as possible of this grain could be brought to the driers so that the driers could be kept working at capacity, and if this had been done, Mr. Speaker, it most certainly would have relieved this situation considerably. But, as everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, there was neither elevator space nor cars to get this grain to the driers, and the driers were not kept working at capacity. And it appears now that the farmers will probably have to absorb that loss. I do not think it is right that they should, because, as I pointed out a moment ago, the transportation problem is a problem that is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and I think it is no more than right that they should have admitted their error in not having cars ready to ship that grain, and they should offer, in some way, to compensate the farmers not only for the loss they already have taken, but for the loss that may accrue as a result of this failure on the part of the Federal Government.

It was a matter of simple calculation, Mr. Speaker, that if this grain was to be properly housed, we should first have had all of the grain cleared out of the country elevators to the lakeheads for exports, and in addition to that we would have to have more than the usual number

of cars so that we could get this bumper crop rolling as soon as possible.

The Federal Government were respectfully and repeatedly warned of this need. Our Saskatchewan Wheat Pool warned them, as did our Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, and our own Department of Agriculture. Also, our Premier himself went to considerable length in drawing this to their attention, but the warnings went unheeded with the resultant loss. They finally did wake up and appoint a transport controller, but it was too late to remedy the situation. It was a case of locking the stable door after a number of the horses had gone. Certainly, we needed a transport controller, and the farmers are most happy to have one, but he should have been appointed at least two months sooner. The farmers are hoping this will be a permanent position, Mr. Speaker, but they would have been better satisfied if the controller, or rather the appointee, had known something of the history of the farm movement and of the struggle against tremendous odds that the farmers have had to put up in the past, in order to enjoy of the rights they now have in the marketing of their grain. For example, Mr. Speaker, as you very well know, the farmers did not get the right to the car-order book system handed to them on a silver platter. No indeed, Sir. They had to put up a real scrap to get it, as you know, and the farmers feel that if this appointee had known something of this history he would not have so arbitrarily denied them this right. So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, he has not given one single good reason for having done so.

Another problem confronting the farmers in the Morse constituency, and I think in a lot of other constituencies — particularly those farmers who live close to water — is the damage done to crops by ducks. This damage has been going on for several years, but I think it really reached its peak this year. I received a number of complaints about it, and several letters, and with my own eyes I could see evidence to substantiate the farmers' complaints. One farmer who lives near Morse and farms on a fairly large scale told me that his loss due to this cause would this fall amount to several thousand dollars. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers would like to see our ducks exterminated. I think most farmers appreciate that they are a considerable asset to our province, but they do not think they should be called upon to pay such a price for this asset and they think something more than has been done should be done about it. I know that our Department of Natural Resources has been trying to find a solution to the problem. I know the solution is not an easy one to find and I think there are some international complications in connection with it but nevertheless, I think and I hope and expect that our Department will do everything they possibly can to alleviate the situation. I believe this is a question that a person could talk on for some time, Mr. Speaker, but I think I will let it go at that for the moment.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, of interest, especially to the farmers in the north and north-west corner of the Morse constituency is the hope that someday they will see a genuine start made on the Saskatchewan River dam. Now this area is a large one — they tell me there are several hundred thousand acres in that area — that can be irrigated. I know the district very well, Mr. Speaker. Most of it is very good land, but for lack of rainfall over the years they do not have much of a yield. That area, I think, comprises all the way from Central Butte, Lawson, Bridgeford, Gilroy, Grainland, Riverhurst, and the land in that district — many of you have probably been there — is neither too light nor too heavy for

irrigation purposes. It is almost ideal, and it is not any wonder that those farmers are so interested in this matter. If this irrigation project should go through, the population of that area would increase by about 40 per cent, almost overnight, and so I say, Mr. Speaker, it is of extreme interest to the people in that part of the district of the constituency, but, sad to say, Mr. Speaker, a lot of them have just about given up hopes of ever getting it. As we very well know, Mr. Gardiner has made a political football out of it — he has used it — and made it an issue in one or more elections, and it looks very much as though he intended to use it as an issue in several more.

I noticed in a radio address here on December last Dr. William Tufts of Outlook, Saskatchewan, who is President of the Saskatchewan River Development Association, gave quite a lengthy address, Mr. Speaker, but he said (I have just a few clippings out of his speech here):

“This irrigation is vitally needed in the province’s economy. He said that construction of this dam would mean irrigation of 500,000 acres of arid land, and production of one and a half times as much electrical power as is presently produced in the province.

“In this irrigated empire, there would be two families living on every quarter section — 40 to 60 per square mile, instead of three.”

One other matter of special importance to the people of Morse, Mr. Speaker, took place in June last. It was the opening of the bridge at Saskatchewan Landing across the Saskatchewan River. This bridge is a great convenience to many of the people in the west part of my constituency. It is the connecting link between the north, west and south part of the province. There has been a ferry at that point for some 68 years, but as everyone knows, that ferry is not an all-year link, and now at least we have an all-year link with that part of the province. This event, the opening of the bridge, was, Mr. Speaker, of such importance that tens of thousands of people from all over this province, and from other parts of Canada, and some of them from the United States were at the opening. This construction is evidence, Mr. Speaker, of what a progressive government can do without the usual fanfare and political manoeuvring; and without using it as a political issue in contrast to what I have just mentioned has happened to the Saskatchewan River dam; we proceeded with this bridge construction without help from Ottawa, and I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that this is the only bridge of its kind in Saskatchewan that has been built without help from Ottawa.

Our friends opposite, as you well know, Sir — when this bridge building was proposed in this legislature, they engineered what might be called delaying tactics. They gave us a lot of dire warnings of what would happen if we proceeded with its construction, and it is possible, Mr. Speaker, that the reason we did not get a grant for the building of this bridge is because Ottawa, noting this, and thinking it would not be quite “cricket” to let down their friends in this legislature who are not in favour of this bridge being built, so we did not get

February 14, 1952

the grant. However, in spite of those obstacles, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the perseverance and ingenuity of the Minister of Highways and his staff, we proceeded to build the bridge, and it is an accomplished fact today. I wish to take this opportunity also, Mr. Speaker, to compliment the member for Swift Current for the persistent and forceful manner in which he brought the need for this bridge to the legislature.

There has been exceptional activity, Mr. Speaker, in the past two or three years in the province, in the field of oil, gas and mineral development. A number of drills have been in operation during this winter, in spite of our severe winter conditions, and one of those drills is presently at work in the Morse constituency at a point some nine miles northwest of Parkbeg. We are all keeping our fingers crossed. We are hoping that oil or gas in commercial quantities will be found at this spot. This hole is only some 24 miles from the flourishing Saskatchewan Government Sodium-Sulphate plant at Chaplin, and if oil or gas is found in commercial quantities at this place, it will provide a very handy source of fuel supply for this rapidly expanding government enterprise. This plant at Chaplin, Mr. Speaker, is one of the many concrete examples of what this government has done in its attempt to diversify the economy of this province. Since this plant has been built the population of Chaplin has doubled, and business has shown a similar increase. This plant gives employment to 90 people at an average monthly pay-roll of over \$22,000.

The Premier yesterday covered the Crown Corporations pretty well. I do not wish to go into that at any length, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to point out (and I do not think the Premier pointed it out yesterday) that these new government enterprises provide work and opportunity for over 1200 people where there was no work nor opportunity before we took office and those figures exclude our power and telephone corporations. If we include the extra employees required for the greatly expanded power corporation, Mr. Speaker, we will find that these businesses give employment to over 2,000 of our people where none was to be had when we took office; and, as the Premier pointed out yesterday, aside from the economic value of those corporations to the province, they also provide a handsome cash return on the investment.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:50 o'clock, P.M.