

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
18th Day

Tuesday, March 4, 1952.

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

MOTION (for Return)

Mr. McCormack moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (a) Report of Dwight D. Hendryx re Saskatchewan Clay Products to the Government Finance Office.
- (b) Report of David Cass-Beggs to the Government or Power Corporation or Government Finance Office.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this Motion calls for the tabling of two reports. One is a report of Mr. Dwight D. Hendryx re Saskatchewan Clay Products to the Government Finance Office.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that under the rules of the House, properly speaking, reports of engineers or any other technical personnel to a Department or to a Crown Corporation, are privileged documents. That has always been understood as part of government procedure in all parliaments, because it is only natural that if technical people are to be called on to advise governments, and to make a technical assessment of a given situation, that report is for the government and for its guidance. In this particular case we have no objection whatsoever to tabling the report, but I merely make these comments in order that it may not become a precedent. The Government has the right, under the rules of the House, to claim that a document is privileged and does not care to table it.

In this case I see no reason why it should not be tabled, particularly in view of the fact that the member who is asking for it has the Clay Products Division in his constituency, and I know that he naturally takes a very great interest in that project.

Mr. McCormack: — In its progress.

Premier Douglas: — The second request is for a report of David Cass-Beggs to the Government or Power Corporation or Government Finance Office.

This is a rather complicated matter, and I am not going to weary the House with a lot of discussion. There is some argument, however, as to whom this report belongs. We will have to go back a bit to the initiation of this report. It came about as a result of a meeting of the economic representatives of the Dominion Government, Provincial Government and the Universities of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, held in

March 4, 1952

Regina April 19 and 20, 1949, to discuss the whole question of water allocation, particularly the South Saskatchewan river project.

Minute No. 4 says: "There has been a pronounced lack of information in the work which P.F.R.A. has already undertaken, and lack of co-ordination in assessing and appraising projects. There is need of a strong working contact between agencies, where jobs and projects are assigned to definite individuals who would be in a position to gather and assemble the necessary information pertaining to the project before commencing construction operations. The P.F.R.A. wants to be guided by as much information as is available."

Minute No. 11 says: "It is Dr. Thompson's belief (Mr. Thompson is head of P.F.R.A.) that with governmental organization, both Dominion and Provincial, a joint approach is essential for the future well-being of the project."

Minute No. 90 sets up a committee to study this matter, and it says at the bottom of Minute No. 88: "Further to this decision, Mr. Thompson assured the meeting that the P.F.R.A. was prepared to supply necessary funds for the hiring of additional help."

Now, out of that committee came the decision to secure the services of Mr. Cass-Beggs, who is on the staff of Toronto University, and who is a well-known authority on hydro-electric power; to secure his services to make the necessary study. That study was made and was forwarded to the P.F.R.A. Here is a letter dated June 23, 1950 to Mr. L.B. Thompson., Director. P.F.R.A.:

"I have been instructed to send you these copies of Professor Cass-Beggs' power report. by the Cabinet. This report is sent to you without comment or endorsement by the Government. Please excuse the rather lengthy delay in the completion of this report."

And in a letter of August 14, 1950, from Mr. Thompson, Director of the P.F.R.A. saying:

"Further to our discussion in my office and your presentation of the accounts of Professor Cass-Beggs for \$1,036.35, this has been approved by the Treasury Board, and I am attaching cheque herewith for \$1,036.35. Would you please convey this to the appropriate Department. I presume this will be the Economic Advisory and Planning Board."

I understand, now, that this report was paid for by the P.F.R.A. The appointment of Professor Cass-Beggs came out of a joint committee; the report was forwarded to the P.F.R.A., and my information is (I have not had time to check it) that a motion was brought down in the Federal House, about six months ago, and that the Professor Cass-Beggs' report has already been tabled in the Federal House.

However, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) wired Mr. Gardiner, asking for permission to table this report. Mr.

Gardiner replied as follows:

"Do not consider Cass-Beggs report as P.F.R.A. document but one secured by P.F.R.A. from your Government readily agree to it being tabled."

We have no objection to having it tabled, but I think it should be made clear that we want to be sure of the 'Paternity of the child'; and the information that I have given, I think, shows that it came out of discussion between the Provincial Governments of the three prairie provinces, the Power Corporation and the Federal authorities; that the report was paid for by the P.F.R.A. and it was forwarded to them and has been tabled in the House of Commons.

We shall be very glad now, of course, to have it tabled here since we have the consent of the Federal Government to do so.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the report was originally made to the Power Corporation, to Mr. Tomlinson. Is that not correct?

Premier Douglas: — No, my understanding is that the report was made for P.F.R.A. and that Mr. David Cass-Beggs operated under this committee of which Mr. Tomlinson, chairman of the Power Corporation, was chairman. He was chairman of the committee that supervised this particular subject.

Mr. McCormack: — Did he not make his report to Mr. Tomlinson?

Premier Douglas: — No, he made his report to this committee of which Mr. Tomlinson was chairman, and on that committee there was also Mr. Scamill, of the Water Rights Branch and Mr. Clipsham, Chief Engineer of the Power Corporation. He made his report to that committee, who, in turn, were securing the report for the P.F.R.A., who asked for it and who had paid for it.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Monday, March 3, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

Mr. L.M. Marion (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much of the time of the House in regard to my address this afternoon, so I am going to start right in.

The first thing I have to do, whether I want to or not, sir, is compliment the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) again, this year, as I did last year. Last Sunday, I took a trip home and, of course, I may be off the beam when I say that, and I may be right; but I met one of our school teachers up there and the first thing she said to me (she calls me 'uncle' by the way — I didn't think I looked that old: "Uncle, you did

March 4, 1952

a lot for us — we got a \$300 raise." Well, I did not want to admit that I was ignorant of the fact, but I said., "You leave it to your old uncle; he will look after you." We have got five school teachers up there, five schoolrooms, so I hope they all got a \$300 raise, whether it comes from the Revenue Tax or not.

However, I can say, truthfully, that there has been no other Minister of Education, sir, who has done as much for the north as the present one today. We have, as I said before, five schoolrooms, and 180 school-age children, so we haven't any too much room. We intend to put another one up, this year; and, as the 'uncle' of the school teacher, I will have to see the Minister of Education for a few more desks for that schoolroom. However, I do not think I need to worry too much.

In regard to roads up in the north, I see the Board of Trade in Prince Albert had an article in the "Leader-Post" a few days ago, or maybe this morning, saying that they had to go to work and go after the Government, and so forth and so on, to have a road from La Ronge north to the uranium fields. Well, that is a good thing for Prince Albert. We had a man in P.A. for years that looked after Prince Albert — a fellow by the name of Tommy Davis, Minister of the Attorney-General's Department.

I do not think Prince Albert lost anything while he was there, and we have not had anything to talk about in the northwest side of the province, and I would think the logical thing to do would be to put a road on the northwest side of the province to go up into the uranium fields. There are plenty of tourist attractions up our way, as I stated before. Prince Albert has a nice road to the National Park on to Lac la Ronge, plenty of tourists in there; I think we should get a 'break' for a change and have a road up into our northern country in the northwest side of the province. Of course, that is a subject of mine which I have always harped on, and I sincerely hope that some of these times the Government listens a little bit and gives us a road up in that country. We really need it. I hear the Minister of Natural Resources say "Hear, hear!" (I do not even have to look. I can tell by the sound of his voice).

However, I think I know why the Minister of Natural Resources says "Hear, hear!" He, at the present time, is in full control of the situation up in the northern part of the province, but I would like to hear "Hear, hear!" from the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Douglas). That "Hear, hear!" from the Minister of Natural Resources does not mean much to me.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Did you hear what I said in my speech the other day?

Mr. Marion: — Yes, I heard it; but I am from Missouri — you have to show me. I would sure like to see that road taken by the Minister of Highways and (not saying that the Minister of Natural Resources could not handle it, because he could, I believe); but if we had it in the Minister of Highways' Department, well, I believe we would have a better chance of getting a road.

Now, another favourite topic of mine is furs up in the north. I have listened to different members here in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and they have all told the House how good it was for the Government to handle the furs, muskrats especially — fur marketing. There is

something to that; it is quite all right. I see by the muskrat marketing fur service that they made \$33,000; not bad. Well, if the marketing service could just pool that money into a special pool, and after they had accumulated enough, and figure out how much each trapper would get out of this thing, and send it to him — something like the Wheat Board; I guess you farmers know what I mean — and send this money back to the trappers, that would be the best thing there is.

Another thing that I would like to see is this compulsion taken away, Mr. Speaker. I will not say much about it, but I will put it this way. We hear a lot of talk (whether it is true or not, I do not know) about muskrats bootlegged into Alberta. Well, if the price of muskrats by the Fur Marketing Board is so good, I do not see why they would have to bootleg their furs into Alberta, but I do not hear of any Alberta rats coming into Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and sold to the Saskatchewan marketing service. I do not hear of any bootlegging from Alberta into Saskatchewan — that is what I mean; but you do hear quite a bit about Saskatchewan rats going into Alberta, bootlegging. So we will leave it at that, and I sincerely hope that the Government sees fit to take this compulsion off.

The next thing., Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to announce, is that our doctor up there is going to retire at the end of March. I believe, Mr. Bentley, the hon. member for Gull Lake and Minister of Public Health, was speaking to me a few minutes ago, and has been off and on for quite a while in regard to the situation in Ile a la Crosse. We have a doctor there who has been there for quite some time. He has now reached the retirement age, and wishes to retire. There is nothing I can say that is too good, or too much, in this Legislature in regard to the work that Dr. Lavoie did for the Metis, white man and everyone concerned in the north, medically and otherwise. I am very sorry to see him go. The hon. member for Gull Lake advised me, a while ago, that he was looking for a doctor and figured that he had a young French Catholic doctor. Well, later on he advised me that he could not get one, and today he is still looking for a doctor. I know how it is. It is quite a job to find a man qualified for that work. We have the best equipped hospital we can get in the north — a 22 bed hospital, I believe, and we have also real good accommodation for this doctor — electric lights, running hot and cold water, and all that. Possibly some of our doctors that do not care to come up into the north may figure they have to go out and chop wood, and this and that — haul water, etc., but the only thing there is wrong with Ile a la Crosse is that you are a little way out from the outside world; pretty tough roads to go through — 10 to 15 hours as a rule in the summer; approximately six to eight hours in the winter, from Meadow Lake. So it is not so good that way; but by 'plane service, in a couple of hours you can be in Saskatoon, and the winter transportation is very good, They have a bombardier snowmobile for the doctor there, too, and there is available an ambulance plane any time — he has never been turned down yet; and the Saskatchewan Flying Service comes there every week and in exceptional cases he charts the machine. I certainly hope that we get a doctor up there in the north, but it would be kind of tough to find a man to replace old Doctor Lavoie.

Meadow Lake is situated 157 miles south of Ile a la Crosse — a pretty nice town. I would call it the home-town of the northwest part of the province. The C.P.R. comes in there and if we had a good road out of there, there would be nothing to it, in a few hours we could be in town.

March 4, 1952

As it is, the situation is not so good. I was very sorry to hear the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) singing his swan song as they say, that he was not going to run and so forth and so on; but I would like to state here that if the member for Meadow Lake had run, seeing that the constituency is divided as it is, I would have been behind him 100 per cent. I am very sorry to see him go, because he did his work faithfully in every way that I know and I know the member from Meadow Lake better than a lot of people do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said just about all I have to say. I do not intend to repeat myself; I have done it already, and I have done it every time I have spoken in this Legislature. We want roads up in the north. We want compulsion out of this muskrat business; and I have to thank the Minister of Education, like I have said before, for all he has done in the North. That is all I am going to say at the present time, and I intend to support the Motion.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all make brief mention, just to remind the members of the Legislature, that this week in Saskatchewan, and across Canada, is "Education Week," which was originally organized by the Canadian Teachers' Federation, I think, and since that time has been sponsored by them along with a number of other national organizations, in order to interest the people in education to a greater extent, and in order to give them whatever information was possible about our educational system and problems. We hope that many will have the opportunity to participate.

I was listening to the member from Arm River, last week, voicing the official Opposition comment on the budget. Several points it seemed to me, became very evident. It was evident, to begin with, that he spent a very considerable amount of his time in analyzing and criticizing not the address of the Provincial Treasurer when he presented his budget, this year, but the address of the Provincial Treasurer when he closed the budget debate, last year. The hon. member still does not seem to admit that there is any real improvement in the debt position in the province of Saskatchewan. The best proof — and I think perhaps we ought to reiterate it, given in the Provincial Treasurer's address. He pointed out, for example, that the total debt for the province had been reduced considerably. More important than that, he pointed out that of the debt remaining, whereas there had been an increase in the debt which was self-liquidating, or partially self-liquidating, of some \$15 million, the dead-weight debt had been reduced by some \$78 million, making an overall very considerable reduction.

The second indication of the very sound financial position of the province of Saskatchewan was in the information which he gave with regard to the rate of interest on Saskatchewan Government borrowings over the period of the last 15 months. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he pointed out that the interest rate during that period was the second lowest of any province in Canada during that period. He also pointed out that in more recent borrowings, the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba had to borrow money at a cost of 4.05 per cent for 10-year terms; but the

arrangements for our capital requirements for the next fiscal year had already been made at a rate of 4 per cent for a 20-year term.

The member also criticized the use of revenue from liquor profits in balancing the budget. He made that criticism notwithstanding the fact that in the budget of 1944, the Liberals estimated some \$2,300,000 from liquor profits in order to balance the budget which they presented at that time. It is true that, last year, we did take into consideration in our estimates, some \$7 million from liquor profits. It is also true that we also brought actually only some \$2 million of that into revenue account.

And without suggesting what services might be removed, he had some criticism of what he called 'useless' spending. As a matter of fact, I think he said that nearly all the increase in the budget could be attributed to spending on useless programmes. Then he took very good care not to mention what those useless programmes were!

The member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker), speaking later, named a number of those programmes, and named also some of the devices which had been introduced by the present Government in order to give more businesslike administration to government methods.

I want to mention just one more device which I think is worthy of special mention, and that is the Budget Bureau which has from time to time been criticized by members opposite. We were, as has been stated, the first province in Canada to organize a Budget Bureau. The Federal Government followed suit in 1947. Interesting enough, the province of British Columbia employs a private firm to do some of their work. If we were to pay our budget people on a basis comparable to what B.C. pays their private-enterprise people, the cost to the Government for their services would be \$250,000 instead of \$61,500 as it actually is.

Since this "useless organization" (so-called by the Opposition sometimes) started its surveys at the request of the departments of the Government in Saskatchewan, their recommendations have meant a savings of at least \$150,000 a year for the people of this province. I would like to give just two examples of the results of that work. As a result of a request from the Hospital Services Plan administrators, they, together with these administrators, made a survey. The result was that the administration staff for that activity alone was reduced by some 50 people — some 25 per cent. Administrative costs in that one branch run, as we have often heard, to some 4.2 per cent, and it seems to me that the Liberals in British Columbia, for instance, should use some of these useless, improvident procedures to which the members opposite refer.

A second programme carried out by this group in co-operation with the Provincial Archivist and the Public Documents Committee is one with regard to the disposition of records in the Government. This programme started some ten months ago. It has already resulted in the disposing of material which filled some 10,000 cubic feet of files; in other words, Mr. Speaker, it filled a room 100 feet long, 10 feet wide and 10 feet high. Yet disposal has been made, having proper consideration to the necessity and the value of keeping many of those documents. It has freed for other use some 8,000 Shannon files, some 145 filing cabinets. In one office the clerical

March 4, 1952

time was reduced, for filing, by 50 per cent. Already, only 10 months after starting, that has been done. Already, one of our other provinces in Canada has written to us for information with regard to that programme. Once again it can be said, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan leads in implementing good business procedures in government.

Now the official critic of the Opposition also undertook to rather scold the Provincial Treasurer for being critical of the financial arrangements made by Ottawa with regard to this province. He seemed to think that we should not be critical, because our subsidies are not on the basis of fiscal need. Well, if one looks up the recommendations made by the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan in 1938 to the Rowell-Sirois Commission, one can find quotations of this kind — and I read an excerpt from page 321 and 322 of that submission:

"Granting that the burden of certain social services, such as the payment of old-age pensions, will be assumed by the Dominion Government, the conclusions remain that the subsidy presently payable to Saskatchewan must be increased."

Later on they say:

"Nevertheless, even though the Dominion assumes such obligations as are suggested, the increase in the subsidy must be substantial."

They went on to say"

"This matter (that is the amount of the subsidy) must be determined on the basis of the fiscal need of the province."

They went on to point out that this increased subsidy was not, in any sense, a gift. It was merely compensation to the people of Saskatchewan because of the injurious effects of the national policy over the years.

Now, apparently it was all right for Liberals in 1938 to say that they wanted subsidies on the basis of need, but it is all wrong for the C.C.F. in 1952 to say that we want subsidies on the basis of fiscal need. When we make that statement, the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) accuses us of ingratitude.

Now I should like to emphasize that if a subsidy on the basis of need was not in any way a gift at that time, then the present subsidy, which is in part an exchange for wide taxing powers in the province is indeed less a gift. And while that money comes to us through the medium of the Dominion Government it rightfully belongs to the Government and to people of Saskatchewan. I think it is worthwhile pointing out that, at this time, when the subsidy was asked for by the Liberal Government, it was after they had asked the Federal Government to take the entire responsibility for old-age pensions; to consider a plan for pensions to all persons of 65 or over, regardless of means; to build and maintain a Trans-Canada Highway and a highway from the U. S. border to the National Park; to

assume the full burden of all direct relief; to consider a scheme of national health insurance, and many other types of assistance.

We are not supposed to be critical of Federal grants for doing less than they asked for in 1938. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Arm River would have us look east to Ottawa each morning, bow three times, and give thanks to the great gods that reside in Ottawa. Any Provincial government, and any opposition in Saskatchewan, which takes seriously its responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan, must continue to urge on the Federal Government subsidies on the basis of need; 100 per cent Federal responsibility for Trans-Canada Highways; old-age pensions at a lower age level; national health insurance and other essentials, if Saskatchewan is to be adequately compensated for financial loss resulting from national fiscal policy.

That urging, Mr. Speaker, that urging by the present Government will continue even though the Opposition call it ingratitude to a benevolent Liberal Government in Ottawa. I take it from the remarks of the official financial critic that a Liberal Government would not so urge, and that I suggest is just one more reason why the Liberal Party cannot be properly entrusted with the responsibility of government in Saskatchewan.

Considerable was said by the same member with regard to the Public Revenue Tax. It seems to me that he overlooked entirely this extremely important fact. We are not imposing a new tax of two mills. It is a tax which was imposed years ago, and which has been used in this province as government revenue, has been used by governments to do as they like with, to spend where and how they themselves determine; and certainly no preceding Liberal government ever gave any consideration to municipalities when they were spending it. It was imposed by the Liberals, and used by them in that way. The Conservatives continued to use it in that way, and the present Government has continued to use it in that way. He overlooked entirely a statement in the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report that:

"Three years would, in the opinion of your Committee, be a reasonable period in which to implement the proposals."

Now, we propose, Mr. Speaker, legislation which will guarantee for the first time that all of this money goes back to the municipalities through the medium of school grants. We propose that at this time, and we propose it as an interim arrangement. The Provincial Treasurer, in his budget speech clearly said: "We propose not to eliminate the tax at this time," and the phrase, "at this time" was repeated a few paragraphs later.

The Municipal Affairs Minister and the Premier reiterated the nature of the interim arrangement insofar as the Public Revenue Tax was concerned, last Friday, in this House. The situation is that the municipalities then can look forward to the time when they have increased school grants, and also have the Public Revenue Tax repealed.

This matter of distribution, Mr. Speaker, is the same principle, after all, which we find in our larger school units. The property tax from one highly assessed district may, in part, be used to pay for

March 4, 1952

educational services carried out in a low assessed district about 75 miles away. I wonder if the Liberals argue that this policy is wrong! I wonder if that had been the basis of some of their disagreements with the larger unit policy!

The effect (and I think this needs emphasizing) of education is, after all, not confined to the area in which one's education is received. People do move, these days, across municipal boundaries in the course of day-to-day life. Many people from outside points do business in, and otherwise participate in building, communities like Saskatoon and Regina. Many people educated in one area live later in other areas, and those areas receive the benefit, or lack of benefit, of the education received in their previous area. People in one municipality do work with people in other municipalities to operate co-operatives, union hospitals, health regions, and a host of other activities, and the money raised in one municipality and spent in a neighbouring less-fortunate municipality is certainly not lost to the first municipality. There is, after all, nothing protective and nothing sacred in this regard about municipal boundaries. The effect of education is a collective effect, and good education and poor education in any part of Saskatchewan ultimately affects property values in every part of Saskatchewan. A better standard of education in the larger unit of Meadow Lake is added security for the property owners of Regina, just as it is for the property owners of Meadow Lake.

I want to turn, now, to say something about the basis of distribution of this additional \$1,600,000 of school grants. First of all, the new rates will all be effective as from January 1, 1952. It has already been announced that a part of this money is paid out by virtue of increasing the flat grant for elementary classrooms. Each classroom (elementary) will receive an additional grant of 50 cents a day, or \$100 a year. That increases their flat grant from \$300 a year to \$400 a year. The increase in the flat grant, you will note, is not proposed for secondary rooms. The reason for that is that the secondary rooms already receive a flat grant of \$700 a year, and the disparity between \$700 and \$300 was, we felt, too great.

Secondly, the majority of the money is being spent in an equalization manner. I turn first of all to the changes proposed with regard to the equalization grants in larger school units. Our formula at the moment is this: We compute a programme cost in the larger unit by considering \$2,100 for every elementary classroom; \$2,200 for every high-school classroom, and a comparable amount for conveying district. Then we compute the income which that unit receives from ordinary grants at the rate of \$300 per elementary classroom; \$700 for every high-school classroom; we add to that amount the income which would be derived from taxation at the rate of 11 mills on rural property, and 15 mills on urban property. If the operating cost so derived is greater than the income so derived, the equalization grant makes up the difference. We get our new basis by adjusting the figures. We calculate an operating cost of \$2,400 for each elementary classroom, \$2,500 for each high school classroom. The income from grants will now be computed on the basis of \$400 for each elementary classroom and still \$700 for each high-school classroom. We add to that income the income which would be derived from taxes at the rate of 12 mills on rural assessments and 16 mills on urban assessments. If the operating cost arrived at on this basis is greater than the income, the equalization grant will make up the difference.

Now I can give some indication to the members, Mr. Speaker, as to how this will affect some of the units at least. I would like to point out that the figures I give will be the difference between the amount which would be paid under the present formula for 1951 and the amount which would be paid if the new formula had been in effect. That is, I give the amounts if operating conditions remain the same. Any considerable change in assessment, or any change in the number of operating rooms will, of course, change that amount. Here are just a few of the increases which will be made as a result of this new formula. May I again caution that these cannot be altogether correct, but they are pretty close to it.

In Broadview, it appears that, for the Broadview unit, the increase will be some \$19,000 — almost two mills in taxation. In Weyburn, it appears that the increase will be some \$7,500 — about one-half a mill; in Radville, \$21,000 — a little more than 2 mills; in Milestone, \$8,000 — about 4/10 of a mill only; in Kamsack, \$20,000 — 2 mills and over; in Nipawin, \$32,000 — some 2 1/2 mills there; in Medstead, some \$22,000 or about 4 mills of taxation; in Meadow Lake, some \$28,000 — an amount which is equal to approximately 5 mills of taxation on their assessment.

It may be noted that the average assessment for classrooms in the Meadow Lake unit is approximately \$47,000. The assistance to a non-unit rural district, which I will explain in a moment, with an assessment of \$47,000, would be an amount of money equal to 7 mills of taxation.

I turn now to the non-unit districts. Here again, of course, they all get the increase of \$100 a year in the flat grant. In 1944, the equalization grant applicable to rural and village districts was at the rate of a maximum of \$1.50 per day. May I say that it was only at that time applicable to rural and village districts; towns or cities did not receive any equalization grant. The maximum that could be obtained by rural districts in 1944 in equalization grants was \$1.50 per day. That maximum, according to the 1952 formula, will be \$6 a day, or four times as great as the maximum equalization grant payable in 1944. A school district earning that in 1944 would have earned \$600 a year; that school district now, in 1952, will earn \$1,600 a year. We increased the equalization grant in 1947, and we included towns for the first time. We increased the equalization grant for rural schools, village schools and towns in 1950. In 1952, these are all going to be increased again, and cities are being included for the first time.

Now, the method we have to use in cities is slightly different from the method which can be used in other school districts. The difference arises because of the fact that in cities, and in some towns, we have a secondary school assessment superimposed on the assessment of the public school, or of the public school and the separate school, as the case may be. Consequently, it is not quite as neat a problem in arithmetic. What we propose to do is this: we will take the total taxable assessment for school purposes, that is, the assessment of the public school, or of the public school plus the separate school, if that is the situation. We would divide that assessment by the total number of rooms — the public school rooms plus separate school rooms, plus collegiate rooms, and we will thereby get what would call an average assessment per classroom; \$120,000 per classroom is the assessment, above which the equalization grant will not be paid.

March 4, 1952

Classrooms with an assessment below that will receive an equalization grant of 12 mills times the difference between their assessment and \$120,000. This again will be paid on behalf of each public schoolroom, and separate schoolroom and each collegiate schoolroom. For example, if the average assessment comes out to be \$100,000, the equalization grant will be paid at the rate of 12 mills on the assessment of \$120,000 minus \$100,000 or \$20,000. That would provide an equalization grant of \$240 per room. If you have a city with 100 public schoolrooms and an average assessment of \$100,000, the public school district would receive \$24,000; with separate schoolrooms numbering 50 they would receive \$12,000; with 75 collegiate rooms they would receive \$18,000.

There is one proviso which I want to mention. If the average assessment works out to be less than \$75,000 per classroom, then we calculate an equalization grant as if the assessment were \$75,000 per classroom. This means that a maximum equalization grant which can be earned in the town or in the city will be \$540 per annum. None of the cities, may I say, earn the maximum.

Turning to towns, I have already commented that they were included previously for purposes of equalization. We calculate now their equalization on this basis: 12 mills on the difference between their assessment per classroom and \$105,000. We propose to make this change to put them on the same basis I have just described for cities. We will pay an equalization grant determined by taking the difference between their assessment and \$120,000 and multiplying that by 12 mills. The maximum equalization grant payable to towns previously was \$360 per room; the maximum equalization grant payable, in 1952, will be \$340 per room, or an increase of \$180 per classroom. Towns in which secondary schools are organized, together with public schools, or public and separate schools, are calculated on the same basis as in cities.

In the rural and village schools the present formula provides an equalization grant on the basis of 12 mills times the difference between their assessment per room and \$105,000. If the assessment in this group of schools is less than \$25,000 per classroom, \$25,000 is the assessment used. In 1952, the basis will be 12 mills times the difference between the average assessment per classroom and \$125,000. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that for the rurals and villages, we use \$125,000; and for the towns and cities, \$120,000. The maximum equalization grant which a rural school could receive, in 1951, was \$960; under the arrangement of 1952, it will be able to receive \$1,200 of equalization grant.

Consolidated schools will receive an equalization grant for classroom operation on the same basis as villages or towns, as the case may be. In 1951, the conveyance grant for consolidated schools was calculated on the basis of one-third of the driver's wages. We propose to introduce for the first time an element of equalization regarding this conveyance grant. If the assessment of the consolidated school is greater than \$125,000 per classroom, we will still pay just one-third of the driver's wages; but if the assessment is less than \$125,000 per classroom, we will pay one-half of the driver's wages as a grant. Schools which are closed and conveying their children could previously earn a maximum grant of \$1.50 per day, and will now be able to earn a maximum grant of \$2.00 per day.

May I ask that the members note particularly three groups of figures. The maximum equalization grant payable to towns or cities is \$540 per room; the maximum equalization grant payable for rural schools is \$1,200 per room. Fortunately we have very few rural schools with an assessment low enough to earn that. Because of the concentration of students in the city, it is possible for a city district to give services equal to services of a rural district at less cost; consequently, a difference in the amount of equalization grant payable. In other words, educational standards can be achieved in a city or a town with the expenditure of less money per person than they can be achieved in a rural area.

Secondly, I want to note that the maximum increase in equalization grants for town schools is \$180 per classroom. The total maximum increase is the flat grant plus that figure, or \$280. In rural schools the maximum equalization grant increase is \$60 more; the total maximum increase here is \$340. I would like to point out that this will provide to Prince Albert, as has been mentioned before in the Legislature, increased assistance to the extent of something in addition to 4 mills of taxation. It will provide for the public school district in the town of Melville an increase of something in the neighbourhood of 3 mills of taxation. In other districts with a higher assessment, the increase is, of course, less. In the city of Regina, for example, the pooled assessment is \$150,000 per classroom. Their increase is restricted to the increase in the flat grant. But I would remind the members of the Legislature that even so, the increase in grants to elementary schools in the city of Regina has, since 1944, been \$220 per year. They are now getting a grant in their elementary schools of more than twice the amount which they received previously.

I would like to look, just for a moment, at what the total grants received by districts under certain circumstances will be. Let us consider, first of all, the town or city school district with an assessment of \$100,000 per classroom. Elementary rooms in that city or town will receive a total grant of \$640 per year, or 6.4 mills. High school rooms will receive \$904 per year, or an amount equal to 9.4 mills of taxation. Vocational rooms will receive \$1,290 per year, or 12.9 mills. If the assessment is \$75,000 the elementary room will receive \$940, or 12.5 mills; the high school room \$1,240, or 16.8 mills; the vocational room \$1,590, or 21.2 mills.

Considering now a rural or village classroom with an assessment of \$50,000, we find that the elementary room grant will be \$1,300 or an amount equal to 26 mills of taxation. A high school room will be \$1,600, or 32 mills of taxation. If the assessment is \$25,000, that district will now earn a total grant of \$1,600, or an amount equal to the amount which would be produced by a levy of 64 mills of taxation. The increase in grants to this group, this year, can mean as much as 13.6 mills, and will mean 6 or 7 mills to many districts.

That gives us a distribution of this type, Mr. Speaker: approximately \$1 million goes to the school districts in the units; approximately \$600,000 goes to the school districts outside the units. May I say that it is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy, the proportion which goes to rural districts and to urban districts. That is because of these facts. Village and town districts, after all, include substantial amounts of rural assessment. It is true because of the fact that in units

March 4, 1952

it is all pooled and any breakdown is impossible. I think that we must not forget that rural youngsters are served by urban schools. That is particularly true of the high schools. And again, I would point out that the rurals can earn a much greater equalization grant by virtue of a lower assessment used and by virtue of a higher maximum assessment used.

I would like to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that this money was previously used by governments for general government purposes as the government willed. I would like to emphasize again the interim use of the money in this way, and that in the interim it is all going back to the municipalities through the school districts. And I would like to emphasize that, because of those facts, the proper basis of comparison is not whether 2 mills goes back to each school district, but rather that all of them are getting back more than they got before — an amount which will vary from \$100 a year upwards, totalling an additional \$1,600,000 in school grants. This, plus what a number of districts will receive in taxes on commercial Crown property, adds up to a fairly substantially increased assistance to education.

I would like to spend some time now in discussing some comparative school finances. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that when I spoke in the previous debate in this House, the press awarded me some sort of honourable mention because of the yards of statistics that I used. If I had even earned a slight mention because of the length of statistics at that time, I am not certain what I should deserve as a result of some miles of statistics on this occasion. But I want to make some comparison of the estimates presented in this Legislature by a Liberal Government in 1944, the last Liberal budget presented in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to apologize for going back to 1945 because, after all, that was not a depression year. That was the time when, according to the members opposite, Saskatchewan was in the greatest flower of its promising youth. I go back to it for another reason: because the only real test of the sincerity of the members opposite is what they did and what they were prepared to do when they had a chance to do it. Everything that they say today must be measured against the backdrop of what they actually did when they had that chance for so many years in this province.

I want to consider first of all the revenue to the Education Fund as it is shown in the estimates for the year 1944-45 presented in this House by a Liberal Government. At this time the interest on the investment of principal moneys of the School Lands Fund, other School Land revenue and the Education Tax produced some \$4,600,000. They provided in those estimates, of course, for some money with regard to school grants and some direct assistance to taxpayers by furnishing free readers. These two items they planned would cost them \$3,200,000. I think that was an over-estimate, because, the year previous, they had planned to spend some \$2,800,000, I think, on school grants and they actually spent some \$200,000 less. They had not made any preparation to spend any substantial amount more. But we give them credit for planning to spend the total amount of some \$3,200,000. Well, let us look at those figures. Let us remember some of the criticism of the members opposite for not using the Education Tax in increased grants, when we look at them. They received \$4,600,000, or they planned to, in that year. They planned to spend for these purposes some \$3,200,000. In other words, after paying for school grants and free

readers they had left \$1,300,000 to be used for some other purposes. May I ask, didn't the schools in those days need more money? Most certainly they did. Were teachers' salaries adequate? Most certainly they were not. Were teachers' salaries all being paid even? Mr. Speaker, they were not. And yet for school grants and assistance in that year, they estimated to spend some 70 per cent of those Education Tax revenues.

Well, let us look at the budget presented, the other day, by the Provincial Treasurer. Interest on School Land moneys is down somewhat. Only a couple of years ago the Federal Government decreased the interest rate paid into that fund and we lost some \$125,000 a year, I think, because of that. Other School Land revenue is, however, up. Here is a new item that did not appear at that time — interest on the Education Fund investment. You know the "prudent and provident" Liberal Government we had in those days failed to invest millions of dollars of Education Tax money. They left it in the bank, drawing three-quarters of one per cent interest! They could have invested those millions of dollars in Victory Bonds, made a contribution to the war programme and earned 3 per cent interest while doing so. But they never thought about doing it. We get into that fund two-thirds of the Education and Hospitalization Tax. That would have been more if we had left the tax on all the articles on which they imposed that tax. That total, Mr. Speaker, comes out to some \$7,600,000. You will remember the total they received from those sources was \$4,600,000. We got about \$3 million more, or about 1 3/4 times as much.

Now let us look at the other side of the picture — the assistance to school districts and taxpayers generally that we propose to pay: General school grants over \$8 million; building grants, \$500,000; building and equipment, vocational facilities, \$200,000; education in Northern Saskatchewan, \$141,000; school readers, \$65,000; free texts, \$100,000 — which adds up, Mr. Speaker, to a total of over \$9 million that we propose to spend directly through school boards or services to the ratepayers, such as free texts; \$9 million as compared to \$3,200,000 by the previous Government. But we must subtract from that \$9 million, \$65,000 which will be paid by the Dominion Government and for our purposes, today, let us subtract \$1,600,000 that is provided by the Public Revenue Tax, and we are still left with \$7,385,400. That amount is twice the amount which the Liberals promised to spend in 1944-45; it is more than 2 1/2 times the amount that they actually spent in 1943-44. This amount, may I point out, Mr. Speaker, is three-quarters of a million dollars greater than the proceeds of the Education Fund mentioned above. This amount is 97 per cent of those proceeds. They planned to spend 70 per cent of those Education Fund proceeds from the same source on grants and free books. That comparison, Mr. Speaker, of 97 to 70 per cent is a comparison of the willingness of a Liberal Government in office to provide assistance to education to the willingness of the present Government to provide assistance to education. May I suggest that the apparent willingness of Liberals out of office must be discounted accordingly.

In addition, I mention this. We have to find \$2 million to provide for other educational services out of the revenues of the province. In 1944-45, the Education Fund receipts mentioned above paid the entire cost of the Department of Education and left them with a surplus of \$48,400. And if you include the charges of the industrial School, the Dominion Grants,

March 4, 1952

that surplus would have been \$100,000. They paid everything from the proceeds of the Education Tax which I have mentioned, and had left \$100,000. We pay in grants and assistance all that came from that tax, from those sources, all of it plus 7 per cent more; we pay \$1,600,000 from the Public Revenue Tax we spend in addition to that \$2,500,000. We will in addition provide \$400,000 in loans to school districts; \$80,000 in Student Aid. We will spend \$789,000 on university buildings out of the Public Works budget, Members from the opposite side of the House, Mr. Speaker, will say, "What about Federal grants?" Well, what about Federal grants?

From 1944-45 to 1952-53 there is an increase in Federal subsidies of some \$14,600,000. We have to subtract from that succession duties, because the province was then collecting succession duties; we are not now. So we subtract \$315,000, and we get an increase of \$14,258,000: \$14 million increase, Mr. Speaker. In 1944-45, the Public Health estimates presented to this House amounted to \$3,100,000. That includes expenditures of about \$1 million under Public Works for mental hospitals; \$3,100,000. In 1952-53, the estimates of the Department of Public Health propose to spend of provincial money \$18 million — the difference of 18 to 3, or \$15 million, which equals the increase of Federal subsidy in one department alone. I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that money includes some \$3 million from the Hospitalization Tax but I point out again that the 2 per cent tax on the basis on which the Liberals levied it, would have raised almost as much as the 3 per cent tax on the present basis. And I would remind that I am not mentioning increases in Social Welfare or in Highways and I think we must not forget that many of these expenditures, as the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report said, had substantially relieved municipalities of their obligations. The \$15 million increase in subsidy then, taken care of by the increase in one department alone. And the members for the Opposition do not get up and ask for any fewer health services nor do they suggest any cheaper way of providing those health services.

Anyway, regardless of that \$15 million increase in one department, let us see what the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report had to say about these Federal subsidies — and I quote from page 136:

"It is sometimes argued that a portion of this margin of improvement should be specifically allocated toward increases in the provincial contribution toward local services, such as education and road improvement. Manitoba is sometimes held up as an example because Manitoba specifically earmarked \$300,000 from the tax agreement income to be paid in the form of grants to local units for the support of welfare services.

"As compared with other provinces the Municipalities of Manitoba would require much more than the \$300,000 annual contribution to place them in a preferred position in terms of provincial support to local welfare services.

"While the Saskatchewan Government has earmarked no specific part of the tax, as revenues for the support of local services, these funds have supported a large measure of expansion of direct and indirect expenditures of the Government on welfare services."

And this, Mr. Speaker, I think is a most important sentence: "If specific allocations were to be considered, the increase in provincial educational grants, introduced in 1950, might be regarded as absorbing a substantial proportion of Saskatchewan Tax Agreement benefits."

The member for Arm River argues for more grants to education. May I say that the action of the Government of which he was one of the members, when they had additional money, as I have just shown, rather belied the sincerity of his urging. In the face of those facts which I have placed on the record, Mr. Speaker, Liberals out of office continued to insult the intelligence of Saskatchewan people by trying to convince them that Liberals in office would provide more generously for education. Fortunately, the people of Saskatchewan have memories.

I want to turn, now, to some discussion of the larger unit programme in the province of Saskatchewan. I realize, however, that not much comment is needed on this programme. Their performance after all and their acceptance by the people argue for them far more eloquently than can I. During 1945 and 1946, 45 units were established in the province on the basis that a vote for disorganization could be taken if, within six months after a trial period of five years, 15 per cent of the ratepayers petitioned. In no other place in Canada has this opportunity been provided. The ratepayers of some five units petitioned for a vote and in each case, of course, the unit was sustained. May I say again that this is a remarkable tribute to the ability and the energy of our unit boards, the co-operation of most of the local boards, and the willingness and the ability of Saskatchewan people to work together, sometimes at higher individual cost, to do a worthwhile job.

The building programme in those units continued during the year. They provided for 131 new classrooms. The non-units, may I say, provided some 60 classrooms during the year. Since 1945 or since 1946 when some of them were organized, the units have built about 1,000 new classrooms — over 900 new classrooms. That means that, if you were to line all these classrooms up along the highway, better than one out of every five of them would be new classrooms since 1945 and 1946. Substantial numbers of the others have had major repairs effected, and they have accomplished this not only during a period of tremendously high costs, but they have accomplished it while at the same time reducing their debenture indebtedness of other buildings. They had a heritage of indebtedness, Mr. Speaker, a heritage left to them by the three scourges of Saskatchewan — depression, war, and a Liberal Government.

One of the most interesting and effective developments in the unit is that of planned satisfactory conveyance methods bringing youngsters from two or more districts to some central point. The units own some 76 transportation units — buses, converted panel trucks and bombardiers; 44 private vehicles are under contract. Nearly 3,000 pupils from 191 classrooms are being conveyed. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the advantages of that kind of a programme are self-evident. I want to enumerate some of them. Recognizing the fact that the school with the small enrolment does not provide the child with the opportunity to work and play with others of his age-group, the educational environment is improved by attendance at a larger probably graded school.

March 4, 1952

The youngster travelling in a bus which is properly equipped and operated, is in general under no greater hardship and in many cases indeed less hardship than if he were travelling to his own rural school by his own devices or by those of his parents. And quite probably he does not have to leave home any earlier in the morning and does not get back any later at night.

Rural youngsters in these districts where this service is provided can attend high school without having to live away from home. In some instances students who formerly had high school opportunity at a one-room high school in which probably grades 8 to 12 were being taught, have been able to go to some of our new composite schools. I could give examples such as in Rosetown of Eatonia. The problem of supplying adequate library service and other equipment is greatly relieved.

The same number of teachers can serve more pupils and that is tremendously important. The chance of retaining teachers in the profession is greatly improved, and that is considerably important.

The experience to date indicates that in spite of roads and weather and other Saskatchewan conditions, the attendance of the youngsters in school today is as good as the average. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important reason; that this system does provide the needs whereby people can stay on the farm and still have better educational opportunities for their youngsters. The larger units are now getting into a position to cope with this important problem. The insinuation has frequently been made in this House by members of the Opposition — in particular my friend from Arm River — that it is this Government and the larger units that are solely and entirely and completely responsible for closing schools. They make the insinuation that there were no closed schools before 1944. Mr. Speaker, as far back as 1943, one year before this Government came into office, two years before our policies could have had any effect, there were 525 rural districts closed, and their youngsters being conveyed by parents. If this indicates ruination of education, then there was a lot of ruining done before there were any larger units or a C.C.F. Government.

There were at that time 174 districts operating with an enrolment of less than 7; there were 700 districts operating with an enrolment of less than 10. Certainly there were more schools closed before 1944 than have been closed under this Government.

I want to turn now to something in which all members of the House will be generally pleased, Mr. Speaker. During the year we have, for the first time, received from the Federal Government financial aid to our University. The basis of providing this aid, of determining it, was at the rate of 50 cents per person in the province, or in each province. It is distributed within the province on a basis of enrolment in those institutions in the province giving courses at post grade 12 level and which either grant a degree or are affiliated with a degree-granting institution in Canada. The per-student grant in Saskatchewan works out to about \$180, I believe. The following Saskatchewan institutions share in this grant, with the major portion going to the University of Saskatchewan: the University of Saskatchewan; Campion College in Regina; Luther College and

seminary, Regina; St. Thomas Moore College, Saskatoon — I might say that St. Thomas Moore have turned their entire grant over to the University of Saskatchewan; St. Andrews' College; Emmanuel College; Luther Theological Seminary; St. Peter's College at Muenster; Sacred Heart College in Regina; the college at Gravelbourg; Notre Dame College at Wilcox; the College at Lebret; St. Thomas College at North Battleford, and St. Chad's College in Regina. The Government of Saskatchewan appreciate this. I do want to say that we had no opportunity to participate in making the decisions other than the opportunity to refuse the assistance for those institutions which are state supported. While we do appreciate it genuinely, may I make this remark — that it does not even nibble at adequate Federal assistance for education as was recommended in the Cronkite-Britnell-Jacobs report as the only way we could get adequate equalization in the province. We do trust that other recommendations of the Massey Commission will be implemented as time goes on.

I notice again that the financial critic of the Opposition dragged out a somewhat hoary argument that the Education Tax should not be spent on University buildings. It seems to me a queer sort of an argument, Mr. Speaker, that you can take the money and use it for teaching at the University, or use it for research at the University (most of which is not even remotely connected with day-to-day education) but you must not use it to provide facilities so that you can teach or carry out the research. But since he raised the subject, the buildings at the University which have been provided in recent years are worthy of mention: an extension to the College of Engineering which provides more classroom space generally; the Medical College, which will play such an important part in the health programme of the province; the gymnasium — the gymnasium previously was a room which had originally been designed as a dining room; the School of Agriculture to provide classroom facilities and dormitory facilities for young people from rural areas; the Soils and Dairy labs, and the grain elevators, the last three closely connected with agriculture in the province. And I want to say these represent legitimate expenditures of education. What better investment could we make? The university, of course, continues its fine service to the people of the province in teaching and research into agricultural and natural resources subjects, in cancer work. The work on the construction of the hospital is proceeding. The new Dean (one whom, I think, we are very fortunate to get), Dr. Wendell McLeod, has been already employed and is already at work. The opening of that medical school, providing a complete medical course for Saskatchewan students, together with the services of the hospital, will be another great milestone in the history of Saskatchewan people in providing for themselves fine, outstanding health services.

The Dominion-Provincial short courses continue to provide opportunity for bringing some scientific information to many of our rural people. These are courses which are paid for by the Dominion and the province jointly. They are supervised by the Department of Education, even though the Minister of Agriculture is very interested; they are directed by university personnel employed by us during winter months for this purpose. Courses were held during the year at some 25 points, and arrangements at these points were made by local organizations who sponsor the courses and make them possible at that point. Many of the instructors are farmers who have had a degree in Agriculture at the university. Members, I think, will be interested in two new courses that have been added in recent

March 4, 1952

years, one in farm mechanics at Saskatoon, and one just recently added in rural electrification, so that they may get opportunities to learn estimating, wiring, use and maintenance of electrically-operated equipment. The Power Corporation is participating fully in that programme.

Since our last meeting five new composite schools in the province have been brought into operation. Construction at Canora and Kamsack (two others), is now under way. There is a new wing being added to the Moose Jaw Technical School. Three of our composite schools, I am pleased to say, are so crowded that they are already having to plan for an extension.

In the Northern Administration points, our enrolment increased by 10 per cent from June, 1950 to June, 1951. They now have an enrolment in those schools of over 1,500 pupils. The interesting fact about it, Mr. Speaker, is that, in 1945 nearly all of these pupils were in the lower elementary school grades. By June, 1951, they had 93 taking grades 7 and 8, 24 taking grades 9, 10 and 11 in schools in the north and 10 of them taking high school work outside. All of us are gratified at that interest in high school education.

Assistance under the Dominion-Provincial Agreement for Vocational Education was also secured from the Federal Government to add to our vocational facilities at the School for the Deaf. This was the assistance noted in the public accounts which the hon. member from Arm River thought should not be included as capital assistance. As a result of these new vocational features, our graduates up there will have open to them new fields of employment. May I say that we have an institution in our School for the Deaf of which all of us can be justifiably proud. I would hope that Members of the Legislature, when they are in Saskatoon, would take the opportunity of visiting that institution, and they will be very welcome indeed.

Various provincial organizations requested and received assistance from the Adult Education Branch in conferences and institutes held at some further points in the province. These organizations included the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, Home and School Associations, the Munroe wing of the Regina General Hospital, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool field staff, the Co-op Farm Conference, and others. I would like to take the time to read a few statements which some of these people have made. I received, just last week, a letter from the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada who are organizing in Saskatchewan some institutes, and the writer said this in her opening paragraph:

"I was most delighted to learn from the Canadian Association for Adult Education

(She did not learn it from us, Mr. Speaker; she learned it from the parent body for adult education in Canada.)

". . . that the most advanced approach for group discussion methods in Canada is to be found in your Department."

And I will read from a pamphlet which many of you will receive in which some people said what they thought about the kind of service we can

give them through adult education:

"We appreciate and are grateful for the contribution to our work through such co-operative projects as the United Church Rural Life School . . . "

- signed by the Rev. R.W.K. Elliott, Superintendent of Missions, United Church of Canada.

Or this statement from Dr. McKerracher:

"I would like to express my thanks for the contribution made to the activities of the Psychiatric Services Branch. It would take too long to enumerate its contributions to morale and improved assurance, but I assure you that the help has been deeply appreciated."

And other statements follow from Mr. Powers, the President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Home and School; Mr. Mader, Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Stutt, country organization department of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Just recently, too, I received this letter, Mr. Speaker, from Dr. Friesen who is the director of public relations for the Manitoba Pool Elevator Company. He said:

"I have recently returned from the second annual Wheat Pool Workshop held at your university, two weeks ago. It was a memorable experience for the five participants from our staff. Much credit is due your Adult Education Branch for giving guidance in the field of community training which Saskatchewan is pioneering.

The Saskatchewan Arts Board, for which the Department of Education supplies secretarial service and to which it makes a grant, continues to make a contribution to the cultural life of the province, and I think members should be interested in some of the activities of that group during the year. In order to stimulate and recognize the work of Saskatchewan artists, an exhibition of their work was arranged. Some 1,200 people saw this exhibition during Exhibition Week in Regina. A number of the works were then loaned by the artists and travelling exhibitions, were sent around throughout the province and some of the works were purchased. Assistance was given to the arranging and judging of handicraft festivals at two points in the province — Gravelbourg and Kerrobert. A short course or a workshop in handicrafts was sponsored and enthusiastically supported by the people of Wilkie and community. This type of work will be increased during the year. Arrangements were made to provide an opportunity for outstanding Saskatchewan musicians to be heard by Saskatchewan citizens and to perform; three concert series were arranged for piano and vocal and string music performance. Some 30 Saskatchewan communities were visited by these artists. In drama, a workshop was held at the Fort Qu'Appelle Valley Centre. Interested people came from many parts of the province and went back to their communities equipped to give better leadership. I want to say "thanks" to the members of the Arts Board for their fine work. With a minimum of support and leadership, the people of Saskatchewan will continue to develop in these fields. May I say that the growth of the people is

March 4, 1952

marked by many milestones in addition to oil wells or power lines, important as they may be.

The Physical Fitness and Recreation Branch of my Department continues to give valuable assistance in coaching, and the organization of physical recreational activities, drama and related activities. One interesting project, this year, was the organization, in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association, of regional schools for hockey coaches and referees. Some 520 people attended at 10 points in the province; 121 towns were represented and each of these 121 towns will, as a result, Mr. Speaker, have somebody there a little more competent to give better leadership to the boys and the men of that community. The opportunity to work with the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association, and their own contribution, is greatly appreciated.

Work on the revision of our elementary school curriculum has continued. We are seeking and getting widespread participation from many people in addition to just teachers and our own staff. It is a tremendous task to get this participation, but it is tremendously important.

I want to mention briefly the Regional Library which comes under my supervision. The first Regional Library on the Canadian prairies came into being on April 5, 1950. It is not yet two years old. In December, 1950, it had ordered 8,000 books. By December 1951, 9 branch libraries had been opened in communities which never before had had libraries. In addition, branches were operating in Prince Albert and Melfort. May I read just a short paragraph from a CBC radio address given by Peter McLintock on May 8, 1951 — Mr. McLintock had been present on the day when one of these new branches was opened. He said:

"Organization and finances, important as they are, are pretty dull stuff. The interesting part of the service is the human side, the way people's faces light up when they run their eyes over hundreds of brand new books, the reading of which is theirs for the asking.

"Like at the village of Domremy last week when the branch library opened there in the local co-op store. One minute after Miss Gilroy and her assistant opened the library, a young lad had borrowed a book on baseball. Another was away with Roger Peterson's 'Field Guide to Western Birds.' A primary teacher left with a copy of 'Little Red Hen', while another took Scott's 'Last Expedition'.

"All told, some 64 cards were issued that afternoon, and the people of Domremy agreed that the regional library will fill a real need in their lives."

And the cost to the local people, Mr. Speaker, was 12 1/2 cents per year for each person in the rural municipality, and 37 1/2 cents for each person in urban municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity and pleasure on some eight different occasions of listening to the present Provincial Treasurer

present his budget address. On each occasion he has presented an encouraging budget. Well, again this year, he has presented a plan for obtaining revenues and for spending them which will satisfy the people of the province that their affairs are in good hands and that the province, and the welfare of the people of the province, is steadily forging ahead.

Mr. L.E. Blanchard (Cumberland): — In rising to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer, for a few minutes, to some of the Government's Crown Corporations. I wish to speak purely from a mechanical standpoint. Some time ago, I read of some of the Government activities regarding help in financing industries which were to start up in this province. The plywood plant at Hudson Bay was one of these industries; and I made it a point to spend a day or two at Hudson Bay to go through this plant. I must say I was very well pleased at the way in which everything was handled up there. I met a friend at Hudson Bay, at that time, and he said, "This is not the only plant that we have here; the Government is setting up a planing mill down the rail-road track. Let us go down and have a look at that." We did, but I must say, Mr. Speaker, I was surely disappointed when I saw what the Government had done with regard to that planing mill in Hudson Bay Junction. The first machine that we managed to see was a planer — a planer built at least 50 years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know what I am talking about when I say I know it was about 50 years old, because about 40 years ago I built wood planers myself, and I know all about them. Instead of being put into operation, that particular planer should have been shipped up to Battleford as museum piece.

From there we went over and inspected a steam boiler, which had a foundation already made, and they put this boiler on it; and I venture to say that our member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), who knows boilers, would agree with me in saying that I am quite sure that machine would not be capable of raising enough steam to blow his hat off. The crown sheet was buckled; the flues, Mr. Speaker, were fixed up with old pieces of stove pipe . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That sounds like the C.C.F. machine!

Mr. Blanchard: — . . . part of it was missing. In fact, it was another museum piece. It turned out afterwards that I was quite right. I heard that they could not get up steam enough to blow the whistle let alone operate the great big cumbersome planer which, as I have said, was 50 years old. Later on, in this mill, I found they had established a different set-up altogether; they have pretty up-to-date machinery, and as far as I know they are still operating on that basis. But the point I want to bring out is that whoever bought this machinery was very ill advised. The man who sold this machinery to the Government had worked for me one time in the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting; I knew what he paid for the machinery, and I also know what the Government paid him for it — there is quite a difference, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak, for just a moment or two, on the Sodium Sulphate plant at Chaplin. I had the pleasure of going through this plant. That is another place where our Government has been

March 4, 1952

ill-advised. The production of sodium sulphate is a proposition which should not be operated by any government, let alone our Government. I noticed up there that they had eight driers to take the moisture out of the sodium sulphate. When I say this Government was ill-advised, apparently they did not know that sodium sulphate is not the type of mineral which those machines were constructed to handle, and when they were put into service they all had to be relined with stainless steel. That will have to be renewed at very short intervals. That is another instance where we find, on checking those driers, that they are not efficient; they are not the proper type to start with.

Another place where our Government has been ill-advised, from a mechanical standpoint — and I refer now, Mr. Speaker, from a purely mechanical standpoint to those driers. Those driers are horizontal, and necessarily inefficient. The driers that I am familiar with are vertical instead of horizontal, and I find them to be very much more efficient.

Now, I am just going to touch on these lightly, Mr. Speaker, as I say, purely from a mechanical standpoint. I am not necessarily criticizing.

Another place where our Government has been ill-advised has been evident in the Shoe Factory. Our Government should have known, before they ever ventured into the shoe business, that up-to-date shoe manufacturing machines could not be bought — they are not for sale; and I know, positively, that they have not been for sale for at least 45 years. They are let out — if you have money enough to lease one of these machines and pay enough money to have it installed in your factory and pay a royalty on it, then you are in the shoe business. The price of installing this machinery and paying a royalty on it makes it prohibitive. That situation has been the same, with the shoe manufacturers controlling this industry throughout the United States and Canada. Now that has been a known fact for at least 40 or 45 years.

As I said, our Government was ill-advised. because I think they were a little too anxious to get into these industries. It is regrettable that this venture turned out to be a failure; and, again I say, our Government has been ill-advised to enter such things as the shoe factory.

Now. Mr. Speaker, another case is the Estevan brick plant. I knew, away back in the 1920's, that the clay that they are using in the Estevan brick plant was not suitable for making brick. You may wonder why I got to know that. I had been working as a machinist and machine instructor at the University at that time. At that time the University had just newly established their Ceramics Department and I had built a great deal of equipment. I had built practically all the equipment that was put into that Ceramics Department up until the time that it burned down in 1925. Samples of the clay were sent up to the University of Saskatchewan. I made up the necessary machinery for making the brick. I made up the kiln for drying the brick. We put it under the machine to press it to see the strain that it would stand and the weight it would carry, and we found out that the clay was not suitable for making bricks that would stand up under a load. This is another case, Mr. Speaker, where I think our Government was ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up very much time, but I would like to refer to the Big River sawmill. In this House we have heard a great deal about the Big River sawmill. I went up there, this last spring or early summer, and I put in two days up there. I went all through the mill, and I must say they have a wonderful set-up; there is no getting away from it. They have some of the most up-to-date equipment there is. The gang saws up there are capable of pushing through a log, or ramming it through I would call it, because they are fed through with a ram — that is the proper word. They can ram a log through there 32 inches in diameter, 16 feet long, in 45 seconds. That would mean that that mill could be classified as a high-production mill. And after going over the place very carefully, I could not see where they could apply the words "high utility" to this mill. These gang saws that they have, we know that they just set these saws to their own requirements. They can make one inch boards or make two-inch boards or whatever they wish, by spacing them according to their requirements. The rest of their equipment, their trim-saws, edgers and so on and so forth, and their circular saw, were all of the conventional type. The jack-ladders that they have to carry the logs up the canal are all conventional types. But in looking over the logs that they had, I could not find any logs there that were anywhere near 32 inches; a great many were 12, 14 and 16 inches in diameter.

The most wonderful part of the whole mill was their power plant. They have four diesel engines mounted on a single base and so arranged that they can operate one engine by itself if necessary, if they do not require a great deal of power. As they require more power they can cut in the second, third and fourth engines. Now I must say it is a wonderful set-up but, on the other hand, it is pretty expensive and, as our Premier has said on numerous occasions, the plant cost something like \$358,000. That is a lot of money. But they have got a lovely plant; there is no getting away from it. But that power plant which they have, and which cost them a lot of money, to my way of thinking is something that is absolutely useless to them.

Now, if you happen to have "Progress — 1952," on page 27 it gives a very nice picture of the Big River mill. This incinerator which you see in the background was built there years and years ago by a lumber company that operated there twenty years ago. It is the only thing that is left standing of the old mill site — that is, the incinerator. But they at that time, had a brain-wave. I could not exactly tell you the height of this, but I do know that the diameter down there at the bottom is a little over 30 feet on the inside. It is steel-jacketed and it also is lined inside with fire-brick. The idea of having a steel water-jacket in there was to burn up the extra shavings and sawdust to create heat enough to warm the water in the outside jacket of this incinerator. That hot water, in turn, was to be pumped down into Cowan Lake. The idea was to keep this water open all winter long. Logs then could have been brought out to the lake on sleighs on the ice, dumped into the open water, go up the ladder into the mill and they could operate all winter long. But they found out this would not work. Now then, instead of our Government going to all the expense of putting in this elaborate equipment and these four diesel engines — and they are lovely engines, there is no mistake about it; I have seen many of them and I know what they are; they are burning up the refuse in this incinerator, Mr. Speaker, that should go into boilers to make steam to operate this plant. This Government has gone from one extreme to the other.

March 4, 1952

Here they have gone to work and bought a whole bunch of junk down here at Hudson Bay, they have bought all sorts of junk right here for their boot and shoe factory, and this equipment they have there is absolutely useless. They bought up some more junk at Flin Flon some woodworking machines that stood out on the prairies there for years with no protection at all, but they bought them up just the same.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I got up to Big River, I found out that I had some friends I had lost track of for fifteen years. I did not know they were there until I was told in Prince Albert that these friends of mine were up at Big River; they have been up there for a period of some ten years. I, naturally, was nosing around a little bit for some information and I asked them, "What do these people up here think of the sawmill?" "Well," they said, "we old timers don't favour it; we don't like the idea." I said, "What about suitable timber?" They said, "Sure, we have some wonderful saw logs, they are miles and miles back in the bush, but if they could have been gotten out when this other lumber company was operating here, they would have been taken out then."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is something over 100 million feet of lumber in there — available timber. I asked about it and they just pooh-poohed the idea. They said, "Well, you may get enough logs trucked down to the bottom end of Cowan Lake then brought up here by barge some 30 miles."

By the way, right from the very start of setting this mill up, they got away on the wrong foot, all the way through. This machinery was rearranged in that plant several times before they got it where it should have been. They undertook to put some piles in the bottom of the lake so that they could form log booms and tow them up 30 miles to the mill. They found out that these piles were in the wrong place. and they had to be dynamited and new ones put in.

Well now, the whole picture is just this: in a very few short years all the available timber in there could be machined. I believe that the capacity of the mill is something like 45,000 feet a day; it would be at least that. I am told by the people up there that in two or three years time all the available timber that successfully can be brought out will be brought out and be done for. The growth up there is not rapid enough so that the mill can be operated continually over a period of years. Like some of our other Crown Corporations, Mr. Speaker, in a very short number of years it will be another white elephant of the Government's.

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

(Debate adjourned)

HOUSING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Heming:

"That this Assembly respectfully urge upon the Federal Government that, in view of the fact that the serious lack of housing in the urban centres of this province has resulted in severe hardships to large numbers or families and is contributing to broken homes, the undermining of the health and morale of our people and the retarding of the development and well-being of the province generally, measures be undertaken to provide adequate housing and that, to this end, the restrictive regulations under the National Housing Act, particularly with respect to section 35 thereof, be immediately removed; and, further, that building materials be made available in sufficient supply and at a price that will make possible the construction of homes at a reasonable and equitable rate."

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to dwell very long on this Motion. To me it looks like most drastic desertion from the principle of a Party that proposes to follow the policy and principle of 'producing for use and not for profit' when a member of that Party brings in a motion here asking the Federal Government to produce something at cost when they have not got it available, and when his own Government here has all the necessary goods to comply with the request in this resolution, at cost, and without any cost to the taxpayer of the province.

I am highly in sympathy with anything that can be done to forward the interest of the lower-income bracket citizens to be able to obtain homes for themselves, but this resolution I cannot see as forwarding, in any way at all — asking the Federal Government to continue as it has been doing and then asking them to tax the people of the Dominion of Canada to subsidize those who probably are already much better off than those who would have to pay the tax for that subsidy.

I am not going to dwell on the political aspect of the resolution but I am going to move an amendment to it, which, I think, Mr. Speaker, will explain what I have in mind. I am most concerned in devising some machinery whereby the low-income bracket people can obtain homes for themselves at a price which they can afford to pay. I have no place in my constituency where this housing proposition would apply, so consequently I am not speaking for the purpose of getting aid from this Government, or any other government, for anybody in my constituency, but I happen to live in the city of Yorkton, and I am very interested in people who are trying to help themselves. I am rather surprised that the member for Yorkton is not here to represent those people who went out and elected him to this Legislature.

Now, what I have in mind (and I can speak from experience, because I have had a little bit to do with both material and building) is that these people should be placed in a position where they can build these

March 4, 1952

homes for themselves and buy the material at as reasonable a price as possible; and that they should be able to borrow the money on as favourable terms for houses built that way as they are now able to borrow it under a contract-purchase. For instance, if this Government would do its duty towards that aim, it could provide the lumber, the brick, nails, paper, windows and doors at cost, because they handle all of them. They manufacture the lumber; they manufacture the brick; they handle cement; they handle nails; they handle all the stuff that goes into houses in their supply centres as retail lumber distributors. Now surely, if this Government and the C.C.F. Party is as humanitarian as they claim to be — "humanity first"; proposing that we produce for "use and not for profit" — we can expect them to practise at least that little bit towards this programme to help those people who are anxious to build homes for themselves in the urban areas, and I would say they might extend it to the rural area as well.

Then I am going after the Federal Government. I am going to ask the Federal Government to provide the money on equally as generous terms as it is now obtainable under the Act for ready-built homes.

I am, therefore, going to move an amendment to this Motion, seconded by Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):

- (1) That the word "Federal" in the first line be deleted, and the word "Provincial" substituted therefor;
- (2) That all the words after the word "end" in the seventh line be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"the Provincial Government provide all necessary building material to complete homes at cost to those who are building homes for themselves; and further that the Federal Government be urged to modify their restrictions in the National Housing Act to enable people building homes for themselves to borrow an equivalent percentage the of the cost of these homes as if they were buying homes under contract, thus making it possible for people in lower income brackets to own their own homes."

Hon. Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interrupt, but I wonder, in order to clarify a point that confuses me, would he indicate what this would be . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the hon. member had better get his resolution before the House.

Mr. Lopton: — Now, I want to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, knowing, as I do, a little about construction, that on an ordinary house, costing now from \$8,000 to \$9,000 that, under this plan, if a man has any ambition at all (and I know there are a lot of young fellows have ambition to help themselves) they can save at least \$2,500 to \$3,000 on that class of house if this Government will supply them the building material and the plumbing, which they can get at cost. Then, with the co-operation of their neighbours and tradesman (and there are lots of them who will co-operate

in building houses for themselves), they can have a home there with a payment already made of at least 25 per cent on an \$8,000 to \$9,000 house. That is a saving on the cost of building that house. Now I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. members want to leave politics and want to do something impartial to benefit the people, then they cannot help but pass this amendment without a vote — unanimously.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, in my particular part of the province, and particularly in the town of Estevan, the housing situation has been a serious one. For some years now we have been trying to get a housing scheme at Estevan and, unfortunately, it does not seem as if we are having too much success in that regard. There was a hope at the time the new legislation went through whereby the Federal Government put up 75 per cent of the cost, the Provincial Government 12 1/2 per cent and the local municipality 12 1/2 per cent, that the town of Estevan would share in some development under that scheme. However, from the information that we have received through the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) and other sources, I am very much afraid that the policy, apparently, is going to be that the town of Estevan would not be considered a suitable place for the investment of these funds.

We have been told that it is the policy of the Federal Government not to go into towns of that size. Apparently they want to restrict it to cities. I am not just too sure whether that is the total story. However, the provincial Minister of Social Welfare has undertaken a lot of work in this respect, and no doubt before this House adjourns, he will give us the benefit of the discussions that he has had with the Hon. Mr. Winters and the officials of Central Mortgage and Housing and the officials administering the National Housing Act.

One of the drawbacks, I think, to people getting in to construct their own houses, is the fact that, in smaller centres — that is outside of the cities — the normal institutions such as the mortgage companies and loaning companies do not want to go in to lend money on these projects; and the reason in one way, I think, is quite obvious — we had a similar type of answer from the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), the other day — that the cost of inspection for outlying districts raised the rates so much that, if they are restricted to a certain interest rate, they do not get a sufficient return on their investment to warrant going out and making all these inspections that would have to be made on a project of this kind.

Our contention, in Estevan, has always been that, being one of the more forward industrial centres of the province and having a very high payroll from the mining industry going on there, and being a power centre of Saskatchewan, the risk of investing in a town such as Estevan is much less, say, than in some of the smaller places like Saskatoon, Regina or Moose Jaw. But unfortunately, we cannot convince some of these financial institutions that that is the case; and then, of course, we are thrown back on the fact that you have to go back to the National Housing Act to get a loan. Our contention always has been that they lend the money on the loaning value of the house — a percentage of the loaning value of the house that is being constructed, and I think most hon. members will agree that the

March 4, 1952

result is that too big an initial payment has to be made by the person building the house before he can get started.

Now that is why I think the amendment moved by the hon. member for Saltcoats is rather a good one. In his amendment, as I understand it, he is asking the Provincial Government to provide necessary building material, over which they have control, at cost. If we go to the Saskatchewan Timber Board, for example, they have had a net surplus up to date of about \$1,250,000. I have always taken the position that the producers should get some of that money back; but if you take the figures at their face value, certainly, when they buy their materials for a very low price and sell them on the market at a substantial profit, if they were to let this timber or lumber out, at cost, there would be a very substantial saving to the people who were building their own houses. Of course, when we come to the brick plant — if they were to give those products at cost, possibly the price would have to go up somewhat; over the record of it, at least. I do think that there is a field for the Government here in the province of Saskatchewan, if they are sincere in their policies, that they could follow; and for that reason I am very pleased to second the amendment.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I just wanted to draw Your Honour's attention to the Motion and ask Your Honour to take the point under advisement and give a ruling at your leisure. I draw attention to the fact that this becomes a mandatory "money" motion; that this would call upon the Provincial Government, according to this motion, to provide all necessary building materials to complete homes, at cost, to those who are building homes for themselves, and so on. This would call for either the expenditure of Provincial funds, or for, as the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) has just pointed out, the giving of services for less money than they are now being provided, so that surpluses which are now available to the province generally would no longer be available. It would consequently result in a loss of revenue.

I doubt very much if the motion, as framed, is in order. It does not even say "give consideration to." It simply says that this Assembly respectfully "urge upon" the Provincial Government; and I would suggest that this resolution is out of order since it calls for a policy affecting public expenditures. Your Honour might look at it to see whether or not it is a properly worded resolution.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on that point, had the motion been that this Assembly "resolved" that the Provincial Government do undertake measures to provide adequate housing, then I would agree with the hon. Premier; but the wording of the amendment, I draw to your attention, as it is worded, if the amendment goes through, all it says is that this Assembly "respectfully urge" upon the Provincial Government that in view of certain things certain measures be undertaken. In other words, they urge the Government to undertake measures. When this went through, all that we would have resolved is that the Government be urged to take these measures. I would agree entirely with the Premier if the resolution were worded in this way: that the Assembly "resolve," that these measures are taken by the Provincial Government. Then, of course, there would be no doubt — it would be a "money" motion, but it has always been within the power of a private member to make a motion urging the Government to give consideration to certain action

being taken which might cost money; and, in effect, while it does not say that consideration be given, the wording of it means the same thing, because we are saying that we "respectfully urge" that the Provincial Government provide. Urging them to do it is merely a suggestion, and so it comes to the same thing., Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — That is not exactly the wording. The "urge" hasn't to do with the providing. It says that this Assembly "respectfully urge upon the Provincial Government that, in view of the serious lack of housing in the urban centres of this province has resulted in severe hardship" and so on. That is what is urged on the Provincial Government.

Then it says, "and that to this end the Provincial Government provide all necessary building materials." Now the urge upon the Government — the plight, with reference to housing — and "to this end that the Provincial Government shall provide." Now the urge does not apply to the providing; it applies to the urging upon the Provincial Government a recognition of the housing condition, and that the clause to provide these services at cost is not modified in any shape or form.

Mr. Lopton: — May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the word "urge" applies just as much to all of the resolution. It is just a matter of opinion, of course, if the Premier wants to make me take it as a technical error; but my understanding of it is that the word "urge" at the beginning of the resolution will apply to the whole resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — The whole thing about the motion is whether it entails the spending of public money. Looking at it at first glance, I should say that it was in order, but in the light of what has been said, I am going to allow the debate to go on, and look up the rulings on it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not pressing it at all, and it could be put, it seems to me, in order, by simply saying that the Provincial Government "give consideration" to providing all necessary materials, etc., or something like that. It is just a matter of keeping these resolutions within the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment.

Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, with reference to this particular motion, I would like to point out that we in North Battleford have one of the worst housing shortages of any of the middle-sized cities in the province. It is rather unfortunate that we seem to be caught in a similar predicament that the member for Estevan is in. We have the lack of interest of lending institutions to loan in the city of North Battleford; and at the same time Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation are doing so on a rather restricted basis. I think I said in the debate on the Speech from the Throne that they were doing some, and yet, when you get up into Lloydminster on the Alberta side of the border, you find that the lending institutions are going in there. Why this is so, I do not know; but we are in the position that, in subscribing to this amendment, we have a group, under present-day conditions, of rather lowly paid wage-earners in North Battleford,

March 4, 1952

being a distributing centre, and having a great number of Provincial and Federal civil servants; and we are entitled, in my opinion, to reasonable and modern housing. I believe that between the two Governments something should be done to alleviate this situation.

I have seen young married couples with small children living in very poor accommodation. Their income does not seem to have much bearing on them, and I am one who believes that, in our province or anywhere in Canada, if we can give the individual the opportunity to own his own home — as I have suggested in the past (and I am going to continue to harp on this) — there is only one way to do this, and that is to give an individual an opportunity to purchase a house with as low a down payment as possible, and then allow him to pay for it on an equivalent of rent and low monthly payments. I think if we do that we will be making better citizens by that very fact alone.

I think I mentioned, last year in this Legislature, that in the U.S.A. you can buy houses with a very small down payment, and you can buy them over a period of 20, 25 or 30 years. That is one reason that I am very much in favour of this amendment.

In North Battleford we have approximately (as the Minister of Social Welfare knows) 80 families living out at the airport, and for these families this accommodation is quite satisfactory — and I give the Minister of Social Welfare credit for being aggressive enough at the time to provide that accommodation; but I think he will agree with me that this accommodation is now getting to the stage where it will soon have to be disposed of. The families living out there, who are raising children, have probably one bathroom to every four or five families, and it has certainly become quite difficult to use economically and satisfactorily to the people.

I would just like to refer to one more thing, while I am on my feet, relative to this resolution. I would suggest, too, that if this resolution can be amended to be put in order — I am not much for the procedure — I like to see things get done; but I think that something could be done with the products that our Crown Corporations are selling throughout this province, to give people the opportunity to build their own houses, as suggested by the member for Saltcoats, and give it to them at as low a cost as possible. I would like also to refer to the responsibility from the financial aspect over and above the Federal responsibility to the Department of Social Welfare. As I have said in the past, my criticism of the Federal Government is that they are not providing finance in such a manner that a person with a small down-payment can buy it, and they are not providing it in such a manner that they can make it on monthly payments.

Now, in the 1950 Session, we passed legislation here, and I was very much in favour of it, because I did feel that it was a step in the right direction. We were in this position. The Federal Government agreed, under Section 35 of this Act, to provide 75 per cent of the finance for housing. The Provincial Government, through the Minister of Social Welfare, agreed to provide 25 per cent. I am going to suggest to the Minister that, if he had not gone to the municipalities and set up some type of housing of his own, and gone to the people of this province and said: "Now, here we have this 25 per cent. We are agreeable to taking over in the

neighbourhood of 12 1/2 per cent, or even 15 per cent," today we would have had a lot of the housing problem solved in this province. We could have had it solved and it is rather unfortunate that some municipal councils did not see their way clear to go into this thing, and I am inclined to somewhat agree with the city councils, and town councils.

During the period immediately following the war, most councils were faced with a terrific problem of capital expenditure. In North Battleford, we had to pave streets, we had to build new water tower, we had other capital investments there. As most of you know, we needed a new city hall there; and the city have enough capital responsibility of their own without going into housing, and I think that, if the two Governments, Provincial and Federal, particularly with this Act as shown in Chapter 51, 1950, we could have solved part of this housing problem.

Now it has been suggested that this was purely rental but on looking at the Act, Section 14 it said quite definitely — clause (e) sub-section (14), the conditions under which family housing units may be sold or leased. Here is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for this Government to get into the housing, provide the finance, give young people either the opportunity of building it with a contractor or building it themselves, and I would suggest that they have certainly failed in that respect.

I believe that if the amendment to this motion will only have this effect: that it will stir up this Provincial Government to do something for the people who want houses in this province, and stir up the Federal Government a little bit, it will be worthwhile. I think Saskatchewan is missing the boat in housing, with the result that housing costs are even getting out of line here. I was talking to a chap the other day, and he was telling me that houses are higher, for argument's sake in the city of Regina than they are in Calgary, Winnipeg or Vancouver. Why? Because there is not the financial structure behind them. In other words, you cannot buy a house with a low down-payment and low monthly payment. With that in mind I am going to support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, it has been generally accepted throughout the world, in every modern nation of the world that boasts of being a democratic nation, that housing is a national responsibility, and now I find that the Opposition wish to make housing in this province the responsibility of the Timber Board. Now, I realize — or possibly I should amend, or rather adjourn the debate. My proposal is this, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestions of the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) are so transparently specious that it will not require very much argument on my part.

I do wish to speak, and speak at some length on the original resolution, but I would like to see this particular amendment out of the way. The Timber Board, after all, does manufacture wood products, but it is limited to dimensional material and siding, and that is about all. But what goes into the construction of a house? Surely the hon. members opposite know that there is cement, hardware, electrical equipment, plumbing and hardwood or fir flooring, which we do not produce in this province; glassware,

March 4, 1952

plaster, paint, shingles, paper — I could name other materials that go into the construction of a house. Why, the cost of the construction of a home limited to the materials produced by the Timber Board of this province would not amount to 8 or 9 per cent of the cost of the construction of that home. So the hon. member from Saltcoats proposes that the Timber board should provide materials required for the construction of a modern home at cost.

Now, the member for North Battleford has stated that this Government has put 80 housing units into North Battleford. We did place probably as many housing units there as the Federal authorities did. We put them there as emergency housing — it was never intended that those become permanent housing units; and we had hoped that the Federal Government with its responsibility for housing, would have caught up with the lag in housing in this province by 1950 or 1951.

I would also point out that the only public housing that the hon. member from Estevan has, and the hon. member from Humboldt and certain others in the Opposition have, that housing was put there by the Provincial Government and not by the Federal Government. That is the only type of public housing that they have.

But I would like to speak on the main Motion, Mr. Speaker, and that is all I am going to say on this particular amendment. I would like to see the amendment voted on now.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Welfare has just suggested that housing is not a provincial matter. Now it seems strange to have such a suggestion come from a Minister who, not so long ago, espoused a scheme whereby not only was housing to be a provincial matter, housing was also to be regarded as a local municipal matter. It is rather strange indeed to find him, but a short while ago, discussing housing as a responsibility of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Municipal Government. And, if I recall correctly, this same Minister of Social Welfare tried his very best to put a housing scheme into operation under that triple responsibility of the three levels of government.

There is another reason why I am rather surprised to have the Minister of Social Welfare try to pass the buck entirely to the Federal Government and I do not want to be misunderstood; I believe that, housing is a Federal responsibility; but I also want to remind the hon. members on your right that, in 1944, when they were seeking a mandate from the people of this province for the first time, they told the people that, if elected to office as a provincial Government, they would attack this problem housing. That was definitely a promise of theirs in those days. Mr. Speaker, you know that very well; you made plenty of those yourself.

However, for the specific benefit of our junior member from Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker), I think it is well that he be informed about some of these promises of 1944. Here is a quotation from an article from the "Saskatchewan Commonwealth." I believe the organ of the C.C.F. Party. Admittedly the organ does squeak at times. This is dated May 24, 1944, on page 5:

"Adequate housing for the thousands of families that are now living in slum areas and in crowded tenements in our cities, and that this programme also include the re-housing of our citizens in the rural areas."

And, Mr. Speaker:

"that our natural resources be developed to the fullest extent to bring this about."

So, in 1944, the people who are now sitting on your right went about this province and said: "We will develop the natural resources, and we will use those resources to provide you with homes."

Mr. Lopton: — Now they say it is up to Ottawa.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Today, the Minister of Social Welfare tries to brush off his own responsibility and throw it all on Ottawa's doorstep.

Or, again, quoting from an article entitled "Better Homes in Saskatchewan," from the "Commonwealth" again, May 26, 1943, this is what they said:

"A congenial government at Ottawa would simplify our problem, but what can a co-operative Saskatchewan do within a monopoly controlled Canada?"

And here is the answer that they give in their "Commonwealth" under that date, and I am quoting:

"The machinery of government will be in the hands of those who form our first C.C.F. Legislature. A housing commission must study the situation in both urban and rural areas, make an estimate of the needs and offer a solution for such. We could work on an individual basis and . . ." (Here I want to interject, especially for the benefit of the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare) "we could work on an individual basis somewhat similar to our recent National Housing Scheme, with government long-term loans at a very low rate of interest paying most of the way."

Again I am interjecting: I suppose, back in 1944, they thought they would be able to persuade their prospective Provincial Treasurer to loan money, to have his Government Insurance Office loan money, for the purpose of financing houses instead of theatres. Reading further from that same article:

"In this way, a considerable number would some day have decent homes and they would own them. In giving ownership a stimulus would be given them to remodel, renovate and make their homes more comfortable as the years went by."

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member for Saltcoats introduced this amendment, he was doing precisely what any hon. member in

March 4, 1952

this Legislature should do: urge the Provincial Government to do something about a problem that exists in our midst, and furthermore, this amendment is simply inviting members of the Government to fulfil their promises. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, there were more things promised with regard to this housing situation, things which they said that their Provincial Government could do if they ever formed a Provincial Government and they did form a government in 1944.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Canora): — They will do it again too.

Mr. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — That will be the day.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Yes, that will be the day. I am quoting now from an article entitled "The World Around the Corner," May 25, 1943, from the "Commonwealth":

"It may sound fantastic to you when I say that last year's strawstack could become this year's house, or barn, or chicken coop. Do you realize that the day is not far off when the grain lands of the west will be measured in terms of rubber tires automobile bodies, airplane wings, prefabricated houses . . ." (No, no prefabricated theatres) — "radios, silk stockings, clothing, dishes and furniture?"

It would be funny if it weren't so pathetic, Mr. Speaker, to have a party promise such things and then turn a complete face-about.

Mr. Dundas: — A Somersault — political somersault.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Quoting again:

"This transformation will be a welcome change from the overflowing bins of unsellable and unwanted grain . . .

They had some grain that was not wanted I guess in those days. Now, they say:

"That is all very well, you say, 'but how are these things to be brought about?' To that question there is only one answer, they have already been brought about. The things of which I speak are a reality. They have been made possible by the development of a new branch of science known as chemurgy. In simple terms, chemurgy means the science of developing industries based upon farming; it means the scientific utilization of anything that grows from the soil. Do you know of any place on earth where houses are more urgently needed than right here on these prairies? Those houses, along with the other articles which I mentioned, should be made in the west, from the plastics produced from grain. Chemurgists tell us that 20 pounds of plastic can be obtained from one bushel of wheat. This is in addition to the rubber, dye stuffs and wheat cakes which can be taken from the same bushel of wheat."

Mr. Speaker: — That has nothing at all to do with the amendment.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Why certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — No, it has not. The production of synthetics has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Egnatoff: — They were going to build synthetic houses.

Mr. Tucker: — Sure, that is what the C.C.F. said in 1944.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, if this has nothing to do with housing I ask you, what has?

"Plastic" (they say in this same article), "is much stronger than wood; it can be moulded into any shape or size, and it is not only fireproof but impervious to temperature changes as well."

Wouldn't they be wonderful houses? Nor is that all:

"Should you tire of your plastic house or furniture . . ."

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! This Motion and this amendment deal with providing houses, not how they are going to be built, whether it is plastic or anything else.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, how on earth can anyone build houses without something to build them from?

Mr. Speaker: — This is providing the material — I ruled that this which you are using now is out of order; it is simply a waste of time.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, here is the Government in office; here a promise is made by the supporters of that Government when seeking office. It is pointing out there that we have plenty of wheat which can be turned into plastics, and that can be made into houses. And the appeal for support by the members opposite was made on the basis that they were going to build houses in Western Canada out of wheat — made out of plastics.

Mr. Speaker: — As far as the hon. member was reading the promises, that may have been in order; but then he went on with a dissertation about all these synthetics and things like that, which has nothing at all to do with the main Motion or the Amendment.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, what I was doing was reminding the Government of the promises on which they were elected, on which you yourself were elected, dealing with housing.

Mr. Speaker: — You were not dealing with the housing problem at all. You were reading a dissertation on synthetics and things of that kind, which has nothing at all to do with this Motion or the amendment. I ruled that a continuation of that is out of order.

March 4, 1952

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am somewhat surprised that you call this type of political promise a "dissertation". I think perhaps . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member will confine himself to the amendment: that is in regard to providing houses, not the material.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in 1944 they promised not only houses, but they promised that those houses could be changed just as quickly as you got tired of the style of the house that you had. That is why they were going to manufacture these houses out of plastic. And they were going to establish, Mr. Speaker, plastic factories right on the prairies, which would be used for manufacturing these houses for the many people who need them.

Mr. Danielson: — They don't like to hear that now, of course not. It sounded good in 1943 and 1944 though. It got you elected, you know. You should not forget that is how you got elected. You had better brush up on this.

Mr. Egnatoff: — The reason I went to some length, Mr. Speaker, in quoting, is to make absolutely certain that I was not just speaking from memory, that I was using the actual words which were used in 1944 by the hon. members who sit on your right today. This amendment deals with all the necessary building materials; it is calling upon the Provincial Government, which controls the timber operations in this province, which is in the business of selling lumber. We are not even going to ask them to build these houses out of plastics, because we realize that that was a fantastic socialistic pipe-dream. But they are in control of the essential materials that are necessary for the construction of houses. They are in control of lumber. And yet, a person building a house has to pay somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$90 a thousand board-feet for rough lumber, plus Education Tax on that lumber. And they pay the producer somewhere in the neighbourhood of only \$30. So here is an opportunity for the Socialist friends on the other side to take hold of this lumbering business of theirs and actually produce for use and not for profit, because that was their pledge.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I point out to the hon. member who is speaking that it is just about one minute to six o'clock and that he, of course will lead to recess. Does he wish to continue or does he wish to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Egnatoff: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at six o'clock p.m.