

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**21st Day**

**Thursday, March 12, 1953**

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

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Wednesday, March 11, 1953, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour)** — Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour is not a heavy spending department as we all know, requiring a modest half a million dollars for the approaching fiscal year. Nevertheless the legislation we have administered is of utmost importance to thousands of people in this province, particularly those in the cities and the towns. The Trade Union Act passed in 1944 makes it quite simple for employees to organize, and it has been used extensively resulting in tremendous increase in union membership in this province with great benefits in hours and wages for the members of the various unions. Also the legislation we have passed — Minimum Wage Act, Hours of Work, One Day's Rest in Seven, and so forth — has been of great benefit to those who for one reason or another have not been able to organize. Both through the action of the Trade Union just referred to and the legislation just referred to, the wages and working conditions of thousands of employees have greatly improved. Following this, it obviously follows that wage-earners from the smaller centres must have these benefits, otherwise they would go to the larger centres to get a better break. So, whatever we have done in a legislative way has been of great benefit, directly and indirectly, to wage-earners in all parts of the province.

Let us take for a moment the Labour Relations Board — I intend to mention all Branches of the Department before I take my seat — the cost of which is estimated at around \$29,000 for the coming year. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this is an important board which meets every month and tends to keep management and labour on an even keel. We had a resignation in the Board, last summer, in the person of Mrs. J. E. Cooper, whom we can now refer to in almost the same breath as the junior member for Regina — someone says the best looking one. Well, I don't think there is any argument there. I am glad from her suggestion a few days ago that hearing aids will now be exempted from Education Tax, as well as artificial limbs, eyes and so forth; also domestic fuel oil was added along with propane gas and natural gas and it should be noted that this includes coal oil used by many people in rooms and blocks for cooking and heating. I am sure they will appreciate the removal of this tax. The vacancy on the Board has been recently filled by Mr. Eugene Lockwood of Davidson, a farmer with considerable experience in co-operatives and we expect he will fill the position very well. I am sure the member from Davidson knows him very well, too. He almost became a member of this Legislature last summer, Mr. Speaker.

Two or three years ago, at the commencement of my speech in this House, I made some reference to the fact that unlike most hon. members

**March 12, 1953**

I had no road problems and felt rather happy about it — just one less worry for a city member. This year, however, I find that I must change my tune somewhat due to the fact that the Trans-Canada Highway will be using four miles of city streets as part of their system, entering the city at the eastern limits, Park Street, down Victoria Avenue to Albert Street, then to the southern limits — a total of 4.4 miles; I measured it on the speedometer of my car just a few days ago. While it is true that some assistance may be provided on Victoria Avenue it will not compensate for the congestion. Just try to get across Victoria Avenue any day now, Mr. Speaker, at the rush hours — 5 o'clock, noon — either as a pedestrian or a motorist, and you will see what I mean. The congestion now with normal traffic is nothing to what it will be when the tourist seasons opens and the Trans-Canada Highway really gets going. Also, along with the tearing up of the boulevards, together with the inevitable accidents, some of which are bound to be fatal, makes the present route most undesirable in the opinion of thousands of citizens of this city. Obviously the main route should go south somewhere near the eastern city limits, then west to join No. 1 Highway about three miles south of the city. This will be known as the 'by-pass', and I am glad to know that the hon. Minister of Highways has indicated it will be built in the not-too-distant future, probably next year. The travelling public will always, of course, be able to come into the city from the east, and many of them will.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in this House during this session and former sessions concerning the farmer, his problems, the prices he pays for machinery, prices he gets for his produce, markets and so forth, which is quite in order, of course, because farming is our basic industry and 60 per cent of the people in this province live on farms. However, this afternoon I am going to take some time to discuss the wage-earners, or labour (the all-inclusive word generally used) particularly those who are employed by the railways, because there has been considerable adverse publicity directed against this group recently. During and after the threatened strike on the Canadian railways a few weeks ago, erroneous and unfair editorials in the local press and throughout the Dominion appeared to be written with the primary object in view of splitting the farmer and labour, and to some extent it appears to have been successful. Remarks of farmers formerly friendly to labour indicate serious change in attitude, much of it directed unfairly at railway employees. Defensive letters to the press cannot possibly correct such unfair criticism, with the result that the railway wage-earner has been put in a rather bad light and is charged with asking too much for his services. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the railway worker is an asset to any community. He usually owns his own home, pays his taxes and generally speaking is an all-round good citizen. He cannot be blamed for desiring to raise and educate his family to the best possible standard which in this day and age requires a good deal more money than it did 10, 20 or 30 years ago, yes, or even 5 years ago. He does not take his money out of circulation indefinitely. Far from it! He usually spends as he goes and the commercial life of any community is the better off for him being in it.

With all deference to my farmer colleagues in this Assembly and farmer friends throughout the province, I suggest that for every railway employee who might be described as being wealthy, we could find 40 or 50 farmers of a similar status. I have nothing against a farmer becoming well off. Good luck to him! As far as I am concerned he can spend his winters

in California if he wants to, and I hope he enjoys himself there. We should, however, give the railway employees the same latitude, or at least not criticize them for negotiating higher wages which mean a better standard for themselves and family.

To get back to the threatened strike, Mr. Speaker, fortunately in my opinion the recent negotiation was completed without that extreme action. There was a strike, however, in August 1950 which lasted for nine days, which was the result of the failure of labour representatives of the non-operating groups and management in being unable to reach an agreement. The running trades, or those who actually operate the trains, were not involved in the strike itself excepting, of course, with the other groups out it was not possible to run any trains. As I said a moment ago, this took place in 1950, and we must go back to 1896 to find another general strike on the railways in western Canada, excepting of course the brief flurry in Winnipeg back in 1919 which did not affect the train movements to any extent. On that occasion retaliation on the part of officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway was both quick and deadly. Employees who had gone out even for a few days were taken back only as new employees, which meant that any of them who were over 40 years of age at that time were deprived of the possibility of ever receiving a pension — possibly, Mr. Speaker, the most vindictive and dastardly action ever taken against a group of men, and a blot on the officialdom of the Canadian Pacific Railway of that day. Stanley Knowles, M.P. for one of the Winnipeg constituencies, tried for years to do something for this group regarding their pension, but without success.

However, to get back to strikes on railways in this country, there have been, as I have said, the general strike in 1896, a very minor one pretty well confined to Winnipeg in 1919, and the non-operating employees for 9 days in 1950. That record itself speaks for the railway employees who should be given credit for keeping the transportation of this country going with a minimum of difficulty in spite of the old-time officials who were pretty hard to get along with and kept labour down every inch of the way. I am thinking for the moment of the old-time railway official, the old type such as George Bury, President of C.P.R. 40 or 50 years ago, a hard-boiled character if there ever was one. He used to go over his territory snapping and snarling at every employee he came in contact with, and generally treating them like dirt. It was he who coined the phrase “to heck with the public” and, of course, his attitude towards both the public and employees was aped by officials of that day and many who followed.

Those days have gone, Mr. Speaker, and good riddance to them. Now we have officials chosen from the more intelligent and efficient ranks who operate the railways properly and with a minimum of friction. Many of them held office in their respective unions before they were promoted.

I feel it is worth while, Mr. Speaker, to take a few minutes to inform the members of this House of some of the facts brought out in recent negotiations between the railways and the employees usually referred to as the ‘running trades’. For many years the idea has prevailed that railway employees were paid tremendous wages and certain interests did

**March 12, 1953**

their best of foster this idea, especially among the farmers. Here is what David Lewis, the employee's nominee in his minority report in the non-operating trades had to say, and I quote:

### **Myths Die Hard**

“The myth that railway workers are particularly highly paid is no exception. I have no doubt that it is a myth and a false one. The evidence placed before this board proved to my satisfaction as far as the 143,000 and more employees involved in these proceedings are concerned, they are behind rather than ahead of their fellow workers in other basic industries.”

That is the end of Mr. Lewis' quote. Here is another from Senator Arthur W. Roebuck, Q.C. in his minority report in the case of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the C.P.R. and I quote:

“The average basic rate of all employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway trainmen, excluding dining car employees, as exhibited in their current agreement, is \$1.30 per hour. The increase that I have suggested of 20 per cent would raise that rate to \$1.58 per hour, which certainly is not excessive when compared to wages paid in industry generally. It must be borne in mind that the members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are conductors, baggagemen, brakemen, switchmen and yard service. These are the men who operate the trains under all conditions of hardship and hazards. When one considers the exposure to which many of them are subjected, the irregular hours and their hours away from home and responsibilities which they carry, it seems to me that the rate suggested is fairly justified.”

The press, with some honourable exceptions, has attempted to perpetuate the myth to which Mr. Lewis refers. For example, do many of the newspapers who vented so much bile against the demands of the so-called 'millionaire' trainmen even as much as mention the fact that common labour employed by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company Limited, owned by the C.P.R., was paid at the rate of \$1.48 an hour, while a yard conductor, usually known as a yard foreman, employed by the C.P.R. received \$1.46 immediately prior to the recent settlement? A yard foreman is a man who has tremendous responsibility, whose work requires years of experience; yet he receives less than common labour employed by the subsidiary of the C.P.R. Even with the 12½ per cent increase, Mr. Speaker, the C.P.R. yard conductor only now receives \$1.63½ per hour, or 3 cents an hour less than common labour employed by the International Nickel Company of Port Colbourne, Ontario.

The relationship between trainmen's wages and those paid to workers in other industries has changed very drastically since 1939, although the relationship between the responsibilities, hazards, skills of

trainmen and those of other wage-earners has not undergone any radical change in this period. I will take an example close to home: this will be of interest to all of us, Mr. Speaker. Let us examine the changes since 1939 in the wage rates of a C.P.R. yard conductor and a building tradesman in the city of Saskatoon. Since the yard conductor is essentially an hourly-paid skilled worker not affected by mileage rates by those who actually go out on the road, he affords a particularly good comparison of skilled craftsman in the construction industry right here in the province of Saskatchewan. I have a list here — only 5; we will just go into 5 of them. We take for instance the bricklayer of Saskatoon again. In 1939 the rate was \$1.00 an hour, now, it is \$2.05 an hour; carpenters 63 cents an hour in 1939; \$1.70 now; Electrician 75 cents an hour in 1939, now \$1.85, or an increase of 147 per cent. The carpenter by the way was an increase of 170 per cent. The plumber, 1939 — \$1.00, 1952, \$1.85, an increase of 85 per cent. Now we come down to the yard conductor — 1939, 84 cents an hour, at the present time \$1.46, recently raised to \$1.63½, or an increase of 74 per cent.

The latest information on average earnings as distinct from basic rates of trainmen is provided in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for 1951, when the average hourly earnings for trainmen amounted to \$1.66 per hour. The latest D.B.S. report on man hours and hourly earnings, December 1, 1952, shows the average hourly earnings in a number of major durable goods manufacturing industries and here they are — 5 more of them: agricultural implements, \$1.60 per hour; primary iron and steel, \$1.63; motor vehicles, \$1.68; smelting and refinery, \$1.64; heavy electrical machinery \$1.67.

It must be remembered in examining these figures for other industries that they are averages for large groups of wage-earners, including a number of unskilled and semi-skilled workers hardly comparable with the trainman whose work calls for skill and carries responsibility for life and property at all times. Furthermore, most workers in other industries cited enjoy a number of so-called 'fringe' benefits, such as paid statutory holidays, night work premium, health and welfare plans, etc., which are not in effect on the railways. Nobody, for instance, ever heard of anybody in the running trades having such a thing as sick leave or getting any extra pay for working at night, or anything extra for working on a statutory holiday, Christmas Day, Good Friday, Thanksgiving. Christmas Day is just Tuesday to a railway employee.

The 'Financial Post', Montreal 'Gazette', other publications not normally considered to be sympathetic to labour, Mr. Speaker, have made much of the very high annual earnings of trainmen as shown in the D.B.S. report for 1951. To read these journals one would think there was something immoral, almost criminal, about the supposedly high wages received by these people. To begin with the D.B.S. figures are averages for a full year's work, with no time lost due to illness, accident, posting to spare board or any other reason. On this basis the D.B.S. reports that in 1951, an average annual wage of road freight conductors amounted to \$5,382. Well, that is quite an amount, Mr. Speaker. It is a higher rate than the Cabinet Ministers in this province get, which works out to \$103.50 per week over 52 weeks. A princely wage it would appear, one to which any wage-earner might well envy; but who would envy the working hours? — an average of nearly 57 hours per week for 50 weeks that go with this so-

**March 12, 1953**

called princely wage. A freight conductor, let it be remembered, is responsible for the entire train, its safety, contents and its arrival on schedule.

Can anyone say that the freight conductor is overpaid? Hardly.

Here is another example: Yard foremen are shown by the D.B.S. as having received average earnings of \$4600 per year, or \$89.46 a week; but according to the same figures in order to earn this wage the average yard foreman has had to work 59½ hours every week for 50 weeks. The average switch-tender in 1951, according to the same source, would have received \$3441, or \$66.17 per week, if he worked 56 hours every week for 50 weeks. The average trainman, all classifications excluding yard masters . . . Yes, perhaps we had better keep 'Stub' Fraser out of this! . . . would have earned \$4157 or \$79.94 per week if he worked week in and week out for 50 weeks, 50 hours each week.

I have some figures here showing the hours worked by some of the heavy industries and here they are: agricultural implements 39.5 hours per week, comparing them with a conductor at 57; primary iron and steel, 41 hours a week, compared to a yard foreman, 59½; motor vehicles, 40.3 per week, trainmen 50; smelting and refining, 40.8 hours; heavy electrical machinery, 41.7. It should be remembered, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that no railway employees come under provincial labour legislation.

I have mentioned up to now — and I am almost through with this subject — trainmen, conductors and yardmen; but enginemen are of course included in the running trades. Here is something that I think we should give a good deal of attention to. All groups excepting those with enough seniority to hold a regular run are subject to a call any hour of the day or night; if it is one in the morning, 5:30 in the morning, 10 o'clock, 2 in the afternoon, 9 in the evening. Day and night are all the same to them and irregular hours with long periods away from their homes are most inconvenient and undesirable compared to the conditions under which the average wage-earner works. Away from home expenses are considerable, and if any group is entitled to a good wage it is those in the running trades, Mr. Speaker.

Something else that perhaps has not been given very much consideration is the technological improvements in equipment which has resulted in great savings to the railways and I might use one example — the powerful diesel locomotive, more of them coming out all the time and now in use in many parts of Canada. If it is only necessary to operate two trains now with 10 employees whereas previously the same tonnage required 3 with 15 employees, it shows a saving of around 33 per cent. The 12 per cent increase in the wages of the men does not anywhere come near to the saving in operating costs. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who write the editorials blaming increased freight rates on increased wages study the matter more carefully, find out the real reason — and lay off the employees! I understand there was another editorial in this morning's 'Leader-Post' about it. I did not have time to look it over.

To turn to some of the Branches in the Department, Mr. Speaker, the administration is a comparatively small amount, \$54,000 but in

addition to the labour features in our Department, we also have several other Branches usually referred to as the safety branches — Electrical Inspections, Steam Boilers, Elevator and Hoists, Apprenticeship, Theatres and Fire Commission.

First, I am going to speak on the Theatres Branch. This is one branch that it is really a pleasure to administer, and we receive the best of co-operation from the Exhibitors' Association, of which Mr. George Miller of Wynyard, is the President, and the Projectionist Union headed by Mr. Jack Hartree of this city. Several new theatres were built during 1952 — at Quill Lake, Cudworth, Theodore, Lanigan, Fort Qu'Appelle and Esterhazy, which speaks well for conditions generally, and these men are to be commended for investing what must be their life-savings in projects of this kind. Also a number of 'drive-in' theatres were built, last year, and there will be more during the approaching season. These theatres, in fact all theatres, are inspected each year, and there are approximately 500 public halls scattered throughout the province which require this service.

Our motion picture censors are located in Winnipeg where the pictures are reviewed, along with the Manitoba censors, and stamped before they are sent into this province. Objectionable scenes and dialogues are eliminated, and some films rejected altogether. I feel that censorship is most necessary in order to prevent undesirable pictures being shown, and while there might not be much harm done to older or middle-aged people, some of these pictures must be quite harmful to youth, the adolescents and children whose minds and characters are in the formative stage and in many cases can be influenced by what they see in the entertainment field. Clean wholesome pictures are desirable, and parents should see that their children are kept from going to films marked "Adult". Only last November, a Toronto youth shot three people after seeing the picture "The Sniper" which he himself has stated incited the idea. The fact that he was adjudged insane does not help matters any, especially the victims. And a similar case occurred in one of the eastern States following the showing of the same picture. Obviously, thousands of young people such pictures would not affect, but great harm is done where the person is subnormal or receptive to such ideas.

Then we have the so-called literature in the name of 'crime comics', and I feel the use of the innocent word 'comics' does a lot to cover up the real contents of these books or cartoons. 'Horrors' might be a better word to use. I do not like to take much time on such a repulsive subject, Mr. Speaker, but in my opinion the reading material of our young people is of utmost importance. Brutal and revolting subjects instilled into the juvenile mind cannot help but have harmful effects in many cases. Here is what Mr. J. B. Bennett of the Bureau of Prisoners in Washington has to say on this subject:

"We have in one of our institutions a boy who carried out a kidnapping plot following the precise pattern he had read about in a magazine called 'Crime does not pay'. Not only did the boy confess that he had got the idea from the crime comics, but the facts surrounding the execution of the crime bore out his statement. There are a number of cases, notably one in Ohio where

**March 12, 1953**

two boys attempting a kidnapping shot and killed a citizen, which indicates pretty strongly the influences of comic magazines on young boys caught at crimes.”

I think most of us here remember Mr. Watson who was murdered in Dawson Creek, British Columbia, five years ago by two young boys, and at the trial it turned out that their minds were saturated with these crime comics. One admitted that he read 50 a week; another said he read as many as 35. A presiding judge delivered a most scathing criticism of these comics laying the blame for the murder almost directly on their influence. I have some other examples here, but really, they are too horrible to read; I am going to skip them.

But here is something that the ‘Anglican Outlook’, the official organ of the Church of England in Canada, characterizes the comic book industry as a \$52 million a year enterprise, and I quote what they have to say about that:

“Eight years ago 10 million comic books were sold each month; today that many are sold each week. A literary critic has described this traffic as ‘cultural slaughter of the innocents’. These books bought with the nickels and dimes of the children and with the money of older people and the rest of adolescents portray sadistic torture, sexy situations and sordid crimes. The men who publish and distribute this kind of rubbish are dominated by the money motive. They are completely unconcerned with the effects upon the readers.”

I do not wish to create the impression, Mr. Speaker, that our young people are growing up to be degenerates or morons; far from it. But if these books or so-called ‘comics’ only affect a small percentage, that is too much. The producers who make objectionable pictures, the writers of sexy books who have been described as ‘nasty little men with dirty minds’, these horrible comics, the production of which tends to undermine the character of youth, together with corresponding use of television and radio shows where crime really is featured, cannot help but be the cause of and contribute to a great deal of crime, with resultant misery. My own description of those who write and print such trash is that they may be referred to as “maggots feeding on the sores of a nation.” So much for that, Mr. Speaker. It is a distasteful subject but one which should be given some publicity. Unfortunately, though, Provincial Governments cannot do much about it because it is a matter covered by Federal legislation and I have a copy here of Bill No. 10 — An Act to Amend the Criminal Code — passed December 5, 1949, but up to now it does not appear to have been effective. After that, Mr. Speaker, I think I will take a drink of water.

Let us now, Mr. Speaker, leave the rather depressing subject of pornographic literature and crime comics and come to something comparatively clean, namely the Steam-Boilers Branch. Someone asked me, the other day, what a boiler inspector did. Obviously he inspects boilers, but along with that they also attend to pressure vessels, refrigeration, pro-



pane gas installations, pressure welding, equipment in grain elevators, passenger and freight elevators and hoists. The estimates for the coming year for this Branch is \$72,000, and the estimated revenue is about the same. The Branch carries itself with no assistance from the Treasury.

The Fire Commission Branch, also in the Department, has for its objectives the elimination of fire hazards in mercantile areas, in schools, hospitals and hotels, in every town, village and hamlet in the province. I will not go into the property loss — it ran \$3 million in 1952; but smoking again leads the list — careless smokers started 372 fires last year; chimneys and flues next, 149; stoves and furnaces, 146; electricity, 123. This Branch is also self-sustaining.

We do however from time to time receive complaints regarding the sale of non-approved fire extinguishers, particularly those of the glass-bowl type which sell for \$5 or \$6 but only cost 41½ cents to make. These are usually handled by travelling salesmen, and I would suggest that anyone requested to buy them first get in touch with the office of the Fire Commissioner or the Local Fire Chief — it does not make any difference — and find out whether or not the articles have been approved. I have not got very much more time, Mr. Speaker. I had a letter that I wanted to quote from, but I do not seem to see it for the moment.

However, I was going to mention something about the excessive number of accidents in which trucks are becoming involved in this province. The first nine months up to September 30, 1952, this number reached the surprising total of 2,350; the number of deaths where trucks were involved, 39; number of injured, 753; the total property damage, \$1,035, 075. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are paying entirely too high a price both in lives and money to have the trucking industry on the road. They do a tremendous amount of damage to the roads, and I have some information on that, too, which I unfortunately have not time to go into just now.

Two years ago, or perhaps three, Mr. Speaker, I made some reference to the fact that I thought some of the businessmen of this province, unfavourable toward the C.C.F. Government, had done us quite a bit of harm by telling their customers about labour legislation that prevented them from staying open and so forth. I have a letter here from a man in the northern part of the province — it is quite a long, but I am only going to read five lines. This is his criticism. He says:

“I have broken down machinery in harvest time, gone to town Saturday 12 o’clock — 11 slow time — closed up. In some towns if you ask what is wrong they say ‘ask your Labour Board; that is the rule and the law and we ain’t paying no overtime. Go to your C.C.F. and buy your repairs; you are supporting them.”

Now that is the kind of thing I mean, and I had no thought of offending the merchants of this province, although I do not mind offending this fellow who told his customers to go to the C.C.F. and get his repairs. There is no difficulty — the individual could have kept his machine shop open Saturday afternoon if he wanted to; either have one of his staff stay on, or he could have stayed on himself. But it looked like an obvious attempt to drive another bit of a wedge between the farmer and the wage-earner.

**March 12, 1953**

Now, Mr. Speaker, I promised to split the radio time with my colleague and seat-mate, the Minister of Social Welfare, and I think he is quite anxious to get at this microphone. So I am going to turn it over to him. Needless to say, Sir, I will support the budget.

**Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, the lack of time will not permit me to extend the usual courtesies, other than to commend our Provincial Treasurer for another sound and objective budget, in keeping with the needs of the people and also in keeping with the expansion of the industrial and social life of this province, which gathers momentum year by year.

Now the people of Saskatchewan appreciate the untiring work of our Provincial Treasurer. They appreciate his ability, and they appreciate his outstanding service in raising the financial position of this province from the morass of debt which encumbered it in 1944, to the healthy and enviable position it occupies in Canada, today.

The people of the province have confidence in our Provincial Treasurer, and that confidence will never be undermined by the repeated but always abortive attempts at character assassination by unscrupulous and vindictive political opponents, who have been frustrated in their political ambitions, and some of whom have been rejected and repudiated at the polls by the people of this province.

I wish to comment on the ability and quality of the new members on both sides of the House. In this their first Session, they have been able in debate and they have shown themselves to be conscientious and equally able in committee and in caucus and all the work associated with this Legislature. As long as Saskatchewan continues to attract members of this calibre to our Legislature, I am sure that the political future of this province will be in good hands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite unnecessary for me to extol my constituency of Saskatoon. In the words of Shakespeare, "A good wine needs no bush." And the fact that Saskatoon accorded Arthur Stone and me the largest popular majority in the province of Saskatchewan, in the last June elections, makes Arthur Stone and me very proud and very humble, and very determined to serve our constituency well, and to serve this province well. We were faced by six able and highly respected political opponents in that campaign, but the popularity of our Premier and the popularity of this Government after eight years of sound administration, proved too much for our opponents, and five of them lost their deposits. The loyalty and hard

work of hundreds of volunteer workers in Saskatoon helped us greatly, as did also the bad record and ineptitude of the Liberal Government at Ottawa over the past several years. You know, Mr. Speaker, the “sell-out” of the west, particularly Saskatchewan, by Ottawa, began the very day in 1949 when we elected 14 Liberal members to Parliament, and if I know the temper and the political acumen of the people of this province, I know that they will never make that mistake again.

Now what is the reason for the desperation that appears so evident among the Liberals today in this province, and which is evidencing in most despicable behaviour on their part; and what is the relative position of the Liberals and the C.C.F. in this province? I think that that is best set forth on the editorial pages of the “Star-Phoenix” on Monday, March 9. It is not often that I can agree with what is written on the editorial page of the “Star-Phoenix”, but I want to say, in all fairness, that the news columns of the “Star-Phoenix” have been pre-eminently fair, and that is why the “Star-Phoenix” enjoys a reputation for honest and good reporting in the tradition that should be associated with a daily newspaper, and that is why they enjoy a popularity that is not shared by the “Leader-Post” in this city. And this is what is written on the editorial page of the “Star-Phoenix”, March 9, under the byline of P.V. Wade, and this attempts to show the desperate situation with respect to the Liberal Party and to draw a comparison between the Liberal Party in this province and the C.C.F. Government. “The Liberal position,” I am quoting now:

“The Liberal position, inevitably, requires total overhaul” — that is an understatement — “and it is going to get it. They find now that they have to swallow automobile insurance, free hospitalization and many of the other C.C.F. pills. They are, (referring to the pills) here to stay, and one bright Liberal” — I am surprised about that — “recently remarked, feelingly, that the only real disastrous aspect of the 1944 debacle was that a single Liberal had been elected then. Had there been a shutout, there would have been no Liberals to vote against the C.C.F. legislation — with the horrible ghostly record now staring them in the face, of opposition to almost everything which has now been accepted as a part of provincial daily life.”

Again quoting from the article:

“Tucker’s decision to return to the Federal field was certainly not greeted with wild enthusiasm by some of the sitting M.P.’s from Saskatchewan, and that includes some of the Liberal hierarchy. They were inclined to want him to stay where he is, to stew in his own juice, and to trust that a Liberal of wide appeal might emerge in the next four or five years, for it is freely admitted that no such person is on the political horizon right now.”

Again quoting from this good Liberal press, and now dealing with their opinion of the C.C.F. Government in this province:

**March 12, 1953**

“With almost nine years in power providing experience, the cabinet of the C.C.F. Government moves shrewdly and with confidence. It is still close enough to the general party support to hear the undertones, and not too far from reality to reject political absurdities. It gives the impression of knowing where it is going and to be moving resolutely in that direction. If anything should happen to Douglas” — and God forbid! (those are my remarks): “If anything should happen to Douglas, there are some capable lieutenants to direct the battle. They are not Tommy Douglasses, but they can read the sign-posts, and that leaves the C.C.F. in pretty good shape.”

Well now, I think that that comparative statement reveals why the Liberal opposition in this province is in such desperate straits as it is today, and why it indulges in such reprehensible tactics that are very evident to the people of this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege. This speech the hon. member is reading so carefully, I suggest should not have had the last remark in it. He has accused the Opposition here of reprehensible tactics. I submit that that is unparliamentary and he, as a Minister of the Crown, should be the last one to engage in language that is unparliamentary.

**Mr. Speaker:** — As I understood the statement of the hon. Minister it was not and did not refer to the Liberal Opposition.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, it did. It was referring to the Liberal Party and Opposition in the House here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, if it referred to the Liberals in the House here — I did not take it that it did refer to any members of the Liberal Opposition here — but if it did, I would ask that he withdraw the remark.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, may I substitute the word “incomprehensible” for “reprehensible”?

Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the work of my Department, I should like to publically extend to the staff of my Department my sincere thanks for their loyalty and for their efficiency during the past year, when we have undergone a major reorganization in our Department. The purpose of that reorganization was to bring the many services which my Department has to offer closely to the people whom they serve, and that will be accomplished now through the establishment of eight regions, and it will be the function of the regions to complete and to decide on the action to be taken with respect to any of the clients in their respective regions.

I should like to turn first, Mr. Speaker, to the care of the aged in this province. This is a section of the people who have a first claim on our gratitude, our respect and our love, and they have the first claim on the policy of improving the social security of the people of this province. Now complete care of the aged (that is all who require it) should be the objective to all levels of government, and of society generally, and to this

end this Government, in 1945, took care of the aged needy, ill people of this province, by giving to them free hospitalization and free medical services. We have embarked on a rapidly expanding programme to provide nursing care for chronics. The Wolseley, Regina, and Saskatoon nursing homes are presently in operation. We hope that Melfort will be opened this year, and provide an additional 150 beds, and work will commence, this year, on a new, fully modern 200-bed nursing home in the city of Regina.

This service is intended for those aged people who do not require active medical treatment in a hospital, but who are unable to care for themselves and who do require nursing care. This still leaves the aged person who requires housing, housing for ambulatory aged people who are living, presently, under adverse conditions. Since they are ambulatory (that means they are able to get around) these people are happiest in the communities or areas in which they spent the productive years of their lives and in which they have so many friends, and I am sure that the communities would wish to keep these aged people with them.

This Government, in order to assist strategically-located urban and contiguous rural municipalities, villages and hamlets which would comprise a natural housing area for aged people, is prepared to grant to that community, which will provide for this type of housing, a 20 per cent capital grant — 20 per cent of the cost of the construction of a housing project will be provided by this Government, as well as an annual grant of \$1000 a year to assist in the maintenance of such housing project. A housing project, Mr. Speaker, should take the form of small but comfortable individual units, in terraces, centrally heated, for the use of elderly married people, and a hostel in connection with these individual homes, with single rooms, a central dining room and kitchen for the care of the single aged people of either sex. I have been in communication with Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation, Ottawa, and I hope to complete arrangements whereby communities can borrow the necessary remaining capital, under Section 9 or Section 35 of the National Housing Act, from Ottawa. My letter from the President of Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation indicates approval under certain conditions. The letter states, and I quote from the letter received from Mr. Mansur, President of C.M.H.C., as follows:

“However, a project may include a hostel-type building for surviving consorts, with common eating and dining rooms and sited in close conjunction with other buildings, composed of self-contained dwelling units. We have indicated to one or two provincial governments that in such case we would consider an application for separate loans covering the dwellings and the hostel, but only if the provincial government was prepared to guarantee the loan with respect to the hostel and the cost of operation of the hostel.”

This is the guarantee requested. This guarantee, the Provincial Government is prepared to make. Now the municipalities comprising the housing area will be required to pay, over a period of forty years, the balance of the capital cost, or 80 per cent, and to assume financial responsibility for the operation of the project. The administration may be assigned by the community or

**March 12, 1953**

municipalities to a church or other organization. The communities which the aged citizens have built up as pioneers will want to assume this responsibility. I believe there will be whole-hearted response to this programme, and that has already been indicated by the number of delegations which have waited on me who stated that it was their intention to proceed with the housing projects for the care of their ambulatory aged people, before they knew that any assistance whatsoever was forthcoming from this Provincial Government; and I look forward to seeing, within a relatively few years, at least 50, and possibly more, of these comfortable types of homes being scattered strategically throughout this province, to care for the aged ambulatory people of this province, many of whom are living under most adverse circumstances, today.

To go on with housing of a different kind, Mr. Speaker: In every modern democratic country in the world, housing has been assumed as a national government responsibility. Let us not forget that, and let us not get away from it. Unfortunately for Canada, the only time the Liberal Government freely admits this is just before a Federal election. In 1949 the Prime Minister, Louis St. Laurent, sounded this trumpet-call from Moncton, New Brunswick, and it re-echoed right across the Dominion of Canada. These were his words:

“Our Government will not be satisfied until there is a decent home for every Canadian family.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the promise that served to elect a lot of Liberal M.P.'s in this country; but the housing situation in Canada has grown steadily worse, since that day, right across this country. Today, Canada needs one million homes, new homes, to replace the slum homes unfit for human habitation, and to provide for the population increases brought about through immigration and through new families. Do you know that in certain cities of this country today, there is a conflict going on between native Canadian families and immigrant families? Our Canadian families declare that they are being forced out of their homes by immigrant families, and immigrant families are so dissatisfied that some of them are going back to Europe. The situation is extremely bad; indeed, it is explosive.

Today, Canada's housing policy is a failure; it is a tragic failure for tens of thousands of Canadians living under conditions where normal family life is impossible. Low rental housing, low rental public housing, is the only solution, because the fact of the matter remains that people on moderate and low incomes cannot afford to purchase homes at the present prices, nor can they afford to pay economic rentals. Ottawa, however, says in effect: leave it to private enterprise; private enterprise, which has never solved the housing problems of this or any other country in any age that I know of. I am not blaming private enterprise. Private enterprise can only operate if it secures economic rental on its houses. This is a matter for public housing, and I would point out that in Britain since the war, nine out of ten houses that have been built in that country have been public or low rental houses. In Sweden, eight out of every ten homes have been public housing. In 1949, the U.S.A. voted 810,000 low rental housing units. What is Canada's record? In 1951, they had produced 2600 low rental housing units in the entire country. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but since the war Britain has built 897 new homes for every 1000 increase in their population; Sweden, 776; United States, 417; this country, 282.

Now, why has there been a housing lag in this country, especially since 1949? Well, in 1950, the cost of construction materials increased 18 per cent; the cost of labour only went up 9 per cent, and I would call that to the hon. members' attention, because we so frequently hear that labour is responsible for these inordinate high costs that have developed. Well, in that one year alone, building materials in this country went up in cost by 18 per cent. In 1951 and 1952, the interest rates imposed by the Government at Ottawa added 7 per cent to the cost of the purchase of a house built under N.H.A.

I would call to your attention also, Mr. Speaker, that in 1950, a prospective homeowner might acquire an N.H.A. house with a down payment of \$1900, but, for some strange reason, that down payment was increased to \$3200 in 1951, and our ordinary working man, or our man of moderate income, has not got \$3200 saved with which to purchase a house.

I would point out also, Mr. Speaker, that in the U.S.A. to the south of us, the national government charges 4 per cent interest to veterans, with down payments as low as \$250, and 4½ per cent interest for non-veterans; but in Canada, under the National Housing Act, the Federal Government charges 5½ per cent interest, and if you get your money through a loan company with which to build your house, you pay 6½ per cent interest.

Now these are the reasons why there have been fewer and fewer houses built in this country under N.H.A. I would like to point out also that between 1939 and the present time, the cost of living has gone up to 187, but the cost of homes, of building construction, has gone up to 260, and that is another reason.

Now what are the effects of bad housing on our people? You know, Mr. Speaker, you and I have heard in our churches and on practically every political platform, particularly those where there was a Liberal speaker: we have heard it repeated so often that the home is the very basis of civilization, that the home is the very foundation upon which the structure of free peoples exists, and yet in this country, due to Federal housing policies, our people are requiring our families to live under conditions where normal, healthy, family life is quite impossible. I know, from my own Department, that inadequate housing, slum conditions, unsanitary, crowded, living conditions, have been a greater factor in broken homes, divorces, desertions, strained marital relations than any other factor. I know, too, that juvenile delinquency, unhappy and maladjusted children retarded in schools and ending in institutions, is the result of poor, over-crowded, unsanitary, living conditions. We know, too, that it leads to delays in marriages, and the establishment of new and young families which should be the aspiration of every free, progressive country in the world. We note, too, how poor housing contributes to poor health and to lay-offs among workers.

Is non-modern housing the answer? Well, in small communities and in the rural areas the menace to health of non-modern homes is minimized. I do not think it is serious. But in cities, non-modern homes are a continuous and serious threat to the health of our people. I was glad to see that Dr. Walton, Medical Health Officer of this City, had the courage to come out and express his opinion, and here it is. I quote from the "Leader-Post", February 2 of this year, and this is what he says:

**March 12, 1953**

“Definite dangers to health exist in building non-modern homes in the outlying parts of the city,” Dr. Walton, Regina’s Medical Health Officer, warned. “The danger is illustrated by 76 cases of infectious hepatitis, a disease of the liver, reported in 1952,” Dr. Walton said. “These mostly occur in those parts of the city which are not served by sewer and water.”

He goes on to state:

“The danger of all intestinal infections is greatly increased by non-modern housing in cities. Non-modern housing is no solution to the housing problem in an urban centre.” The Medical Health Officer reported that housing continued to be a major health problem in Regina, in 1952. “There are far too many families housed in dwelling units which should never have been occupied.”

In the fact of that statement I fail to understand why the “Leader-Post” has repeatedly advocated, on its editorial page, the construction of non-modern homes in this city. Now the owner of that paper is a millionaire, and I am quite sure that he would not want to require the people of this city to live in unhealthy, non-modern homes. For the reasons stated by Dr. Walton, I cannot understand why, and I quote from the “Leader-Post” December 30:

“The Chamber of Commerce and the City Council of Regina made representations to the national housing authorities, some weeks ago, urging the granting of loans for the building of small, non-modern homes.”

The only way in which this problem of housing can be solved is set forth by the Canadian Council of Churches, meeting each year in conference in various parts of this Dominion. It comprises practically all the Protestant churches in the Dominion of Canada, and this is what the Canadian Council of Churches states, or the resolution which it passed:

“Be it resolved that the Canadian Council of Churches, in the name of Christ, and for the sake of the health and morale of our people, urge upon all levels of Canadian government, federal provincial and municipal, the necessity and urgency of providing decent housing for people earning moderate or low wages and salaries, through an effective public housing programme which will produce low-cost, low-rental dwelling units. And be it further resolved that we urge the Federal Government to establish the proper system of priorities for building materials.”

I do think that that sets forth the only basis upon which we can solve our housing needs, and I want to state that this Government has gone along with Ottawa in any housing proposal which that Government has ever offered. Our only difficulty has been that when we try to get agreements



“on the line” or get them to agree to what appears to be the provisions of the National Housing Act, such agreements are not forthcoming. Section 35 was supposed to apply, as far as I know, to all communities in Canada, but now it is stated, arbitrarily I believe, that it can only apply to the cities, which means that the towns and smaller communities are left out.

Now personally, I think that Section 35 of the National Housing Act is workable. Saskatchewan has the first low-rental project in western Canada in Moose Jaw, and agreements pending with Prince Albert, under this section of the Act. In brief, Section 35 provides that out of every \$10 invested in housing, \$9 will be provided by the two senior governments and rent reductions are paid for in the same ratio. Now the payment of taxes is guaranteed; they are normal taxes, and in such cities as Regina and Saskatoon, the profits from the Light and Power alone would more than pay for any subsidy required under this section of the Act.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the Minister while he is on the air, but could he tell me out of the \$9 what the proportion is?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would be very happy to. I was trying to make my statements as briefly as I could. Under Section 35 of the National Housing Act, 75 per cent of the capital cost is provided by the Federal Government, 15 per cent by the Provincial Government of this province, and 10 per cent by the municipality; but the municipality can include in that 10 per cent, the sale price of the lots and the improvements which they are required to make anyway, so that in actual cost it does not amount to anything like that ratio of 10 per cent.

I want to say that, as far as our low-rental housing project in Moose Jaw is concerned, it is only costing Moose Jaw at the rate of 8 cents net per day per house, and surely that is not too much to house a good Canadian family and take them out of some of the slums in which they are presently living under conditions where normal family life is quite impossible.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility of the churches is not only in passing resolutions. Many of their parishioners require information and education on this problem of low-rental housing, and I would advise all organizations who are interested in this, particularly the labour organizations, if there is reluctance on the part of their local councils to go ahead under this type of housing, that they see to it that they have councils that will do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the Corrections Branch of my Department, which has the responsibility of dealing with juvenile and adult delinquency. I notice that we have had the annual question placed on the Order Paper by the Opposition as to how many boys there are in the Boys' School and what is the cost of the Boys' School. That is the Opposition's annual contribution to the solution to the serious, difficult and tragic problem of juvenile delinquency.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that our ever-improving probation and parole services, and the use of carefully selected foster homes as alternative homes to those which have failed these boys, and the success

**March 12, 1953**

in general of our corrections programme, has kept down the number of admissions to the school, whereas elsewhere in Canada, new and larger schools are being built to take care of the serious increase in juvenile delinquency.

On this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we take no joy in new admissions to our Boys' School, because these new admissions mean that the parental homes from which these boys come have failed in their responsibilities; it means that the schools have failed, the churches have failed, the communities from which they came have failed; and every new admission to the Boys' School is a blot against society — maybe not a blot but at least it is a reflection against society. New admissions, Mr. Speaker, mean desperately ill boys, seriously maladjusted as a result of conditions over which these boys had no control. Yes, these are seriously ill boys — more ill possibly than the great majority of those who are admitted to our hospitals where it requires 1½ employees for ever patient. In our hospital — because it is a hospital — we only employ one for every 1½ to 2 patients. Remember this, also, that not only sick minds must be restored in that school, but individual instruction in academic education must be given, in order to overcome the serious retardation in school grades that every single one of those boys experience. Vocational and group training are provided there — group training in an atmosphere of the home that these boys very often have never known, because we try to make that a home out there. The school is fully utilized by many outside groups and organizations, and if my friends opposite would find time to visit it, if they were interested, they would find such activities as basic education classes for adult handicapped persons going on in that school. These people are being taught to read and write, because they have never received even basic education or any of the rehabilitative training under the niggardly social services of any previous administration.

I would particularly invite my hon. friend from Cannington, who is not in his seat, and who has criticized this branch; my friend from Saltcoats, who is not in his seat and who has criticized this branch; and my friend from Moosomin who, yesterday, extolled the wonders of the Moosomin gaol which is closed. I would like to invite these gentlemen to come with me to the Regina gaol and there they would find . . .

**Government Member:** — And leave them there!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, I might be tempted to — until they have a full appreciation of what constitutes a good rehabilitation programme for delinquents. There they would find a correctional and rehabilitative programme in operation, and one in harmony with good Christian philosophy and scientific practice, and these gentlemen might be cured of their opposition to enlightened . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Will the hon. Minister tell us what he is reading from?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is the type of silly, stupid question that usually emanates from that quarter.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister to withdraw. He has been reading right along, and we are entitled to know whether he is reading a speech or reading a quotation, and if he is reading a quotation I would like him to tell us what he is reading from.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have been observing the hon. member and if he is reading very much, he has sure got it in fine print, because he is saying a very great deal for the amount of material he has in his hand.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He reads well, all right.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I may not have the glibness of my hon. friend opposite, but I am entitled to use notes as is anybody else in this House, and you do not throw me ‘off base’, my hon. friend. I am not through with you yet.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member, if he is quoting, will indicate that he is quoting.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Oh yes, I have authentic quotations here. I always authenticate information which I give, which is somewhat different to the policy of the Opposition.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You read well.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed. I say that, if these gentlemen opposite, who criticize our programme, would come out and visit the Regina gaol, (and may I extend that invitation to all the members of this House), I think that they would understand and get an appreciation of our programme. At the Regina gaol they would find that when an individual prisoner is admitted, he appears before a classification team. His case history is taken; his skills and physical and mental assets are assessed, and he is given a complete scientific analysis, on which the treatment team which we have can base a sound rehabilitation programme for that individual.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Next page.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — They would find at Regina gaol group work under group leaders. The group leaders in days gone by under the Liberals, called guards, were armed with guns and billies. They were employed because they were strong in the back and weak in the head! That was the only qualification they needed under the Liberal programme.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Judge not, that you be not judged.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . that — and you know the right Liberal people to get the job.

The group leaders, today, are trained in their job and they are doing excellent work in getting these prisoners to work together in a co-operative way. They carry on their farm work, their recreational work, their group discussions, and they lead a very active life at the Regina gaol. Academic education is carried on there. We have basic education — reading and writing. There are many adults who can neither write nor read, when

**March 12, 1953**

they are admitted. We have Government Correspondence Courses for the higher grades, and assistance given to the prisoners who wish to take this work. We have vocational trade training: such trades as motor mechanics, woodworking, shoe repairing, carpentry, tailoring, cooking; and many of these men have acquired a trade for the first time.

Our probation and parole service is improving, and if a man is being paroled to a certain area, his problems when he returns to that area are discussed. Employment may be secured for him. Our whole programme is based on that of rehabilitation, and the gentlemen opposite would find that the Regina gaol is probably the happiest penal institution in Canada, and that is why Saskatchewan gaols have not had gaol riots leading to bloodshed and death and destruction of millions of dollars worth of property. These riots have been occurring in scores throughout this continent during the past year. Saskatchewan can take pride in its corrections programme and its positive results.

Our programme has been examined and favourably commented on by some of the leading penologists of the North American continent. In passing, may I state that in order to read about our Saskatchewan penal programme, I very often have to take some national magazine printed outside the province of Saskatchewan. Here is a Toronto magazine of February of this year, and this is what it says:

“In making an objective and scientific comparison of programmes throughout Canada, generally speaking, legislation which is in content social, as well as legal, and which permits the province to take over most of the expenses of the programme, appears to be the best. This is best illustrated in the case of Saskatchewan. Since the present government in Saskatchewan is one which takes the greatest interest in all the phases of welfare, these schools are staffed by the best-trained personnel that can be trained, and appear to be modern in every respect.

“In contrast to that, Alberta may well have been the poorest organization for dealing with delinquency in any province; yet the situation in Quebec is, in some respects, as much open to higher criticism. Now, do the people of this province . . .”

**Mr. McCormack:** — Will the hon. member please give the publication to which he is referring?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The ‘Canadian Forum’ published in Toronto. Yesterday it was advocated by the member for Moosomin (who has returned to his seat) that the Moosomin gaol should never have been vacated, and it should be utilized today. May I state that if he had read the Laycock Commission Report on the condition of that gaol he would never have made that statement. I am sure that if he examined that institution which is a relic of barbaric days, of primitive methods in dealing with these unfortunate people, he would never have made that statement. All it has is rows of steel

cell blocks, and if those steel cells were removed, the building would collapse; and yet they want us to put some of these youngsters (some of them are youngsters) in those cells. That gaol . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Would the Minister permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I was wondering if the Minister could explain why he spent about \$30,000 on it, the year they closed it up?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I doubt whether that was expended. Even if so, that was before we got our programme going properly. Possibly it was not known as to what the requirements for gaol population would be; but the fact remains that . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — I would like to ask the Minister another question. He stated, a moment ago, that if the cells were removed from the Moosomin gaol it would crack. Is that now, or was that at the time you closed the gaol?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That was at the time the gaol was closed. Believe me, you are surely not advocating that we should put boys in an institution in blocks of steel cells! Surely the first thing to be done would be to remove those cells, and if they were removed, such is the construction of the building, it would collapse. It has been fairly inspected. We have offered that gaol to any local organization that would care to use it for any purpose whatsoever, and if your nostalgic interest in that building is as you say it is, why in the world do you not come to me and I will turn it over to you for \$1, and you can use it for any purpose whatsoever you may care to.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Will the Minister permit another question?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Oh yes, of course.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I was wondering if he would turn over the farm, along with the gaol, if I made an offer for it.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I never said anything about the farm.

**Mr. McDonald:** — No, I did not think so.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — All I have got to say is that I think too highly of the member for Moosomin to think, for one minute, that he would ever advocate, after examining that building, our placing our juvenile delinquents in it.

I would like to deal next, Mr. Speaker, with Child Welfare. Personally, I am proud of the ever-improving work of the Child Welfare Division in my Department. We have in care, in any one year, between 2000 and 2500 neglected or potentially neglected children. Starting with the basic philosophy that every child has a right to be brought up in a home and community where he can become a happy, useful citizen, one of the responsibilities of that Division is to render protection services within the home. Every effort

**March 12, 1953**

is made to straighten out the marital difficulties and other difficulties, such as economic difficulties, that may exist within the home. Our desire is to make conditions so that the child can safely remain within that home. If the difficulties cannot be ironed out, then we take the child into wardship, or temporary wardship. We may take the child into non-ward care — that is by agreement with the parents — or temporary wardship, until the problems within the home are ironed out and circumstances make it possible for us to return the child to the home. I am happy to state, Mr. Speaker, that out of the over 1200 families who received services, last year, it was only necessary to take the children of 23 families into permanent wardship.

Services were given to 723 unmarried mothers, last year; 620 putative fathers were contacted; 108 affiliation agreements were entered into without resorting to the courts, and \$36,000 for the care of the children was collected from putative fathers. Unmarried mothers receive assistance both before and after the birth of the child. Every effort is made to make it possible for the mother to retain the child, and under such circumstances we will place the mother on mother's allowance and provide for other assistance. Two hundred and fifty-six of the children of unwed parents were taken into wardship, last year, transferred by the courts.

The very foundation of our Child Welfare Programme is foster-home care and over 900 foster homes take care of over 1100 of our children in care of the Department. I have nothing but admiration and praise for the work of the foster homes of this province. The foster parents take these neglected children into their homes, into their families, and give them all the advantages of home life of a good Saskatchewan family. They are making it possible for us to do an effective job in child welfare in this province.

Some 314 children were adopted last year, and 677 adoption homes were under supervision. There is wide-spread interest and concern in humane and scientific adoption practice throughout North America, and this is being evidenced by the fact that the United Nations Organization have set up a committee to study sound scientific adoption practices throughout the civilized world. I am very proud that Saskatchewan was invited as one of the two provinces in the Dominion of Canada to become a member of that United Nations Organization Committee. We are proud, but that imposes a responsibility on us, and it is with some concern that we read in the papers, last summer, and again a few days ago, of the evidence that widespread racketeering in the adoption of Canadian babies outside the nation is taking place. I won't read the article in my hand, but so widespread has this become that our Department receives letters from the United States regarding the possibility of adopting children from this province. Here is a letter, dated March 8, that came to my desk, yesterday, from Eureka, California:

“We have tried to adopt children here in the States, but the demand is much greater than the supply . . .”

You would think they were talking about a physical commodity.

“ . . . especially for tiny babies which is what we want. Quite a few couples here in town have gotten them from Edmonton, and I wrote there but I thought I would write to you.”

Now that particular letter came to me from Saskatoon, but I am informed by our Child Welfare Branch that at least two letters a week of this nature are being received. So I think that there is evidence that this unscientific and inhumane practice of adopting children outside of a responsible jurisdiction or province is pretty widespread in this country. And when I have the temerity to mention it the hon. Leader of the Opposition said we must not do so, it will give comfort to the enemy.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What was said there — the indication was that Ontario had a tremendous baby-adopting racket going across the border, and the hon. Minister suggested that the whole thing be turned over to the United Nations, and I suggested that he as a Minister of the Crown in Saskatchewan, until he found out that this was more than an isolated case, should not cast reflections on another province of our country by claiming that he could not handle it, and asking the United Nations to take it over; and if we did that it would be taken advantage of by the Society Union to make propaganda against Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — My enemy, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Leader of the Opposition, are the racketeers that indulge in this inhumane, barbaric practice of trafficking in babies.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, it has turned out now that it was an isolated case, and had the Minister had his way, it would have been reflected on a neighbouring province and its government.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, as I have pointed out, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition had been listening, we get letters in our Department from the United States at the rate of at least two a week which is evidence that this practice of adopting babies outside of the country is condoned. But I wish to inform the people of this province that there never has been, since this Government came into office, and there will never be, a single baby adopted outside of the borders of this province. How can we carry on proper adoption . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Has the Minister made any check as to the reliability of this person who suggested that Alberta was engaging in this traffic in babies? Because this again is a reflection on a neighbouring government of a Canadian Province. Has he checked on the reliability of this writer or the facts that he mentions there?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would point out to my hon. friend that a commission sat in Alberta to investigate. This commission was under the chairmanship of Dr. Whitton, mayor of Ottawa . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is two years ago.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The Commission brought in its report and it was stated in that report that the adoption of children in Alberta outside the province was a general practice and should not be condoned; and within the last year or so when the press asked the Premier of Alberta if this had been discontinued his answer was, to the best of my knowledge, “no”. Now, whether it is discontinued at the present time or not, I do not know, but because it has been permitted in Alberta in the past, within

**March 12, 1953**

recent months at least, these people from the United States think they can come into Saskatchewan as well and get babies for adoption here.

I am very happy to announce, Mr. Speaker, that we have reduced the institutional care of neglected children in this province to a minimum. We have only two institutions: one is Embury House where only seriously maladjusted children are taken into care. They undergo treatment and, as soon as they have recovered, they are passed into adoption homes. We have the second, which is our Regina Babies Nursery here in Regina where children are brought in pending their being placed in foster homes or adoption homes. We have never attained, or we do not pretend to have attained, perfection in this difficult field of the care of neglected children, but if I know the spirit of the staff they will go on trying to improve that service year by year. I am afraid I am speaking a long time, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to deal and report a little more fully on my Department, and there are many activities that I have not dealt with.

I would like to deal with the rehabilitation of the handicapped persons. Now many persons who have been disabled by accident or crippling diseases or deformities or mental illness or for other causes still have assets which far outweigh their disabilities. We found by careful assessment that, if these people are trained, taking into consideration their assets and their disabilities, they can be trained to the point where they can accept employment, do a good job, earn their own living and in many cases come off our relief rolls. Our work in this difficult field is still of an experimental nature. Last year, we had 217 of a case load of physically handicapped persons in our Rehabilitation Branch. Aside from the humanitarian aspect, the programme appears to be sound economically, and we have been following for some time the financial experience of a group of 38 people who had completed our training and had been placed in employment. Last year, they earned a total of approximately \$50,000, and it took approximately \$17,000 to train them, and that was just a little more than the amount of relief that we had been paying them in the past. So from the viewpoint of the monetary end of it, setting aside the humanitarian aspects the programme would appear to be well worthwhile. I am pleased that the Federal Government is taking an interest in our programme, and we hope that there will evolve in the near future a national programme for the rehabilitation of handicapped persons.

Besides the physically handicapped there are the socially and the economically handicapped groups, including relatively large numbers of Metis people. The Metis people of Saskatchewan can take pride in their ancestry. They are the sons on the paternal side of courageous, adventurous, early explorers who came to this country from overseas, and on the maternal side they can take pride in their patient, hard-working, loyal, honest native mothers.

The Metis people of this province have contributed greatly to the early development of the west. They were the guides and the scouts and the pathfinders and the interpreters and the diplomats, very often, in a very hostile country, and because they were good skilled hunters they often provided the food for the early settlers. When the Indians ceded their land to the Crown — I think it was in 1870 — the Metis almost invariably preferred to retain their independence by refusing sanctuary on reservations as wards of the Federal Government, and for that I admire them. But the tragedy has been that, over the years, the resources upon which the Metis people depend



for their livelihood disappeared and employment opportunities lessened with changing production methods in the province. The Metis became a neglected, isolated people lacking in educational economic opportunities and without assistance from Government sources in the past, except immediately before elections. But I won't go into that.

Rehabilitation work among the Metis people under our Department is being carried out at Baljennie, Glenmary, Lestock, Crooked Lake, Willow Bunch, Lebret, Duck Lake and Crescent Lake, where there are concentrations of these people. The first thing was the establishment of schools, although it was a municipal responsibility to establish these schools. We discovered that children were growing up to manhood and womanhood without having been in school and in consequence were illiterate. There are many illiterate people among the Metis, unfortunately. We have purchased land for gardens and farming purposes. We have the Lebret farm which completely cares for about 80 people. We provide welfare services. But I would like to deal for a moment with the fine work that is being done in this province by Father Blanchard of Willow Bunch. Bishop Lemieux of the Diocese of Gravelbourg, who is deeply interested in the problem of the Metis people, has been gracious enough to release Father Blanchard to the Department to assist in the carrying out of an effective rehabilitation programme among the Metis people. He has made a success, to my mind, of one group already; that is the Willow Bunch group of Metis people. His approach is based on the philosophy and, indeed, the efficacy of co-operation. These people have been exploited in the past. They are suspicious very often of any attempts being made to rehabilitate them. But in Father Blanchard they have confidence because the basis on which they are building is a religious base. The result is that he gains their confidence from the beginning. Father Blanchard trained in co-operative organization and co-operative philosophy, and he believes completely in it. His first step was to establish Saving Unions, and then from there to co-operative farms. His success so far has been such as to make me believe that he is going to be invaluable in this province in successfully rehabilitating the Metis people.

**Mr. Ripley:** — Would the minister permit a question? There are several thousand of these Metis people up in the north, in my constituency, and, of course, co-operative farming and so on is out of the question there. Is there any extension of your programme of aid to the Metis that will help the advance in the north? Does the programme extend that far north at the present time, or will it in the near future?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, I am sure there is, and I would like to discuss the situation with you, and if we deem it mutually advisable or feasible, I am sure Father Blanchard will be glad to go into the North and examine the situation. There are other types of co-operatives that can be organized, and if anyone can do a job, I am sure that he can.

In concluding, I merely want to mention . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Before the Minister concludes, I have been wanting to ask him about this point. Just two years ago, I believe, they were working on a programme to help religious and fraternal institutions who were looking after aged people in the homes run by those institutions, and as far as I know, the only thing done thus far was to make a small nominal grant to

**March 12, 1953**

some of these institutions just before the last election. I wondered if those grants are going to be made each year, or whether they were sort of a grant made on that special occasion, without any intention of having them on a yearly basis?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — My hon. friend knows better than to ask a question like that . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am just asking for information, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — In the first place, you know perfectly well that this Government has never made a grant at any time on the basis of its election results.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I say that, as far as I know, the only grants made to these institutions were made just before the election, and I am asking now are they going to be made each year, or were they made at that time, not on any annual basis, but just made at that time? I am just asking a question, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Any grants that were made, are of course, annual grants. The only thing I am hoping is that we will be able to increase those grants, and if the hon. gentleman had not been so facetious in his question, I would have been happy to answer it the first time he asked it. I would like to . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Might I ask the Minister if any grants were made to these institutions before the last election? During the eight years this government has been in office, were any grants made until just before the last election? I suggest that that is the case, and I asked him if we may look to those grants from now on each year.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Those grants were made — I think we started them in 1951. However, I haven't the information immediately at hand but may I assure the hon. member that no grants by my Department were ever made on the basis of the political results they would bring. That is a Liberal dodge.

**Mr. Tucker:** — We were glad to get them, of course.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would like to deal momentarily with the fine work of the Civil Defence and Disaster organization of this province under the directorship of John Probe, in meeting serious flood situations which existed last spring. The town of Eastend, as you know, was completely inundated, and homes were partially, at least, destroyed, and required rebuilding or rehabilitation. He went in there and did a job and may I say that the people of that town were in a very bad way indeed. They were discouraged. Many of them intended leaving Eastend, but because of the rapid rehabilitation of their homes, the condition of that town, today, is better than it has ever been in the history of Eastend, so I have been informed. The hon. Minister of Health and I were invited, a couple of weeks ago, as the guests of the citizens of Eastend, so that they might express their appreciation for the work that had been done by the Civil Defence Branch. It was a great pleasure to be there and to talk to those people and to note their enthusiasm, which was so evident. I have confidence that Eastend is going to be one of the finer towns of this province.

The Civil Defence Branch carried on rehabilitation in flooded areas along the Saskatchewan River and Frenchman's Creek, in six municipalities in the Eastend district, and Swift Current, to the amount of over a quarter of a million dollars. That is aside, of course, from all the money that was expended on washed-out roads, bridges, and so on. The value of the Civil Defence . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Was this money administered by Mr. Probe — the re-building of washed-out roads, bridges, etc?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — No, no! I said aside from the money that was expended on roads and bridges. I merely wish to state that I hope the members of the House will support our Civil Defence and Civil Disaster organizations in their various constituencies. They are doing a very fine work, as applicable in peace as in war. I think that the organization and the training that they are building up in the province will be very, very valuable.

**Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget Debate, I would first like to congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer on the very fine address he made in delivering the budget address. I noticed one of the members on this side of the House expressed complete confidence in the Minister's ability in a very unusual way, and that was by sleeping all through the address. I was watching the visitors, the expressions on their faces, the expressions on the faces of the Opposition, and the people in the gallery. During the time he was delivering his address, and when he mentioned the budget of seventy million dollars, I thought I could see a little fear registered on their faces, and they were wondering what terrible tax this man was going to impose on the people at this time; but after he went on, and they found out that he had actually reduced the amount of taxes of the province, of the people and what they had to pay, why, when the people left this assembly hall, the happy smiles on their faces, I am sure, is the way that most all the people in Saskatchewan greeted this budget.

Now, before I go on, I would like to congratulate the two Ministers on their fine addresses this afternoon. One had a little depressing subject — he was talking about work, and the other Minister was mentioning the fine working conditions out at Regina Gaol. I was just thinking of the working conditions of this Legislature. The Hon. Minister of Social Welfare mentioned just one thing which I would like to correct him on — I don't think he intended to say it that way. He said Father Blanchard was going to organize Credit Unions. Actually, he is trying to organize Savings Unions. There is quite a difference between credit unions and savings unions. That is correct, isn't it, Mr. Sturdy?

Now, I would like to mention my constituency — the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. We are very fortunate and very pleased to be able to say it is the only constituency in the province of Saskatchewan where No. 1 Highway is completed from one side to the other. Some people might think that they were discriminating against the other constituencies in doing this, but actually this is not the case. Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency has the distinction of being the home of the oldest settled part in this province, and

**March 12, 1953**

the history of all the farm movements started in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency along the mainline of the C.P.R., which is the route that No. 1 Highway follows. In speaking of this fine highway, I might mention that quite a few Americans have told me that this is as fine a highway as they have ever travelled on in any part of the North American continent. That is quite a credit to our Minister of Highways. I would also like to mention that we have another black-top highway, and that is from Qu'Appelle to Fort Qu'Appelle, and that is only fitting because the town of Fort Qu'Appelle is a summer resort town, and most people travelling from Regina, that is their summer home — the Lake of Katepwa and the other two lakes at Fort Qu'Appelle.

Then, we also have another highway to be proud of and that is No. 56 Highway which leads directly north of Indian Head. It is not quite completed, and it will go and serve the south end of Katepwa Lake, and that way people will be able to either go east or west of Katepwa Lake when they are travelling from Regina.

I would now like to mention that the rest of the constituency I represent is not quite so fortunate. No. 16 Highway, 33 Highway, No. 35, all there is is the markings there; No. 47 — there is not even the marking there. So we are hoping to get some of this \$18 million highway budget. And then there is the main market road problem. Unfortunately, the connecting roads between those three highways, 33, 16, and No. 1, are hardly passable at some times of the year, so that is a very serious problem, something we hope we can remedy.

Now, I am not going to say anything more about my constituency, but I notice that one of the members of the Opposition, when we was speaking mentioned income tax, and that is a very serious thing, Mr. Speaker. Then, during the Cannington by-election, the Hon. 'Jimmy' Gardiner was speaking at the town of Windthorst. He stated that any farmer that had no money in the Fall, would not need to worry about making out income tax papers. This is a very misleading statement and has caused many farmers very serious difficulties. I might mention that this statement was quoted in the 'Leader-Post' on several occasions, and this is what has happened. As you know, no farmer has any money left in the Fall, or any other time, because he spends it all, and when he has never been told, like he is when he receives a municipal tax notice, that he must pay that tax, he completely forgets all about it — rightly so, when, on the authority of Mr. Gardiner, he has been told that he does not need to pay any income tax if he has no money left in the Fall.

What is taking place today? I will admit the Federal Government are not directly taking part in this campaign. In fact, I think it is described as 'bureaucracy'. But the Income Tax Branch in Regina goes out to the farm population, and they will probably take two farmers in every town on the first trip, and they will have them make out a financial statement, and then they must make up their income tax for as far back as they have never made up an income tax form. The income tax is based on their financial statement at the day these income tax inspectors go out — and what happens? Generally, it means a mortgage on the farm, or borrowing money on his assets, or going into bankruptcy.

Now that is quite a common thing today, and a very serious thing. I am not saying here that people should not pay income tax; it is a very necessary tax. But I maintain that they should have been told that they have to pay income tax. The situation that 50 per cent of the farmers find themselves in today is not of their own making: it is directly the fault of the Federal Government that they must pay income tax.

There is another very serious thing, and this has to do with the 1949 election. After the 1949 Federal election, there was an Act of Parliament passed, and this is the gist of it — I haven't got it here, but very few people know about it. When the head of the house dies, the husband on a farm, he might be killed, or he might die, everything on the farm becomes taxable for income tax. What I mean is that all taxable things as wheat, cattle, horses, and things of that nature. The mother and the children who are left, are not allowed to spread this income over several years, such a selling wheat, say, in 1953 they could extend it to 1954, or from 1952, but it immediately becomes taxable, and before any of the assets on that farm become taxed, the widow must pay the tax to the Federal Government, to the Income Tax Branch. Now, this is something that is not too well known to most farmers, and I have often wondered that the Farmers' Union have never got hold of this very damaging piece of legislation because . . .

**Mr. McCormack:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to mislead the House, but there are several sections under that particular section in the Income Tax Act. I know, I have had some experience with it. The income can be applied back over the last five years and can be made income as it comes into the hands of the beneficiaries, or it can be assessed to that year under which there is a double exemption given. There are at least three provisions in there.

**Mr. Wahl:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to contradict the hon. member. What I said is absolutely correct, and I wish that he would take the time and trouble to look up this law before he leaves this House today. The reason I know this is because it has happened several times in my hometown. I have seen this happen, and I was requested by the widow of one of these gentlemen to bring this to the attention of this House.

Now, there is another thing I would like to mention, and again I don't like to criticize income tax; I think it has its merits, and people have to pay taxes. To a person with a large income it is a very fair tax, but our pioneers, when they were setting up their homes in this province and other provinces, found it very difficult. In fact, we went 'broke' paying 10 and 12 per cent interest. But did you ever consider that the young veteran today, or anyone starting up on the farm, is paying 30 per cent interest through the income tax. Now, I have wondered if it would not be possible to have young farmers who are starting on farms, exempted from income tax. It has been mentioned many times that it is difficult and practically impossible for young people to start on farms today. I believe that is true.

There is another thing I would like to mention and that is a report by the Department of Agriculture in the United States. They mention that things a farmer has to sell this year will be lower in price, and things he has to buy will be higher. Now that is a very alarming statement too, and very alarming to businessmen. Actually, last Fall, it was rather rough on the

**March 12, 1953**

small businessman in any town or village in the three prairie provinces. About the only way he could stay in business was to procure an overdraft from the bank, and I am told from travellers (and I meet many of them, because I am a business man) that drafts were being returned last Fall by about 100 per cent of the small storekeepers, and the many businessmen who have been in business for 25 years or more and had never returned drafts before, were returning 50 per cent of their drafts. That is a very alarming story. With this spread between the selling price of the farmer's product and the buying price of what he has to buy, it seems to me that businessmen are going to be in for a very rough time again this year.

Rural electric power — I am just going to mention this, because in the campaign (and I live down close to Manitoba), it was stated by all the Liberal speakers that if they were elected, we would receive free power the same as they receive in Manitoba. Well, I would just like to correct that statement. I corrected it during the campaign, and they told me it was not correct. But it is correct that all farmers in Manitoba do not receive free power, and by that I do not mean a payment of \$65.00 which is a token payment; but I will say that certain farmers in Manitoba, right now, are paying up to \$1200 to receive farm electric power. I am going to explain to this House why it is. There are certain parts of Manitoba that the two power companies have a franchise covering certain farm areas, and their usual charge for electrifying a farm is \$875, considerably more than in Saskatchewan. When people say that power is free in Manitoba, it is free to some people.

Our farmers are very pleased at the Saskatchewan Government's power programme. If you are buying a 32-volt plant to serve your farm, in most cases, to get you one that would be of any use, it would cost you around \$1600, so they do not feel too badly laying out the \$500 or \$600, and I have noticed they voted for this programme because they did not want to get something for nothing. They know there are always strings attached, and the strings attached to that would be this: that some people would never receive this 'free' electric power on their farms in their lives in Saskatchewan. Now, I think that is quite true.

I am not going to say much more. It is a quarter to six, and the working conditions — as a new member I was rather surprised as I always understood that the members came up here and spent most of their time sleeping in their seats, and the rest of the time playing rummy in the members' room. When I left home they all told me that whatever I did, at least try and do some work up here; but since I have been here I found that you get up in the morning about eight or half-past . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — We do play rummy — and we do work!

**Mr. Wahl:** — Probably the Cabinet Ministers work longer than that! Anyways, this goes on until 12 o'clock at night, so I am going to say that, needless to say, I am going to support the budget.

**Hon. J.W. Burton (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the Debate.

(Agreed)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:50 o'clock p.m.