

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Twelfth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 18, 1955

The House met at three o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

RE PRESS STATEMENT

Mr. R. Kohaly (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of personal privilege.

The Leader-Post of Friday, February 18, has a 7-column headline stating, "Bentley charges Kohaly with inaccuracy in Jobless Issue." Now, I want to take personal exception to that headline. It is not correct, and it ought to be corrected by the parties involved. I do not want to protract the particular problem between the Minister and me. I am not discussing that. I am discussing this, and I think that it should be cleared up.

My figures were not inaccurate as far as the Leader-Post is concerned and as proof, the weekly Labour Report, taken from the Legislative Library, of the Department of Labour of this province shows the figures. I quoted 21,000 as of February 4th; they quote as of February 3rd, 20,989. I may have been inaccurate to the extent of 11 people of 21,000 people approximately. However, the next figure, a February 10th shows 21,190 and so, when I took a date in between, I was not inaccurate and I feel that that 7-column heading that indicates inaccuracy on my part is not fair and is not correct, and that I should take this point of personal privilege and have it cleared up. I think that is the only point that prompts that heading.

Now there are differences of opinion between myself and the Minister of some of these figures, but I don't think it refers to that. I do not want to protract the discussion any further unless somebody else wants to. But I do insist that that is an unfair heading, that my figures are correct, and that they are in the reports of the Saskatchewan Government Department of Labour, and that the report is on file in the Legislative Library.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 17th, 1955, the adjourned debate of Mr. Dewhurst for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned last night I was just exchanging a few pleasantries with the members of the Opposition and pointing out the failure of the Leader of the Liberal party of the day and the party itself, since its last convention, to proffer a programme with regard to health and other things that might be intelligible to the people. I had also dealt with some other matters that have been dealt with here, this afternoon.

In my opening remarks with regard to the programme of the Liberal party, I have stated that I would examine each one of those statements that are the planks of their party, so far as health is concerned, in their platform.

February 18, 1955

I pointed out that what they have offered to the people is a health platform that is nothing more or less than a shady attempt, and a pretty transparent attempt, to copy a programme of solid achievement by the C.C.F. Government, and then to claim it as their own.

For the benefit of the members, Mr. Speaker, I would like again to quote their first statement of principles, and then I will deal with their planks one at a time. This is what they say; this is their purpose in regard to health:

“The Saskatchewan Liberal party having by its legislation pioneered local health insurance schemes for our rural economy, which provided hospital and medical and surgical services outstanding for their high standard and moderate costs, services which rapidly extended within the province to serve a large proportion of the people, and having as its objective the extension of such services until they serve the whole population, and having also established invaluable diagnostic, preventive and treatment services for tuberculosis and cancer control, will upon its return to power, continue and augment health services within the province to provide:”

And then the six planks follow. Superficially, I suppose a person could say that that statement appears to offer precisely the programme that the present Government is carrying out. But, the statement is inaccurate as to facts, it is misleading as to intent, and it is notable for what it fails to say.

It is true that they did, shortly before the retirement from office in 1944, place on the statute books some enabling legislation on cancer control. It is well to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party was in power from 1905 to 1929 — 24 years in this province. They had all that time to introduce something on cancer. Cancer is not something new. It took a Tory Minister of Health, a co-operative government with a Tory Minister of Health, to introduce the first cancer programme of any kind in this province — my esteemed friend Dr. Munroe, who is a friend of all of us. Then, when that government went out, our Liberal friends had another 10 years of office; jury in six of those years (the latter 6) 2 of them were over extended time, one of them I believe could be called an illegally extended year of time. Then in the last year they produced this legislation. So I say it is misleading and it is inaccurate and its intent is wrong. They did not make one step towards the implementation of that legislation. So a person can only conclude that that Legislation was intended as a pre-election campaign promise.

The Liberal statement of what they did prior to 1944, their great accomplishments, avoids mention of care for the pensioners, for persons on social aid, for persons who are mentally ill. The reason was that nothing was done for that kind of people by the Liberal government as long as it was in office. And, coming under the category of health insurance, which should by any measuring stick of all be regarded, are those categories such as medical, hospital, surgical, nursing, mental and other health care for pensioners and other persons receiving social aid, and their dependants. There are about 35,000 of these people in this province and for the first time, in 1945, these people began to be treated not as charity patients, but as persons who had a right to the services, and were encouraged to seek the best medical care

and other health care in order that their lives would be prolonged and made happy and productive.

The Liberal party did and said nothing about the crushing burden of mental illness falling upon the relatives or estates of those among the mentally ill who were judged independent. It took a C.C.F. Government, Mr. Speaker, which, in 1945, made treatment in our mental hospitals available regardless of ability to pay. Our friends across the way made no such contribution to that particular section of our population which certainly needed it, as time has proven.

I would like now to take their planks one at a time and deal with them. Their first plank was:

“Continuation of the present hospital services plan.” What could be more inane than a remark like that? With all their faults, with all the stupidities that we might charge against the Liberal party in this province, no one can accuse them of deliberately cutting their own throats, and any government or party seeking power who would say anything different from that would be deliberately cutting its own throat. They never did it when they were in power; but because a government has done it since they got out of power, now they would like to say, “Me, too; we’ll do it”, and so they say that. I am going to deal with that a little bit later. That is their first plank. The second plank:

“Financial assistance for the construction and equipment of approved hospitals to provide essential services as close to the people as possible.”

I said the previous one was an inanity. I don’t know what word to use to describe this one.

Premier Douglas: — Assininity.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Assininity? I don’t know if that is parliamentary, so I won’t undertake to use it; but if some people have it in their minds, I won’t try to remove it, because I would probably find occasion to agree with that description.

Mr. Cameron: — People will read the platform regardless.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes, and laugh. My hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, said “people will read the platform regardless of what I say”. I say, yes, they will read it and laugh, except those that haven’t got any sense of humour, and they will likely tear it up and throw it away.

A statement or a promise to provide “financial assistance for construction of hospitals as close to the people as possible,” is just as meaningless as a statement could possibly be. Making quality care available to everyone is precisely what the present programme is doing. I don’t know what our friends over there do better than make promises. They have a lot of faults. They probably have many things wrong with them, but one thing they are unexcelled in, and that is in making promises. If there is anything in their attitude or their actions which equals their ability to make promises, it is their failure to keep them after they have made them.

Mr. McDonald: — We’ve a long way to go to catch up to you, boy!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — There is a lot of mumbling going on over there, Mr. Speaker,

February 18, 1955

but then it does not mean very much. They should join our friends from Swift Current and wear beards; the mumbling would sound more musical.

Construction grants to assist in the building of small rural hospitals was pioneered by the C.C.F. Government in 1946, not, prior to that, by anyone else, but in 1946. I want my friends to remember that, and the record is there to prove it. The need for such assistance was urgent at the time, and I will tell you why it was urgent in a moment or two. The programme was introduced in recognition of the fact that there will always be a place in a rural economy like Saskatchewan for the small hospitals. So, obviously, what they said was meaningless.

I wonder if our friends cannot forget, or do they expect us to forget, the deplorable hospital system that we had in Saskatchewan prior to coming into power of the C.C.F. and which we inherited from the Liberal regime in 1944. There were a few small hospitals at the time. All of Saskatchewan hospital beds numbered less than 4 per thousand — not much more than half of what we have at the present time. I don't know what they are trying to tell people. They had all the opportunity in the past to do these things and did not do them. Now they come along and say they are going to do them.

Most of the small hospitals that did exist were renovated houses; they were fire traps; they had no proper sanitation facilities, and they lacked the facilities for good hospital and medical care, and these people, I suppose, are saying now that they will build more of them to get them as close to the people as possible. The Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan was introduced in 1947. There was no Liberal Government in power; nor had it ever been introduced before, Mr. Speaker. The reason it was introduced was because we needed this high-quality care for everybody in the province, and this Government proceeded to do it.

The rapid development of good roads in this province during the last few years and the increase in motor car registrations has assured ready access, through most of the year, to the bigger and better-equipped and better-staffed hospitals in the province. Consequently, the emphasis has been on construction since 1947 and before that while this Government was in power and up until the present time, is to provide for hospitals close to the people, the smaller hospitals. Now I want to this remembered. At every stage of the programme, year in and year out, month in and month out, people who represent or come from the municipal associations, from the hospital associations, from the health profession and other groups, were consulted, and their advice is being acted on. We have imposed no plan on the people. We have simply guided the construction programme for the provision of the smaller hospitals, close to the people, closer than our friends are likely to get unless they don't know what they are doing; and we have done it along the lines that were recommended by the people I mentioned whose advice we seek.

As a result of that there has emerged in Saskatchewan a pattern of hospital construction that does ensure the very thing that our friends across the way are promising — quality facilities in care within the reach of all, or will be very shortly. At the same time, we have assured an end of wasteful and extravagant overbuilding and overlapping of these facilities. Most people in Saskatchewan are within 25 miles of first-class hospital facilities. If the Liberal party were similarly interested in providing the best in hospital construction, in hospital care and in ideal hospital locations at reasonable cost, they would have spelled out their programme in detail. Almost every small community would like to have a hospital. For one thing it brings business,

and boards of trade are interested. But what the statement of the Liberal party in their platform really implies is that they, that Liberals, would assist in building many small hospitals, whether they were needed or not, as long as they brought votes to the Liberal party.

Mr. Danielson: — How wrong can you get.

Mr. McDonald: — How crazy can you get.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Now their third plank. I expect they really hope to stand on this platform. Personally, I think it is a pretty shaky one, but I suppose it is the best they could devise. Their third plank:

“Relief of present overcrowding of hospitals by provisions of special institutions for the care of the chronically ill.”

The Liberal party in offering a programme to relieve overcrowding of hospitals by provision of special institutions for the care of the chronically ill should know that the first task is not to relieve overcrowding, but to assure that the chronically ill receive the kind of care which makes them comfortable and assures real opportunity for return to normal and happy lives. I would like our friends across the way to mark that. Many of the chronically-ill conditions can best be treated in general hospitals where specialized medical care is readily available. The important first objective of the present Government has been to make it possible for the chronically ill to receive good hospital care when they needed it, even though it times it might mean they would occupy a bed when they were not actually acutely ill.

Several hundred beds have been provided for chronically-ill people in the province, and already more are under construction. This problem, Mr. Speaker, is being solved while the Liberals are talking about it and making, as I say, these meaningless promises.

And their fourth one has a lot of words to it — not that they mean very much; but I suppose they sounded good to them when they wrote them down. The fourth one is:

“A steady extension in co-operation with the municipalities, the Federal Government and existing health agencies, or contributory health insurance with the ultimate objective of providing a province-wide scheme of medical, surgical, nursing, dental, pharmaceutical and optometrical services.”

What do they mean by “co-operation with the municipalities?” Nothing was done prior to 1944 in assisting the municipalities to pool their resources to the instrument of the organized health region. The present Government has made possible the establishment of eight of these regions. It pays two-thirds of the cost to operate and provides many additional consultative and technical services so that health services of a high quality can be offered. Government policy makes it possible for these democratically-controlled regions to set up complete medical care programmes, totally or in part, whenever the region itself feels that they care to do so, and the Government makes substantial grants to assist them to do it.

What I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, is: does the Liberal statement mean that the Liberals would prefer to work with individual municipalities and let the health regions starve through inattentiveness and inaction and neglect? Nothing in the statement suggests that these people who make this promise, or Liberal friends, know anything about how to help municipalities to help themselves. I think this statement is purposely vague on what they mean by a “steady extension in co-operation with municipalities and Federal Government and existing health agencies, or contributory health insurance.” I don’t really believe they know for sure what health insurance, health services, really involve. I may deal with that aspect of it a little later this afternoon.

What the Liberal party stand is on who should control health insurance is something that they have not stated yet. I assume they propose to follow up the proposals advocated by the voluntary health agencies. Such proposals call for programmes handled by the voluntary agencies, with the government only coming into the picture to pay the premiums for the indigent people who are unable to pay their own. The Liberal statement fails to show understanding that comprehensive health insurance involves many professions and skills. This is something they had better learn if, in the course of the next decade or so, they hope to come over and occupy these seats on your right, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal statement fails to show understanding that comprehensive health insurance requires many, many things beyond what they have stated here. Unless the Liberals state to the contrary, I must assume that they have in mind a multiplicity of little programmes operated by a multiplicity of little agencies all over the country.

Contrary to that, I want our friends to understand the programme and the policy of this Government, which is a policy committed to the developing of a unified and co-ordinated health service, which is the only way by which health service of high quality can be made available to all the people so that it is worth something to them.

We now come to the fifth plank in the platform. I do not know whether this is just a bunch of slats, or whether they are really supposed to be planks; and so I get a bit confused and trying to work out what is in their minds by the words they put down. Here is their fifth plank, however — we will dignify it by the name of any ‘plank’ because that is the general usage throughout the years in political platforms. I quote:

“Administration of health insurance by a central commission with adequate representation of those providing the services, those receiving the services and the government, such representation to be appointed only with the approval of the groups concerned.”

That statement calls for the administration of health services by a central commission, and they mention who will compose the central commission. I would like to remind the members opposite, and everybody in the House and everyone who might hear, that even the Prime Minister of this country, Prime Minister St. Laurent, in recent utterances on health insurance has emphasized that control of health service must rest with the agency responsible for collecting funds, which means, of course, the government. The principle of ministerial responsibility which means that the Minister is answerable to the representatives of the people in the Legislature is found in all the health programmes initiated by the present Government of Saskatchewan. Spokesmen for health professions and other groups that I have mentioned before — municipal

associations, labour, farm groups, hospital groups and so on — do advise the Government, through the Health Services Planning Commission, on which there are members drawn from these various agencies I have mentioned. We attach a tremendous amount of weight to the advice that they give us; but, because it is the taxpayers' money which is being spent, the Government considers it only proper that all health programmes should be controlled by the responsible Minister concerned, in this case, the Minister of Public Health. Unless the Liberal party is prepared to say to the contrary, it must be assumed that they mean by "central commission" a body not answerable to the Legislature for their actions.

Mr. Speaker, I think they should make that position clear. Is it their intention, or is it not their intention, to hand over the operation of all the health services, which they say they are going to maintain and continue to expand and augment, to an independent commission (independent of whom?) Completely outside the control of the Legislature, outside the control of the Government that they hope some day to have sitting over here, and to allow a commission of that kind to spend public money without, in any way, being responsible for how that money is collected from the public? I think they should state their intentions and state them in no uncertain terms, and remember — the new Leader of the Opposition should remember — the statement I just mentioned was made by the Prime Minister of this country who is, I assume, in Liberal ranks, somewhat senior to our young friend across the way, who has recently assumed the position of Leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan. I will mention that again. Prime Minister St. Laurent has said, and he has emphasized very strongly, that control of health service must rest with the agency responsible for the collection of public funds. I would like our friends to keep that in mind.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They never thought of that.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Now they have another plank — the sixth and last one on the list, according to the information I have, emanating from their convention, and their statement of what they are pleased to call principles with regard to health. The sixth one is:

“Maximum utilization by the province of health grants provided for the province by the Federal Government.”

That again is like the other one I have quoted: it is meaningless; there is no substance to it. I don't think they knew what they were talking about when they wrote it down, except that it sounded good and they hoped, by that statement, to intimate to and convince anyone who reads the statement that this Government does not make the maximum use of the Federal grants. Well, I would like to disabuse their minds. We not only make maximum use of them, but we would like to have some more. If it were not for the restrictions on them we would use them to the last nickel, and we use them to nearly that now.

I want to remind our friends that these grants are, at the present time, already being utilized as fully as possible. Nothing they could do would utilize them any more fully. Some are ear-marked for long-term construction projects to which the province is committed, and these will be used up as the construction projects proceed. We do not start a project and get the money from the Federal Government as soon as we say we are going to start. We get it in stages; and as the project is completed in the stages, we get the money. Until we get the money our friends across the way would like to suggest to the

public and maybe convince themselves, that we are not utilizing the grants. Once we have committed ourselves to a construction programme, we make our application to the Federal Government for its construction grant that is promised according to their policy, and they either agree or disagree with our project. If they agree, they say we will get the grant — therefore we get it; but we do not spend it until we get it. So we are utilizing the construction grants, and will utilize them when our construction programmes are completed, to the full. They cannot use any more than that unless something happens, which I will refer to in a few moments.

Now other grants are being used to train qualified workers and engage qualified workers. There is a shortage of trained people all across Canada. We are getting them as fast as they are available, but this shortage exists and nothing the Liberal party can promise or say will alter that shortage, nor speed up the time when the shortage will not be in existence. So that statement, again, of their sixth plank doesn't mean very much.

I want to remind our friends across the way that there are certain regulations and restrictions on our ability to get Federal grants. It is all very well for our friends to get up and say "the Federal Government makes so much money available for certain things in the provinces and Saskatchewan isn't using it". Some of these grants are not being used because the thing that the Federal Government says they can only be used for is being done already here, or has been provided for in Saskatchewan. The Federal Government says, "if you have already provided for them, you do not get any more help." So a province like Saskatchewan, which has done a great deal and has pioneered in health services in this country, finds itself in the position of being unable to utilize these grants because they had done the things that the grants were supposed to be used for, years before the grants came into existence.

Some of the grants are only available for new or expanded programmes, and we cannot use all those. No province can use all those, particularly a province like Ontario, who had no desire to extend their health services and, therefore, did not take advantage of the grants; or a province like Saskatchewan, which as I said a moment ago, had done the very job that the grant money was supposed to be used for, so it is not available to us and we cannot use that at all. It may be possible that our friends across the way think by having a Liberal government here they can have some inside track with the Federal Liberal Government, and get preferred treatment in the matter of grants. If that is the case, then I can only say that it is about as cheap a kind of political activity for anyone to anticipate or hope to have happen.

Mr. Danielson: — You are setting up a straw man now, boy!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, there is no other way for them to do it except by getting special favours. If they get the same restrictions on the grants if they were here (which they won't be, of course, which is fortunate for the people of Saskatchewan); but if they were here, they would either have to get special treatment or they would have to get along under the regulations set by the Federal Government.

There are some fields where we use far more than the Federal Government grants. In the field of cancer services our expenditures exceed by many hundreds of thousands of dollars the amount the Federal Government matches for us, and the same might be said for some of the other grants also. And we do not get any grant assistance from the Liberal government at Ottawa for our hospital services plan, even though this was promised several years ago. So

when they talk about utilizing the grants to the full, they are building up a straw man when they say that by attempting to convince the public that we are not taking full advantage of any financial assistance which the Federal Government makes available. We take advantage of every nickel that, just as fast as we possibly can, because we need the services in this province.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I do not want anyone to get the impression that we regard these health grants from the Federal Government as generous. They are far, far short of the amounts of money and assistance that the Federal Government promised to make available to the provinces when they held their Dominion-Provincial conferences of 1945 in 1946. Read your 'Green Books' — even the gentleman across the way, who is smiling a bit sarcastically, can read. I have seen and heard him read, so I know he can read I would suggest that he read the Green Books and see what is there.

Mr. McDonald: — He can't they see the book for the green.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Through the last Liberal convention, and through their new leader, the Liberal party is promising many things. Among other things, if I have listened and heard correctly, both since the Legislature opened and two radio talks before that and so on, they have promised larger school grants, larger municipal road grants, higher allowances to old-age pensioners, mothers' allowance cases, blind pensioners and reduced taxation, at a time when Federal Liberal foreign policies are reducing farm income from which the bulk of the provincial revenues come. These are the kinds of promises they are making. I said a while ago that there is one field they have never been excelled in, any place in the world that I have ever read any history on, and that is in their ability to make promises, and again I follow that up with the same qualification — that their ability to make promises is only equalled, or possibly even excelled, by their failure to keep any of the promises after they are made.

Mr. McDonald: — You'll eat those words.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I remember sitting in this House at a time when I think it was conceded from this side there was some gray matter among the members over there, for I remember after one of their members was removed to another position our Premier made the statement that he didn't think the Liberal party was stupid enough to blow its own brains out . . .

Mr. Danielson: — We considered the source from which it came.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes, that's right, and it came from an excellent and authoritative source. There is no one better able to recognize brains than the leader of the party on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker

Mr. McDonald: — . . . a poor example today.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I remember when some of these people, since I have been in this House, making speeches here, stated that the C.C.F. Government provides too many social services. It is well remembered — even some of our friends over there will have memories long enough to remember that. Then they come out with a statement of what they call 'principles', and their other promises of what we are going to do! Now they cannot have it both ways. They cannot provide more social services and say this government has too many social services, because when they say they are going to provide more social services, they must mean more than this Government provides, and then

t

they are guilty, in the past, and I expect they are thinking yet even if they are afraid to actually say so; they have been guilty in the past of saying we provide too many social services . . .

Mr. Danielson: — When?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, I can only assume it is the Liberal intention to reduce the amount of money which makes these services possible, because, remember, they said our taxes are too high and tacitly promised to reduce them. Now we should be told by the new leader and his colleagues how they propose to reduce these social services, how they propose to do any of the things they talk about. For instance, do they plan to reduce the cost of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan? Is that their intention? I would like them to tell us about that.

Mr. McDonald: — You tell us!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I'll hear a lot of words, but I do not expect I will hear much sense. Mr. Speaker, there are three main costs in the operation of hospital. Those costs are payrolls, food and drugs. Do our friends across the way propose to reduce these salaries and wages of the hospital workers? If they do, I am sure the people who work in the hospitals will be extremely interested in hearing a statement of that kind.

Mr. Danielson: — Another straw man.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They talk about reducing costs, and that is one way they would probably think of doing it; that is the way they did it in the old days, Mr. Speaker. There has been no change of heart that I can see; only a change of words — that is all. If they are going to reduce costs, I suppose that means they will join with the Liberals at Ottawa and other people in this country who would like to see the value of farm products lowered. I am sure the farmers of the province would like to know if it is their intention to assist in lowering food costs at the farmers' expense so they can lower hospital costs so as to lower taxes and do all the other things they say they are going to do.

Now, in drugs: have our friends across the way received an undertaking from the Liberal Government of Canada that price controls will be reinstated in the field of drugs? If so, the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to be told. Naturally they will wonder, if that is going to be done, why it was not done several years ago, if it can be done now. Those are the three fields that represent the higher costs in operating hospitals, and if those people over there are going to reduce those costs, then I think we have a right to know where they intend to start.

Or has the Liberal party of Saskatchewan received a promise from the Prime Minister that he will confer with the new leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan in a hotel room somewhere here in Regina and make a deal whereby the Federal treasury will pay a larger share of the health services to a Liberal government in Saskatchewan than it has been prepared to pay while a C.C.F. Government was in office?

I think, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened recently in the Federal field, there is no reason why we should not properly ask for a joint statement from the leader of the Liberal party in Canada and the leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, as to whether they intend to confer on matters of this kind and make backroom deals in hotel rooms such as has been done in other parts of Canada.

I have read their six planks and have dealt with them. They made no mention of the things I propose to mention now — they said they would augment these fields, and that means add to them and extend them. They haven't done anything in the field of rheumatic fever control. This Government has instituted, in one area of the province, a programme of rheumatic fever control, through co-operation of the Medical Society there, the Health Region officials, the public generally and the persons afflicted whereby 50 persons are presently receiving assistance. The purpose of that programme is to provide these people, at public expense (not very great expense, but some) with certain additional assistance during their younger years until they become adults, so that the rheumatic fever they have been afflicted with when they were younger will not result in serious heart ailments at a later date when they become adults. This was never done by our Liberal friends, nor, as far as I know, was it ever thought of; nor is there any remark in their programme on health work in their 'New Look' that they produced last November.

We have had dental disease in this province as long as there have been teeth, longer than the Leader of the Opposition has lived, as long as the two older members over here in the Liberal party have lived, as long as I have been here, and that is getting along; we three can be called senior citizens now. Did they do anything about it? We have done so, Mr. Speaker. We have been training and engaging young women who are trained dental hygienists to go out into the country and visit the children and to show them and teach them how to care for teeth and to apply topical fluorides for their teeth. I say here, we will continue, as a Health department, until we are convinced we are wrong, to advocate that wherever communal water supply can be fluoridated, that such shall be done.

Teacher psychologist is another field that we have entered into, and we find, in health regions in school units among those people who are interested in the welfare of children and in behaviour problems that teachers and parents are confronted with, that some assistance be given in that field by trained personnel. We have undertaken that and are doing it at the present time.

Public health nursing is something they did know a little bit about; but if you were to look over the activities of public health nursing under any previous Liberal government in this country and compare with what goes on at the present time, you would hardly see any similarity between the two programmes.

We heard a lot about the northern administration district — I am sorry the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) is not in his seat. The northern administration district is now getting, for the first time, complete health services in the way of a medical health officer, who is assigned to that region, a sanitary officer, and just as fast as we have personnel and funds to do it we will extend our programme to further assist the people he talked about. And I want to say in this connection: one of his remarks, if I heard correctly, yesterday, was that the incidence of T.B. and V.D. is greater since this Government came in. I do not believe there are any statistics to prove a statement of that kind, but I will tell my friends over there, and through them, him (because he is not in the seat) that we have a far better case-finding machinery today. The result is we are finding these people and offering them help that was never offered to them before.

February 18, 1955

I would like to also mention something about our poliomyelitis programme. I am very happy to be able to report, of course, that 1954 was not as serious a year as 1952-53. Nevertheless, we have quite a backlog of victims of residual paralysis from poliomyelitis which we are caring for in our restoration centres which I will mention in the moment. I think the House will be interested in knowing that this Government does foresee what is likely to take place, does make provision for any preventive service that seems to have any value whatsoever, and because of that, we have made provision for the purchase of sufficient of the Salk type vaccine to be able to vaccinate all the five-and-six-year olds is because they are in the age group which poliomyelitis is most likely to attack. This is not going to be compulsory — don't let anyone get any wrong idea; but we will have sufficient available to vaccinate all the five-and-six-year olds, if the parents of those children wish it to be done.

I would also like to mention our physical restoration centres. I am mentioning these, Mr. Speaker, for a definite reason. I have read the Liberal health programme and their platform plank by plank, and in that there was nothing to indicate that they have any idea that the things I am speaking of now are a necessary part of any complete and co-ordinated health programme for the good of all the people. Our physical restoration centres, both at Regina and Saskatoon, are as full as we can get them with patients who are being treated there by the highest quality personnel, and we have been fortunate, in the last few months, of being able to recruit more and more qualified people, such as physiotherapist and occupational therapist and the whole field of therapy people who are required to rehabilitate these polio victims and to keep their academic standing and their speech and the physical activities at as high a standard as possible so that some day, through other agencies, they will be able to go out into the world and be self-supporting, which would not have happened had these restoration centres not been available for their use. I would like to remind the House that here, in Regina, when the new nursing home is built, we are going to have 50 beds allocated to us for the use of bed-ridden persons who are attending our centre.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say this. The Federal Government has been asked many times, since 1945, to share with the provinces the cost of a comprehensive health insurance programme. Their participation was requested in a resolution before the Saskatchewan Legislature here, last year. Repeatedly, the Federal Government has stated that it has no intention of introducing a national health insurance programme at this time. Now, I want to know what the Liberals in this province are trying to do. I said yesterday and I say again, there is no time when a Liberal member in this Legislature, or a Liberal member of Parliament from Saskatchewan in the House of Commons, has stood up and given his unqualified (or even qualified) support to a national health insurance programme. It is truly did not oppose the resolution here, last year; but I remember no speeches or no commitments in favor by any member on your left, Mr. Speaker. I think they are implying, in their statements on health insurance, that Ottawa will likely co-operate with the Liberal government here more than it will with a C.C.F. one. If that is the case, then I can only say that they are playing politics with the health of the people, and there aren't words strong enough that you would permit, Mr. Speaker, for me to use to describe an action of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, this Saskatchewan's Golden Jubilee commemorating 50 years of progress. The progressive spirit of the majority of Saskatchewan's people resulted in the election of a C.C.F. Government in 1944. That is eleven years ago. Those eleven years have seen more done in the field of health and

welfare than in all the years of Liberal rule. The C.C.F. will continue to do the very things they are doing and expand them.

I will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. We have in these two men very able representatives of the groups which originated the C.C.F. party — the farmer and the labour groups. The mover, the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) speaks for agriculture, and there are few people in this province who have a better understanding of the problems of rural Saskatchewan, or who have laboured more diligently and more efficiently for the farming people of this province, than the member from Wadena. The seconder, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming), is a man who for many years has fought for a better standard of living for the labouring people of this province. Both of these men have made, not only a valuable contribution to this debate, but they have also made an able contribution to the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) on his new and very important position as the leader of the Liberal party in the province and as the Leader of the Opposition in the House. I cannot say I envy him his task, but I do admire the courage he had assuming such a task. I understand that the hon. Leader and his family have taken up residence in our fair city of Regina, and I would like to say a special word of welcome not only to the hon. Leader, but to Mrs. McDonald and the McDonald family, to the city of Regina. I hope you will enjoy living here; I think you will find it a very friendly city. After living here most of my life I can honestly say that I know of no place I would rather live, and I hope you and your good family will shortly feel the same.

I was very much interested in listening to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition here, the other day; but I was wishing, when he was talking, that I had taken my mathematics a little more seriously when I went to school, because I would like to have been able to add up what the implementation of all the promises he made, on behalf of the Liberal party, would have meant in dollars and cents to this province; but I could not count that high, Mr. Speaker. I did decide, before he was through, that he was even worse at mathematics than I am, because I felt quite sure that had he taken a pencil and paper and add up all the money that he spent in this Legislature, last Thursday, he would never have had the courage to make the promises that he did. One thing I am sure of, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. Leader never expects to be the Provincial Treasurer of this province.

I have also, like the previous speaker, been following with interest some of the speeches of the hon. Leader since he became the provincial leader, and some of them were mentioned by the previous speaker; but it was not only what he said, but the way it was said, that startled me a little bit.

February 18, 1955

One in particular I would like to refer to. When I first saw it I thought my eyes were deceiving me, but I when I looked again there was no doubt this is what it said, and it is headed:

“Hospitalization product of Liberal thinking” . . .

and it goes on (and I am quoting from the report in the ‘Leader-Post’):

“For the Liberal party to abolish hospitalization would be like a parent killing his own child.”

Now what do you think of a statement like that? Claiming hospitalization as a Liberal baby! Mr. Speaker, when I recalled how, when this plan was first introduced, the members of the Liberal party ridiculed the plan — they threw cold water on it; they said there weren’t enough doctors, there weren’t enough beds, there weren’t enough hospitals and we would ruin the province; Blue Cross is just as good. I even heard prominent Liberals say that when this plan came into operation they were going to the hospital for a good long rest — as if they needed a rest, Mr. Speaker! When I read that statement I found it almost incredible and the only explanation I could get for such a statement was the same one that the hon. Premier gave — that, as the Leader of the Opposition is a relative newcomer to the ranks of the Liberal party, I think he has been listening to the Liberal propaganda and he has just fallen for it, and that is really never safe to do. I cannot blame the Liberal party for wanting to adopt this C.C.F. ‘baby’, but I can assure them that the Minister of Social Welfare is very particular in this matter of adoption, and this is one they will never have a chance at.

Later on, in the same speech, Mr. Speaker, he goes on to speak about health insurance, and again I am going to quote. Here is what he says:

“Health insurance should be approached in easy stages. It is better to proceed in easy stages, making gradual and solid advances, and to consolidate our gains so that the services established are on a sound and durable basis.”

That certainly sounds like a Liberal statement, Mr. Speaker, and the emphasis is definitely on the word ‘gradual’. It is 34 years now (isn’t it?) since they promised us health insurance. How long does it take to establish a sound and durable basis? If the matter of providing hospitalization in this province had been left to the Liberal party, I am afraid they would still be looking for that ‘sound and durable basis’ and we would have had no hospitalization plan. If you want to know what the Liberals really think of hospitalization, take a look at the province of Manitoba where there is a Liberal government in power. You won’t find any hospital services plan there.

I also notice, though, that there is one C.C.F. baby that the Liberal party is prepared to kill off, and that is our automobile insurance plan. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that that was one of the most unwise statements that the Liberals ever made, because I am quite sure that our compulsory automobile insurance plan is one of the most popular measures that this Government has ever introduced. I am not worrying too much, because I have too much faith in the good sense of the people of this province to believe that they will allow the Liberal party either to get rid of our automobile insurance plan, or take any risk on just what would happen to our hospitalization plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to the Speech from the Throne. No one could listen to that Speech, nor to the inspiring address of our Premier, the other day, without feeling a great faith in the future of this province. When I was listening to the tremendous development that is taking place in this province in the field of natural resources, and the development of oil and gas and uranium, and the expansion of power in this province, and rural electrification and the telephone system and so on, I was thinking of all these things in terms of just what they will mean to young people growing up in his province today. It isn't so long ago that our students from universities, when they graduated, had to leave his province and seek other fields to find a career; and we lost them. We lost them to eastern Canada, or we lost them to the United States or some other part of the world. This no longer needs to be the case, because we need, in this province, engineers and geologists, architects and technicians of all kinds. Now in this province we have a medical college and we can train our own doctors right here, and there are endless opportunities in store for young people who have the training and the faith in this province to make their future career here. To me, this is one of the most heartening aspects of the developments that are taking place in the province right now.

I am also glad to say that, along with these tremendous developments, we can say that we are providing the best health care programme on this continent. We are maintaining a very high level of social services and, as forecast in the Speech from the Throne this year, there is to be further assistance to our old-age pensioners; mothers' allowances are to be raised, there is to be more money for people who take foster children into their care; we are entering into an agreement with the Federal Government to provide assistance to the physically incapacitated; there is a steadily rising level of assistance to education; we are giving to the people of this province the cheapest car insurance that can be found anywhere. And, because we do have a very efficiently run administration, we have been able to do all these things without excessively taxing the people or without jeopardizing our borrowing power. We can borrow money on the market today at a rate that is comparable to any other province in this Dominion. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that is a record of which we can be justly proud.

There are a great many aspects of the Government programme I would like to deal with, but I am going to confine myself primarily, today, to the subject of education, because it is one of the programmes of government in which I am particularly interested. The Leader of the Opposition had a good deal to say about education, and I also want to say a good deal about education today.

I want to start out by saying that I am very proud of the progress that is being made in this province in the field of education, and I would like to commend the hon. Minister and the members of his Department for the very able leadership they are giving in everything pertaining to education. It is the aim of this C.C.F. Government to provide, as much as is humanly possible, equality of opportunity for every child in this province. To be able to do this in a province such as ours, with sparsely settled areas, presents a great many difficulties; but we have been moving steadily towards that goal, and we have been doing this in many ways. In the first place, in the matter of building and equipment.

There has been a very energetic and a very extensive school building and repair programme going on over this province in the past number

February 18, 1955

of years. I find that, in the period from 1945 to 1951, there were 825 new schools built, 623 of which were built in units and 192 in non-units, and, of course, there have been a great many more schools built since that time, but I only have the figures up to 1951. The Government has materially assisted in this programme; indeed, they have assisted it to the tune of \$8 1/2 million. I think there is being a very efficient job done in the building of these new schools.

A great many of them have benefited from our rural electrification programme and we find many of our schools and many of our teacherages now have the benefit of electric lights. Great care is being taken in the schools in seeing that there is good lighting, which is a protection to the children's eyes, and that is very important. There is a better ventilating system; there is more modern heating equipment — many of the schools are oil heated. The little red schoolhouse may be all right for a song, but I taught in one of them, Mr. Speaker, and I still have very vivid memories of some bitterly cold days when I arrived at school and the school was just freezing cold and, after got warmed up little bit, the children near the stove were just roasted; if you got ten feet away you started to shiver and the poor children who sat at the front of the room had to have hot bricks at their feet to keep themselves warm. When I see some of the lovely new modern schools I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that I was born 40 years too soon.

We are making good progress in overcoming our teacher shortage also. The fact that we brought 135 teachers from the British Isles, last year, has helped some, and I am glad to be able to report that the number of study supervisors has been cut from 524, last year, to 260 this year. The Estevan School Unit reports that, for the first time in many years, their whole slate of teachers are qualified teachers. Not only this, but the general certification of the teachers is much higher this year.

In the Estevan Unit we have some other very interesting figures. Certainly costs have risen — they are doubled; but I also found this — and the figures I am quoting are from their own report, the report that they published, and I did check them with the Department, and they are quite correct. They show that, in 1946, the equalization grant was \$3,326; in 1954, it was \$32,849 — that is 10 times greater. Also, in the same period of time, the operational grants went from \$37,215 to \$46,711. There has been an increase in the enrolment of this Unit of 10 per cent — 3 per cent in the public school; but to me the most striking thing about the whole report was that the number of students in grade XII has increased, in this period, by 214 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — This is very indicative of what is happening all over this province. You may remember that the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) last year cited Foam Lake, where six years ago there were 40 high school students; in 1953, there were 240 high school students, or six times the number, and they expect 300 students in high school this year. Many of these children have been brought into the high schools by buses, or they live in the dormitories provided by the Unit. I feel it is very true that the fact that we have been able to make it easier and less expensive for rural children and small town children to get a high school education is certainly a milestone in the business of providing equality of opportunity in education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable criticism recently — I have read several editorials in the 'Leader-Post', and there has been

some criticism in school districts and in some of the school units about rising costs in education. Universal education in a rapidly changing and a modern and scientific world such as we live in is a very expensive business, and I think we are just going to have to face the fact that it is going to continue to be expensive and it is going to become even more expensive than it is today, because the kind of training, that is, the kind of skills that we demand to meet modern-day needs are very different from the kind of skills that were demanded by our fathers and our forefathers, and they do call for a higher level of education, for more variety in training and for more years of school; and, of course, all of this results in higher cost. Critics of rising costs in education, I believe, fail to realize that we are living in a new age. Modern machinery on every hand is replacing simple manual labour, and the lot of the unskilled and the uneducated person is becoming increasingly difficult; it is seasonal, it is transient, and they are the first group in the economy to become unemployed.

A good example of the changing needs in education is that of farming. Farming at one time was considered rather a simple art. It called for a lot of hard physical labour and for long hours of work, but not necessarily a very great deal of education. Today, however, farming has become a very scientific business, and to farm successfully a man needs to be something of an economist. He has to understand markets; he has to know a lot about soil and horticultural; he has to have a great body of scientific information, and he has to keep constantly in touch with new methods. Also, in order to handle the kind of complicated machinery we find on farms today, he has to be something of a mechanic as well.

What is true in farming is true all along the line. In the world of business complicated business machines are rapidly taking the place of physical labour. I attended the opening of the Ford plant in Regina recently, and I saw one machine and it took the place of the labour of nine people, but naturally the person who runs that machine must be a trained person. In the building industry all sorts of new techniques are being introduced, and they call for a new kind of training. We are living more or less in the day of the expert. We find it in professional life — the family doctor is being replaced by the specialists; and the friendly neighbour of pioneer days who used to come and help when people were ill is replaced by the trained nurse. Our social workers must be trained persons, and we see the trend even in the armed forces. There was a time when wars were fought with spears and swords, but now we talk in terms of planes and tanks and radar and guided missiles and atom bombs. Warfare and defence, today, it is a technical job and it calls for trained men and trained women. So, when we talk of cost in education we should be realistic, and the demands of a new day should be kept in mind.

Aside from this new emphasis in education the need for more education, for more years of school, what are some of the other factors involved in the rise in educational costs? Well, of course, education, like everything else, has been hit by inflation, and I do not need to tell any of you what the effects of inflation have been. You only need to look at your family budget. I know that the price I paid for a pound of coffee 10 years ago was about 39 cents; today I pay \$1.29. Compare what you pay for a pair of shoes today to what you paid 10 years ago, or any article of clothing, or rent, or to buy a house. The hon. member from Wadena made some comparisons of the cost of farm machinery, and, of course, things that schools buy a naturally could not escape this inflation either. The cost of a ton of coal 10 years ago was \$9.50; the same ton of coal today is \$18.50. Building materials have tripled; all the

February 18, 1955

supplies that the schools use have increased; labour has increased. Compare the cost of a caretaker of a school today, or a bus driver, to what it was 10 years ago; and, of course, it would be ridiculous to expect that education could possibly do anything but follow the pattern of the rest of the economy follows in a period of inflation.

In many ways, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was particularly vulnerable because during the depression, in the 1930's, there wasn't any money to replace schools and school equipment, and many of them did need replacing and most of them needed a great deal of repair. Large numbers of the schools were in poor condition, and even after money was available, it was a while before materials were available, so that a great deal of this building — in fact almost all of the building — had to be done in a time of sharply rising costs. Besides this, in many cases there were debentures still to be paid on the old school; in fact the Units took over a very heavy load of debt when they were organized. For a time some of these mounting expenses were paid out of tax arrears, and so they weren't so quickly noted; but, of course, that source is dried up now.

In many of the Units and in many of the School Boards a good deal of the replacing and the repairing has been done on it 'pay as you go' method, and the costs have been taken from operating revenue. In 1949, capital expenditure of \$2.6 million was taken from operating revenue; and in 1952, I find that 77.6 per cent of capital expenditure in the units and 62.6 per cent in the non-units of the capital expenditure was taken from current revenue. I am not criticizing this pay-as-you-go method. In the long run it certainly will reduce costs through a great saving in interest; but it is one of the factors which has caused rising costs.

Another thing that I think is often overlooked is that, at about time the Units were organized, there was a re-assessment in this province. I have a memorandum here from the Trustees' Association and I want to quote from it. It states this:

“That the assessment in rural municipalities — the 1952 assessment and rural municipalities — was one-third less than the 1930 assessment, and when the assessment was reduced by a one-third it was necessary to increase the mill rate by one-half to produce the same levy.”

For example, if before the re-assessment the mill rate was 12, it would immediately jump to 18 mills, and unless you tie mill rates to assessments it can be very deceptive. In other words, a re-assessment meant a substantial rise in mill rate without one extra dollar going into the pot for education.

Mr. Speaker, of course transportation costs is another thing. The trend to larger farms and the moving of people into towns and cities have meant that more children have had to be conveyed; I notice Estevan alone reported 591 to be conveyed.

Certainly, also teachers' salaries have been a major factor in rising costs. The teachers' salaries, of course, had to follow the pattern of other salaries and other wages in this Dominion, and I was quite interested in looking up labour costs to find that the teachers' salaries have risen by just about the same percentage as the cost of farm labour. Of course teachers also

need to live in a period of inflation. I noticed a report in the School Trustee magazine which states that, since 1945, teachers' salaries in this province have risen 104 per cent, but the national average rise in teachers' salaries was 108 per cent, so, if those figures are correct, we are still 4 per cent below the national average rise in this province. What, then, Mr. Speaker, has been the effect of these better salary schedules, because I think this is really the important thing? I believe the thing we should be concerned about, more than just merely cutting costs, is to see that we do get the very best value for every dollar we spend on education, and certainly the value we get for every dollar we spend on education depends almost entirely on the kind of teachers we can retain and that we can recruit in this province. If we are going to be able to persuade some of our most able young people to enter the teaching profession (and certainly we do need the most able young people there), it stands to reason that we have to provide salary schedules comparable to those of other provinces. Looking at the effect, we now have in this province a salary schedule that is reasonably comparable to that of other provinces. We have better schools. We have better teacher tenure laws, and we have a vastly improved teacher superannuation scheme — and I do mean vastly improved, because, in 1944, \$573 was the average pension while, last year, it was \$1,447.

We are beginning to see the effects of these things. The number of students entering our teachers' training colleges is increasing; it has increased by 94, this year, in the teachers' colleges and 182 at the College of Education. There are 303 more students enrolled as teachers-in-training than there were two years ago. We are also able to see the effect of all these things in the fact that we are stopping the exodus of teachers to other provinces. This year we had the smallest exodus we have had for a great number of years, and also I was pleased to note that there are 92 teachers who have come from other provinces to teach in Saskatchewan.

While education costs have increased in this province, we are not alone, and I was very interested in looking at figures from the province of Alberta. I find that there are very few districts in Alberta where the mill rate is below 30 mills. There are 44 districts, by the way, where the mill rate is from 35 to 39 mills; 20 where the mill rate is from 40 to 50 mills, and there are four with mill rates over 50, and one with the mill rate of 60. In Saskatchewan, they range from 17 to 35 mills, and we have only eight where the mill rate is over 30 mills. The taxes for school purposes in Alberta are substantially higher than in Saskatchewan. I also find that our Government pays a slightly higher percentage of the total operational costs for education than the Alberta government pays. We pay 29.95 per cent and Alberta pays 29.51 per cent, while Manitoba pays a great deal less — 23 percent of the total operational costs.

In the light of all of these things, how has the C.C.F. Government been assisting schools in meeting the changing needs and in financing education?

Well, for one thing, there has been an almost complete revision of curriculum to bring it into line with modern-day needs, and there has been excellent community participation and revising this curriculum. Then, as far as finance goes, grants have a good deal more than tripled since 1944: \$3,166,544, in 1944; over \$10 million last year, and they are to be increased again this year. The system of equalization grants has brought a great deal more equality of opportunity throughout this province, and we find that the Government pays 63 per cent of the costs in districts like Meadow Lake and Hudson Bay. We have built 28 new schools in the northern area. Not only do we build them but we operate them, and we have brought educational opportunities to children who never had a chance before.

Then, through loans and scholarships, we have been assisting students to go on with higher education. Since 1950, \$793,162 has been loaned to students, and 2,870 students have been assisted. The picture at the University is good. Grants have risen there from \$550,000 in 1945 to something in excess of \$1,500,000. Besides this, we have built buildings this year. We have spent \$4 million on buildings, and the total expense on University buildings, since 1944, is over \$15 million. I think that is something to be proud of. Grants to schools for building and equipment, last year alone, were \$1 1/2 million, and I told you the total in 10 years was \$8 1/2 million. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, financial assistance to education in this province has been rising steadily and rapidly since this Government took office.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest forward step that has been taken in this province and education with the organization of the Larger Unit. There are so many advantages in these units. For one thing, there is better library service, and that is tremendously important in providing a good education. The units, generally speaking, are better equipped. They offer better audio visual education; they have helping teachers; they have hot lunches for the children; they arrange field days and musical festivals; things like this that only the city children had advantage of before. They do a good job in equalizing costs within the units, and most important, they provide much better opportunities for high school education. Also, it is a well-known fact that teachers prefer teaching in units. There are great many advantages there, and that is why they prefer it. It has been easier to keep the units staffed with qualified teachers and also, because of the units, it has been possible to get a more fair and more uniform salary schedule. Certainly, without the unit system, the teacher situation in this province would be much more grave than it is today. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the parents and the children of this province have a great deal to thank this Government for the fact that we did organize Larger Units.

Coming back, in conclusion, to what I said about the cost of education, whether or not the cost of education is too high or too low is a matter of where we place our values. Do we want to go back to the horse-and-buggy days, or do we want to move on with the modern age? People are always willing to pay for the things they really want. We can still buy a horse and buggy for around \$150; but most people do buy a motor car for \$2,000 to \$3,000. Compare the cost of a tub and washboard with that of a modern electric washer, or broom with a vacuum cleaner, or a plow with a tractor or a combine; and yet we are willing to pay that difference because of the value we think we receive. We can spend in this province, Mr. Speaker, and we did spend, last year, approximately \$9 million for tobacco, \$4 million for cosmetics and \$50 million on liquor. We are willing to pay for blacktop highways, for rural electrification, and we expect to pay for these things. Education is no different, and yet it always seems to me that, even in a period of slight recession, the very first play some people turn to cut the cost is teachers' salaries and costs of education, despite the fact that the very life of democracy depends on a well-informed and a well-educated public.

As long as the C.C.F. government is in power in this province, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to move as rapidly as possible to a greater measure of equality and of opportunity for education for every child in this province, toward greater stability and a more adequate standard of living for our teaching profession, and toward a more efficient administration of our schools. And, of course, the proper answer to this whole question of the adequate financing of education, particularly in the province like Saskatchewan

where we have scattered communities; the proper answer, of course, is Federal aid to education on an equalization basis. The need for more Federal aid has been recognized by every major educational body in this country, and it is time that the Federal Government assumed their responsibility in this matter.

Mr. Speaker I support the motion.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural and of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that members of the Legislature are honoured by being able to follow, in the debate, our honourable and charming member from Regina, but it undoubtedly has its disadvantages, too, because what I have to say will undoubtedly seem rough and dull. However, one of the things, I suppose we men have to put up with, is that kind of disadvantage.

The member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), who is not in his seat at the moment, made a statement, yesterday, in which I was rather interested, when he referred to the weakness of the Opposition. I do not know — maybe he is right. Then he mentioned help that the Opposition needed. For his benefit I would like to tell him something about life in the Opposition when we had a Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — You had to live with it to know it!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We didn't get any extra help for the Leader of the Opposition, which position I occupied for some years, nor did we have an office and a secretary all the year round. I was expected either to let my secretary go at the end of the Session or make provision for her salary. Of course, I will admit to we had a comparatively soft job in the Opposition in those days, and that our hon. friends opposite, at this time, have a rather difficult job. We faced a government that had certainly grown old and senile and was in the habit of doing nothing and not doing it very well. But my hon. friends opposite face a different situation at this time.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) shovelled off quite a load of misrepresentation and abuse on some of our employees, and today he is not in his seat.

Premier Douglas: — “He who fights and runs away . . .”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I regret that I will not be able to withhold any of the remarks that I intended to make, because of his absence. I would say that if there had been anything, during this Session, to prove that the statements of the member for Souris-Estevan that the Opposition was weak, it is a correct statement, it was the speech made by the hon. member for Meadow Lake, yesterday. People do not make speeches like that, full of so much that was far from the truth, and full of abuse of people outside the House, unless they have a very weak case indeed.

The member for Meadow Lake made a speech, last year, on February 23rd, in this House and his speech at that time was chiefly about Green Lake, and the people of Green Lake. You know, Mr. Speaker, not all the people of Green Lake agreed with him. There was a letter came in, signed by 52 people of Green Lake, and I am sure that members of the House would like to have an opportunity to look at it, so I will lay a copy of it on the Table.

February 18, 1955

I want to give a few ‘quotes’ from that letter. The first one is this:

“We, the undersigned citizens of Green Lake Métis settlement, strongly protest the speech that was delivered by Mr. H.C. Dunfield in the Legislative Assembly, Regina, on February 23, 1954.”

The second quotation:

“Now, Mr. Dunfield should be fair in his criticism. We admit there has been bootlegging in Green Lake, but not nearly as much as he claims it to be; most of the bootlegging comes from Meadow Lake and elsewhere.

“We notice Mr. Dunfield mentions the word propaganda in his speech very frequently. We presume he hasn’t got much love for a propagandist; in this case he wouldn’t have much love for himself.”

The third quotation:

“Today there is work available for all, summer and winter. Wages are from \$5 to \$22 per day. Yes, Mr. Dunfield can’t always pull wool over our eyes. We may be ignorant but at least we know what is good and what is bad.”

And the last quotation I want to read from the letter is the ending, and it reads as follows:

“Now the above is contrary to what Mr. Dunfield said. Anyone interested in this venture can come to Green Lake and see for himself. Remember, when you come, you will be travelling over a C.C.F. highway — no Liberal mud holes to overcome. We realize that fur and wild game will be a thing of the past in the near future. As a result we will be compelled to adopt the ways of the white man to till the land for living. We know Green Lake’s project is a costly venture, but we can assure you it will not be a waste of money. Time will tell.”

The hon. member for Meadow Lake made a similar speech again this year, and, from a political point of view, Mr. Speaker, I hope he makes lots of them — at Green Lake, at Buffalo Narrows, Ile à la Crosse and other places. The hon. member ended by saying that the Government had established in northern Saskatchewan the first totalitarian state in Canada. How ridiculous it is! Conclusive proof to the contrary is the very fact that he is able to pour forth his calumny without let or hindrance here at this time. The first thing that disappears, in a totalitarian state, is the right of free speech. The member professes to be concerned with the northern native people . . .

Mr. Lopton: — He is speaking in the southern area, here.

Mr. Cameron: — He didn’t except between north and south.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: —Mr. Speaker, a teacher once wrote on a boy's report card:

“Johnny's arithmetic is a disgrace to both of us, but I try, and he doesn't.”

None of us can be proud, Mr. Speaker, of the way our Indian and Métis people have been treated, nor of the conditions under which they live; but we in the C.C.F. Government have tried, and are continuing to try. These people have been ruthlessly exploited in the past by many white people, including the hon. member's friends, Clark and Bedard — possibly, also, by the hon. member himself. In thus speech he made, last year, there was this outstanding statement:

“Those people could live under conditions in which a white man could never live.”

The idea of a man with racial prejudice and the idea of exploitation! Later in the speech he said:

“I had many of them working for me.”

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — They must live under pretty rotten conditions!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — He ought to go to South Africa.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I remember, last year, the Opposition making fun of us for employing an anthropologist. I can almost see the humour in the faces of the two senior members over there, when that question was brought up. They seemed to enjoy it. Now the anthropologist is quoted! I am not going to deal with those quotations given by the hon. member for Meadow Lake at this time, but a little later in my speech.

Why did we employ this man, an anthropologist? We employed him because we knew we had a problem, and a difficult problem. The results of antiquated and inhuman exploitation and of segregation were all there. Those were the things that built up fear and suspicion. We knew, too, as many of the native people in the north realize, today, that they had no choice if they were going to continue to exist but to make some change in their mode of living. We have been working at that problem. We know that we have made mistakes, and we know that we will make mistakes to; but we are trying, and have tried in the past, and we are succeeding. The Liberal government never tried. I was here in this Legislature, and I never heard of any programme, with the exception of the very start of the Green Lake settlement, and the conditions in that settlement were pretty horrible the first time I saw it.

The hon. member stated that tremendous amounts were squandered in the north. We have used tremendous amounts of money to build schools all over the north — ‘squandered’ according to the hon. member, I guess. We built hospitals at Buffalo Narrows, Sandy Bay, Stony Rapids, Cumberland House, Uranium City — I guess according to the Liberal party, that is ‘squandered’ money; and of the operation of these schools and hospitals. We built roads in the north. The hon. member did not even mention the road built in his own constituency, 40 miles on the Beauval Road; nor the Air Ambulance service, which runs into many thousands of dollars every year in the north; the doctors and nurses employed in the north, and this Green Lake project as well.

February 18, 1955

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that my hon. friend and his friends on whose behalf he was speaking here, yesterday, would be much more happy if the native people in the north were left alone for them to exploit; if they didn't have any education. They don't want them to have a chance to market their products in any other way except those through those particular individuals. He mentioned the north being an unorganized territory. He mentioned that the Liberal government only had one man in an area where there are now 10 employees. That is quite possible, with teachers, nurses, a doctor, conservation officer . . .

Mr. Cameron: — He said doing the same work.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You could easily count up to 10 in any area where they had one; but they were not giving service. Even the officer that was there did not do very much either.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He was a liberal.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It was unorganized territory at that time; it still is unorganized now.

Mr. Loptson: — He picked the right figure.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Never, before we took office, did they ever have any ratepayer committees in those areas. We established that to give to those people a chance to have a committee, to discuss their local affairs with the administrator, and to take part in it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That's totalitarianism!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Right here on this question of totalitarianism, I would like to quote from an article that appeared on the editorial page of the Saskatoon 'Star Phoenix' last August, the 25th of August. It was a reprint from the Montreal Daily 'Le Devoir' and it says:

“The C.C.F. party is the only Democratic one we have had in Canada. Liberals and Conservatives belong to political parties born of capitalism and totalitarianism. Those old parties have followers but few adherents. They would indeed be ill at ease if they were compelled to disclose the source of their election funds.”

Mr. Cameron: — I wonder if they would say that today.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Liberals would be very ill at ease, Mr. Speaker, if they were forced to disclose where their election funds come from.

Mr. Cameron: — So would you.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Not at all. Mr. Speaker, it is always the way with the Liberals.

Mr. McDonald: — You get yours from the labour unions.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They cannot possibly imagine any other political party having any different kind of ethics from what they have had; they have been willing to sell out to 'big business', and that is where

they got their money. They cannot imagine a political party built on any other basis.

The Department of Natural Resources' personnel was mentioned, yesterday. The hon. member I think referred to them as 'arrogant dictators', 'little Caesars', and so forth. He said they were feared. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Indian and Métis people in the north fear and distrust the white man generally and you cannot blame them. That is one of the circumstances that makes the problem a very difficult one to solve. They have had cause for that suspicion and fear in the past; but I want to tell you that our conservation officers or not C.C.F. organizers. They are not hired for that purpose.

Mr. McDonald: — Ah, phooey!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition please contain himself . . .

Mr. McDonald: — It's impossible.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . until he hears the story.

Mr. McDonald: — I've heard enough.

Premier Douglas: — You can hear, but you don't understand.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition wanting to leave the Conservative party; but I could never figure out why he should want to get into the Liberal party.

Mr. McDonald: — Likely the same thing could be said about yourself.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We recruit our conservation officers from among the young men of the province of Saskatchewan, and they are selected for their ability, their integrity, their reputation in their own communities. I admit that the majority of them will be C.C.F., just as the majority of the people in the province of Saskatchewan are. You couldn't expect anything else.

Mr. Loftson: — There aren't many of them left now.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — These young men are young men who want to do that kind of work . . .

Mr. Cameron: — There aren't many left in the north.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and we hire them first on a temporary basis. They go to our conservation officers' school, where they have not only training in the classroom, but also training in the field.

Mr. McDonald: — Socialism . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friend says 'Socialism'. Probably, in his opinion, anybody who has schools is a Socialist. Sometimes when I listen to him, I think that might be right.

February 18, 1955

These young men go to conservation officers' school and then they become conservation officers, employees in a probationary class. I think we have as fine a group of employees in the Department of Natural Resources as you can find anywhere. I know them very well. I see them in the field; I see them at our conferences, but I agree that you might think my opinion is somewhat biased.

Last Spring, and during Forest Conservation Week, we had for special speaker in the celebrations across the North in Forest Conservation Week, Mrs. K. Russenholt from Winnipeg — she speaks on C.B.C. She was certainly not a C.C.F.'er when she came here; I don't know — she may be now. I saw her in Regina and then she went on north, and I saw her again near the end of the week. She had put in a week with many of our conservation officers and people in the Department and the public generally. When she met me the second time, she said: "Mr. Brockelbank, I never saw anything like this. I have been a lot of places, but never did I see anything like this that I see here. Everyone who works for you is dedicated to his job." I considered that to be the greatest compliment that could be paid to my employees, and I think they deserved it.

These men are feared by those who want to get away with something, and I hope it will always be like that. More and more they are becoming both respected and liked and appreciated in their communities.

I would like now to come to this question about washing fish.

First, at no time did our officer instruct or compel fishermen to wash their fish or even suggest that they do it. He did insist that the fish were clean, and that can be done and properly done. On June 15, 1954, our officer did find a number of fishermen dressing fish, then dipping them in water and packing them in ice, which was his first knowledge that fish were being dipped in the lake, — the lake water in June would be at a temperature of 55, to 60 degrees. Over a hundred boxes of Clark's fish remained on Dominion Dock on Doré Lake from June 16th to June 19th — fresh fish. You can imagine what it would be like. Mr. Clark has never followed the practice of making any investment in equipment in plants, but his policy has been to go in, without equipment, very often where somebody else put equipment, buy some fish when things were favourable and get out. This time it didn't work, and it didn't work because the weather was bad. He was on an isolated lake, without any proper facilities for keeping the fish because he would not invest the capital in the necessary facilities. The Department of Natural Resources cannot recoup a man for his losses under those circumstances.

Now, in regard to the prosecution of Mr. Bedard which took place on June 18th, 1955, there were about 30 boxes of unmarked fish and those were in only fair to bad condition, hardly fit for human consumption. On June 15th fish were inspected on the dock, some of them were boxed, and the boxes were not marked. Bedard was warned not to leave before the boxes were marked, and that was in our correspondence long before this House got into Session. Bedard said he couldn't leave on account of the roads. The conservation officer went back to check the fish out on the 17th of June. He found that Bedard had left early, about 5 a.m. Obviously, the conservation officer wondered what was taking place because it was understood he was going to come back and check out the load of fish. When he came back they were gone. So he followed, and he overtook Bedard about 23 miles south of Doré Lake headquarters, with a truckload of fish, no bill of lading, boxes not marked; fish were very soft.

He followed the truck through and laid the charge at Meadow Lake under Section 30 of The Fisheries Act, and on July 18th the trial was held. Bedard pleaded guilty, was fined \$5.00 and costs of \$2.00, and the fish were confiscated, which actually was not much of a loss because they were pretty well spoiled already.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake, according to my information, asked our conservation officer for information in regard to this case. He was told that he could hear all at the trial. Our conservation officer did not consider it proper to discuss the evidence before the trial. I am informed, too, and I have absolutely no reason to doubt it, that Bedard told a conservation officer that he would “get him”. It was after this trial that the whole question of washing fish was cooked up, and it was also after this that the petition came in asking for the removal of this conservation officer. And that is simple, because Clark and Bedard do not want any conservation officer in that part of the country whom they cannot push around. Apparently, with the assistance of the hon. member for Meadow Lake, they want to get rid of them.

Now for one minute, let us have a look at this petition which was tabled in the House, yesterday. All members of the House will have an opportunity to look at, and I want you to notice his signatures. I feel absolutely sure that those are not the signatures of the people of Doré Lake. These are signatures of people who are accustomed to the handling of a pen or pencil; they are not the signatures of fishermen. They may be their names. I know, too, that they did not compose or put together the heading on this petition. I think that is all that need be said about that. In spite of the trouble with the fishing industry, commercial fishing is generally expanding in northern Saskatchewan, and steps are being taken right along to get better quality products. I am happy to announce that the Federal Government is putting into effect the fish inspection regulations which will apply all across Canada.

Our fish resources are important also for the sportsman, and year by year the number of anglers increases. In 1943 we had 7,700; by 1948, we had 21,000 licensed anglers; in 1953 we had 68,000, and in the current year we estimate 70,000 licensed anglers. So fish resources, not only from the point of view of commercial fishermen, but also from the point of view of those of us who like to go fishing, is well worth taking care of.

There is one serious threat concerning many of our angling waters, particularly in the south of the province, and that is the invasion of carp. Carp is not a native of North America, but was imported to this continent from Europe or Asia. It is a fish that destroys the habitat for other fish by keeping the water murky and all ‘riled-up’ . . .

Mr. J.T. Douglas: — Must be Liberal fish.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and there is danger of that fish getting in the Saskatchewan River system — it is now in the Qu’Appelle system. The Saskatchewan Fish and Game league has recommended that the use of minnows for bait prohibited throughout the southern part of the province, because that is one of the ways carp gets spread. Fishermen using minnows for bait, when they come to the end of the day, are not too particular where they dump out their bait pail, and so carp are carried to another lake. Our biologists recommend the same thing. The experience they have had in the United States indicates that the only possible hope of holding carp in control (it is unlikely that we will ever get rid of it) is fairly strict regulation. Something can be done by putting in screens to prevent the carp from migrating further in

February 18, 1955

some of our smaller streams. You could not do that in the Saskatchewan River; but we are considering taking the necessary steps to control, to stop if possible, to slow down, the spread of carp.

Continuing in the field of the sportsman, hunting and Saskatchewan has constantly grown more popular for many years. In 1943, there were 3,000 big game licences; in 1954, about 38,000. And in bird hunting there were 8,000 licensed hunters in 1943; 60,000 in 1954.

Then we come to another resource, our fur. This, to a few thousand people of the province is pretty important. First of all, I would like to deal with the muskrat. You know, our hon. friends opposite always make fun of the idea of planning. I always thought you could not do very much unless you planned your work. We planned the conservation programme. That conservation programme has really worked in regard to muskrat. For five years, 1940 to 1944, the average take was 190,000; for the next five years it went up to 430,000; and for the last five years, the average annual take a muskrat was 589,000 per year. This year our guess is that, from last Fall to this Spring when the trapping is finished, there will be close to one million muskrat pelts taken in this province, which, as far as I know, will be a record for all time. Conservation programmes do bring results.

I attended the Trappers' Convention again, this winter, in January, and I might point out that a Trappers' Convention such as we have had each year for six years now does not look very much like a totalitarian state. At that convention a resolution in favor of open marketing of muskrats was carried. But when the delegates at that convention were discussing that resolution, every one of them was careful to say, "We want to keep the conservation programme"; that is unanimous. Every one of them was careful to say, "We want to keep the Fur Marketing Service." That too is unanimous.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the northern trapper has not accepted this marketing programme. Their standard of living is not too high and I am absolutely sure that, if all their furs went direct to the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service, they would be in one year half a million dollars to a million dollars better off. You see, Saskatchewan Government Trading operates some stores in the north, and though no dealer can legally buy muskrat or beaver, they do by the other fur, mink and weasel and squirrel and so on. So, in these stores our storekeepers first of all recommend that the trapper ship his furs into the Fur Marketing Service. If he says, "No, I want to sell them", then our storekeepers will buy them. We were buying furs right under the nose of the Hudson's Bay Company, meeting their prices, meeting private dealers' prices, and yet, when we bought those furs, shipped them down to the Fur Marketing Services, we made a very substantial profit on them, and the other fellows were buying at a lower price yet, especially where there was no Saskatchewan Government Trading Store. So, we cannot help, I am sure, but feel real sorry that the people of the north, the trappers of the north, cannot accept a marketing programme such as we have accepted in our wheat marketing in the south. Last Fall was, of course, a very favourable season for the dealer.

No change in the system of marketing fur, muskrat and beaver can be made before the Fall of 1955. When they passed this resolution, the first thing I did was to refer it to the Game Advisory Committee. That Game Advisory Committee consists of my deputy minister (Mr. Churchman) as chairman; the Game Commissioner is on the Committee, and also a representative of the Indian Affairs Branch — his name has escaped me for just a moment. I asked them to look into the problems that would arise, what effect this would have

on the conservation programme. and then we will have to refer to it to the Hon. Mr. Pickersgill at Ottawa, because this compulsory marketing is by a joint agreement between the province and the Dominion.

I might point out, this time, that we did not start the principle of compulsory marketing of fur. Before we started this programme there was compulsory marketing of fur for the Summerberry marshes in Manitoba, the Sipanok lease (which is an Indian Affairs lease) east of Carrot River — the Indian Affairs people took them, and they were sold on a sale in Winnipeg until we established our sale here. The same programme is carried out in parts of Ontario and Quebec as well.

This question is going to need some pretty careful consideration, because we do not want to lose the conservation programme which has meant so much better harvest for the trapper. I am sorry that both northern members, the member for Athabaska (Mr. Ripley) and the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield), are not in their seats, because I would like to ask them where they stand on this question, whether they have been trying to persuade the trappers in their constituencies to stay with the Fur Marketing system of marketing, similar to our Wheat Board marketing, or whether they have been trying to persuade them to be against that. I have never heard them declare themselves, but it would certainly be interesting to know just what they have been doing, because going out of the compulsory marketing of beaver and muskrat is just the same as it would be to put the Canadian Wheat Board on a voluntary basis. I cannot imagine any of my bold political friends on the other side of the floor advocating that here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cameron: — Some argument!

Premier Douglas: — They did it in 1935.

Mr. McDonald: — There's no comparison.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, 1935 is 20 years ago, and they have made probably one year's progress since then.

Mr. McDonald: — There is no comparison in the two services.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I wish the Leader of the Opposition, if he believes in the orderly marketing system as we have in wheat, would have a heart-to-heart talk with his two supporters from Athabaska and Meadow Lake.

Mr. McDonald: — There is no comparison and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, I would like to deal for a few moments with the question of public works in northern Saskatchewan and, first of all, the roads in northern Saskatchewan.

We have had a policy in regard to the mining roads in Saskatchewan for some time. It used to be that we would go for a three-way split of the cost of an approved mining road, over and beyond the first mile and a half. The first mile and a half we considered to be a normal length of road, and normal expense for the mine itself to undertake. If they were that close to a road, they were pretty lucky. This three-way split would be one-third the

company, one-third the Federal Government and one-third the Provincial Government, and at one time the Federal Government did announce a policy in regard to mining roads.

We got aid from the Federal Government on two roads only. One was the road from Stony Rapids to Black Lake, 14 miles long; not a very expensive road, because it went over mostly sandy plain, with very little rock work and not much muskeg work either. The other road was the one from Black Bay through Uranium City to Beaverlodge. In this case the companies at Beaverlodge made a contribution. The smaller as companies put up small amounts, Eldorado was the large contributor, of course, and the Federal Government put up an amount as well as the province. But the Federal Government did not accept a full one-third of this road, because before it was finished, they left the picture in the province and Eldorado had to go 50-50 then on the finishing of it.

I would like to point out to you, that, in this particular case, Eldorado Mining and Refining Company is a Crown Corporation owned by the Federal Government and, consequently, the Federal Government just had to have a road from Black Bay to Eldorado. And so, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in this case it was the province helping the Federal Government, rather than the Federal Government helping the province.

I am a little suspicious, and I have grown more suspicious since. It seems that the Federal Government, since the construction of that Eldorado Road, has lost interest in mining roads and Saskatchewan, because we have had a number of applications made for assistance and every one was turned down by the Federal Government. We didn't like that, so we changed our policy. We said that our policy will not be tied to the Federal grants, will not depend on the Federal Government having to come in. If there is an approved mining road, we will go for one-third of the cost insofar as our budget will allow, and the rest will be between the company and the Federal Government.

I wish that my hon. friends opposite, if they had any influence, would try to talk to the Federal Government into making these contributions to mining roads, because the Federal Government gets a lot more out of mining in the Provincial Government does. We get the royalty, but they get the income tax, and, in regard to the Saskatchewan mining income, the Federal Government's income tax amounts to probably three or four times the royalty that we collect. So I think that it is only fair to say, "You should be interested in getting more mines and as a result getting more income tax."

There are other development roads in the north which I might comment on. One is the main central road north to Lac la Ronge, which is a Department of Highways' Road and which everybody, I think, is familiar with. A new one that is now under construction is the one from Kinoosao, commonly known as Co-op Point, to Lynn Lake in Manitoba. That is a distance of 65 miles. Co-op Point is on Reindeer Lake, which is the second largest lake in the province. Wollaston Lake is not far away from Reindeer Lake. The fish from Wollaston and Reindeer will have an outlet to railhead at Lynn Lake. All this 65 miles of road, all of it is in Manitoba except about a mile and a half. Nevertheless, the Department of Natural Resources is constructing the road (It is just going to be a narrow truck road), with a promised grant from Manitoba. I wish it had been larger, but it was the best we could get.

I might mention that this road from Co-op Point to Lynn Lake will be of definite benefit to Manitoba. They will sell all the gasoline and

collect all the gasoline tax that is used on that road. It will be a road for the people of Lynn Lake to get out to two or three beautiful lakes. It will be a road that makes more accessible another stretch of the pre-Cambrian area in Manitoba. Granted it is also a value to us because it will put the Reindeer Lake and Wollaston Lake fish a cent or a cent-and-a-half a pound closer to the market, which will mean a better return for the fisherman.

Another road I would like to comment on is the one from Green Lake north to Beauval, and, in my mind at least, and I hope in many people's minds, it will be projected on by Ile a la Crosse to Buffalo Narrows. That is over a hundred miles as the crow flies. This year we graded 40 miles between the Waterhen River and Beauval. I do not know how fast we will be able to go on to completion, but that is a road that will serve several communities. It will enable them to get out their fish more cheaply and make it of greater value. It will make possible, I believe, the development of quite a blueberry industry, as that country is wonderful for wild blueberries; but you have to have a way to get them out over reasonably good roads and without too much cost.

It will do something else, too. It will let the tourists into the west end of the Churchill River valley, to the Buffalo Lakes, Lake Ile a la Crosse, and for boating, for fishing, for scenery, a wonderful part of the province of Saskatchewan. That is certainly cannot be expected to come in a day, but, as far as I am concerned, and I am sure as far as the Government is concerned, we will keep working at it every opportunity we get; but we are not going to promise it to win the next election.

Another road is the forest access road which extends north from Hudson Bay in my own constituency. It is now built 40 miles. It was a joint effort between the Department of Natural Resources and the Saskatchewan Timber Board that has built that road. I might mention the Nipawin-Carrot River-Cumberland House winter trail which we got pushed through a month or two ago. It is approximately 115 miles from Nipawin to Cumberland House over that winter trail. I drove it early this year. It took about six hours to make the 115 miles over the new road. It is just a winter trail. It is on a location that is very good and does not go over any lakes or large muskegs, but certainly it will be quite a job to make it more than winter trail.

Our old perennial, is, of course, the Nipawin-Flin Flon highway and I was so delighted that my hon. friend from Arborfield, who represents the constituency of the Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) sent around, or I presume he sent around, a little paper about what he had been saying about the Nipawin-Flin Flon highway. He said:

“Let us keep on fighting for the completion of No. 35 Highway and for the building of a highway from Carrot River to The Pas.”

Well, now, there is nothing like asking for plenty, anyway, and when you add to that all the other highways in the province that need reconstruction, all the market roads that he is going to ask for when he gets up on its feet here, it is going to be quite an order. But one of the bright things on this piece of paper is that the hon. member has spoken a very what do you call it?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — A mouthful.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Minister of Agriculture says ‘a mouthful’; probably that is the best — I cannot think of a better word.

February 18, 1955

He says: "This government will not last forever." We don't expect to! We don't expect to last forever, and so it is a very good thing to see the hon. member recognize that. But, unless my hon. friend gets some —

Mr. MacNutt: — I'm going to ask —

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am sorry to inform the hon. Minister, but I am guilty of sending those slips of paper around. It is in the 'Daily Reminder' issued in Flin Flon.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And here I was giving my hon. friend credit — I hope you got credit over there for sending it around. And then he says:

"And the next government, led by 'Hammy' McDonald, will certainly build the roads for us."

Boy, if they build roads like they did in the good old days when they were here before, it will take a long time!

Mr. McDonald: — Those roads are still here.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — A long, long time. I think it is time that we took a sensible kind of look at this Nipawin-Flin Flon highway proposition. I know the hon. member for Nipawin, Mr. MacNutt, from Arborfield, whenever he gets a chance, thinks it is good politics up at Nipawin, and so he keeps talking about it, and he says let's fight for it. Well, that road was started in good faith at a time when there was no road to Flin Flon at all. Then, all of a sudden Manitoba awakened, got a Federal grant, Federal assistance, and built No. 10 Highway into Flin Flon. People do not have to be told what happened there. People know what happened there. It was for purely political considerations that the Federal grant was switched to Manitoba, because they figured they could not afford to have a C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan getting help like that.

Mr. Cameron: — Crying again!

Mr. McDonald: — Poor Federal Government!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, there is no doubt about it that the second road to Flin Flon would be desirable. It would be nice, but it would cost a lot of money. I do not think that there are very many members in the House who would say that the second road should have priority over for example, the Beauval-Buffalo Narrows road, in an area where they have not got any road at all at the present time. It has often been stated that, if the Federal Government had a change of heart and would kick through with a 50-50 proposition on the Nipawin-Flin Flon highway, we would go ahead with it, and I would agree to it.

Mr. MacNutt: — What would you do without the Federal Government?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But I think that is a very remote hope. I think there is a better chance of getting the South Saskatchewan River dam than there is of getting them to go 50-50 on that highway. But, if my hon. friend from Nipawin can go down to Ottawa and persuade his friends there to go 50-50 on that highway, then he really

will be doing something for the Nipawin-Flin Flon highway. However, I really don't expect him to do it, because I do not believe he thinks that he could get that assistance. Anyway, if it was built, he would not any longer be able to use it to kick around as a political football, and he is having lots of fun at that.

Let us now take a look at alternatives, possible connections for example with No. 10 Highway in Manitoba. I realize that it would be desirable for Saskatchewan to have a better connection to Flin Flon than we have at the present time. First, there is the Cumberland House trail I mentioned. That, too, I am afraid is remote, because of its length and because it is all raw country and has not been worked at all. But I do think that in the Hudson Bay area there are possibilities: first, north and east of Hudson Bay. Presently, that forest access road, built on an excellent location, a gravel ridge, extends 40 miles. It is 6 or 8 miles north-west of Otosquen. From the end of the present road it is about 35 miles as the crow flies to No. 10 Highway at Westray in Manitoba. That would mean about 45 miles of road to get there, of course, and about 20 of that would be in Manitoba. Westray is 20 miles from The Pas. This would mean this route from Hudson Bay to The Pas would be about 105 miles, but there are 45 miles of untouched road on that route.

Another possibility is from Hudson Bay east. No. 3 Highway is being constructed to Hudson Bay from the west. I hope it continues east; I am sure it will. From Hudson Bay to the Manitoba border is about 35 miles of road, and then from the Manitoba border to No. 10 Highway, at a point north of Mafeking, is another 35 miles in Manitoba. This would be a much longer route from Hudson Bay to The Pas — about 170 miles, compared with 105 for the other route. One of the big questions, of course, would be whether or not Manitoba would be willing to do their part of the construction.

I am not talking about those things because they are going to be realized tomorrow; I am talking about them because I believe in planning. We should be thinking ahead about these things, and I am certainly going to keep these things in mind and push some of them forward just as fast as I get a chance.

Other public works in the north — first of all, air-fields. The Department of Natural Resources has built air-fields at Lac La Ronge, at Ile a la Crosse, at Buffalo Narrows, at La Loche, at Pine House Lake, at Stony Rapids, Cumberland House, and Hudson Bay. At Big River there is an old air-field that was built in the Dominion days before 1930. Meadow Lake built an air-field with assistance from the province. Beaverlodge air-strip at Eldorado mine was built by the Federal Government. That is the only one in northern Saskatchewan that has been built by the Federal Government. At Gunnar, one was built by Gunnar mines, and there is a small in emergency strip at Cree Lake which was built by a private party. That is a very small strip. Now, we are hopeful of getting some Federal assistance for the extension and improvement of Lac la Ronge air-field. These air-fields have been a great service. It is true that lakes are dotted all over the north where you can land on pontoons in the summertime and on the ice in the winter on skis; but wherever you have the air-fields, it means you can have all-year-round flying, and you don't have a lay-off at the freeze-up and at the break-up period.

One word about the air weapons range which was taken over by the Department of National Defence in north-western Saskatchewan. This block of land north of Cold Lake was leased to the Department of National Defence. The first action in this connection was in 1952. I just want to say that I am sorry they

have not yet made a settlement with the fishermen who fished on Primrose Lake. These fishermen are organized and standing out for a fair settlement. We have been working with them and they have not yet got a settlement and I was going to ask the hon. member for Meadow Lake if he were here to see what he could do about getting a settlement.

A word or two about Saskatchewan Government Airways itself. When Saskatchewan Government Airways was organized, a good many years ago, the then manager of the Saskatchewan Government Airways, Mr. Glass, was in Ottawa. One of our other people was with him. They saw the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe, and at that time Mr. Glass urged that no other companies be permitted to obtain a charter in the north, as he considered there was not room for two companies to carry on under competitive conditions in an area which could support only one operator. Mr. Howe agreed, welcomed the advent of Saskatchewan Government Airways, and thought it was in the best interests of the northland that it be served by one company only. He believed that air transport in most areas of Canada must of necessity be monopolistic in nature, and agreed to support the continuance of S.G.A. I can believe that is right. Mr. Howe has been responsible for Trans-Canada Airlines, and certainly he has had the co-operation of the Air-Transport Board in preserving an area in which T.C.A. enjoyed a monopoly and in which they have been giving a most excellent service.

Now, we find that the former Manager of Saskatchewan Government Airways, a member of Athabaska Airways (a new company) will make an application for a charter licence to operate out of Prince Albert and Lac la Ronge and then, Mr. Floyd Glass Jr., quoted in the 'Star Phoenix' of January 6th, saying:

“It was time that people realized that the monopolistic government enterprises were not healthy for the development of the province.”

Well, he had better tell that to C.D. Howe in regard to the T.C.A. The Athabaska Airways put up a very poor case; there is no question of more service being needed; and yet they were granted the licence by the Air Transport Board. That is going to make it more difficult for “Airways” because operating in that area, Airways serves the lean scheduled flights and the other parties will be sitting there to pick off the cream on some of the charter flights. I certainly object to that kind of procedure.

I would like to mention a word or two about the crash at Buffalo Narrows, when we were also sorry that such a disaster came. We have no report yet from the Department of Transport. A thorough investigation was made — or as far as I know it was a thorough investigation; and our people were out there, too, and help with the investigation as well as the Department of Transport people.

One thing I want to mention in particular was that there was a leakage of the names of the victims at the time of the accident. The mother of one of the victims, the mother of the lady that was killed in the accident, heard on the radio her daughter's name and she collapsed and had to go to the hospital. Now, I don't know how those names got out. We withheld them, but somehow the Canadian Press got a hold of it, and I think it would have been very decent of them if they had withheld those names and checked to make sure that the next-of-kin were notified before they were released. It seems to me, sometimes, that the press forgets some decency and some ethics in its haste to be first with the news.

Another point is that the 'Leader-Post', even before the funeral of a pilot, dug up the story of the strike of 1951, on the excuse that they have a duty to the public. If ever there was a flimsy excuse that was it. If they wanted to make sure that that was not overlooked, all they had to do was notify the Department of Transport and not advertise it in the daily papers for the widow and child of the pilot to see. As a matter of fact, that pilot was cleared by an Arbitration Board which was composed of three old-time bush fliers and his licence was never cancelled by the Department of Transport. The D.O.T. would not have anything to do with it, and since that time he had three years of perfect record of flying. It seems to me that this digging up the Leader-Post did served no useful purpose, but was just a bit of 'yellow journalism', with a little bit of hope of political advantage.

Before I close tonight, I intend, Mr. Speaker — and this is not a threat (I do not mean it that way), I intend to adjourn the debate. I know I have talked a long time now, but you will all be rested over the weekend and can maybe take some more. But before I do adjourn the debate tonight, I would like to say a few words about my own constituency.

I have had the honour to represent this area since 1938. This is the 19th Session of the Legislature I have attended, and two of my colleagues are here — you, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe). A couple of our friends across the floor are senior in point of sessions they have attended. The member for Humboldt (Mr. Burton) had some broken service. He had a tour at Ottawa, so we beat him out on that. I do want to say that my constituency is one which could be appreciated, I am sure, by any member in this Legislature. They have had extremely tough going there for the last five years between frost, crop snowed under, and too much rain. I want to pay a tribute to the fortitude and resourcefulness of those people. It is very commendable indeed. I want to express my appreciation to the Government, on behalf of the people of my constituency, for the programme of assistance that has been conducted. I have been there and watched it pretty closely, and I know just how much that programme is appreciated. There was summer-fallow assistance, and there was work and wages.

When I was out at a meeting in my constituency and I was talking about this work-and-wages programme, some smart fellow said, "That's just like the 'thirties." I said, "Yes, all except for about 80 cents an hour. There is about that much difference."

Mr. Cameron: — Is that all today? The cost of living is about four times as much. That's terrible.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — 80 cents an hour? We have had a considerable amount of work with the resources there. We have been very thankful that it is one of the best timber areas. We have been able to expand our programme to help to get some potatoes. The people know they are going to be able to get seed, and with the drainage work that is being carried on, all these things have given to the people a real hope. Some people try to make out that the trouble arose in that area not because of excessive rainfall, but because of a failure of the Government in some way. That certainly is not true.

At Hudson Bay the rainfall for April to August, 1954, was 70 per cent over normal. That was following two or three quite wet years. The temperature was, for that same period, three degrees below normal, which meant that there was less evaporation, less drying. Here is a very interesting fact.

February 18, 1955

The Assiniboine River at Sturgis is metered by the Federal Government and, in 1954, in the summer season, the Assiniboine River at Sturgis was 712 per cent of the normal flow. It was excessive rainfall and it wasn't something that was not done that with the greatest cause of the trouble. As a matter of fact, it was not the new settler who went in since there was a C.C.F. Government who suffered the worst; those settlers who went in previous to that time, really suffered worst of all. Not even drainage surveys had been done when we took over. The Minister of Agriculture and his Department have done a great job in doing those surveys and getting work done. Again it has been a case where we have had to repair the failures and shortcomings of the previous government; but it is being done and that part of the country is going to come through and be one of the best in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a good point at which I think I can sit down and adjourn the debate. If the rest of you aren't tired, I am anyway.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question. Could you tell me who Mr. Alex Bishop is — the person who signed this letter that you tabled today?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I cannot tell you. I don't know him personally.

Mr. McDonald: — The Minister made some reference to the one that was tabled yesterday, that he didn't think it had been written by the people who signed it; but I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, at least the people's names that appear on the letter that was tabled yesterday are in their own handwriting. This letter that was tabled today — we don't know who the person is who signed it. It is a copy of an original letter, and the names are not written at all; they are printed on here and I note in the letter starts off as though this Mr. Bishop had been writing the letter himself. He said, "we, the undersigned" and then he goes on . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member asking a question or making another speech in this debate?

Mr. McDonald: — I am asking for clarification. Then as he proceeds in the letter, as he gets down further, he says "they", referring to the Métis as "they". Well now I do not think the Métis wrote this letter, and I don't think they ever signed it, and I would like to have the original copy of the letter tabled in the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Isn't that the copy that the member from Meadow Lake tabled?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I tabled this.

Premier Douglas: — We usually table a copy. Here is the original, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — That is the property of the House.

Premier Douglas: — This is the property of the House and individual signatures are here, some in ink, some in pencil; but it is quite apparent that they are genuine signatures. If the hon. member says he does not believe these people signed this, this proves that he doesn't know what he is talking about. But that is not unusual.

Mr. McDonald: — I might say that this also proves that neither you or the Minister of Natural Resources know what you are talking about, because these are original signatures as they are shown on this letter that we tabled yesterday.

Premier Douglas: — We were talking about this document. My hon. friend does not know which document he is talking about.

Mr. McDonald: — I am not confused at all, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Let us get this thing straight. Is the hon. member disputing the authenticity of the document that the Minister of Natural Resource has tabled?

Mr. McDonald: — I am asking for the original to be tabled, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the original is here, and it is being tabled. The Minister has put it on the table. I am just pointing out that when my hon. friend said that the document was not signed by the people who were alleged to have signed it, the signatures here prove that he doesn't know what he is talking about.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier obviously doesn't know what he is talking about, because he didn't listen to what I said. I said this does not prove that the people whose names appear on here ever signed the document, and I would like to see the original document tabled, which he has tabled, and that is fine.

Premier Douglas: — You are just entitled to a copy; you are not entitled to the original.

Mr. Speaker: — Is this the original copy that is now in the possession of the Clerk? You can examine it with the copy and see if it is exact.

Mr. McDonald: — That is just what I asked for, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — We want to see the original, that is all. First it was just a copy that was tabled by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, all the member is entitled to is a copy. The original must be kept in the possession of the Clerk. You should know that by this time.

Mr. McDonald: — I beg your pardon?

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member ought to know that all he is entitled to is a copy, the original is left in the possession of the Clerk, and that is where it is. All he is entitled to is a copy, and that is what he has and he should know that it is a copy of the original.

(Debate Adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.