

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session - Twelfth Legislature**  
**22nd Day**

Friday, March 11, 1955

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP OF CANADA**

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), seconded by Mr. Erb:

“That we, the Members of the Legislative Assembly, in Session assembled, extend our warmest congratulations to Mr. Garnet Campbell and his brothers, of Avonlea, Saskatchewan, on their magnificent achievement today in winning the Macdonald Brier trophy emblematic of the curling championship of Canada. In this signal victory, won over representatives of the nine sister Provinces and of Northern Ontario, the Campbell brothers brought the championship title to Saskatchewan for the first time, and with it great honour to themselves, to their home town and to their home Province, and thus most auspiciously opened the official celebrations marking Saskatchewan's Golden Jubilee year.”

**Mr. Walter Erb (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I could talk eloquently, loud and long, about Garnet Campbell and his brothers, of Avonlea, who today won the Canadian Curling Championship.

As you know, they played right through their games without losing a single one, and I am sure that all of us take great pride in their achievement. I suppose many of us saw the game, last night, and anyone who is interested in curling, I am sure, will wait a long time before seeing such curling again. I must say that at that last rock, we all had our tongues in our cheeks and our hearts in our throats. I also want to tell the members to what I probably contribute much of their success, and it is that I observed the Campbell boys drinking nothing but milk. My hon. seatmate (Mr. Gibbs) might take that to heart.

I am sure that all hon. members join me in expressing our congratulations to the Campbell brothers and wishing them the best in all their future curling activities.

**Premier Douglas:** — On Monday night, you will remember, I made the remark that in every little town in Saskatchewan people were singing ‘The Campbells are coming’; and now the Campbells have arrived. They certainly came. They came, they saw and they conquered, and I know that the people of the province are exceedingly proud of them. I know that the members of this Assembly would like to express to the Campbell brothers and to the people of Avonlea our heartiest congratulations on a piece of fine sportsmanship and magnificent curling. I would like to express our congratulations, too, to the

**March 11, 1955**

hon. member for Milestone who is as proud as a father who has just had quadruplets. He is very pleased and we are all pleased with him.

I am not going to make any extensive remarks at this time about the Campbell victory, because, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members would be interested to know that Your Honour has graciously consented to a proposal that some time next week, or whenever it suits the convenience of the Campbell rink, we would like to have them here at the Legislature and in this Chamber have the House adjourn and make them a presentation on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, as a permanent memento of the fact that they have brought honour to this province, particularly in our Jubilee year, by winning the Macdonald Brier here in their own home grounds; and so there will be opportunity at that time, when we have that function, to say more about it.

But in order that it may be placed on the records of this Legislative Assembly that this signal victory has been won, I would like to move the motion standing in my name, seconded by Mr. Erb, the member for Milestone.

The House resumed from Thursday, March 10, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would first like to compliment the Provincial Treasurer on his fine presentation of the budget. I always enjoy him; he does a dramatic job, and this year I thought probably he was not quite so dramatic; but he still did a good job, and I enjoyed it. I enjoy hearing him shuffle those millions around here and there, and I think he gets quite a bit of pleasure out of it, too; but I did think that his attitude, this year, probably owing to the slight recession was not quite so dramatic.

This is the first time that I have spoken in this Session and I would like to compliment our new leader, 'Hammy' McDonald. I have taken an active part in the Liberal party for the last 25 or 30 years and, during that time, I have served under a great many eminent men, and I am happy, today, to be able to serve under Hammy McDonald. The Liberal party in Saskatchewan has a record that it can justly be proud of, and I am sure that in our new leader we have someone who will carry on the traditions of the past and maintain those principles which Liberalism stands for.

I appreciated some of the speeches from the other side in connection with our new leader, though some of them were rather amusing, and I would like to say to those people who made the amusing speeches that the Liberal party is quite capable of picking its own leaders without any assistance from the C.C.F. If those C.C.F'ers over there want to get into a real leadership scrap, I suggest they go down to Ottawa and clean up their own leadership down there. After all, when a leader of the C.C.F. party goes into a vote and only commands four or five of his followers, and the balance either vote against him or abstain from voting, I think they have lots of room down there to get into a leadership scrap, and leave the Liberal leadership to the Liberals of this province.

There is a very noticeable difference in the trend of the speeches of the gentlemen opposite this year as compared with last year. Last year, they were crying about our surplus of wheat. I said at that time, and I repeat again

today, that if man has a couple of thousand bushels of dry wheat in his bin he is in a very favourable position. He has good insurance against a crop like we had this year; better than money in the bank. I also said at that time that the good man above in His own wisdom and time would look after our surpluses. Both those predictions have come true earlier than I thought they would.

Just before I go on with the rest of my talk I want to make a few comments on the remarks of the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Burton) yesterday. I listened to the Provincial Secretary, yesterday, and I was surprised that an important Minister of the Government should spend 10 minutes on the affairs of his department, and an hour giving a distorted political picture of things all the way from fertilizer to I don't know what. Now, Mr. Speaker, if anyone wanted to give better examples of mill rates than the Minister did, much better examples could have been cited. For instance, since 1944, electricity has been brought to the farmer's yard without cost to the farmers by the Manitoba government; in Saskatchewan, the same service costs \$500 per farm, paid by the farmer. Now if you convert that into mill rates you will find that the Saskatchewan farmer is paying, on a \$2,500 assessment (and that is an average assessment) 20 mills for 10 years more than the Manitoba farmer is paying for the same service. There are a lot more mill rates we can quote. I never heard of farmers buying combines and all that sort of stuff by mill rates; any I bought I paid cash for them, or paid money not mill rates. During the 1952 election speakers went through my constituency waving a phony receipt, saying that there was a municipal tax; that farmers in Manitoba were paying a rural municipal tax for power line construction, since 1944. That, of course, is an example of C.C.F. election tactics.

Another noticeable difference in the tactics of the gentlemen opposite, this year, is that, so far at least, they have ceased to criticize the United Nations and they are much less vocal in their praise of Russia. Possibly the split in their party at Ottawa over the support of the U.N. has sobered their thinking to some extent. I hope it has.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, did my hon. friend say the United Nations, or does he mean the United States?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I said the United Nations.

**Premier Douglas:** — Is my hon. friend saying that the United Nations has been abused by members on this side of the House?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I didn't say 'abused'; I hope I didn't, Mr. . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Well, read it again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I think you would oppose the United Nations . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, then again on a point of privilege. No member on this side of the House is opposed to the United Nations.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, all right, Mr. Speaker, we'll see.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Sure, you're against them.

**March 11, 1955**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry, the other day, to hear the member for Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown) compare the members of this House to stuff that you take out of a pig sty. In my opinion, statements of that kind reflect no credit on the members who make them, and it is an insult to many fine men who have gone before us in this House. In my opinion . . .

**Mr. R. Brown (Last Mountain):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I would like to inform my hon. friend that I have not spoken in this debate as yet, and I did not refer to the members of this House in that statement.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, we'll just clear that up right now, Mr. Speaker. We'll just clear that up right now . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — He's talking about another debate.

**Premier Douglas:** — He is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I have the hon. gentleman's speech here . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What date?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — It was in the Throne Speech.

**Premier Douglas:** — It's out of order.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, all right, but it is there and you can read it. At any rate, in my opinion, it is high time that we had a little more political honesty and a little more dignity in our public life in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — This has been an unfortunate year for farmers who depend on grain farming. In the eastern and southeastern part of the province we had an almost total crop failure this year. In the southwest and part of the western part of the province, I believe we had a normal crop. This year has demonstrated again what the old-timers of this province know, and that is that it is not good to put all your eggs in one basket. The man who carries on a mixed-farming type of operation is again, this year, even in the crop failure areas, in a much better position to carry on than are those who carry on a straight grain-farming operation.

I was amused at the Government's statement that the 1954 crop was one of the most disappointing ever experienced. If you accept the C.C.F. theory that everything started in 1944, that would probably be correct; but when I think back to the frozen crops in 1907, the frozen crop of 1911, the rusted crop of 1916, the ten years of almost total crop failure all over the prairies — why, to say this is the most disappointing crop that we have ever had is sheer nonsense! And in those earlier years . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nolle:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I think that the statement made, contained in the Throne Speech was 'the worst crop since 1943'.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I don't think so. There have been very few years in the last 50 years in this province that some part of the province has not experienced a crop failure; some years it was much bigger than others, and in the years in the 'thirties there was almost universal crop failure for ten years. Prudent farmers and prudent municipalities have laid up reserves in those good years to cope with the failures when they occur. The C.C.F. Government has continued to raise taxes and spend millions on experimental and unnecessary ventures, yet, in the first recession in their political experience, they become panicky. They fail to recognize the fact that if private enterprise stopped pouring money into this treasury, this socialistic government would collapse overnight. Yet at the first sign of difficulty they go crying to Ottawa, like a baby crying at its mother's knee.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's a queer joint.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — This Government has been in office in ten of the most prosperous years we have ever experienced, with the highest yield of best grade and best prices, highest taxes and more wheat carried over in the farmers' hands in these years than the whole province produced in some of the years that I have mentioned, yet they have been spending money with utter disregard for value received. Where is the spirit and courage the pioneers of the early days exhibited? It certainly isn't contained in the government benches.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend, for a few minutes to discuss with you some of the problems affecting our municipalities, schools, etc., and some of the Government's broken promises to them. In order to do that I am going to revert to the 1952 election. I have in my hand here a copy of that C.C.F. propaganda rag 'The Commonwealth', and on the front page is a picture of my late C.C.F. opponent in the 1952 election, Mr. Gordon Sawyer; and I want to say here that Mr. Gordon Sawyer is a gentleman and an honest man, and I do not think that Gordon Sawyer would, knowingly, tell an untruth; but he was a victim of circumstances. He did not know the score, and he accepted a lot of the C.C.F. propaganda that was developed here in Regina which was sent down to him and printed in this paper. Now, having said that, I am going to go on and discuss some of the paragraphs that are contained in that paper.

The first one is, and this is from April 2, 1952, 'Commonwealth', and I am going to quote a paragraph out of this paper, Mr. Speaker:

"Another commendable feature highlights the C.C.F. road grant policy. It is a fact that municipalities can now be certain of regular grants on a non-partisan basis.

"Prior to 1944, the amount of grants and the frequency with which they were given depended upon the political factors involved, especially the date of the next election."

**Some Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Now that is C.C.F. propaganda. Just wait until I get through, and probably you won't be saying 'Hear, Hear'.

Mr. Speaker, I have a bunch of tables and a bunch of figures here; I hope you will permit me to read them. I want to give you the picture of the total market road grants given to municipalities in this province since this C.C.F. Government took office.

**March 11, 1955**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Why not go back and get the Liberal grants, too?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I will, in a minute; I'll get those in. Don't get in a hurry about it; it will be all here.

The average for the three years before the 1948 election to all the municipalities of the province – and that was three C.C.F. years – was \$168,000. I am just quoting the round figures. In the election year of 1948-49, they stepped it up to \$560,000; more than four times as much in the election year of 1948-49 than they paid in the three previous years, on an average. That is the 1948 election.

Let us go down to another election year, the 1952 election. The average for three years to all the municipalities in the province for grants for main market roads was approximately \$400,000; in the election year of 1952-53, they stepped it up to \$662,000, an increase of 50 per cent; and in the year following the election year of 1952, the grants dropped back to \$423,000. Those were election years, of course! Yet the 'Commonwealth' says: "grants under Liberals depended upon election"; well I don't know why these grants came up at election time. For the election year, 1948, market road grants in the province as a whole were increased four times the three preceding years – four times, in the 1948 election. Following the election these grants were greatly reduced, until we come to the election year of 1952, and then there is an increase of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. The very next year after the election grants fall to the previous level, and there is a reduction of almost a quarter of a million dollars. I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that these untruths in these papers did not affect the vote in Cannington very much, although some people did believe it; but this paper circulates all over the province, and I think it did have an effect on some constituencies in the province. In my humble opinion this is a poor way to win an election.

I have given you the picture of the province. I am now going to give you the picture as it affects my constituency of Cannington, and the pattern is just the same only a little worse. I am going to quote now from the 'Commonwealth' of April 2, 1952:

“Like other municipalities throughout the province the rural municipalities in Cannington constituency received grants on an unfair and irregular basis prior to 1944. On the average a grant was made every three or four years. Since 1946, however, (and this is the part I want you to remember) municipalities in the Cannington constituency, without exception, have received grants each year.”

That was the election year, 1952, and there was no indication there that there was to be a reduction in the grants, and that the next year 138 municipalities would receive no grant at all, with a drastic reduction in the other municipalities. Yet at the time the C.C.F. speakers were boasting from a platform that they were going to take off the public revenue tax in that coming year of 1953, they did not mention anything about the reduction in the grants.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the Public Accounts and see just what did happen in Cannington constituency. I have given you the overall picture of the province; now I am going to give you the picture of the grants that were paid to rural municipalities in the Cannington constituency, of which there are, I think, 12 or 13 wholly or partly within the boundaries of the Cannington constituency. The average for three years, for those municipalities,

before the 1948 election was, roughly, \$5,000 per year. In the election year of 1948-49 they were raised to \$11,850 – almost doubled in the election year of 1948 to what it was the three years previously. Now, let us go down to the 1952-53 election year. The average for the three years before the 1952 election to the rural municipalities in the Cannington constituency was \$8,800 per year; in that election year, however, they paid those municipalities \$16,200 – almost double. In 1953-54, after the election, they paid the magnificent sum of \$3,130 to all the municipalities in Cannington, which is about one-fifth of what they paid in the election year. In connection with that \$3,000, that whole \$3,000 went to three municipalities. One municipality got \$2,000 roughly, and the other \$1,000 was split between two municipalities, and the other municipalities in Cannington did not get a nickel in the year after the election – and they, the C.C.F. were boasting about the regularity of their grants.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — The new look!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I have given you the picture of Cannington constituency. I am going to go down now and give you the situation of an individual municipality in the Cannington constituency. Here again, Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote from a paid advertisement in a local paper, over the signature of Gordon Sawyer – and again I do not think that Gordon Sawyer knew the score or he would never have allowed this to have gone in the paper; I am quite sure he didn't know. In a local paper it says this:

“In 1948-49 R.M. No. 124 received \$1,810 . . .”

That is correct, that was in 1948-49, an election year. They picked out the biggest grant they had given; but that was correct; I am not objecting to that. In 1951-52 that municipality received \$1,290. Again that is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I have no objection to it, although it was election year and much higher than the average. But here is the part that I do object to, and the part that is strictly untrue by any measure you want to apply to it, and I quote:

“Before 1945, grants were irregular and as low as \$72 in 1940-41, and zero for the three years previously.”

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Is that true?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That is the end of the quotation. They say before 1945 grants were irregular and as low as \$72 in 1940-41 and zero for the three previous years. That statement is very far from true, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say more about it, but I don't think you would allow me. The statement referred to a period from 1937-38 to 1944-45, a period of seven years of Liberal government. Now let us see what Public Accounts says – and after all, Mr. Speaker, these are not my figures; they are taken from Public Accounts. Let us see what that municipality got in those seven years under a Liberal government, where they say they got \$72 and zero. In those three years there was spent in that municipality, without cost to the municipality: for timber bridges, \$1,992; for market road grants, \$2,336; for other roads, not provincial highways, \$1,843; Kipling to Moosomin road, \$5,833. A total of \$12,000 went into that municipality, Mr. Speaker – and they talk about that. As I said, I would like to use stronger language, but I am afraid you wouldn't allow me.

**March 11, 1955**

The statement referred to a period from 1937-38 to 1944-45, a period of seven years of Liberal government. Now let us see what Public Accounts says – and after all, Mr. Speaker, these are not my figures; they are taken from Public Accounts. Let us see what that municipality got in those seven years under a Liberal government, where they say they got \$72 and zero. In those three years there was spent in that municipality, without cost to the municipality: for timber bridges, \$1,992; for market road grants, \$2,336; for other roads, not provincial highways, \$1,843; Kipling to Moosomin road, \$5,833. A total of \$12,000 went into that municipality, Mr. Speaker – and they talk about that. As I said, I would like to use stronger language, but I am afraid you wouldn't allow me.

The item in the local paper seeks to leave the impression that in this seven-year period there were few and irregular grants to rural municipality No. 124. The men who control our rural municipal councils are the finest bunch of men in the world. They are not men who can be bought by a paltry road grant from this or any other government, and it makes my blood boil when some cheap politician gets up and suggests that by giving a certain municipality a little more grant you could buy their influence. They are not that sort of men.

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — You found that out, eh?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, just in passing, I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that the annual convention of the Rural Municipal Association will probably be held in this city of Regina next year, and I believe in previous years it was the custom to recess the House for a day or two to allow the members to attend that convention. I think that custom should be revived. It would be an education to some of the members of this House to attend a Rural Municipal convention and see democracy in action as demonstrated at a Municipal convention.

If the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) had been up at Saskatoon, last week, he would have heard first-hand from the men who collect the taxes and the farmers who pay the taxes just what those people thought of the school tax today. I didn't notice any Rural Municipal people congratulating the Minister of Highways on his bridge programme, or the progress he has made with his grid system, or the fact that 138 municipalities in this province got no road grant at all in 1953-54. I didn't see them doing that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Government has broken faith with the rural municipalities. When equalization grants were set up the Government stated there would be a \$500 basic grant; they have not carried out that promise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word about equalization grants. I believe, when they were set up with the formula we had they were the fairest system of grants that had ever been devised. I still believe that; but this Government neglected to take notice of the recommendations of the Britnell-Cronkite Commission, and I am going to read you a couple of the recommendations that I refer to. If you look at page 38, Chapter IV, of the report of that Commission you will find these comments on equalization grants:

“The Committee wishes, however, to express the opinion that any extension of the grants should be made with greatest caution.”

A little later on, down in the same paragraph, they make this observation:



“These equalization grants tend to undermine local responsibilities and, therefore, the device should be used sparingly.”

I agree with both those statements. I am in favour of equalization, but I think you can overdo it.

I think the Minister of Education should take these factors into consideration in connection with school grants. I am in favour of equalization, but they are, in some cases, defeating the aims they set out to accomplish. If the end result of equalization grants has been to cut off 138 municipalities from grants altogether, and to reduce grants in a great many more municipalities, the scheme has been carried too far. If the Government gives the rural municipalities \$200,000 more this year than they did last year, the rural municipalities, in 1955-56, will still get less than they did the election year of 1952-53, and they are in a much worse position today than they were in 1952-53. Now is the time that our municipalities need some assistance. The Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) told us the other day about the difficulties that he was having with his road problems. The municipalities are in a similar position and have bigger difficulties proportionately than the Minister of Highways has. I will say more about that later.

We hear a lot about this grid system – if and when it comes. Last year, they said “a staff has been appointed to design a grid system of main market roads”; this year, they tell us “it is anticipated that a grid system plan will be completed in time to be studied by a Royal Commission.” Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. When you consider that each nine-township municipality has approximately 480-odd miles of road allowance to look after, that is more miles of road allowance than the entire length of No. 1 that lies in the province of Saskatchewan – and we have approximately 300 municipalities looking after that road allowance, that length of road. The \$3,000 grant that you people gave to Cannington in 1953-54 would just about pay for the grease on the maintainer we have in that constituency, with a few blades thrown in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss with you for a few minutes the grid system. I am in favour of it. In fact, I think it is long since overdue. We had a system similar to that for market roads, but I agree that we should have had a grid system – not this year, next year or five years hence; we should have had it before, and I am very much in favour of it. I asked the question the other day, in the House, as to how many municipalities signed an agreement with the Government in connection with a grid system this year, and the answer was ‘zero’. Just another case of a lot of propaganda and no roads.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government had called in a dozen reeves and their secretaries from the different parts of this province, and sat down with the heads of staff, and discussed this matter, they could have arrived at a solution of this problem that would have been satisfactory to the municipal men and fair to the rest of the province. I am prepared to take the advice of the municipal men of this province, when it comes to that sort of thing, over the advice of any advisory board or commission, no matter how clever or how well educated those men may be. We have, in the province, far too many advisory boards. We have advisory marketing boards, advisory municipal boards, Royal Commission on rural life, Bureau of Economic Advisory and Planning, and so on, ad infinitum. It will soon be that we will need an advisory board to advise the advisers of the advisory board if we keep on.

**March 11, 1955**

**Mr. McDonald:** — We're near that now.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — One wonders what we have 14 Ministers for on that side of the House. Are those Ministers not capable, or do they not understand their departments well enough to run them? Take the matter of the grid system. First it goes to the experts, the Advisory Commission, then it gets tangled up in red tape, and the result is — no roads. I have seen suggestions by some of these experts as to the type of roads that these grids are going to be, and I want to say here and now that if those roads are built to any of the standards that I have seen suggested, they will be out of reach, financially, of 85 or 90 per cent of the municipalities in this province. A municipality with 400 miles of road cannot afford to build a super highway from municipal taxes. They have to cut the cost according to their means and so many things are encroaching on the municipal tax dollar that the municipalities are getting proportionately less each year for their road programme. It is high time, in my opinion, that the government members over there stopped playing that old cracked record of what happened in the 'thirties and 'forties. I don't know who they think they are kidding, but they certainly are not kidding the municipal men of this province, nor people who lived here during those periods. And I just want to say a word about that. I went through those 'thirties, and I am going to say, too, it was an education for anybody to go through them; it was a tough deal, but it was an education . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — It didn't do you any good, though.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — And if we go back to the 'thirties we will find that we were all broke. I was broke; my municipality was broke; the provincial government was broke, and the only money they got to carry on with came from the Dominion government. What happened was that, after a very few years, the municipalities hadn't any more credit. And what did they need that credit for? Not to build roads. No. And not to build telephone lines or anything else. What they needed that credit for, Mr. Speaker — and you know it, you went through it — was to furnish food and clothing for our children, feed for our livestock, and seed for our farmers, and this is what happened — the municipalities went broke first.

During the last years of the depression, 95 per cent of my municipality was on relief, and that was true of a great part of the southern part of the province. In the mid-'thirties the municipalities went broke. They had to go to the government, and the provincial government advanced them money, or guaranteed their loans at the bank, and they were able to carry on; but, naturally, they didn't build roads or anything else. When somebody over here was talking about the model roads they built in the 'thirties, I think they should be ashamed, because either they don't know the score, or they are trying to create a false impression.

Now, after not too long, the provincial government found itself in difficulty. What did they do? They went to the Dominion government and the Dominion government guaranteed the debt. We were all broke. Governments do not produce wealth, Mr. Speaker. All the money they have to spend is what they collect from you and me and everybody else in taxes. The farmers of that day didn't have a nickel in their pockets and, consequently, the government couldn't collect any money and they had to go to some other source for it; and for this Government, after ten years of the greatest prosperity, with people with more money in their pockets than they have ever had, to cast slighting remarks on the municipal men and the people who were in control of this province at that time, is not politically honest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things that I would like to discuss, but I am afraid I have dwelt too long on some of these. I would like to discuss some matters with regard to schools and rural schools. When I say 'rural schools' I want to include the town, village and hamlet schools because, after all, they are all rural schools for practical purposes, and when I say rural schools I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can be allowed to include those. I want to say, at the outset, that I am not opposed to the Larger Units.

**Premier Douglas:** — Are you for them?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Yes, absolutely. I always have been. I take second place to no one in this House or out of it, including the Minister of Education, in my desire to see that the young people of this province receive the very best education it is possible for us to give them. I recognize in the Units progress of our times in our educational system. As times have progressed so has education progressed, but I am going to make some criticisms and I am not making them in a spirit of vindictiveness; I am not making them for political purposes. I am making them because I believe that those things I am going to suggest will have to come before our Units will be on a sound economic and practical basis. One of the things that I am going to say – and again, I am not saying it in a vindictive spirit; we all make mistakes; I have made a lot of them, everybody makes mistakes, that is why they put erasers on the end of lead pencils, so people can rub out their mistakes.

In the first place, when these Units were set up, in my opinion, they departed from a fundamental principle of taxation, namely, that those who collect taxes should have some say in the expenditure of those taxes, and vice versa; the people who spend money should have some responsibility for the collection of that money; and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the departure from that time-honoured principle is one of the reasons we are having part of the criticism of our Larger Units, today. We hear quite a lot of criticism about the financing of our Units, and until we rectify some of those things, I do not think we are going to have a sound, efficient, economical operation of our Units. I think the Provincial Treasurer would agree with me in that – that if he collects money he wants to know where it is going.

Another weakness, in my opinion, is that we have too much remote control. There is no one in this province has a better right or a better knowledge of what is best for the children of this province than the parents of those children.

I am going on a little further and say that I think we have too many supervisors in our schools. I realize, and I am glad to know, that the situation is improving year by year; it improved last year partly owing to the better teacher supply and partly through closing schools. But there are still too many there, in my opinion. It seems to me that an opportunity to recruit teachers from the British Isles needs some explanation. We had applications, I believe, for over 600 teachers to come from the British Isles, and we sent two officials from the Department of Education over there to interview these people, at a cost of some \$5,000 or \$6,000, and we landed back with 132 teachers. I presume that most of those who applied were qualified teachers, and my experience is that anyone who learns a profession or trade in the British Isles has a very good knowledge of that profession or trade; and I believe at least enough of those people should have been brought out to staff our schools so that we would not have had to have supervisors in our schools.

**March 11, 1955**

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had a great many more things here I wanted to say to you, but I believe my air-time is up, and I do not want to infringe on my good friend from Hanley who is following me, so I will have to save the rest of this for some other opportunity. I hope I will have an opportunity to put some more of the thoughts that I have before this House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the budget, not because of what is in the budget, but because of what is left out.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to deal with all of the statements which my hon. friend made, and I must say that on my own account I am disappointed that he did not say the other things that he has on his notes there, because I was looking forward to them with considerable anticipation.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — If you want to sit down I'll say them.

**Mr. Walker:** — I want, however, to comment on some of the things he said. I noticed that his address followed very closely the pattern and style set by his leader. His leader has made the No. 1 issue in this Legislature a slough along the Trans-Canada Highway somewhere near Moosomin. That, to him, is apparently the main issue confronting the people of Saskatchewan, and the main issue which he feels this Legislature should consider.

The hon. member for Cannington is concerned about some municipality down there, whose name and number I have forgotten; concerned over some little problem. I would have been much better pleased if the member for Cannington had spent a little more time dealing with principles involved in government, principles involved in treatment of municipalities and policies in general rather than the problems of some particular municipality with which he happens to be acquainted.

He did say something, however, about the principle of the larger school unit, and I welcome the statement that one member of the Opposition has now decided to come down in favour of the larger school unit — with a lot of reservations. He said that in establishing the larger school unit we departed from a very important and fundamental principle; that is, he says, that we took away from the body that levied the taxes the power to have something to say over their spending.

When the hon. member for Cannington was at the municipal conventions he must have spent too much time in a hotel room somewhere, because anybody who knows anything about municipal affairs knows that under the old regime the municipalities had no control of how school districts spent their money. Under the old regime the school district requisitioned a certain sum, and it was the responsibility of the municipality to levy and collect that sum, and the municipality was not consulted. I don't know where my hon. friend gets his quaint ideas of municipal affairs.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Where did you get your information from?

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, apparently that misconception is widespread over on the other side. Apparently it is shared by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), which, of course, does not add anything to the lustre of the member for Cannington.

**Mr. Danielson:** — How wrong can you get?

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that he had something to say about equalization grants, and I was glad to see that he was in favour of equalization grants. He said he was in favour of the principle of equalization grants, but he said: “I am in favour of equalization, but I am afraid the Government overdoes it.” In what way the Government overdoes it, he did not say. He said we were not paying enough money in equalization grants. We overdo it, he says, but I would like to have him be a little more explicit. He did talk about some municipality getting a little less money in 1953 than it got in 1952, and he cited some figures to show that there was a reduction of \$400 or \$800 in the amount which they received. But, I did not hear him say a word, Mr. Speaker, about the turning back of the Public Revenue Tax to the municipality, and in every municipality . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I made mention of the Public Revenue Tax in my address.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am willing to concede that he knows about the Public Revenue Tax, and I am willing to concede that he knew about it when he was speaking; but I wish that he had included the figures for the Public Revenue Tax in the amount of money which this Government makes available to municipalities, and he did not do so. Yet, every municipality in his constituency receives anywhere from \$2,000 to \$7,000 or \$8,000 by virtue of this Government’s surrendering the Public Revenue Tax that was put on by the Liberals, many years ago.

The hon. member had a lot to say about political honesty, Mr. Speaker. He talked about Manitoba’s situation in respect to power. I have here in my hand the Winnipeg ‘Tribune’, November 20, 1952. I want to read part of a news item which appeared there, as follows:

“A delegation of two St. Vital councillors is scheduled to approach the Winnipeg Electric Company to seek a reduction in rates for installing power in rural areas. A decision was taken, Monday night, after council read a letter from a St. Vital resident who claimed the Winnipeg Electric Company wanted to charge him \$840 for installing electricity in his rural home.”

I suggest that everything is not milk and honey, as my hon. friend would like to make you believe, in the province of Manitoba.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, that was not under the rule of the Power Commission District.

**Mr. Walker:** — My hon. friend says that wasn’t under the rule of the Power Commission District. That is true. Liberals in Manitoba, like Liberals in Saskatchewan, had a hodge-podge of private enterprise and private plants scattered all over the province, and had no over-all integrated system in Manitoba as we have in this province.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I was talking about the rural electrification of Manitoba.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to go on . . .

**March 11, 1955**

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member is just quoting what . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't think my hon. friend would want to mislead the public in quoting that last figure. That figure was for wiring the buildings.

**Several Members:** — No, no, you're wrong!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member who was speaking is taking the responsibility and has given you the source from which he has quoted and is perfectly at liberty. That is not a point of order at all.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, he had several things to say about political honesty. He started out by saying that in the Speech, we had put misrepresentations in the mouth of His Honour – and I am not going to discuss the Speech from the Throne here in this debate, because I realize that that debate is closed. I am commenting on what my hon. friend said. He said that we put in the mouth of His Honour a statement to the effect that the 1954 crop was the lowest in the history of the province. I would just like to correct the record by reading to him what the Speech from the Throne did say in that regard:

“Continuous wet weather, the most widespread rust infestation in history and frost reduced a very promising crop to the lowest level since 1943.”

All the meanderings which he made about 1915 and the rusted crop of 1905, of course, had nothing to do with the statement that was made in the Speech from the Throne. So I suggest that, before he starts reading us a lecture on political honesty, he read his text at home before he comes to the Legislature.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I'll do that.

**Mr. Walker:** — In addressing myself to the debate on the Budget, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to those who have already spoken, to the Provincial Treasurer on the very excellent budget which he has again brought before this House. This is an excellent budget and is not in violation of the traditions which he has established. He has always brought before us human budgets, budgets based upon the progressive principle of equalizing the abundance which this country produces. His budget again this year has met, I am convinced, with a very favourable response among the people of Saskatchewan. That budget will stand or fall as a record of performance. That budget, unlike the empty vaporings that come from the other side of the House, will measure up in terms of real needs and real satisfactions to the people of Saskatchewan.

When the Provincial Treasurer gave the House that budget, he outlined the policy of this party. He put that policy squarely upon the record. I wish that the Leader of the Opposition and his party would be as frank with this House. I wish that he would lay the policies of his party before this House.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You couldn't understand them anyway.

**Mr. Walker:** — So far, this Session has gone for nearly four weeks and we have not been able to smoke him out of the bulrushes yet, as the

hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) would say. We haven't yet been able to get from him a concise statement of the policies of his party concerning the urgent and pressing problems of the people of Saskatchewan.

The Liberal party is on trial. The Liberal party must show it has capacity to grapple with the problems of the people of Saskatchewan if it expects to be trusted with their confidence. The Liberal party has to prove itself and I suggest . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — What's with you? You haven't got any policy.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — . . . that they could do with a little bit of advice. I think that the Liberal party would do well to make a frank re-appraisal of its attitude towards this Government's policies. I think that they should recognize that, after 12 years, many of the policies of this Government have become a permanent part of our institution and the fabric of our provincial life. They should come to admit that things like the school units, for example, are here to stay; that our Crown corporations are a permanent part of Saskatchewan life. They should come to admit that an independent civil service, guaranteed by a Civil Service Act, is here to stay.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Their own policy.

**Mr. Walker:** — They should accept the really progressive policies that were inaugurated by this Government and take pride in the accomplishments of this province, instead of always going out and decrying everything that Saskatchewan does, always belittling everything that this province accomplishes. I think that they ought to re-appraise their whole attitude toward the Government of this province.

I suggest that if they will do that, if they come forward and offer themselves to the people of Saskatchewan with a progressive and a forward look and open countenance, they are more likely to be accepted by the people of Saskatchewan. This picayune criticism, the people of Saskatchewan do not like. They want to see the two major parties in this Legislature conduct themselves with a reasonable spirit of co-operation. They want to see the Opposition making constructive suggestions to the Government, proposing constructive alternatives to the policies of the Government, and what do you get? You get the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) — and I am sorry he is not in his seat — making a speech, last Friday, purporting, I suppose, to lay down the policies of the Liberal party; he passed over a number of things and he came to Crown corporations and he said, "Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with Crown corporations." So, he drew himself up and he said, "Crown corporations have been having a bad time. Why, we had to close down the tannery." Four years ago — three years ago — yes! He said we have had a bad time; we have had to close down the tannery.

Then he said things haven't been going very well either with others; there have been a lot of casualties again — we have had to close down the woollen mill. Well, that is ancient history — that happened years ago, Mr. Speaker, in 1952. Then all at once, like the hound after the fox, he saw a rabbit run the other way — he forgot about the other ten corporations. He never mentioned the rest of them. The tannery which has been closed for years and the woollen mill are the only two he thought were worthy of consideration.

He did not mention the Fish Marketing Service, which showed a profit last year; the Fur Marketing Service, which showed a surplus; the

**March 11, 1955**

Government Trading Division, which showed a surplus; the Government Insurance Office, which showed a surplus; Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company, which showed a surplus; the Industrial Development Fund, which showed a surplus; the Government Printing Office, which showed a surplus; the Saskatchewan Power which showed a surplus; the Saskatchewan Minerals Sodium Sulphate division, which showed a substantial surplus, and the Clay products division, which showed a surplus; the Timber Board, which showed a surplus. None of these were worthy of inclusion in his contribution to the debates of this House.

I suggest that if he would just go and have a good look at himself in the mirror, put on a little more of an open countenance, a little more of an open approach to the problems of government in Saskatchewan, he would be more gladly received by the people of this province.

I am not going to deal with all that he said, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to mention a few other items. He said that, in northern Saskatchewan, there's no railroad up to Uranium City. When the Liberals were in power Uranium City was a deserted lake in northern Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's a long way back.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — There was nothing at Uranium City when the Liberals were in power; but in Alberta they had built a railroad north to within 150 miles of Uranium City on their side of the boundary, and in Manitoba they had built a railroad up to Lynn Lake, two-thirds of the way up from the south to the north end of their province, and the Liberal party in this province, sleeping in its cobwebs, had done nothing.

I am not one of those who believe that now we should build another railroad to Uranium City, that we should try to get half the traffic that is now going to Uranium City, in order to compete with another province. I think that if we are going to have interprovincial competition it should be constructive competition, not the kind suggested by the hon. member for Maple Creek. If it is more convenient and more economical for trade if Uranium City is served by Edmonton, I am not going to say that we should spend millions of dollars to try and steal half of it away. After all, the development of our northland is too big a thing for provinces to get into wasteful and inefficient rivalry over its development.

He spoke about the manufacturing capacity of this province. He tried to leave the impression that in Saskatchewan, for some reason, we were not enjoying the benefits of development, and he tried to make you think for some reason that this lack of development of manufacturing industry in this province was somehow the fault of this Government. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that, if you refer to the Canada Year Book for the year 1946 at page 391, you will find there a detailed statement of the gross productive capacity of manufacturing industries in the three prairie provinces. You find that in this province in the year 1938, Saskatchewan had only one-third of the manufacturing capacity of Alberta, that Saskatchewan was developing at only one-third of the rate of Alberta, and less than that of Manitoba. I suggest that the reason why this province was in such a backward condition in 1944 was because of their policies.

For example, here you have the increase in the productive capacity of Saskatchewan from 1937 to 1944 — only \$113 million of increase in capacity. But, in Manitoba, the increase in those seven years was \$211 million of gross output, and Alberta's increase was \$266 million of gross output. The



C.C.F. in Saskatchewan inherited a neglected industrial economy, an industrial economy that we have been making very significant strides in overtaking the other provinces of Canada; and for the hon. member for Maple Creek to say that the other provinces are still ahead of Saskatchewan, he had better go back and look at the figures prior to 1944, and they will tell him why.

The hon. member said something about base metal production. He said the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer would try to make you believe that Saskatchewan is doing very well in base metal production, and he said that the Premier has made the statement that Saskatchewan produced more base metals than Alberta and Manitoba put together, last year. This statement is true. He admitted that it was true, but he tried to belittle the accomplishments of this province by suggesting . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — How much did Alberta and Manitoba produce? Tell us.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Well, I'll tell my hon. friend. Here are the figures. Alberta did not produce any. And Manitoba — the member for Maple Creek said, "Oh, they always did produce less than Saskatchewan."

**Mr. Danielson:** — How much is less?

**Mr. Walker:** — That's what he said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — How much is less?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Walker:** — Let me read the figures. In Manitoba the total copper production in 1938 was 65 million pounds, but in Saskatchewan it was only 18 million pounds. Gold production in Manitoba was 185,000 ounces; in Saskatchewan only 50,000 ounces. That is 1938, when my hon. friend from Arm River had some responsibility for the government of this province.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's accepted.

**Mr. Walker:** — Here's selenium — 1938: Manitoba, 57,000 pounds; Saskatchewan, 28,000; silver: Manitoba, 1,198,000 ounces; Saskatchewan, 898,000 ounces; tellurium, 4,400 pounds in Manitoba; 2,206 in Saskatchewan; zinc: 46 million pounds in Manitoba; 29 million pounds in Saskatchewan. So, in 1938, Saskatchewan ranked below Manitoba for every single item of mineral production; and when the Premier now says that Saskatchewan produces more base metals than Manitoba and Alberta put together, he is saluting a real triumph and a real accomplishment for the people of this province, and all the detracting and all the niggling of my hon. friends opposite will not take away this accomplishment of the people of Saskatchewan.

We had the complaint from the member for Maple Creek that the Minister of Education was misusing trust money, that he was taking trust money out of the Education Trust fund and was misusing it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is so, I suggest that the member for Maple Creek ought to hurry down to the nearest police court, that he ought to hurry to the nearest Justice of the Peace and lay a charge against the Minister of Education. To suggest, as he did, that trust funds were being misused and misappropriated, I think is beneath the dignity of a member of this House.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They even get free legal advice over there, too.

**March 11, 1955**

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — No intelligent or responsible person in Saskatchewan has ever made the suggestion before, or since, that the Minister of Education was misusing the Education Trust funds of this province. But, of course, having made that statement he was not bound by it, even himself, because, in the next breath, he said that this province has got some hundred million dollars of trust money in one fund or another, and that we should be using the interest on this trust fund to build sewers at Leader and at Maple Creek and Richmond. Mr. Speaker, such a misuse of the Education Trust Fund I can hardly conceive of. I suggest that we need a little more sense of responsibility on the part of those who attempt to criticize this budget.

I was going to make some comments on some of the remarks of the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), but since he is not in his seat either, I shall forgo that pleasure.

If the members of the Opposition are out to criticize this Government, they should criticize this Government and not everybody else they can cast their eyes upon. Why, we have them now criticizing municipal councils and criticizing larger school unit boards. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that lies very ill in the mouths of any member of the Liberal party. I suggest that they ought to confine their criticisms to the Government and not criticize people who are neither here nor have the means to defend themselves.

A case in point was the address of the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), the other day. In the course of his remarks, criticizing the School Unit Boards, he said: "There are many ways that the units could save money, and I suggest that the Minister look into it." We have an Act called the Larger Units Act which gives to unit boards certain legal and financial responsibilities. To suggest, as was done in this House, that the Minister of Education ought to take it upon himself to interfere in the operation of the school unit boards is, I think, uncalled for. I think the school unit boards are just as well able to manage their business as the hon. member for Wilkie, or the hon. member for Cannington. They probably know more about their business than either of these two gentlemen.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What about yourself?

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, it is always a little difficult to make adequate comparisons between the position of the municipalities in this province and what they were back in the 1930's. I don't think that it is always valid to take a situation that exists now and try to compare it with 1938 or 1940; but I think that you can get some guidance as to the financial soundness and solvency of our rural municipalities if you compare them here with the province of Alberta.

I perused the annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs there, and I made this comparison. This is for the year 1953. In the province of Alberta there are 44 million acres of farm land; in this province there are 61 million acres. The total amount of money levied for taxes on that land in Alberta is \$26 million, and in this province \$28 million, and that works out to 59.1 cents per acre in the province of Alberta and 46.6 cents per acre in the province of Saskatchewan. Admittedly, those figures are average: the total amount levied in the province of Alberta is divided by the total number of acres and similarly in Saskatchewan.

I think I might give you a breakdown of that to show how much of it was for municipal purposes, how much for school purposes. In Alberta, 28.1 cents was for school purposes; in this province, 23.3 cents for school purposes per acre. In Alberta 27.2 cents per acre is the average levy for ordinary municipal purposes; in this province, 22 cents per acre, or 5 cents less per acre, practically one-quarter less in this province than in Alberta. If it is true that the tax rate in this province is high (and I do not doubt that it is), then it is exorbitant in the province neighbouring.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What about Manitoba?

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Then, of course, if you want to look at it on the basis of a mill rate, I find that the average mill rate in Alberta for municipal and school purposes is 52.1 mills, whereas in Saskatchewan it is 42.7 mills average. The average municipal mill rate there is 23.1; here it is 20.1. The average school mill rate there is 2.65; here 21.3. So, Mr. Speaker, these people who are going out and decrying the success of our municipal institutions in this province are not only rendering a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan, but are actually misleading the people of Saskatchewan.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why our municipalities are in a better position is because in the province we have taken many of the responsibilities that formerly lay upon the shoulders of municipalities. This Government has done something for municipalities. Unlike the previous government in this province, we have given them assistance in material terms and not just hot air and words.

My hon. friend from Cannington always likes to talk about bridges. I took the trouble to look up the amount spent on bridges in the 12-year period from 1933 to 1944 inclusive, and in that 12-year period \$1,418,000 was spent on bridges in this province. In the last ten years it is \$4,424,000 – practically three times as much. Let them measure their record in terms of hard facts and realities, and get down off the cloud of hot air that they are usually riding upon.

I looked for some evidence of Liberal party policy from the speeches of their members. I, of course, have been disappointed. I looked, for example, to hear where they stand on the matter of the Rand formula. I was edified before I came down here to notice that the Leader of the Opposition said, well, we are not going to tell you what we think about it, we are going to wait to see what the Government is going to do. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan look for a little bit of courage from a leader of a political party. They look for somebody who has got a little bit of nerve; they look for somebody who is not afraid to get up in this House and tackle the Premier of Saskatchewan, if he has got anything in his brief case.

**Mr. McDonald:** — He never says anything.

**Mr. Walker:** — He should take that brief case and open it up and read those speeches and let the Premier have a go at him. No, no, he is being very quiet here this year, and that fact is not being lost on the citizens of this province.

**Mr. Carr:** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

**Some Government Members:** — Oh, no, not now – after!

**March 11, 1955**

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — I will be glad to answer a question when I have completed my remarks. It will give him time to think up a question, too.

The citizens of Saskatchewan are well pleased with this budget. This budget contains evidence of the continued high degree of efficiency presently, and for the past ten years, maintained in the various government departments. How, I ask you, can you spend a million and a half dollars more on real services to the people of Saskatchewan by way of increased supplementary allowances to old-age pensioners, by way of increased grants to schools and still, in these times of continuing higher costs, without increasing the budget by at least that much or more? Yet, what is the situation? The total increase in our estimated expenditures is no greater than the total allowed for these two items alone, which means, of course, that in every department the utmost efficiency, the utmost care, the utmost astuteness with the pruning hook has undoubtedly been used. The people of Saskatchewan are glad to see that situation; while at Ottawa the Civil Service is multiplying and mushrooming even in these years, even in the past year, this province has demonstrated that it is following a hard and realistic programme of administration.

This budget is also evidence, Mr. Speaker, of a continued satisfactory state in the financial health of Saskatchewan. This budget, with further evidence of reduction in our provincial debt, is of the utmost satisfaction not only to those from whom we have to obtain capital funds for capital extension, but also those who have to pay the interest on our provincial debt. It is a matter of great satisfaction to see the amount that is required to cover the carrying charges on our public debt being reduced once again.

This budget is very satisfactory to the people because it contains a humanitarian programme that was begun and launched in 1944. This budget has shown all the people of Saskatchewan that we believe in doing things for the people who cannot do things for themselves. We are providing, as the House knows, increased supplementary allowances for those over 70; and, I think that that fact alone is a conspicuous piece of evidence as to where the heart of this party is, and where is the heart of the Opposition. After all, people over 70 are, by agreement with the Federal Government, their financial responsibility. The Federal Government has assumed the exclusive responsibility for the security of these people. This province could technically and theoretically and legally sit idly by and allow these people to suffer in want and in destitution while the Federal Government, with their billions of dollars annually in their revenue, could allow them to starve, allow them to continue in want. But here, where money is scarce, where revenues are hard to find, this Government has done something practical about the problems of those people. This Government has refused to sit upon its technical, legal rights. It has refused to say to the Federal Government, these people are your responsibility; if you don't look after them we are going to let them suffer.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is because of the evidence of efficiency, financial good health, and humanitarianism; it is for those reasons that this budget commends itself to the people of Saskatchewan, and it is for those reasons that I vote to support it in this House.

**Mr. Carr:** — Mr. Speaker, the question I wish to ask is, is the hon. member for Hanley in favour of the Rand formula as proposed by the S.F.U.?

**Mr. Walker:** — I'll answer that, and I would like to ask the question of my hon. friend, too, if I may. I would like to know from him whether he is in favour of being Secretary of the Liberal Party or Secretary for the Rural

Municipality of Warman. With reference to the Rand formula, I will only say this. This Government puts its beliefs on the statute books of Saskatchewan. This Government carries its principles out in practice, in operation, and all I need to do is refer my hon. friend to the bills of the 1954 session, and he will see that this Government is on record. Will my hon. friend put himself now on record?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Darling (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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