

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Twelfth Legislature
26th Day

Thursday, March 15, 1956

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

FIRE AT SIMMIE

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I am sure all members will want to join with me in expressing sympathy to the citizens of the little town of Simmie for the damaging fire that occurred there last night. Simmie is just about 40 miles south of Swift Current, in the Swift Current Constituency. I understand that several thousand dollars worth of damage has been done, with stores and some homes burned; although it was fortunate that no one was injured or burned. I thought I would just bring it to the attention of the House.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Wednesday, March 14, 1956, 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. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last night, I had started to talk about my Constituency. The farmers in Morse have very much in common with farmers in other prairie constituencies; they are troubled with ever-rising costs, and they have their granaries bulging with wheat, and lots of them have piles of it out on the ground, with little or no delivery opportunity. Some of those farmers have become so pressed for cash for their immediate needs that they have availed themselves of the opportunity to get money under the Federal Wheat Loan Plan, but I haven't yet seen any of those farmers, Mr. Speaker, who are satisfied with having to pay interest on money they rightly consider to be their own, and this dissatisfaction has been decidedly more pronounced since it has leaked out that there is so much storage space available in terminal elevators. Then, to add insult to injury, we were told that the reason this storage space hadn't been filled up was because there was a shortage of some 36,000 boxcars.

When our friends opposite want to make what they believe to be slighting remarks to us on this side of the House, they frequently refer to us as 'C.C.F. planners'. We consider it a compliment to be referred to as 'Planners', and it strikes me that if we had a few planners in the Government at Ottawa, this situation wouldn't have arisen. I do not suggest that if we had got this 150 million bushels off the farms it would have settled all the farmers problems, but, Mr. Speaker, without initial price of \$1.20, it would have put \$180 million more purchasing power into the hands

March 15, 1956

of the farmers, and I am sure that wouldn't have made the farmers mad, and the business men throughout this Province and throughout Canada would be very pleased if it had taken place.

Mr. Speaker, the recent proposals of the Canadian Government on National Health Insurance came as welcome news to Saskatchewan. The Liberal Government has talked of a comprehensive national health insurance plan since 1919, and now at long last we are taking some action. To me, Mr. Speaker, their delaying tactics are quite understandable, because National Health Insurance is certainly at variance with the so-called free enterprise system, and too, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that up until the present moment, no Province in Canada with a Liberal administration has adopted or even indicated its willingness to adopt a suitable hospital scheme. The Conservative government of Ontario has recently declared its intention of inaugurating a scheme, but not a single Liberal government has done so. It is conceivable, therefore, that the National Government could find it embarrassing to provide support for programme in which no government under the same political banner has taken action.

One of the stipulations of the plan is that no Federal funds are granted until suitable hospitalization insurance programmes are actually in operation in the majority of the Provinces, representing a majority of the people of Canada. This means that it will be at least one year, and possibly two years or more, before Saskatchewan will receive benefits under the plan. No such stipulation has been attached to any other National programme, and as the National Health grants of 1948, or the recent Federal-Provincial programme of Disability Allowances. In these programmes the Federal Government simply offered the funds, and any Province was free to accept them or not, depending upon whether or not the Provinces made matching grants available. But the most hopeful judgment, Mr. Speaker, it will probably be in mid-1957 or 1958 before all the criteria is met which would result in national grants to Saskatchewan.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, is that these national grants exclude financial assistance for the hospitalization of patients suffering from mental disease and tuberculosis, and as everyone knows, from the point of good health, the need in the field of mental disease is especially great or greater than it is in the field of general illness. Mental hospitals throughout Canada are overcrowded and are in great need of additional support. From the viewpoint of humanity and logic, therefore, a National Hospitalization programme should include support for the care of all diseases.

The Federal percentage of the sharing of costs is 50 per cent for Canada as a whole. Actually a sliding scale has been designed in which the Provinces spending the least for hospitalization get the greatest assistance; while the provinces spending a higher per capita amount get less assistance. Thus under this formula Saskatchewan, because of its greatly advanced hospitalization services, gets less - 47 per cent.

Since the Federal Government has greater taxing powers than the provinces, it could easily support services across the country with a much more generous contribution than 50 per cent. In their 1945 proposals on national health insurance, they promised that health insurance would be introduced in two stages - first, hospitalization which would include the

services of the family doctor, and the Federal government would contribute from its revenue about 60 per cent of the cost. The second and complete plan to be introduced later would include all specialists services, dental, nursing and laboratory services, and the cost of medicine. But, as I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, we are very happy to know that at least we are on the way to getting some of this assistance.

If I may go back to my Constituency again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention one project that we have there. I want to compliment the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) for the many projects that he has in the Morse Constituency, I want to deal specifically with the forage projects that he has in that Constituency, and I think with the time at my disposal I will only have time to deal with one of them, and that is the largest one. Now this is a project lying just north of Mortlach. Twelve years ago when this Government was elected, the area that now comprises that project was more or less of a desert, drifting soil and Russian thistle, and the Department of Agriculture under the present Minister decided that they would make use of these areas, and they have made use of a number of them in my Constituency, and I want to make particular reference to this one. I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to know just what has happened in that project. There are 9,120 acres in that project, and as I said in 1944 it was more or less a desert of drifting soil and Russian thistle. Today, in comparison it is a veritable Garden of Eden. We used to think down in the south country there, that the only place you could grow alfalfa was on the irrigated land or in the park belt areas. Well, we have grown some of the finest crops of alfalfa down there, that I believe can be grown anywhere, irrigated land included. I should say first of all that the Department has planted a lot of trees out there, several thousand of them, for wind breaks, and in the process of reclaiming this land, they have raised many thousands, I don't know how many, but a goodly number of thousands of bushels of feed grain, and to give you some idea of the crops that are being raised there at the present time, and have been for many years now, last year's crop, there were 23 fodder co-ops went up there, and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, those fodder co-ops have an agreement with the Minister. They go in there, they are groups of farmers, very often groups of dairy farmers, and they form themselves into a co-operative and they go out into this land, and they undertake to harvest a certain part of that crop, and they pay a reasonable amount per ton for the uncut hay. They cut it and haul it, and one stipulation is that they are supposed to set aside 25 per cent of that year's harvest for reserve. They can do with it what they like after they have once had it, but that is what they are expected to do. They are expected to save 25 per cent of it for next year. Now last year, those 23 co-ops went in there and they harvested 5,280 tons. The Mortlach municipality, where the project is situated, have a similar agreement to that of the co-ops. They harvested 208 tons, and then there was another group of farmers from Qu'Appelle. Those men were flooded out last year, and they made an agreement with the Department and they harvested 625 tons. The Department themselves harvested 1,475 tons, making a total harvest last year of 7,688 tons, and at the moment the Department has stacked from that project and listed for sale 7,800 tons of fodder, and I want to assure the Minister of Agriculture that the mixed farmers and the dairy men in particular appreciate very much what the Department of Agriculture has done in my constituency. I would like to say a great deal more about what has been done there, but I haven't the time at the moment.

March 15, 1956

Before I leave my constituency there was one other thing that I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker. It has been mentioned in this House many times before, it is the sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin. The Minister dealt with it very well the other day. It has been pointed out many times in this House the benefits that have accrued to the people of this Province, and particularly to the Treasury Department from that plant. I merely wanted to add that the crop just recently harvested there this year is one of the largest, if not the largest that has ever been harvested at that plant. I thought, Mr. Speaker, you would be interested to know that.

The other day the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) was making some comparisons as to Mothers Allowances paid between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Now I have only got a certain amount of air time here, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot deal with it as fully as I would like to, but I was very surprised that he stepped into the social welfare field at all, because Manitoba has the lowest record of all the western Provinces in the field of social welfare. Some of the figures that my hon. friend gave are quite true. He gave the figure for a mother and one child on mothers' allowance that Saskatchewan pays as \$40 a month. He wouldn't tell us where he got his figures though. . .

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Straight from the Deputy Minister in Manitoba.

Mr. Gibson: — Manitoba on the other hand pays \$51. That is true, if you can qualify for it, but the. . .

Mr. Danielson: — Where did you get your figures?

Mr. Gibson: — I got them right out of the book you got them out of. Here it is on my desk. But the means test and the eligibility tests in Manitoba are so severe that not very many can qualify. I haven't got too much time to go into it, Mr. Speaker, but in Saskatchewan the number of families that received this mothers' allowance in the year that the member was talking of (1953-54) was 2,272, and in Manitoba it was only 1,099, and the number of children in Saskatchewan was 5,009, and in Manitoba 2,008, and the incapacitated fathers 6,098, and 300 for Manitoba. The total is 8,895 for Saskatchewan, 4,247 for Manitoba.

And now when we get down to the money that was paid, Mr. Speaker, for mothers' allowances, Saskatchewan paid \$1,217,000 and Manitoba paid \$1,600,000. . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . .difference in the number of applicants.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gibson: — But when it comes to health services, Saskatchewan paid \$333,252 for health services to this group, and Manitoba paid nothing.

Mr. Danielson: — That isn't true.

Mr. Gibson: — Alright that isn't true, I did say that wrong. In Manitoba if you want those services, you have first to become an indigent, and you have to get it from the municipalities.

In Saskatchewan and a mother and one child may have a total of \$5,000 in real and personal property, including \$1,000 in cash, and there is no restriction on what happens to that property, but in Manitoba the cash value of all assets may not exceed \$3,000.

Mr. Danielson: — Tell us about the income.

Mr. Gibson: — Just a moment. I will tell you about the income, you bet I will. The applicant may be required to turn over cash assets to the Director of Public Welfare who will release sufficient to pay current liabilities, and the Director may then hold up to \$2,000 in trust for the recipient, and pay out the balance as mothers' allowance. In other words, if you have got over \$2,000 they will pay you mothers' allowance out of your own money.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, with \$100 income. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gibson: — Mr. Speaker, I have taken all of these figures right out of the annual report of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker. . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will take his seat.

Mr. Gibson: — I have taken it right out of that report.

Mr. Danielson: — Tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gibson: — Saskatchewan allows the mothers an outside income of \$540 each year, or \$45 a month before reducing the allowance. Manitoba doesn't allow them \$45 a month, they allow them \$20 a month before reducing the allowance, and they have some other restrictions - if there are any children living at home who are earning over \$55 a month, they must pay half of that amount to the mother, and this is deducted from the mothers' allowance. In Saskatchewan no lien is registered against property to assure repayment of the allowance, but in Manitoba a lien is registered against the real property, and any allowance is recoverable from the property to the extent the equity in the property exceeds \$2,000. Saskatchewan provides allowances to mothers where the father who is in a penal institution under sentence for one year or more. In Manitoba they provide allowances where the father who is in a penal institution only if he is totally and permanently incapacitated as certified by a medical certificate. So the mothers who have husbands in penal institutions in Manitoba, who aren't incapacitated, can starve. In Saskatchewan they pay allowances to divorce or separated mothers, but in Manitoba, they only pay allowances for separated mothers if the father is dead or totally and permanently incapacitated. In Saskatchewan they pay allowances to mothers deserted for one year or more, but Manitoba pays allowances if the mother has been deserted for four years or more, so she has got to starve three years longer in Manitoba to qualify; and furthermore, the children must have been in receipt of municipal assistance for some time prior to the application. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, for a deserted mother in order

March 15, 1956

to qualify in Saskatchewan, they are not required to be a British or Canadian subject; but in Manitoba parents must be or have been British subjects. Saskatchewan requires one year's residence in the Province, and Manitoba requires two years residence prior to the death of the father. In the case of desertion, the mother must have legal residence one year in Manitoba prior to desertion, and she must have been deserted for four years before becoming eligible. They let them stand there in pretty near every case for three years, and then they can become eligible. In Saskatchewan a mother may live anywhere in Saskatchewan once the allowance is granted, but in Manitoba she must live in the municipality where she has a legal residence once she receives the allowance, unless she receives approval of the Minister to live elsewhere. We hear that is the kind of conditions they impose in Russia.

Mr. Danielson: — Who wrote that for you?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gibson: — Let us see what they do with the blind pensioners allowance in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan the recipient of a blind pension allowance may earn a supplementary allowance up to \$20 a month, depending upon income and marital status, and that same person is entitled to hospitalization and complete health services. In Manitoba that blind pensioner would get no supplementary allowance, no health services, none whatever, no hospitalization, no nothing.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the same applies to the old-age assistance group. They can earn up to \$20 a month, too, depending on those same circumstances, and they too are provided with the same hospitalization and health services, and then the A.A.A. group, that is the 65 to 69 group, all of that group is given a hospital card, every one of them. In Manitoba, no hospital card, no health services for any of those groups. As I said before, if you require that assistance in Manitoba, you must prove yourself to be indigent, and you get it from the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is up, but I will just take one minute longer. For homes for the aged we pay 20 per cent and \$40 per bed allowance. In Manitoba they paid 10 per cent and no bed allowance. When it comes to nursing homes, we pay the full amount. We operate all nursing homes, they give only a small grant. Our nursing homes cost up to \$6,000 a bed; we have got four nursing homes in this Province, and we operate them ourselves. They haven't got anything like that in Manitoba. The Government of there does not build or operate nursing homes.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Budget.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a record right about now to be the shortest speech on record supporting the Budget debate, and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't any alternative but to support the Budget. It is one of progress and economy, and due to the fact that for the third session now my wife has presented me with another baby daughter, 7½ pounds, I have no alternative, Mr. Speaker, but to support the Budget.

Mr. M. J. Willis (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this Budget debate, first I want to congratulate you for the able and capable manner in which you have conducted the affairs of this Legislature, over the past 12 years, and I wish you all the health that is possible in the years in which you will now be able to have a holiday.

During 1955, in many parts of this Province we had Jubilee celebrations, and I must congratulate the Committee in charge of the advertising and all the tremendous work in the central office, and all the people of this Province for joining in those celebrations. We were rather unfortunate in my Constituency, as we had several of those celebrations rained out. However, next summer our community will celebrate its 50th anniversary. The Committee in charge, through me, is extending an invitation to the rest of you to come to this three-day affair on the 6th, 7th and 8th of July. The Committee has been working for over three years, and is getting out a book, which is in the printer's hands now, known as the "Wheat Land Heritage". During those celebrations we will have the privilege of honouring my good friend the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wellbelove) who is retiring this year from public life, who has worked on the hospital board, the school board, and the council, and every worthwhile movement of our community, and has been a pillar of the spiritual side of life in that community, and we only wish that his helpmate could have been spared to join with us in the celebration next summer.

For a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about education for the simple reason we have been taken to task in this particular field. This year this Government will give grants to the schools, the elementary and secondary and technical schools, to the amount of \$12,200,000. But let us not forget that when we came into office, the grants were only \$3 million. In other words, in 12 years we have increased the grants four times what it was when we took office. Besides that, this year, we have an item chargeable to capital of \$400,000, to help units and school districts to build schools. We are granting this year \$1,935,000 to our University, and over the years we have given grants by the Provincial government to help composite schools in this Province to the amount of \$1,400,000. These grants for composite schools have brought to the rural children the opportunity for technical education that were never offered before in the history of this Province. We have given conveyance grants now for 12,700 pupils in the past year, and in our centralized school programme by means of buses and bombardiers, we have 328 centralized schools which give the rural children a chance to have the same facilities as those children in towns and cities. We have aided 598 students to the amount of \$191,000. There have been 998 students aided by our student fund. We have seen established 47 units on a permanent basis in this Province. Now my friends across the way never take a stand for the units. We don't know since the units have been inaugurated whether they are for them, or whether they are not. I would like them, and I understand the Leader of the Opposition is going to speak following me, and I hope that he will make his stand quite clear whether he is in favour of units or not. But the 47 units being established on a permanent basis mean that the people of this Province in 47 areas already have accepted them and are well satisfied with them. On a temporary basis, until there period of 4½ years is up, there are nine more. There are only four areas that are not in a unit basis.

March 15, 1956

I am very pleased to say that the Government is giving consideration to technical institution in the Province, because as you will recall last year, I spoke on that phase of education.

I just noticed in reading the other day in the 'Star-Phoenix' of March 10th, that the grants in the Shell Lake area from this Government amounted to \$321,000 or 60 per cent of their Budget, and since inauguration of that unit has spent \$637,000 on new buildings and they predict in the next four or five years, they will spend another \$200,000 on classrooms. I am sorry that the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) is not in his seat, because I notice he asked the question on March 9th, what was the indebtedness in the Yorkton area. The current debt is \$295,000 and the debenture \$150,000. But he didn't give the assets of that unit. He didn't tell this House or the people of this Province that there are 14 new classrooms that have been built totalling \$150,000. He didn't tell this House that 320 students from the rural areas go into the Yorkton collegiate for tuition which is paid for by the unit in the amount of \$50,000 a year. He didn't tell them that there is a library set up a 5,000 books in their central library, and at least 100 books in every classroom in the libraries of the schools of that unit. He didn't tell them that the average rural mill rate was 21.8 prior to the unit coming in, and is now 27.5. He didn't tell them that the unit will receive \$60,000 more in grants this year.

When they speak of education, and what they are going to do for education in this Province, Mr. Speaker, I think they should hang their heads in shame. What did we find when we came into office? School grants at the lowest ebb in the history of this Province, teachers unpaid, and I well recall that we passed \$100,000 to pay teachers off, that the school districts had dissolved and someone had to take the responsibility, and remember that \$100,000 was on a \$500 and \$600 salary. Now they are going to pay 50 per cent of the cost of education. If it is only 50 per cent of what they did in 1944, Mr. Speaker, it won't affect the standards of the teaching profession or anyone else in this Province, and I am sure the people will not be fooled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard, secondly, when they are speaking about how they are going to help the municipalities. Well, I think it is only fair to look at how they helped in the past, because I think the most of us are judged on past records. I have before me the grants that were given by our friends across the way when they were in office for a 5-year period from 1938 to 1944, and out of 11 municipalities that were wholly or partially in my area, these are the grants, and I am just going to give the totals, because I promised to be off the air in another six or seven minutes.

From 1938 to 1943 the Liberals gave grants to municipalities in the Constituency of Elrose, and the boundaries have never been changed in that Constituency, totalling \$12,155.

Mr. McCarthy: — You were lucky to get that much.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): — I know what the Elrose Constituency will get if we ever get a Liberal government in this Province.

Now from 1944, the next five years to 1949, the Elrose Constituency received in grants \$86,000. Seven times as much as the Liberals gave in their 5-year period. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is not offering anything except making a lot of noise, and it doesn't pay much to make a lot of noise.

Since this Government took office, the 11 municipalities that are in the Elrose Constituency received from the turning back of the Public Revenue Tax, \$348,000 or \$87,000 a year. Now when my friends say they are feeling so badly about the municipalities, this is the record, Mr. Speaker, that we have had.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — You just borrow money from the others.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! This yelling across the floor, it does not enhance the dignity of this Chamber, especially when it is going over the air. I would ask the members to kindly refrain.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I am trying to rush along to make room, but if they are going to take my time, I am certainly going to take more time. I think I am entitled to it; I like to play fair. This Government has said to the people of this Province that they are going to give for market roads \$2,500,000 and I may say that I have met several of the councils at the Convention down here, and they are quite satisfied with the plan, and this plan was not drawn up without the consent of those people involved. Moreover, I am very pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that we are bringing gas to the town of Eston this year, and while we are having our Jubilee celebration, I extend the invitation to come down there because we have a lovely telephone building, and will have an automatic telephone exchange open next year; we opened our new hospital last year, and this year with gas coming into our town we are opening a new school, it has not been officially opened, but we are using it at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying the record that we have had over the past 12 years - we have endeavoured to help education, we have endeavoured to help the municipalities, but I do resent people that were so niggardly with the teachers that they drove the teachers out of this Province, and it has taken us 12 years to build confidence with the teaching profession to stay again, but now they come back and say “we are going to give them, pay 50 per cent.” They do not say what 50 per cent. It is easy if it is only \$3 million, such as they gave them in their best year in 1944.

And, so, Mr. Speaker, as I promised I would share the time, I have no hesitation in supporting the Budget, and I feel sure that the people of this Province will accept it as they have in our policies in 1944, 1948 and 1952.

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Firstly, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and his good wife on the addition in their family, and I want to thank him for the cigar that he sent across the House to myself and other members of the Opposition. I can say it is the first

March 15, 1956

thing that I have ever received from a socialist for nothing. But I do sincerely appreciate it very much, I want to wish you and your wife and good family the very best in the future.

I, too, want to again congratulate you, Sir, on the length of time that you have served in this House, along with other present members who have indicated they are not going to contest the next Provincial election.

As I said in an earlier debate in this House I think that anyone who enters public life and serves their community in any way, either as members of council, school boards, hospital boards, or members of the legislature of the House of Commons, if they are serving the people in a true desire to do what they can to better the life for all of us here in the Province of Saskatchewan or in Canada; and I want to again personally congratulate these people for what they have contributed and to wish them well in the future. I only wish that some people on the other side of the House to your right, Mr. Speaker, would take the same attitude with regard to members who are sitting on this side of the House. The senior member of this House sits in the Liberal Opposition; a man who has given more of his time and energy to the Province of Saskatchewan than any other man in this House. I am referring to Mr. Herman Danielson, the member for Arm River. He is the senior member in this Legislature. He has been here for 22 years, and he will be here for quite a few years yet, but I think it is uncalled for, from a Minister of the Crown especially, to say that the member for Arm River hasn't the best interests of Saskatchewan at heart. I believe that the member for Arm River, as all members in this House, has the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan at heart. Naturally we disagree in our philosophy, but all of us in our own way are working for the betterment of the Province as a whole.

I was rather disturbed when the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) said, and I will quote:

“Every member over here”, (referring to the Government side of the House) “if the Minister of the gospel. The member for Arm River and his colleagues do not understand humanity first.”

Mr. Speaker, the socialist party are not the only people who have the best interests of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, or anywhere else, at heart. We are just as concerned in the Liberal party, in the Conservative party and in all other parties with the wellbeing of the Province and our country, as any socialist in or outside of this Legislature.

It seems to me that the present Government has adopted an attitude that they are right on everything, and anyone who disagrees with them is not standing up for the Province of Saskatchewan - that we are being disloyal. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anyone in or outside of this House that has any more loyalty to the Province of Saskatchewan than myself and my colleagues sitting in this House this afternoon. I was rather amazed at some of the remarks that have been made during this present debate. Every time one of the Government members get on his feet, he wants to compare

expenditures back in 1934, or 1944, with the expenditures of the Provincial Government today, and I wish that some of the people sitting opposite would compare their personal expenditures of 1934 or 1944 with their personal expenditures of today. Each and every one of us, Mr. Speaker, are much better off today than we were back during the hungry 'thirties. Our own financial position is much better. I can say that as far as my own initial position is concerned, and I think it is true of all the members on this side of the House, and I think that the people of this Province are fast becoming tired of this old argument as to who spent the most money, the Liberal government in 1935, or the C.C.F. government in 1954, or 1955 or 1956.

The Liberal party today are prepared to be judged on their merits of 1956. We are proud of the efforts of past Liberal governments in this Province, but are we going to live in the past, or are we going to prepare for the future? According to the announcements that have emanated from Ministers of the Crown of this Government, I think they have little or no preparation for the future development of the Province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that they continue with a depression complex. Certainly the depression left a mark on everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan and other parts of Canada and the western world, who lived through the depression. But I think it is time we realized that we have tremendous revenues available today, that we have untold resources that have been untapped so far, and we must immediately tap those resources of new revenue.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two things about wheat. It seems to me that we have heard an awful lot about it for a long time, especially from Government members who consistently demand that Ottawa do this, that, and the other thing, well they have sat on their haunches and done nothing themselves. I wonder if they realize today that in the Province of Saskatchewan we have a minimum of 40 million bushels of space in our country elevators. Why isn't that space taken up? Because the farmers of this Province are unable to deliver their grain due to blocked roads. What are we doing about it? I think it is a provincial responsibility to see that those roads are open as quickly as possible. I understand that the Department of Highways are making some effort.

Mr. E. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Let your hot air out and thaw them.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — But we can go much farther than that, Mr. Speaker. There are many municipalities in this Province that have good equipment that could be utilized to open these snow bound roads, but due to the fact that the municipalities haven't the money to operate that equipment, they are unable to use it. I shouldn't say they haven't the money at the moment, but if they used the money they have available at the moment for removing snow, then they will have no money left to move dirt next summer. And with the present grid road system at the present Government is attempting to shove down the neck of the rural municipalities of this Province, every municipality in Saskatchewan is going to need all the financial resources they have at their disposal to help to build this road grid in our Province.

March 15, 1956

It is estimated that on top of the 40 million bushels of space that exists now, which we are unable to fill due to the fact that our roads are blocked, before the snow leaves and roads dry up, we will have an additional 35 million bushels of space made available. If we are going to utilize this space, this grain must be delivered before the frost comes out of the ground, and I sincerely hope that this Government will do everything within their power to see that these roads will be opened just as quickly as possible. This amount of space, Mr. Speaker, would mean that the farmers of this Province could receive in cash \$81 million if they were able to deliver this wheat at the moment. I know in my own municipality of Maryfield No. 91, just a year ago now, our municipality spent approximately \$2,600 in removing snow. We needed that money to move dirt this summer, but when you spend it on snow then you are not able to spend it on moving dirt as well.

Now a while ago, one day when I happened to be out of the Legislature, there was some reference made to an editorial that appeared in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' under a dateline of September 26th, and the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E. Walker) read part of this editorial, but he apparently forgot to read the editorial in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' that was written a few days later, as a matter of fact on September 30th, apologizing for the editorial that was written a few days before.

Mr. E. Walker: — What made them change their minds?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — What made them change their minds? Well, at least the Winnipeg 'Free Press' when it is proven to be wrong, will admit they're wrong, but those people on the other side of the House refuse to admit they were wrong even when they are proven to be wrong.

The editorial that appeared in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' under the dateline of September 26th, was not right. It did not contain the facts of the wheat situation, so I wrote a letter to the Editor of the Winnipeg 'Free Press' pointing this out to him, and I want to read part of that letter to you. This letter was written on September 27th, 1955.

"I know your editorial of Monday, September 26th, headed 'Saskatchewan Red Herring'. I should like to point out that the Defence Production Act regulations allows accelerated depreciation on new buildings for public storage of grain. Accelerated depreciation has been freely available to anyone wishing to build public grain storage capacity since August 1st, 1953. The accelerated depreciation offered enables the owner of new public storage capacity to write off his expenditure in full during the first three years of operation. This provision has been used extensively by the grain companies. Certificates have been granted totalling \$14,743,000. Additional certificates are being granted week by week.

"Since July 1st, 1953, new storage in the amount of 35,163,000 bushels has been added to our public grain elevator capacity. Of this, seven million bushels of terminal storage space has been paid for by the Federal government.

“I thought I would like to take this opportunity of bringing this matter to your attention, and you may use these facts in any way you wish.”

On October 6th, I received an answer from the Editor of the Winnipeg ‘Free Press’, Mr. Kent, in which he said this, and I quote:

“I am sorry that this is a belated acknowledgment of your letter of September 27th. As you probably will have seen, we did correct in an editorial the misconception in which our previous comment had been placed.

“I do most sincerely regret the misunderstanding that occurred in this case, though I am afraid that I am bound to persist in the view that the use of defence production powers to accelerate grain storage is wrong in principle, . . .”

Well, that is his personal opinion, whether it is wrong in principle or whether it is not. I know that during the Session of the House of Commons, a year ago, the members of the Opposition in the House of Commons did their very best to kill the very Act, or at least to limit the powers under the Defence Production Act, that allows this accelerated depreciation.

Now I want to read, Mr. Speaker, from the editorial that appeared in the ‘Free Press’ on September 30th.

Premier Douglas: — I would like to interrupt my hon. friend on a question of privilege. He says the members of the Opposition did their best to defeat that Act. Which group in the Opposition is he referring to?

Mr. McDonald: — In the House of Commons. Well I think the Conservatives put you in the back seat and therefore while.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read from this editorial.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, my friend can't get out of a misrepresentation like that. The C.C.F. group voted for the Bill. The Conservative Opposition voted against the Bill.

Mr. McDonald: — Who said they didn't vote for it?

Premier Douglas: — You were trying to leave the impression that all the Opposition voted against it.

Mr. McDonald: — That isn't the point of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — It certainly is.

Mr. McDonald: — It is nowhere near it. Now, Mr. Speaker, quoting from the editorial of September 30th:

March 15, 1956

“An editorial that appeared here four days ago was based on a misunderstanding. Mr. McDonald, the Saskatchewan Liberal Leader had been talking about the accelerated depreciation for tax purposes as a means of getting more grain storage built.

“Mr. McDonald has since written to say, that as Mr. Howe also subsequently pointed out, accelerated depreciation has in fact been permitted for the past two years.

“We were wrong, therefore, and we apologize for criticizing Mr. McDonald.

“We also said that it would be improper to use Mr. Howe's defence production powers to give what amounts to a subsidy to grain storage, by comparison with other buildings.

“We should have said it has been and it is improper. If the Opposition knows its business it will be fully justified in using this as an example of why such sweeping, ill-defined powers ought not to be conferred on the government.”

I will only bring that to the attention of the House at this time, Mr. Speaker, so that the record of this House can be kept in order.

Now here a few days ago; as a matter of fact, I think it was the day before yesterday, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) when he was speaking in this debate have certain things to say about flood conditions and disasters that have happened in Saskatchewan and other parts of Canada, and he was referring to the treatment that our province has received in comparison to the treatment of other provinces in Canada.

There seems to be an impression about Saskatchewan and other places due to the fact of the propaganda that has emanated from the socialist party in this province that we haven't received the same treatment as other parts of Canada. Now it is quite true that in the Province of Manitoba in 1950, after the flood in 1950, there was a fund set up known as the Canadian Disaster Relief Fund. There was over \$5 million left in this fund after they had contributed to the different parties in Manitoba that had suffered flood damage. That amount of money was left in trust under special act of Parliament, and there were five trustees in charge of that fund: one is from the Maritime Provinces, one from Ontario, one from Québec, one from the Prairie Provinces, and one from British Columbia. This fund was made up from voluntary contributions from all parts of Canada and other parts of the world, and out of that fund, in 1950 in the Province of Manitoba, there were certain damages paid. For instance, they paid for the personal damage both in urban centres and in the rural areas in Manitoba. People were compensated for the loss of cattle, they were compensated for crop losses, they were compensated for certain furniture that they had lost, for some animals such as pigs and cattle, they were compensated for the repairs that were necessary to some farm machinery, and many other things.

Now I don't know whether this Government, we faced the flood last spring, even made application to the Canadian Disaster Relief Fund. I do not know, but I would like to know whether they made application to this fund. If so, did they receive any money, from the Canadian Disaster Relief Fund?

Premier Douglas: — If my hon. Friend wants the answer. . .

Mr. McDonald: — I sincerely hope, when I am finished my speech, you will give me an answer.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member has asked a direct question which is permissible to be answered.

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, well the Premier will have his opportunity to speak tomorrow.

Premier Douglas: — I am answering it now. Yes, we made application.

Mr. McDonald: — That is where the difference between Saskatchewan and the Province of Manitoba lies, in the fact that those people who had personal damage from the flood in Manitoba were compensated out of this disaster fund, and I believe that we in Saskatchewan ought to have had some compensation for similar damages here in Saskatchewan. Now the Premier, on the air and in other places, many times has said that we in Saskatchewan have been discriminated against. I wish he would give specific instances. He says that we are not being treated the same as some of our neighbouring provinces, and I wonder if he realizes that there are certain projects in regard to controlling floods in Saskatchewan where the Federal Government have given us assistance. And I want to refer to some of these projects.

One of them is right in the Premier's seat, (not the seat he sits in in this Legislature, but the one he represents) at the Souris River project, between Yellow Grass and Weyburn. Another project is the project at Cabri. The third one is the project at Lacadena; another one at Lancer. They are now studying a project that they would like to carry out on the Wascana Creek. I understand they are having some difficulty with other people that might be involved in this particular area, but they are hoping to be able to spend some Federal money on the Wascana Creek.

In the Province of Manitoba, they have received some assistance from the Federal Government in drainage in that particular area, and I can refer to the Pipestone Creek project, where the total expenditure was about \$230,000, and about \$100,000 of that money came from Ottawa. I think the greatest difficulty in Saskatchewan is due to the fact that we as the provincial government have failed to take the steps that we should have taken, either to compensate those people who had personal property damage in 1955, either from the Canadian Disaster Relief Fund or from the Provincial Funds of this Province.

As I said, speaking in an earlier debate, it seems to me that there is a rule for some help to those people who have suffered flood damage and are unable to get compensation under PFAA due to the regulations

March 15, 1956

under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. I think there is a field there that is open, and I believe that the responsibility is not too large for a provincial government to handle.

So I sincerely hope that the present Provincial administration will take another look at this province. I am afraid that it is quite possible that we may be faced again this spring with flooding conditions. The amount of snow that we have now, and the amount of moisture that was around the Province of Saskatchewan last fall could possibly mean that we will find ourselves in trouble again, and I hope that the Government is taking every step possible to be prepared for flood supposing it should arrive within the next few weeks.

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the Budget itself, as there are several things I would like to say in regard to the Budget itself. The Provincial Treasurer has gone to great lengths to try to prove to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, that the debt of this Province is decreasing. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us just take a look at his own figures, and all the figures that I will use here this afternoon either came from his Department or from the statements of the Bank of Montréal, which my hon. friend from Arm River referred to a few days ago, the Bureau of Statistics or the Bank of Canada.

The public debt of this Province, increased \$20 million in the last fiscal year. This is indicated by the Budget speech, or in the Budget speech on pages 14 and 15. We find that during the fiscal year 1955-56, we paid off \$19,630,000 of debt, but in the same period we accumulated \$45 million of new debt. It is rather amazing to hear the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier, on several occasions, stand in their place and say well the Liberals had certain things to do with a certain project, the Conservatives have something to do with it, and the C.C.F. had something to do with it. And then they wind up by saying the Conservatives and Liberals created this debt, and 'we paid it off'.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is this: in this last fiscal year, as I mentioned a moment ago, we paid off a little better than \$15 million of debt in this Province, and on top of that we paid off almost \$4½ million of debt paid out of the sinking funds in the Province of Saskatchewan. But in the same period, we borrowed \$45 million to do it.

When the hon. member for Arm River was speaking here the other day, he said this was the first government that had ever been able to borrow themselves out of debt. Well that is just about exactly what they are trying to do. The debt in this Province is \$55½ million more than it was in 1948.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — We've got something to show for it.

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, we have got something to show for it, that is right. I was going to say something else there, maybe I hadn't better, it is probably unparliamentary.

The Provincial Treasurer tried to conceal some of the debt

in this Province by subtracting what he calls loans to revenue-producing enterprises, and we got an answer to a question in the Legislature here on March 13th, giving a certain information in regard to this picture in 1944 and again in 1955. But we find that in 1944 the Provincial Treasurer had done everything possible to keep his self-liquidating or revenue-producing part of our debt as small as possible, but on the other hand in 1955, he has added everything humanly possible to make it as large as possible. No I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it all fairness, both of the columns, under the one 1944 and the one 1955 ought to have the same items, naturally not the same amount of money, but the items should be represented in both columns.

Nor, first of all, we notice in 1955 that from other Crown Corporations, that is Corporations other than Power and Telephones, we are subtracting \$9,344,000. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you can call these Crown Corporations self-liquidating or not, some of them have liquidated themselves, and we said at one time that we would throw them out the window, well the Government has thrown them all out. They haven't even paid the interest on the \$9 million, let alone call the \$9 million self-liquidating.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Just 14 per cent.

Mr. McDonald: — Then the second item that I want to refer to is an item of \$582,000 under clearing and breaking. Well, now I suppose that that will be self-liquidating. I sincerely hope so. But if he is going to include that amount of money under clearing and breaking, then why didn't he include under the 1944 column the \$6½ million that the farmers of this Province paid back of the seed grain debt. That was self-liquidating, it liquidated itself anyway. Why didn't you put it in there?

Then we can go to his Budget speech of 1952, and in 1952 he said that expenditures on highways are partially self-liquidating. Well, a lot of the highways have liquidated themselves, but whether the debt is partially self-liquidating or not, I don't know, but I doubt it very much. And the Provincial Treasurer must have doubted the wisdom of using this in a column that is partially self-liquidating debts, because he has never put it in that column again. I suppose he has realized that the people of Saskatchewan know better than to accept that as the position so far as highways are concerned.

I am only using this, Mr. Speaker, to show that there is inconsistency between what was called self-liquidating debt in 1944, by the Provincial Treasurer, and what he called self-liquidating debt in 1955. As I mentioned, he should have included the \$6½ million of seed grain debt that has been paid back by the farmers of this Province. He should have included in the column under 1944, \$44 million worth of Treasury Bills, that were cancelled in 1947 by the Federal Government. That was self-liquidating as far as this Government is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Telephones): — By this Government.

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense, by this Government. The Federal Government in 1947 cancelled \$44 million worth of Treasury Bills so far as the Province of Saskatchewan was concerned.

March 15, 1956

Premier Douglas: — In exchange for what?

Mr. McDonald: — Any other relief debts that were paid by individuals or municipalities ought to have been included in the column under the year 1944. There is also \$20 million of contingent liabilities which was included in the debt of 1944, most of which has been paid off by agencies other than this Government. They too ought to have been included under the column of 1944. I imagine that most of this \$20 million was out of the backing of notes to the Wheat Pool in Saskatchewan, and the Co-operative Creameries. They were agencies that have repaid the loan, and consequently the Province of Saskatchewan are not backing this loan in the banks of Canada. They might also have included any school loans that existed in the year 1944. For school loans he has the sum of almost \$3¼ million for 1955, but nothing for 1944. All he is trying to do is to build up the largest amount of money possible to show this self-liquidating debt in 1955, and to keep this the smallest amount possible for the year 1944. This has enabled him to reach the conclusion that the so-called dead weight debt, which he improperly called net weight debt, was \$177 million in 1944, and it's only \$70½ million at the present time. But, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and the Bank of Montréal, or any other bank, when they issue their statements for the next year, we will find that they will list as the net debt of this Province not \$70 million, but over \$200 million, Mr. Speaker.

One can refer to the statements of the particular institutions, the Bank of Montréal and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and they will support the statement that I have made here this afternoon, and I will refer to them again in a few minutes, but I would like this time to point out the change in the setting up of our debt, since the present Provincial Treasurer took over. Now in the first seven Budgets that he brought down in this Legislature, used more or less the same system, and he at that time was adopting the same system as has been adopted in other parts of Canada. Then, in 1952, he changed his method, and at that time he came up with some new names for different kinds of debt. One of them was gross debt, broken into self-liquidating and partial self-liquidating, and dead weight. Well, it wasn't very long until this partial self-liquidating went out the window, and we haven't heard of it since the 1952 Budget, and we had never heard of it before that. But then he adopted a method whereby he had net debt, debt of revenue-producing enterprises, and then he wound up with another figure with no name on it, and since that he has called that the net debt. But, Mr. Speaker, I have a breakdown here of the public debt of this Province from the years 1944 up to and including the year 1955. The public debt of this Province hit its lowest level in the year 1948, and at that time we had a net debt of \$148,627,000. It had decreased from a net debt of \$214,253,000 in 1944. Quite a reduction. That reduction in debt was due to the fact that other agencies had paid off over \$72 million of debt, that the Province of Saskatchewan had backed. This reduction was not due to any good management or mismanagement of the finances of this Province by this present Provincial Treasurer. That reduction in debt was due to the good management of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Co-operative Creameries and other agencies, that it paid their debts off, and consequently we had this drop in the Provincial debt. Now from this low in 1948 of \$144,627,000, our debt has increased up to \$200,088,000 in 1955. Now if that is a reduction in debt, I fail to see it.

Mr. Speaker, during my life time I have had occasion several times to go into debt. I have had to go to the bank and borrow money. I might say that I have never been turned down at the bank, something that I appreciate very much. Sometimes they spend quite a while trying to find me when the note comes due, but my credit has been very good at the bank, and I think the credit of this Province today has been very good. It is indicated because of the fact that this Province has been able to borrow some \$45 million in the last fiscal year. Again, I correct an impression that has been left by the Provincial Treasurer. On many occasions the Provincial Treasurer has said that he is borrowing money at lower rates than other Provinces, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that isn't the situation. In April, 1954, he said, and I want to quote:

“Only this month we were able to borrow \$10 million at a lower rate of interest than any other Province or even the Dominion since 1950.”

That is taken from the 'Leader Post' of April 24, 1954. Now that statement, Mr. Speaker, isn't born out by fact, because in 1950, the Dominion Government refunded two loans, one amounting to \$395,000,000 at two per cent, and the second one amounting to \$350,000,000 at 2¾ per cent. The average coupon rate in 1954 for the Dominion of Canada was 2.86 per cent, while in Saskatchewan it was 3.9 per cent. During the same period, as a matter of fact in 1951, New Brunswick and Ontario sold bonds at 3¼ per cent, and Québec had a rate of 2.78 per cent. Again in 1952, Nova Scotia were able to complete a deal for 2¼ per cent interest, at the same time the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan was paying 3¼ per cent, and the Province of Québec were able to negotiate a deal at 3¼ per cent, but the Québec bonds sold for \$98.65 on every \$100, and we were only able to get \$97.28 in Saskatchewan.

For a number of years the present Provincial Treasure has been able to issue bonds at about 3½ per cent interest, and in some instances I believe he was able to get the money at about three per cent, but it is worthy to note that he is not able to do this any longer, because of the fact that on the last loan he arranged for the Province he had to pay I think it was 3¾ per cent of the \$25 million that was borrowed in the United States on January 2, 1956. The borrowings for the year 1955-56 range as far as coupon rate is concerned from 3¼ per cent on May 15th, 1955, to 3¾ per cent on January 2nd, 1956.

Now it seems that in the past, I can remember members of this Government and supporters of this political party, that sit in power in this Province, saying what a terrible thing it was for us to be paying interest to those terrible people down in Montréal, Toronto and New York. Those big financial people, that were bleeding us to death, and I believe that the Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) referred to that in the House again a few days ago. Well, he and the Provincial Treasurer ought to get a little closer together. For a notice from Public Accounts on page 563, the Public Accounts that are before us this year, that since this Government came to power they have on eight occasions borrowed money from those terrible financial people down in the United States. On February 1st, 1951, the Provincial Treasurer or of \$6 million from the United States. On March 15, 1951,

March 15, 1956

he borrowed \$1,875,000 in the United States. On June 1st, 1951, he borrowed \$4,150,000 in the United States. On August 15th, 1950, he borrowed \$6 million from the terrible people in the United States. On September 15th, 1950, he borrowed a further \$2 million, from the coupon clippers down in the United States. Then on November 1st, 1951, he borrowed a further \$4,450,000. On August 1st, 1953, he borrowed \$15 million from the coupon clippers, and then on June 1st, 1954, he borrowed a further \$12 million from these people in the United States, and on January 2nd, 1956, he borrowed a further \$25 million from the same coupon clippers.

Why when they came into power they weren't going to pay interest to these big financial concerns in Eastern Canada and the United States. They said "this is terrible, we must stop this at once." This Government has borrowed more money from the United States, than any other Government that has held office in this Province.

Mr. Loptson: — Nobody will trust them. They have got to go to some foreign country where they are not known.

Premier Douglas: — Nobody will let you money.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Now I would like to also refer to the per capita debt here in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe the Provincial Treasurer asked the member for Arm River to give him the per capita debt the other day when he was referring to the statement in the back of the Annual Report of the Bank of Montréal. Well, I have the per capita debt here, and in the Province of Saskatchewan for the year 1955, that is at March 31st, 1955, the per capita debt in Saskatchewan was \$214, and Mr. Speaker, there are only two provinces in Canada that have a larger per capita debt than the Province of Saskatchewan. Now this is taken from the Annual Report of the Bank of Montréal.

Then if you want to turn to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics Report, you will find that as at the 31st of March, the per capita debt for the year previous to this Bank Report was \$205, for the Province of Saskatchewan. And we can turn to page 12 of the same report and we will find there that the average coupon rate for the debt in the Province of Saskatchewan, for the year 1954 was 3.88, almost 4 per cent. But, Mr. Speaker, again there is only one province in Canada that is higher than this one here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

3.88 Saskatchewan

2.87 Alberta

3.41 British Columbia

3.74 Manitoba

3.53 Ontario

3.22 Québec

3.71 New Brunswick

3.37 Nova Scotia

3.30 Prince Edward Island

4.26 Newfoundland (and poor little Newfoundland is caught in the draft, and is worse off than we are.)

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, might I make a correction? The hon. gentleman is completely confused. What he is quoting. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I am sure he would like to get the truth. On what he is quoting, Mr. Speaker, I must correct this. We can't allow this statement to go on the records of this House because it could do irreparable damage.

The question we were asked was “what was the average rate of interest being paid in each year?” The rate of interest which we quoted for Saskatchewan of 3.88 per cent or whatever it was does not just include the borrowings for that year, but much of that, Mr. Speaker, is for debt that was created back in 1929 and 1935. The hon. gentleman is trying to give the impression that Saskatchewan paid during the past year a higher rate than the other Provinces. . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Treasurer would let me finish my statement. He is confused most of the time, I know, but why jumped the gun.

I am reading to you from table six which is gross bonded debt, not of 1954, but the total bonded debt of this Province from its inception until today, and the average on that is 3.88 per cent, which is the second highest in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Because of Liberal borrowings in the past.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — And you have been trying to tell the people of this Province that you are such a financial wizard, that you are bringing it down to where one would think it was the lowest in Canada.

Now I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to this Bugle here - the Commonwealth. On the front page, again they are the great humanitarians, “Political Economic And Religious Freedom”. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggested that we may have some types of freedom, but others I refuse to admit. Now in the middle of this paper, this is the issue of December 7th, 1955. The editor of this paper set out the Liberal programme, and he wrote an editorial here saying it would cost \$100 million to implement the Liberal programme. In other words he says it would cost \$100 million to clean up the mess that this Government has created. Now I want to suggest to the editor that if he thinks anyone can clean up the mess this Government has created in one year for \$100 million he must be a new Moses.

Just the other day there was an article in the ‘Leader Post’ saying that the Minister of Telephones had said certain things at a public meeting in the City of Regina. He said:

“Why when we made these promises back prior to the election of 1944, we didn't intend to fulfill those in four years.

March 15, 1956

“Why”, he said, “we have been in power for 12 years, and we haven't fulfilled them all yet, but we are working towards it.”

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That is not true. There was no such statement made.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — It was in the ‘Leader Post’.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The ‘Leader Post’ would print anything.

Mr. McDonald: — I am sorry my secretary is out, or I would bring the clipping in and read it to you.

Anyway in this article in the ‘Commonwealth’, as I say, the editor seems to think that we are to spend \$100 million in one year; well that might be quite an undertaking, and I agree with him. But I do not agree that an expenditure of \$100 million over a period of three or four years would be out of the reach of the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan to fulfill the programme of the Liberal party. Now I want you to remember, Mr. Speaker, that before I opened this paper, I drew to your attention that they pride themselves on Political, Economic and Religious freedom. When I read this bunk, he says it is bunk, and when I read the way he sets it up, it sure is bunk. So I wrote a letter to the editor of the ‘Commonwealth’, and I asked him if he would extend me the privilege of answering this article. What did he do? Freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech that we hear so much about; I was denied the opportunity of placing an article in this rug, the ‘Commonwealth’.

Mr. Speaker, this Government believes in freedoms for certain people, but as far as the masses of this Province are concerned, they are no more interested in their freedom, then some other people I could name, but I am not going to take the time.

Some Govt. Member: — Like ‘Hammy’ McDonald.

Mr. McDonald: — Now the member from Morse had something to say here today in regard to social services, and we heard a lot about social services in this Legislature a year ago, when the Minister of Social Welfare introduced measures into this Legislature, and at that time he said that we were going to pay the highest supplementary allowance to some of our senior citizens of any province in Canada. Now we just got a return tabled in the House February 15th, and we have the information in regard to the supplementary allowance is to our senior citizens, and I rather thought that there were very few senior citizens that were receiving this maximum supplementary allowance, but I was really astounded, Mr. Speaker, to find that there are only 32 people in the Province of Saskatchewan who are receiving the maximum of \$20 a month. And we have it in every 50 cent breakdown all the way from that \$20 to \$2.50 and it is amazing to note that there is only one person getting \$19.50, there are four getting \$19.00, eight getting \$18.50 and so on. The first large number that appears is the number who are receiving \$10.00 a month, 3,966. Then those between \$10.00 and \$5.00 are very small in number, but again there

are a considerable number getting the \$5.00, namely 1,380 people. But the great bulk of our pensioners receiving supplementary allowances are still receiving the \$2.50, a total of 8,544. Now, I understand that there were some pensioners that were cut off this \$2.50, but again after awhile they were reinstated and today are getting the \$2.50 again.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can do better than this as far as our senior citizens are concerned. This last summer when we celebrated our Jubilee we gave a lot of credit to our senior citizens of Saskatchewan, and I believe we do owe a tremendous debt to the senior citizens of this Province, and I only wish that this Government could find it possible to pay more than this \$2.50 to each and every citizen who is receiving a supplementary allowance.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — How much does the Government of Manitoba pay?

Mr. McDonald: — These people are always yapping about Manitoba or some other province. There is nothing that I would say either in or out of this House that would influence what is done in Manitoba or any other province. But what I want to say to you is that you have the resources at your disposal to pay far more money in supplementary allowances to the senior citizens of this Province than you are paying.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Nuts!

Mr. McDonald: — You know it is rather amazing, Mr. Speaker, to find that in this Province this year, we have revenues of over \$87 million. Surely to goodness we could find a little more than \$2.50 for our senior citizens.

Now I have said, Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions, and I want to say here again today, that in my opinion property taxation in this Province has gone through the roof. I was just looking at the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs and I find that in this present year we will be collecting approximately \$60 million on property taxation in Saskatchewan. That's \$60 million will be used to carry out the responsibilities of municipal governments across the Province, but on the other hand we are collecting \$87 million from those sources of revenue that are available to the Province. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that \$60 million as compared to \$87 million, of property taxation is out of line, and I suggest to you that unless we do something and do it immediately there is going to be a lot of property revert to the Crown in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's a lot of nonsense.

Mr. McDonald: — Sometimes I wonder if it isn't part of their plan. They are always planning something, so it is a wonder that they haven't cooked this one up as well. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the people that live in this Province came here in the first place to enjoy that right of owning property. A lot of those rights that many people came to Saskatchewan to enjoy are fast being taken away from them, and I think it is time that we took action to see that none of the fundamental rights and freedoms we enjoyed when we first came to what is now Saskatchewan are taken away from us. And not only that, that we work and see that part of those rights that has been

March 15, 1956

taken away from us are restored to the people of this Province.

Now in conclusion, I just want to read to the Minister of Telephones, an account of a speech he made in Regina, on March 10, 1956.

“The C.C.F. had promised a complete medical, hospitalization and dental programme irrespective of the person's ability to pay. That promise was not made with the understanding that the job would be completed in four years, or eight years, or 12 years, but we have gone a long way toward reaching our objective.”

I want to refer again to the programme of the Liberal party as outlined in this Bugle ‘The Commonwealth’, and there again, Mr. Speaker, there isn't anybody on the face of the earth could implement that programme in its entirety in one year. It is a programme that could be carried out over a four year period, the first period that we would serve as a Government in this Province.

Now until such time as this Government is prepared to bring down a Budget in this House that will meet the needs of the people of this Province, and I cannot support that Budget. The people of this Province have asked for many changes as far as services are concerned. This Government has refused. This Government has refused to call a Provincial-Municipal Conference, so that they could discuss problems, both urban and rural as far as our municipalities are concerned. They have preferred to pick off a rural municipality at a time, and an urban municipality at a time, and deal with them one at a time, rather than to let them come in here in a body and demonstrate to this Government the services they require in the rural and urban areas of this Province.

Until such time as this Government is prepared to do that, and until such time as they are prepared to divide up the revenues of this Province, to provide the services that the people of this Province are asking for today, I cannot support the Budget.

Hon. L. F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes of the time of the Assembly.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat quoted from \$60 million of tax levies in the urban and rural municipalities. The latest figure that we have shows \$54,947,000, which is \$5 million less than the figure just quoted by the hon. member who has taken his seat.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the figure I used was estimated for 1956. I think that is 1955 that you are reading there, is it not?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the tax rolls for 1956 have not been made up as yet, nor is the mill rate levied.

Mr. McDonald: — What was the figure you gave?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — It was for 1954.

Mr. McDonald: — How much?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — It was \$54,947,000.

Mr. McDonald: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Now, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member I think agrees that your figures are right and his figures are wrong.

Mr. McDonald: — No, Mr. Speaker, I agree that the figures of the hon. Minister is using are right, but his are 1954 and it is \$54 million, but if you take in the average increase over the past two years, you could estimate that in 1956 it will be \$60 million.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, I am not making a guess at the figures that I am quoting, and I think the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat will be adequately dealt with in due course. But I would just like to deal very briefly with two matters. One associated with the proposed main market road grid, and the other question associated with the Métis settlement in one of the Local Improvement Districts of the Province. The hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) according to the press, and other remarks that he made during the course of his address in the debate of the Budget had this to say, in a quote from the 'Leader Post':

“The C.C.F. Government has shown more incompetence and arrogance in setting up the municipal road grid system than in any thing else they have done to the municipalities.

“Seventy-five per cent of the municipalities will not be able to take advantage of the grid system because of the cost.”

And further on, he said:

“They had a bunch of so-called 'experts' sit down in a back room, and draw a bunch of lines on a map, and then they came out with the map and told the councils that was their grid system.”

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Correct.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — And then he also stated:

“That he could find a half-a-dozen Reeves, or half-a-dozen secretaries that could come in here and in a very short period of time put similar marks, probably to better advantage, on the maps than what the engineering service of the Department of Highways and Municipal

March 15, 1956

Advisory Commission were able to conceive after some two years of study.”

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I said a dozen Reeves, a dozen Secretaries, and a dozen School Trustees.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is right in his opinion might I suggest that the Resolution of the SARM asking that a study be made of a provincial-wide main market road grid system came from the Annual Meeting of the delegates of the Rural Municipal Association and that Resolution was approved of by the Executive of the Association, submitted to the Government for its consideration, and the Government acknowledged the Resolution, and set the staff to work to develop the plan that the Resolution called for.

After all, this is a 12,000-mile project, and the final location, or the determination of the final location of these roads is a matter of consultation with the Rural Municipal elected officials, and up to the present time the Advisory Committee has interviewed officials about 120 rural municipal councils. They have had Resolutions of approval of the location of the grid system, insofar as it affects their municipalities from 30 additional municipalities, and to the present time 105 rural municipalities have, by way of Resolution or letter, approved of the municipal road grid system in their municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, out of 150 municipalities, 105 have approved and there are some 32 municipalities we haven't heard from, and the balance have suggested slight alterations in the location. Very few of the municipalities north of the Qu'Appelle Valley have been interviewed and if that trend continues throughout the entire Province, as indicated up to the present time, this 75 per cent that the hon. member from Cannington speaks of that won't be able to participate, will be just as far out as other remarks that have been made associated with municipal government and the treatment by the Provincial Government in the field of municipal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I might also just mention before I move into the L.I.D. operation, that if we had continued the same assessment that was in effect prior to the equalization assessment in the rural areas of this Province, the municipalities would receive as much money as they are receiving today on a 15-mill rate. In other words, if the present mill rate applied to the assessed values of the properties prior to the equalization, the municipalities would be receiving \$4¼ million more than they are receiving today, or as I stated before they could levy a 15-mill rate on the old assessment, and get just as much revenue as they are getting at the present time.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — How would that reduce their taxes?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I wonder if the hon. member opposite realizes that the rural municipalities themselves spent, last year, in public works slightly in excess of \$8½ million, and every municipality recognizes that they must have year round all-weather roads. That is recognized by the ratepayers, and by the Rural Municipal Councils elected to represent the ratepayers.

The hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), who has just taken his seat, has put up rather a strong argument for all-weather main market roads, when he made mention of the snow coverage that is over the municipal roads at the present time. Recognizing that, and also recognizing, Mr. Speaker, that the rural municipalities spent \$8½ million in public works in 1955, this main market road project suggests that they make the maximum of \$2½ million of that money annually, and spread it over 12,000 of their main travelled roads. That is all it suggests doing, and the formula that has been worked out recognizes that there are weak municipalities in the Province of Saskatchewan and hence the formula makes provision for this.

I wonder if the hon. members opposite, I think in looking over their pleasant countenances, that within their constituencies they have one or more shipping points that have in storage upwards to 350,000 bushels of grain. I know the hon. member from Davidson with that string of some seven elevators and annexes probably has 500,000 bushels of grain in store in his home town. The hon. member from Saltcoats, taking a look at the town of Saltcoats or the town of Bredenbury, I think he must admit that in those markets there are 300,000 to 400,000 bushels of grain in store. The hon. member from Cannington lives in a diversified agricultural section of the Province, but in his own constituency there are marketing points with 300,000 to 400,000 bushels of grain in storage.

Mr. Danielson: — The roads are all blocked.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the local country elevator storage on grain at the points that I have made reference to is equal in cost to the total taxes collected for all municipal purposes in a rural municipality that has \$3 million of assessment.

Going on to the L.I.D.'s. There has been something said about tax collections. I might say in 1955 the L.I.D. tax levy for L.I.D. purposes was \$357,000, and up to December 31st, there was \$312,000 collected. Looking over the record of Government assistance to Local Improvement Districts, we note that in the 5-year period 1940 to 1944-45 inclusive, the government of the day, for roads and bridges, gave the municipalities grants amounting to \$287,000. In the 5-year period 1950 to 1954 inclusive, the present Government gave grants to assist the Local Improvement Districts in their road and bridge construction \$1,256,000. Now that every story can be repeated in every municipality in the Province of Saskatchewan, and is not confined exclusively to Local Improvement Districts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at what is known as Green Lake, and I was very happy to see your young and happy countenance grace that section of the Province of a few years ago, and you are no doubt quite familiar as a result of that visit of the programme of the Government in rehabilitating the Métis people in the Green Lake area. There are some 705 Métis people there. The total acreage under cultivation for 1955 was 2,070 acres. There was an additional 163 acres cleared in 1955, ready for seeding in the spring of 1956. There are 202 head of cattle on the central farm. Now we have developed rather an expensive work-and-wages programme in order to assist the Métis in becoming rehabilitated, in order to keep to the minimum social aid in that area, and also to enable the Métis people to secure some revenue which will assist them in becoming rehabilitated on the various plots that have been set aside for the Métis families.

March 15, 1956

Up to the present time there are 74 Métis families that have taken up these cultivated plots, ranging from 20 to as high as 80 acres per unit. In the work-and-wages programme it is interesting to note that during the period 1950 to 1954 the Métis people took the out 10,859,000 board feet of lumber. They do the logging, they bring the logs down to the mill; the mill is privately owned and through a joint arrangement and an agreement, the Métis people are employed both in the sawmill and in the planing mill, and there is from 20 to 123 to 125 Métis people employed the year round in the lumber operation. So in that period of time, 1950 to 1954 inclusive, they took out 10,859,000 board feet of lumber. In addition to that they took out some 1,600,600 cords of pulpwood, 93 cords of box wood, 1,182 bridge pilings, and 2,875 fence posts. In addition to the work they carry out in the forests, they are employed in the clearing of their plots, and the acreage that is being brought under cultivation.

In conversation with the operator of the sawmill and the planing mill last September, he told me this. He said:

“If you had asked me what kind of employees I had some three years ago, I would have pointed out to you many of the difficulties I had encountered,” but he said, “today I have one of the best group of employees around the sawmill and around that planing mill that I have ever had in my 20-odd years experience in the operation of sawmills end of planing mills.”

Mr. Speaker, the Métis people in the Green Lake area are a credit to that race. They are making very substantial progress in becoming rehabilitated, and the Government of this Province is recognizing the progress that these people are making and we have assured them of our interest in their welfare, extending the programmes, looking after higher education, along with the recreation that must go with proper living within the confines of a settlement of that kind. Last September, there was a Committee of Métis appointed to consult with the L.I.D. inspector, to work with him, and there is a mechanical training course taking place at the central farm; there is a greater recognition given to the students that are now going to the 5-room school that is located at Green Lake, and moving forward in the recognition of the ability of the younger generation are showing, a recognition of the interest of their parents in the projects that we are developing there, is a pretty strong indication that we have in that settlement a group of people who will be able to take their place along with other Canadian citizens in any part of Saskatchewan, or the Dominion of Canada.

Now I hope, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of the consideration of the estimates, we may go into some more detail, relative to the operation of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the Local Improvement Districts, and noting in the Budget a recognition of the Green Lake area, and the Métis associated therewith, noting in the Budget a recognition that in the Local Improvement Districts there are well over 600 townships, well over 20,000 people, something over 3,000 miles of road, that is recognized in the Budget, and for that and many other reasons, I have no hesitation in supporting the Budget that is now being debated in this Legislature.

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I do not really think it is necessary for me to rise in this debate for the purpose of informing you that I will support this budget. But I am going to do that, and I am going to do it because I believe it is a programme of progress and development in the province of Saskatchewan, for the welfare of Saskatchewan people, put in the form of a budget. Everyone in the House will remember a few days ago when the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) (and I'm sorry he is not in his seat at the moment), was speaking in this debate, and he very strongly condemned the work of the Saskatchewan Timber Board, I told a very sad story of what the Timber Board has done to the operators in the forests of Saskatchewan. Then he proceeded to ask to extol the virtues of the methods of handling these forest matters in the province of Manitoba, and how happy the operators were there. Well, Mr. Speaker, about 10 minutes after the hon. member finished his speech, the page boy came along and tapped me on the shoulder, and said there was a gentleman wanting to see me. I went out. This man was one of those loggers from Manitoba. What did he want? He wanted to see if there was any possibility of him getting a contract to log in Saskatchewan for the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

You see, the stories that my hon. friends over there tell are absolute nonsense. We have operating for the Saskatchewan Timber Board, taking contracts every year, people who are doing well, driving good cars, get a holiday some time every summer; some who are working on farms, developing a farm, too, and who are coming back every year. It is just silly to try and tell the people of Saskatchewan that there is such a heaven for loggers in the province of Manitoba, or anyplace else. They - the loggers would not continue to work here if one-quarter of what the hon. member from Meadow Lake said about the situation was true.

He also have something to say about the other corporations. I think you mentioned the Fur Marketing Service. Well, Mr. Speaker, since we have had open marketing of muskrat and beaver pelts during the present trapping season, on a number of occasions trappers have reported to me their experience. The latest one was put in a very pointed manner. He said: See these two sheets of returns; one is from the Hudson Bay Company from Regina, sold in November, 1955 - 20 muskrats. He got \$6 for them; an average of 30 cents apiece.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That's good.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And the other sheet was 55 muskrats from the same lot, which he sent to the Fur Marketing Service, and he got \$42.88 - an average of 78 cents. Then he said, (and this is what I would like my hon. friends to heed) 'Now, I think I have a right to ask, who do these fellows across the floor from you represent? To me, after this, their only purpose in life is to protect those who profit by our hard labour.

The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, long ago learned that in the production of wheat and livestock and fur, and many other primary products, that they are completely at the mercy of the private market. That is why the Liberal Party today is supporting the Wheat Board - at least, giving lip service to it! That is why the farmers support it, and the trappers in the north are certainly supporting the same kind of an idea, and I think

March 15, 1956

are going to organize, and do something about it. I hope that my hon. friends opposite will help them, rather than hinder them by trying to make political capital out of the situation; will help them to organize, so that they can really do a job of orderly marketing of their furs.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on this occasion.

Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I was quite reluctant to participate in the budget speech. Everything has been pretty adequately said, but since the next scheduled speaker in the House to take up the debate, I might just as well fill in and continue the debate.

I want to deal, first of all, with my own department, and review some of the progress made over the past few years. So much has been said on the opposite side of the House, as to what has been done, and what more should be done, and also it has been suggested that the Department of Agriculture is not taking sufficient action in some directions. I want to deal with that during this budget debate.

Before doing so, Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to congratulate you on the very able manner in which you have conducted the affairs of this House. A most impartial manner, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker; you have been kind, fair and generous to all members of this House, and I do hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that you'll leave the House, when you do, with our deepest feelings of appreciation in saying farewell to you, and we hope that you will be able to come back in your retirement, Mr. Speaker, and sit in the galleries, or behind the rail of this Legislature, and by your presence preside as well over the deliberations of the House in that capacity, as you have in actuality.

Mr. Speaker, to get an overall picture of the development of the Department of the Agriculture over the past few years, I do not need to mention that for the years 1944 and 1945, the total appropriation for the Department was \$761,000, and this was raised to an expenditure of \$5,400,000 in 1954-55. In the last fiscal year, because of the emergency flood situation, the expenditure totalled more than \$6 million for the Department of Agriculture. It is all well and good, Mr. Speaker, to relate in terms of money they increased appropriation to this Department, but I think the hon. members would like to have some indication as to how that money was spent - what it meant in terms of increased services, new programmes and new activities in the Department that benefit the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan. I want to deal with this expansion in some detail.

I wish, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the Agricultural Representatives Branch. In 1944, there were 21 agricultural representatives in the service; 11 of whom worked out of the two largest cities. Since then the field staff of this department has increased to 37 agricultural representatives living in their respective districts - most of whom have office staff, and the benefit of stenographic help. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the Department added many specialists in various fields to assist the field staff of the Agricultural Representative Service in connection with their extension work.

In 1944 the expenditure for this Branch was a mere \$84,000; the expenditure in this fiscal year will be \$451,000, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and enumerate the expanded activities, the number of meetings which were held in rural areas, and the number of land-use surveys which have been inaugurated, but suffice it to say that in 1945, the Saskatchewan Legislature passed the Agricultural Representative Act which provided for the appointment of agricultural representatives, and assistant representatives, with the requirements of a farm background, and a university degree in agricultural science.

A further provision was that a provincial advisory council be appointed made up of the Dominion and University services, and farm representatives from each Agricultural Representative districts in the province. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because previous to 1945, the Agricultural Representative Branch did not even have the status of a branch; it was a division of the department. I wish to emphasize that it is now a full-fledged branch of the Department, and is the extension arm for the various other programmes that I wish to refer to in the course of my remarks this afternoon.

This branch is in charge of initiating various types of earned assistance projects, Mr. Speaker. Very recently we turned over to the Branch what is known as the earned assistance allocation for various types of projects. Under this current assistance programme, in connection with fodder development alone this year, there were project applications to the extent of \$164,000 to which the Provincial Department, through the Agricultural Representatives Branch, contributed \$82,000. In connection with pasture projects alone, to which earned assistance has been applied, since the policy was inaugurated in 1948 it has resulted in the construction of 64 co-operatives community pastures totalling nearly 330,000 acres of Crown land, and there are at present 810 patrons of these community pastures, and approximately 15,000 cattle are pastured in these community pastures.

Later on, when I deal with my estimates in connection with the Lands Branch, I will endeavour to give the members of better overall picture of the allocation of the Crown lands, and the contribution it has made toward the stabilization of the farm settlement pattern in the province.

Another type of current assistance programme that is initiated and carried out by the Agricultural Representatives Branch is the weed control programme. In 1955, the Department contributed some \$68,000 towards perennial weed control. Since this policy was inaugurated in 1948, some \$360,000 in assistance was paid out to some 153 municipalities towards perennial weed control.

Next I deal, Mr. Speaker, with the Animal Industry Branch. In 1944 (and this may be of interest to the hon. member from Cannington, (Mr. McCarthy)) there was no record of any Bang's testing in Saskatchewan. In 1944, approximately 390 calves were vaccinated. In 1946-47, the number of cattle tested for Bang's Disease rose to over 7,000; the number of calves vaccinated, 1,000; and figures indicate that we have had a progressive increase throughout each year. In 1952-53, there were 61,000 cattle tested for Bang's Disease, and 33,000 calves vaccinated. In 1955-56 there were 54,000 tested; and 26,000 calves vaccinated, making a total during this period of time of nearly one-half million cattle tested for Bang's Disease, and some 160,000 calves vaccinated under these programmes. The reason this was possible was

March 15, 1956

because the Department, through the Veterinary Division, has made available scholarship grants to Saskatchewan students, who intend to take up the profession of veterinary medicine. Scholarship grants are made available to a maximum of \$900 which can be earned by any student entering the Veterinary College at Guelph, Ontario. In 1944 there were no such grants available whatever; in 1944 there were no veterinary service districts established. Today there are some 24 veterinary service districts established, with practicing veterinarians, and some 31 districts organized and awaiting a practicing veterinarian.

The ram distribution policy was a new policy inaugurated in 1948-49. Since then 748 rams have been placed under this earned assistance, or rather under this premium policy.

Now, I want to turn very quickly to the Conservation and Development Branch. There was no Conservation and Development Branch in 1944. This is an entirely new branch which was organized in 1949, and I hope that the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) will listen very carefully to what I have to say about the Conservation and Development Branch in previous activities of this kind in the province of Saskatchewan.

Since the land resources were turned over to the province in 1930 there was only one additional drainage district organized. There were no engineering services whatever, Mr. Speaker. There were two engineers in the government services at that time in the Water Rights division. Today, by contrast, we have 28 engineers and draftsmen in the Department. Last year alone there were 64 drainage parties actively engaged in field surveys. We understood at an early date that we would experience some very difficult problems in Saskatchewan, unless we heeded the experience of the 1930's and experiences previous to that and did something at an early date about problems that were certain to develop.

I should mention that in 1949, Water Rights Administration was also turned over to the Department of Agriculture. Responsibility for drainage development was turned over to the Department of Agriculture in the same year. In addition, another significant move was made in 1949. The administration of agricultural lands was turned over to the Department of Agriculture, for the intended purpose of dealing with the conservation and development of these great resources in a proper manner.

I want to refer now, Mr. Speaker, very briefly again to progress that has been made in connection with drainage. I am sure that the hon. member for Moosomin is quite interested in what has been done in this field and I want to correct some of the misimpressions that he has apparently acquired in his political enthusiasm when speaking at public meetings. He has asked for an Order for Return in this Legislature and it may not be quite complete. Just to bring him up to date this Order for Return calls for a statement showing for each year since 1931-32, to 1954-55 inclusive, the amount which the Government has spent on projects for the drainage of farm lands. I have already informed him that insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, there was nothing done whatever up to 1944, and that a complete new branch was organized in 1949 and not a full staff of engineers have been constantly working on engineering surveys that are a prelude to physical development.

I found, Mr. Speaker, that there was no previous survey information available on which to base the physical development of an irrigation or a drainage project. All that work had to be done. So that in the year 1949-50 when this branch was set up, (I am speaking now of drainage alone) there was \$25,000 spent on construction of projects and in addition there were feasibility surveys carried out amounting to a total of \$27,000. The next year for actual construction and engineering surveys, \$55,000 was spent. In the next year, 1951-52, nearly \$200,000 was spent. In 1952-53, \$411,000 was spent, and in 1953-54, a half \$1 million was spent in physical development and engineering services in connection with drainage activities. In the year 1954-55, \$658,000 was spent. And last year, 1955-56, there was \$1,600,000 spent in actual physical development of drainage projects, both of an emergency character and also of a more permanent character, Mr. Speaker. So that we have since 1949 spent a total of over \$4 million on behalf of drainage in Saskatchewan. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in Saskatchewan's history, engineering services were made available without charge and for the first time in the history of this province, substantial provincial money has been spent on behalf of draining farm land. Of all the expenditures that I referred to during this period of time, 1949 to 1956, of this year, only in three cases did the lands benefited contribute financially to drainage reclamation. With these exceptions all the rest was borne entirely by the provincial government. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in the midst of our emergency drainage situation this year, had the audacity to say that all we did was sit on our haunches and seek help from Ottawa. I want to bring to his attention, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That's all you did.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . a reply to a question that I tabled in this Legislature a few days ago. I hope he has made a few additions. . .

Mr. Loptson: — That's all you did do.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, take a look at what 'Jimmy' Gardiner did and you will find no drainage was done.

Mr. Loptson: — He did some — he's not in the drainage business, but he did some drainage there, but you didn't.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He did not carry the ditch to a natural water course and where the water is going to go this spring, I don't know. I wish to advise the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) that last year we spent \$124,000 on behalf of emergency drainage relief in his constituency. And it is expected that another \$86,000 will be required to complete works undertaken in Moosomin constituency alone. Some of these projects could perhaps be questioned in terms of economic benefits, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition was standing on his feet a little while ago and he said he ought to do more, that we ought to pay people for property damage and that sort of thing. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that in this province we ought to get the same treatment that was given to other provinces, such as the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia.

March 15, 1956

Mr. McDonald: — You did. You got exactly the same.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — When these members say we got similar treatment, Mr. Speaker, they are just talking through their hats.

Mr. McDonald: — You got the exact same treatment.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In the case of Manitoba - and the hon. member just said a little while ago that Manitoba got drainage assistance - they got assistance for draining. . .

Mr. McDonald: — So did you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We got no assistance for drainage but they got assistance for dyking. They got the same treatment and British Columbia. They paid farmers for reclaiming land that was flooded in Manitoba. But, in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, they tried to apply the same formula that was applied in the case of Hurricane Hazel in Holland Marsh just out of the City of Toronto, to the Saskatchewan situation. It simply meant, Mr. Speaker, that only a few people were compensated for damage to buildings and appurtenant structures only. Most of those were cottages in the Qu'Appelle Valley. But the application of this formula to Saskatchewan was of no value to the rest of the farmers who experienced flooding of their land and loss of income.

We have directed our attention to the removal of water from flooded lands in order that those lands would become productive again and in our hope to achieve that we have, perhaps, in some cases developed projects that are not too economic, but it is far better to drain land and rehabilitate the farmer than it is to pay out relief. It is in this manner, Mr. Speaker, that we expect to bring relief to those who have experienced flooding on their farm lands. In that behalf we spent last year \$1,600,000 - and still the hon. member has the audacity to stand on his feet and say that we sat on our haunches and howled at Ottawa.

Mr. McDonald: — You are ten years late.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Ten years late - I'll have a little more to say a little later on about this comparison between what Ottawa has done in the discharge of its responsibilities to provincial governments and what we are doing in connection with discharging our responsibilities to local governments.

The hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) also echoed the same sentiments expressed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he got up in the Legislature here and talked about drainage in Nipawin constituency and had the nerve to say "too little and too late."

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Do you know how much was spent in Nipawin constituency last year for drainage? It was \$310,000 - and still this man has the nerve to stand up in this Legislature and say "too little and too late."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Nipawin constituency and the old drainage district of Moose Range was the place where we began our initial engineering surveys. It was an old drainage district and we knew that if we had any considerable run-off or heavy precipitation we would have to re-design the entire drainage setup in that area. That was done at an early date and those drainage works are complete in that particular area, Mr. Speaker.

The same holds true throughout the province. There had not been a single drainage district developed in this province prior to the formation of the Conservation Development Branch that was properly engineered!

Some Govt Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, we were able to carry out an extensive programme last year was because the engineering surveys had been done over the past years previously. And still the hon. Leader of the Opposition says, “Well, you should have started on this 13 years ago.” He is right back into a couple of years of Liberal administration when he says that and thereby expresses regrets for the Liberals because they did not do a single thing about drainage or irrigation development from the time the resources were turned over to the province right up to the day when this Government began irrigation developments and drainage reclamation.

Mr. Lopton: — What were we supposed to drain?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — It was supposed to be Federal responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, Mr. Speaker, it was better than that. It was at that time the complete responsibility of the farmers on the lands benefited. The provincial government did not even give them the benefit of engineering services. They were expected to pay for it if there were any engineers available to do the engineering.

Mr. McDonald: — That is not sure when you know it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Those are the facts when I tell the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) why no drainage was done in this province before. It is being done now, Mr. Speaker, on a scale never before experienced in the history of this province.

Mr. McDonald: — You are wrong there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Will the hon. members kindly desist this crossfire. I tell you that if it does persist I will adjourn the House. I won't sit here and see the House thrown into confusion. The hon. member for Moosomin and the hon. members have had their opportunity - they have spoken - they seem to take objection to what I take objection to when it is levied against them - and I would ask you to kindly let the speakers go on without this interruption. And that applies to both sides.

Mr. McDonald: — On a point of order, during my speech here this afternoon and my remarks, there were several interruptions and I don't want to interrupt the Minister of Agriculture, but I do want to correct the

March 15, 1956

impression he is leaving here in the House, that there were no engineering facilities available prior to the dates that he gave here a moment ago.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Order! If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to correct the matter, he knows the method in which he can do so. He can get up on a point of order or a point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, I am on a point of order right now, Mr. Speaker. She knows as well as I do that engineering facilities of the P.F.R.A. has been available to farmers for many, many years in this province and I have had personal experience with the P.F.R.A. in doing the engineering work and drainage on my own farm.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, you are simply confirming what I am saying, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loptson: — You just said there was not any.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I said the provincial government never provided any engineering services. Members opposite are always talking about what the province should do. But before we came into power, Mr. Speaker, they expected the Dominion Government, through P.F.R.A. to do all of these things when they were in power.

Mr. McDonald: — They still do it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They are not doing it. The P.F.R.A. has not contributed anything to drainage in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say. . . on a point of order. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — When we came into power, Mr. Speaker, the province had not assumed its responsibility for either irrigation or drainage.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! What is your point of order?

Mr. McDonald: — The statement that the Minister just made is not correct. P.F.R.A. are doing that work in the last fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Where?

Mr. McDonald: — Right in my own constituency. And in any other part of the province where they are asked to do it.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to correct my hon. friend too, because P.F.R.A. surveyed right in my constituency and you have got the maps that were made out by the P.F.R.A. engineers in your Department.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — If the hon. member disagrees with statements that are being made, he should rise to his feet and raise a point of order.

Mr. Loptson: — You don't know.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There is very little that these men can tell me about my Department or the relationship between the provincial government and the P.F.R.A., and when they do, that will be the day.

Now in regard to what the hon. member for Moosomin has said — P.F.R.A. does not take any responsibility whatever for drainage. They ought to know that P.F.R.A. was set up and designed for water conservation and storage. They have taken that position and have retained that position, but they do sometimes lead people to believe that they are going to do and drainage and confuse the whole situation, Mr. Speaker, and blame the province for not. . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, a point of order. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! What is your point of order?

Mr. Loptson: — My point of order is that the statement of the Minister is not correct.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Loptson: — That is exactly. . .

Mr. Speaker: — That is exactly not a point of order and I will ask of the hon. member to take his seat.

Mr. Loptson: — A point of privilege that.

Mr. Speaker: — If he makes a statement in regard to his department, he will take the responsibility for it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I will that. I have correspondence in this House and I am prepared to table it, between myself and the federal Minister of Agriculture in which he states that P.F.R.A. has not undertaken any drainage in Saskatchewan, and how well do I know that. I ought to know. If you will just keep quiet over there, you might learn something. We have referred at least a half a dozen projects to the P.F.R.A. hoping that in this emergency situation they would come in and give us some help in connection with drainage. We believe that the activities of P.F.R.A. ought to include drainage, for after all there is no difference between reclaiming land by irrigation than there is by reclaiming land by drainage. We think P.F.R.A. ought to be expanded, but every one of those submissions that we made to P.F.R.A. would undertake Kipling marsh, because it was a straight-cut proposition that would augment water supplies in the Moosomin reservoir, Mr. Speaker; they could certainly justify it on the basis of storage. And finally, a submission was made to Ottawa for that project by Dr. Thompson, to Mr. Gardiner and he wrote back to me and I have read the correspondence in this House in which he said that they are not interested in drainage and it is not their responsibility.

In regard to the project that I was referring to, in Mr. Gardiner's constituency, they began a small drainage project up there, very significantly in his own constituency. But they discontinued that project, too. When it came to the point where drainage would be involved - it was justified on the basis of water storage - but when it came to the point where the ditch was going into a natural run, they stopped construction right there.

March 15, 1956

And the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) ought to go and take a look at that monstrosity this spring when the run-off starts.

Mr. Loptson: — I will tell you something about it later.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, the P.F.R.A. has not contributed anything to drainage in this province as a matter of policy.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, sure.

Mr. McCarthy: — I would just like to ask him if the P.F.R.A. did not have some surveyors down helping him to survey that ditch in the Kipling marsh?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's a nice point in question; just a nice demonstration. Well, they went down there, and they undertook some survey work and we welcomed the services we could get and I understand certain local commitments were made but they would not undertake the drainage of that marsh. When it came down to organizing, they would not fulfill the commitments to do so.

Mr. McCarthy: — But they did help you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Development work was delayed and it was for that reason that this project was delayed right up to freeze-up and it is for this reason too, that we had to have a contractor in there all winter, hired him late this fall in the hope that he would get done, with a finishing date on his contract which of course calls for a higher yardage cost and he has been there all winter trying to get that ditch through. I would suggest this. That if the P.F.R.A. are going to undertake the work and do the engineering surveys on them, and lead the people to believe that they are going to do them, they ought to go through with them and finish them and not leave them on our doorstep. And that is the situation as far as Kipling marsh is concerned.

Mr. McCarthy: — You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They made the promises - we have to fulfill them.

Now, I want to turn to the Lands Branch. Our lease policy has been criticized by hon. members opposite. I wonder if they know just why the provincial government decided on a policy of leasing farm lands and whether or not they endeavoured to find out if this is not a policy that has been asked for, implemented by both the provincial and federal governments many years ago. Just to cast our minds back - I was looking over my last annual report which reminded me of the Royal Commission that was set up in this province in 1922. It materialized out of what is known as the Better Farming Conference that was held at Swift Current July 6, 7, and 8, 1920. The members of this Royal Commission were Dean Rutherford, John Bracken, George Spence (whom we see every day going to work) and H.O.

Powell, Neil McTaggart and Dr. F. H. Auld, who was the secretary. The amounts on August 24th, 1920, and after a series of public hearings and study the Commission presented its report on January 31, 1921. And what did they recommend? They recommended to both the federal and provincial governments – (because land resources at that time were administered by the federal government) that the federal government withdraw the right to homestead vacant Crown lands in the area south of the Canadian National Railway line from Lloydminster to Kamsack, the Commission being of the opinion that all available Crown land in that area was not suitable for grain production much of which had already been homesteaded. The vacant Crown land was to be reserved for grazing lease disposition. Expired ranch leases were to be made available for community pastures, as were some of the forest reserves. Homesteaders who moved from land not suitable for grain production were to be allowed a second homestead north of the dividing line, and it is because of that expressed opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we have this breakline – the P.F.R.A. as well, Mr. Speaker.

But the point I want to emphasize is that at that early date, Mr. Speaker, it was realized that something should be done to correct the pattern of settlement that had developed over the years as a result of ill-advised settlement taking place in certain parts of the province. The recommendations of that Commission found their expression in the organization of P.F.R.A. pastures and found its expression in the land of policies governing land administration when this government came to power. I would like to point out what has been achieved as a result of utilizing Crown lands to assist as many farmers as possible towards a more economic unit.

I am not one, Mr. Speaker, who believes that the small farmer ought to be liquidated, that we should just let him go by the wayside because of economic factors. I believe we have a responsibility to assist as far as we can in establishing as many sound farm units in Saskatchewan as we can. There are, Mr. Speaker, about 112,000 farms in Saskatchewan. The importance of Crown lands to these farmers is shown by the following figures. Since the long-term lease came into being, over 6,000 leases and permits for cultivation have been issued. Nearly 14,000 leases and permits for grazing and haying have been issued; 710 patrons of provincial community pastures. That is, 710 farmers have the benefit of provincial pastures. 920 farmers have the benefit of co-operative community pastures on leased lands, the kind of assistant pastures that I referred to a moment ago, 64 of which are established in the province of Saskatchewan, and at the moment, comprising approximately 400,000 acres of land.

In addition, there are the P.F.R.A. pastures and it must not be overlooked, Mr. Speaker, that it was provincial lands that went into P.F.R.A. pastures. We transferred title on approximately 1¼ million acres of lands, that are presently in P.F.R.A. pastures and added another 250,000 under lease on a long-term basis to P.F.R.A. All in all, Mr. Speaker, one can readily see the tremendous benefits to the farm economy as a result of these Crown land policies that have had the effect of assisting many small unit operators towards a more economic and stable type of operational unit.

I just totalled up the number of farmers helped and I find some 22,000 farmers that have been helped in one way or another in connection with the disposition of Crown lands. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, in

March 15, 1956

order to permit the rapid development of new land resources and in order to establish Crown leases as quickly as possible on sound cultivation units, the province has spent, since 1952, \$3,450,000 in behalf of land clearance, either by direct cash payments to individual lessees of Crown lands, or by actual clearing and breaking programmes in the new settlement areas. For the benefit of the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) I want to point out to him that over \$500,000 has been spent in the Smoky-Burn – Connell Creek area in connection with land development and drainage installation. And still, Mr. Speaker, we hear that same criticism, “too little and too late.” It seems, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what the programme has been that this Government has brought into existence, our Opposition friends are back there working on every little petty gripe that might provide some opportunity for them to stir up some political resentment. And the Smoky-Burn is no exception, Mr. Speaker. You would think that the Government was responsible for the rain, and for the fact that these boys wished to settle in this area. They had a rough time of it, Mr. Speaker, but no one can say that the Government has not exerted every ounce of its strength to reclaim this land by extensive drainage and to establish those veterans out of public funds as quickly as possible, and over \$500,000 has been spent in that connection - and much more, when drainage and road facilities are added, Mr. Speaker. I hope that hon. members opposite will refrain from some of their petty kind of criticism and at least give the Government some credit for its good intentions and achievements; and particularly so, Mr. Speaker, for expenditures and programmes that were never in existence before, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, had they been in power, such programmes would not have been in existence today.

Mr. Lopton: — You may have good intentions, but that is no good. You have got to have results.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — When one totals the cash payments that have been made on behalf of clearing and breaking payments, and crop remissions, I find a total of over \$5 million having been spent in the development of some 350,000 acres of new Crown lands for cultivation since the policies were inaugurated in 1947.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make some reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) when he said that the C.C.F. Government has shown more incompetence and arrogance in setting up the municipal road grid system than anything else they have done to the municipalities.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lopton: — That's right, too.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, are we not treating the municipalities right when we are sharing 50 per cent of the cost of a municipal road grid? I wish, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government had treated us as generously. They seem to think that 50-50 is not enough, but the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up and says “You'll never have a South Saskatchewan Dam until you have a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan.” He forgets that this province. . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, no such statement was ever made. What I said was this - that you wouldn't

have a dam in Saskatchewan until a government was elected here that would create the proper economic conditions. . .

Premier Douglas: — What a dream!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That correction makes it much worse. The Dam is not dependent, nor need we to wait to have proper economic conditions. All we need is the go-ahead signal from Ottawa to do so. It does not have to wait on anything else. And we offered to contribute \$83 million towards that project against Ottawa's \$62 million.

Mr. Loptson: — You had no business.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We would get our right arm to have them come in 50-50 on that project.

Mr. Loptson: — Whose money are you spending? - \$83 million for that project.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And so, apparently, to use the same general ratio of 50-50, certainly we would welcome it in the case of the dam. But, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition tells us that we have to wait until we have - I suppose the right political party - that's a Liberal provincial government in Saskatchewan - he forgets all the promises that have been made by the Rt. Hon. J. G. Gardiner and Federal Liberal M.P.'s up and down this province. He forgets the Rosthern by-election - when Mr. Tucker got up on hustings there with Mr. Gardiner standing alongside of him - and he said "If you send Mr. Bouchey to Ottawa, that is the best assurance you have got of getting the South Saskatchewan River dam." Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition says, "If you have a Liberal provincial government, you will have a good guarantee of getting this dam."

Mr. McDonald: — With anything about a C.C.F. we might get it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We can expect the same treatment, I think, from the provincial Liberals, that we have already received from the Federal Liberals. I think the implication there was, Mr. Speaker, that is again a political issue. If this is going to be a political football and an attempt to intimidate the people of Saskatchewan by saying to them, "you must select a Liberal government before Ottawa will again look at this dam" he has misjudged the integrity and intelligence of the people of this province.

The hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) suggested to us that we ought to get a new horse to ride. I would point out to him. . .

Mr. Loptson: — The old gray mare. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . that there is no need to get a new horse. He is presently riding the wrong horse when speaking against advance payments on farm-stored grain, and when the next provincial election is over, I think he will be unseated, Mr. Speaker, and will be looking around for a new horse.

March 15, 1956

Mr. Speaker: — Might I suggest to the hon. member if he is starting on a new subject, that we call it 5.30?

The House recessed until 7:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking before supper, there was some difference of opinion in regard to statements that I made in connection with P.F.R.A. being reluctant to enter into our drainage programmes last summer. I want to make it very clear that I am not making any suggestions that P.F.R.A. is not co-operative, or that we cannot get the benefit of engineering services. We asked them last summer to undertake certain surveys on certain projects, and we were hopeful, too, that they would proceed in the construction of those projects. My criticism is directed to the fact that they were not authorized to undertake those projects. I want to say, too, that P.F.R.A. has undertaken many water storage projects that have been of great benefit insofar as stream control is concerned. I want to make it clear that any works undertaken by P.F.R.A. are very greatly appreciated. The co-operation between P.F.R.A. and Provincial Government and Department of Agriculture of this province has always been the happiest and the best. It has been said to me on many occasions that P.F.R.A. has received better co-operation in this province than any other province where they are operating. It is well understood that P.F.R.A. was not organized originally to deal with drainage; they are primarily a water conservation and storage organization, but we were hopeful that, because of the existing emergency this year, we would have received the benefit of their organization, and had we had that benefit we could have done much more this past summer.

Now, to clear up some of the points in this connection, we were hopeful right along that certain of these projects that appear to be the type of project that could be justified by P.F.R.A. - we referred or submitted these projects to them and they in turn submitted them to Ottawa for approval, where they were turned down. In connection with Kipling, I wired Mr. Gardiner September 21st - should there be any doubt, I will read extracts from this correspondence - in which I said:

“Understand P.F.R.A. submitted proposals re Kipling and Ponass Lake projects. These should be started at once to give relief to farm land for next spring and at Kipling to lessen the danger of town flooding next spring.

“We received no reply to our general submission last spring, nor on the above mentioned projects submitted during the summer. Advance season makes the situation urgent and would very much appreciate an immediate reply from you as to whether your department can build either or both of these projects this fall.”

We wanted to know, because we felt these were projects that should, if at all possible, have been undertaken this past year to prevent a worse condition

this spring. I had a reply from Mr. Gardiner dated September 29th as follows:

“I have your wire at September 21st and in reply would state no decision has been reached to proceed with drainage projects under P.F.R.A. at any point within the P.F.R.A. area. The federal government has had two experiences in connection with taking water off the land of one group of individuals and putting it on the land of another group of individuals, which was very costly. . .”

and he goes on to say that court cases resulted. Then he goes on to express some concern regarding the drainage of Kipling marsh. There are always risks when you drain land and we were willing to take that risk in the case of Kipling marsh and would certainly consult with the Manitoba people in order to avoid any damage in our neighbouring province. I wrote to Mr. Gardiner in reply to his letter on September 29th, in which I said:

"I was very disappointed in receiving your reply that no drainage assistance will be available in regard to Kipling marsh and Ponass Lake as we had thought that drainage of these would meet the limitations imposed by P.F.R.A. policies, even if the federal government decided not to assist in flood relief programmes needed in Saskatchewan this summer.”

I pointed out to him that in the last few years there have been a number of occasions to justify our position in this matter. I pointed to the drainage of Foam Lake, to Quill Lake, where it was understood that the federal department would construct the entire ditch and, in fact, work had been commenced on the right-of-way. I mentioned in connection with Kipling marsh that it was surveyed by P.F.R.A. staff a year ago, before the emergency flood problem of this year occurred and the local people were given to understand that if they contributed to the ditch, possibly about \$10 per acre, your department would construct a ditch. And in regard to possible damages as a result of drainage undertaken by the province, I informed Mr. Gardiner that we have no statutes under which the province would be released from damage claims either. He replied on October 11th, in which he says:

“You state we made surveys in the plain marsh. We have followed the practice from the beginning of making surveys when asked to do so, by municipalities or provincial governments, but we have attempted to make it clear on each occasion that these surveys in no way committed us to undertake any piece of work which was under consideration. There has been great difficulty in impressing on the minds of local people the fact that such surveys are not to be considered as a reason for believing that the federal government is going to spend money on the project.”

March 15, 1956

But I say, Mr. Speaker, there are local people - there are many of them in this organization - I wish that they were not there - I wish that professional people were employed - who make these commitments locally, and unhappily create a tremendous amount of confusion and misunderstanding. He refers to the Marchwell-Langenburg proposal. Another one that I have cited to him is the case of which Mr. Gardiner's reply illustrates the point very well:

“We have had to go back on a number of occasions and convince them (that is, the local people) that the appearance of our men in that area is for the purpose of assisting local authorities who have not the facilities to make these surveys themselves.”

Which makes it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that P.F.R.A. does not intend to get into drainage. We thought there was every justification to do so. Furthermore, in reply to the House of Commons to questions submitted by Mr. McCulloch, M.P., in which he enquired:

1. How many projects to combat flooding have been undertaken by the federal government in the province of Saskatchewan under:
 - a. Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act during 1954 and/or 1955?
 - b. Canada Water and Conservation Assistance Act.
2. What was the cost to the federal treasury in each case?”

The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) seems to maintain that they have done some drainage, but the facts seem to indicate that they have done none, because the answer is “to date none.” No requests. . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct that. That drainage was done to bring water into a dam. It was not done specifically as a drainage project.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That was the precise reason, Mr. Speaker, that we expected they would undertake the Kipling marsh, because the water from that marsh would go to the Pipestone reservoir, and for that reason we felt that they could justify it. In the case of Ponass Lake we had a precedent where they drained Foam Lake into Quill Lake on the representation of local people that it was beneficial to maintain the waters of Quill Lake to prevent the. . .

Mr. Loptson: — Might I. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Will you kindly wait until I get finished with this one statement, please. We felt logically that Ponass Lake would also be drained into Quill Lake, which is a great evaporation reservoir, and is beneficial to the surrounding agricultural land, because when this lake goes down, and the wind comes up, the alkali blows out on adjacent farm

lands, which of course reduce the productivity because of salt. Now, my hon. friend, did you want to say something?

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I was just going to call your attention to the fact that draining one lake into another lake was not creating a dam that was not already there.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — But that is persuasively it. They said it was storage. They drained Foam Lake into Quill Lake, and logically we felt they could drain Ponass into Quill Lake. However, the answer in Ottawa was 'none', and the other question was, "How much money did you spend?" The answer was "nil". Then there was a note that said: 'Some are helpful in controlling floods, but such benefit is incidental to the main purpose of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act'. Some of their activities, as I pointed out, are beneficial for stream control. When you store water, you do help in the matter of stream and general flood control.

The other answer was most interesting, Mr. Speaker. It said we had made no application under the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act. That was one of the. . . now, they should have answered and said there was 'no assistance available for drainage under any federal government agency here.' They should have said 'we are not going to give it', and let it go at that, but to come out with such a lame excuse as the Prime Minister did and say: 'The reason the Province didn't get it was because we applied under the wrong legislation.' How ridiculous can people get in trying to find an excuse? Which all indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, they must have a guilty conscience in this regard.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, why don't you apply under the right legislation, then?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking - I don't like to go back again to the Conservation and Development Branch, but because of the time element I took some shortcuts. I am not going to mention in great detail the extent of projects developed this year, but to give an indication of the scope of the activity, I want to inform the House that for the period April 1st to December of 1955, 131 projects were worked on, and others are being surveyed now, during the winter months. As I mentioned earlier in my address, practically all the engineering work done over the past years has now been utilized as the result of actual physical development, so our engineers have to work through the winter months under exceedingly great handicaps this winter to get ahead again with engineering plans.

Last season there were 4,274 acres of topographic surveys made; 235 miles of strip topographic surveys were completed in the last few months; 2,800,000 cubic yards of earth were moved last season to build 172 miles of ditch and 33 miles of road, and to maintain 46 miles of old ditch or natural channel; 225 structures were built, and 54 maintained that had been built previously; 80 miles of line, and 145 acres of right-of-way were cleared, and in addition, there is the irrigation aspect which I will not go into at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again want to refer to the position taken by the hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) when he stood up in this House, and said he was opposed to advance payments on farm-stored grain through the

March 15, 1956

Wheat Board. I would like to remind him. . .

Mr. Horsman (Wilkie): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement. I said I was in favour of any system that would help the farmer, whether it was cash advances or anything else. I pointed out some of the difficulties in the way; I didn't say I was absolutely opposed to cash advances.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, I am very pleased to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I must take the hon. member's word for it, but he certainly left the impression that he favoured the bank loans because he criticized the members at Ottawa for opposing bank loans. I suppose that he wanted to take an opposite position to them. The hon. member suggested too, as I mentioned this afternoon, we might find a new horse to ride. Now, I want to tell the hon. member that the horse we have been riding is getting better trained every year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loptson: — Getting pretty old!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I would like to suggest to him that this horse is so progressive now, and has reached the gait where, as the hon. Minister for Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) has stated, we intend to spend \$10 million for gas development and \$17 million for power development during the coming year, making a total of \$27 million for little Saskatchewan, on two enterprises alone, and doing this alone, bringing the services not only to the rural areas of Saskatchewan, but to the urban communities of this province.

I would like to make a comparison, Mr. Speaker. Here we are going along entirely on our own and the hon. members opposite are always suggesting that our political group must always run to Ottawa for assistance. I want to remind them that if the people of Saskatchewan lived in the state of North Dakota or Montana, they would find that the National Government there would provide them with power generation facilities, plus the construction of the reservoir, and the Federal Government would also loan them money at a low rate of interest as was mentioned by the hon. Mr. Darling when he was speaking, they would make money available to power distribution co-operatives. So they have had cheap power and electrification down there for many years, and have enjoyed it long before we ever dreamed of having it here.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, many people of this Province felt that it was uneconomical and beyond the financial ability of this Province to do the things that are being accomplished by the Power Corporation, and I congratulate them, Mr. Speaker. But, like everything else, Mr. Speaker, this enterprise was opposed and obstructed at every turn of the road in the course of its development. I am going to deal with their change of tactics. I could go on and mention, Mr. Speaker, that every progressive measure introduced by this Government was opposed by the Opposition.

The hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) says that this 50-50 assumption of responsibility for the road grid is too little - that we ought to do more. Again, let us make a comparison between what the Federal Government is doing for the Province here as compared to across the line. Again the farm people of Saskatchewan, if they were living just across the border in the United States, would find out that down there the National Government has built and constructed as its own expense, and maintained

innumerable highways across the states of North Dakota, Montana and Minnesota. Everyone knows this, Mr. Speaker. We all know, too, that the construction of highways, maintaining them generally in a province like Saskatchewan presents a real financial burden to such a province.

Despite the comparison mentioned in this province we have 8,000 miles of highway that is the responsibility of the provincial government, and this province, Mr. Speaker, has in addition agreed to share the cost of another 12,000 miles with the municipalities. In other words, to assume responsibility for an additional 6,000 miles of road in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, let's make a comparison, Mr. Speaker. If they were honest in their criticism that we are not doing as much for the municipalities as the Federal Government is for us, they should be asking the Federal Government to contribute more to highway construction generally in the province of Saskatchewan. At least, Mr. Speaker, we would be grateful if the Federal Government paid 50 per cent of the cost of one good north-south highway, and one more good east-west highway in the northern part of the province; and possibly a development road programme for the northern part of the province as they did in the province of Manitoba, to Flin Flon.

Mr. Lopton: — We voted for your resolution on that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, and many other directions, the rural municipalities are getting a much better deal from this Government than what we are getting from the Federal Government. I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members (I see the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is not in his seat), but I would remind him that we have now assumed the complete cost for hospitalization and complete medical services for some groups in the province of Saskatchewan. We have taken that burden completely off the shoulders of the municipalities, and nobody ought to know that better than the hon. member from Arm River. We never talked about any 50-50 sharing of costs in the case of hospital services. Union hospitals, and other hospitals need not worry anymore regarding hospital obligations. The plan carries that responsibility, and the hon. member for Arm River got up and thought he had a good point when he said: "After all, you fellows didn't put up the money; the people put up the money for the Hospital Services Plan." Heavenly days! He didn't think that we were going to dig down into our own pockets and contribute the whole amount to this hospitalization fund! But, the point is this, Mr. Speaker, the burden was removed from the municipalities and it provided a scheme of security under which people had a plan for hospitalization when they took ill, and it has been greatly appreciated. This is the real point in having this kind of security scheme, Mr. Speaker. Those things are overlooked entirely. It is overlooked, too, that this Province alone again paid grants of well over \$1 million for the construction of hospitals long before the Federal Government ever came into the picture. By the way, that isn't a 50-50 basis; still we are satisfied with it. We can say the same for social aid. The province carries a heavy percentage of costs in that case, too, so why not carry these comparisons just a little bit further, Mr. Speaker.

Now, of course, our friends have changed their tactics. The hospitalization plan is popular and well-received; the Power Corporation is

March 15, 1956

now popular and well-received, too, so they are now trying to get on the band wagon, Mr. Speaker, but they don't know how. And the reason for this isn't hard to find. However, the people all know that they were opposed to all these things including accident insurance, but now they would also like to get on the band wagon, and at the same time, despite the accomplishments provincial league, they would like to say we are always running to Ottawa, and that we are not doing enough.

I am going to point out another comparison, Mr. Speaker, as to how generous these people can be out of office, as compared to when they are in office, and again I don't like to refer to the Leader of the Opposition too much, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say too, that I like the Leader of the Opposition. He is a fine young man, but I think he is in bad company; and I believe that he has had some particularly confusing advice from many sources. I often think that he regrets that he was ever catapulted into the leadership of the Liberal party of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McDonald: — Never regretted for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I think it can be said to the last speaker's question, the Rt. Hon. J. G. Gardiner, and I understand, too, the hon. member for Saltcoats, was the one that induced Dr. Thomson to get into the political field. He is a fine agriculturalist, highly regarded and respected by everybody, and he is highly regarded, too, by myself, but he could have done a great public service in the position he was in, but no, that wasn't good enough, they wanted to try to use him to rescue the Liberal party from its political fate in Saskatchewan.

Again the Leader of the Opposition is quoted in the Prince Albert 'Herald' of July 27th, and I would suggest he get a copy of this paper and look over some of the things he said in a momentary great expansive mood.

Mr. Speaker, no matter in what regard, when these gentlemen go about this Province they keep their ears to the ground to find out if there aren't any little differences, or some particular local need that they can capitalize on. When we went up to Prince Albert, they discovered that they needed a bridge very badly in Prince Albert. . .

Mr. McDonald: — They do.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And he said something is wrong somewhere that Prince Albert did not have a new bridge, since it had a Cabinet Minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in the Legislature. Of course, he was going to find the money, I suppose, since it was not the Federal Government's responsibility, but the Provincial Government's responsibility, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there are bridges in this Province towards which the Dominion paid 80 per cent of the cost. If he should go across the Borden Bridge he can keep that in mind; and in the case of one or two of the bridges in Saskatoon they paid even a larger percentage of the cost. At any rate, here is what he said, and this is a prize a statement. He said, referring to the Provincial Government:

“They will spend \$160 million, in the last year”, (and that takes everything, for Crown Corporations and all the services of Government.)

“They will spend \$160 million, and at \$1 million per bridge, the C.C.F. could build 160 bridges.”

Well now, Mr. Speaker, as I said he is a nice young man, but he is just a bit immature. He should be more careful and more responsible when he makes statements like that, because every time he makes a statement of that kind, I feel sure that the people of this Province judge people by their sense of responsibility. He doesn't realize that he is in a position of great responsibility, and that people expect him to make rational statements. The people of this Province expect the group opposite to come forward with a constructive programme, that will beat ours, but they can't do it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — We've got it! We've got it!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, they have tried to attract attention towards less responsibility for Ottawa and more for the provincial government, by saying we are running to Ottawa, or they talk about the heavy burden of taxation on the poor municipalities. They weep and wail over more assistance to the municipalities. I wish they would have weeped and wailed over municipalities when I was Reeve back in 1936.

Reference to this is getting to be a perennial thing with me, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to refer to again, just to remind them of the way their former administrations acted, and just why people will not accept them at their word when they say they are going to do all of these grand things. Oh, 50 per cent for education is nothing to them now when they say 75 per cent contribution to the road grid system, and in some cases may be 100 per cent. If they are ever called upon to assume the responsibility for this Government has presently accepted they will find out that the programmes that we have provided, and assistance that we have extended to municipalities, is very, very generous indeed. I wish we would have had the benefit of all those policies when I was Reeve of the municipality.

Mr. Lopton: — Where would you have got the money?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Back in 1938, Mr. Speaker, economic circumstances were bad, and in those years one would naturally think that any government would have regard for maintaining municipal services, particularly a government whose legislation provides that people are obligated to pay their threshing expenses first, and then pay their taxes. Those are the first things. The Government came out with a statement on August 10, 1938, Mr. Speaker, which outlines the Government's policy as to how the farmer would make disposition of his crop. It said:

“(1) In payment of harvesting and threshing expenses.”

March 15, 1956

On first sight this looked reasonable and fine, and was in line with legal aspects, and in the interest of the farmer. And then the statement said:

“(2) Sufficient to maintain the farmer and his family until the fall of 1939.

“(3) Feed for the livestock.

“(4) One year’s taxes.”

It looks good, but under number (1) “In payment of harvesting and threshing expenses”, it wasn't the thresherman that was to be paid, nor the hired help that were used in connection with harvesting the crop - what do you suppose they put under that? Again, Mr. Speaker, these people who are so worried about the municipalities, said:

“(1) Provides for payment of harvesting and threshing expensive, harvest labour, repairs, binder twine, and fuel necessary for harvest.”

If they had of stopped there it would have been alright, but the statement goes on:

“(2) Where the farmer’s grain is threshed or combined by contract with another party with a price per bushel, or per acre or per day, allowing for custom rates.”

Quite alright, had it not been for the following:

“(3) Where threshing or combining or other harvesting operation is done by machinery owned by the farmer, but subject to lien for balance of the purchase price, allow the following:”

For the implement company, Mr. Speaker!

“For the tractor 1½ cents a bushel, for every bushel of wheat and barley threshed by the tractor.

“For the separator 1½ cents a bushel, for every bushel of wheat and barley threshed.

“And 1 cent for the tractor on oats, and 1 cent for the separator.

“And on the combine \$1.00 per acre, and on the binder 25 cents per acre.”

Actually in my own municipality, Mr. Speaker, I knew the case of one man, and he happened to be on the municipal council, who fails to pay the John Deere Company for an amount he owed on a binder, and instead paid his taxes, and he advised one of the agents who was administrating

this is policy of his action. He got a letter back from the representative of the Debt Adjustment Board, telling him to go to the municipality, get back the tax money he paid, and pay the implement company. That is the way they looked after municipalities in their day, and I could cite many more cases, Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time to do so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was looking, as I generally do, through the 'Leader Post' this morning, and I see all the fine things they are saying about us, is stepping up their political campaign. They are going in for cartoons now, and I believe we have now reached the point where we can award handsome putty auto-jack to the Editor of the 'Leader Post' for endeavouring to foist another responsibility on the Provincial Government, because of Ottawa's neglect. And as I looked at this cartoon, Mr. Speaker, I note it said:

"Needs Help Quickly"

Here they depict a farmer stuck in a snowdrift with a load of wheat, on his way to an immediate cash market, and a sign "Snow Plowed Roads". So the Minister of Highways, I suppose is expected to provide all his bulldozers and snow plows to go out now and take all the snow off rural roads, too, so farmers can get their grain into the elevators.

They are endeavouring now to shift responsibility to the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, because of the neglect of Ottawa to either get cash advances on farm-stored grain or to permit the farmers to deliver their grain when there was empty storage space available. Mr. Speaker, we were told first that the storage space was all filled up. Next Mr. Howe said there was a boxcar shortage. The next thing we were told is well the roads are tough, and farmers can't get in with their grain. Now the Provincial Government should come to the rescue! I am just amazed, Mr. Speaker, as to all the things that the Provincial Government is supposed to do. Besides assuming 75 to 100 per cent of the responsibility for municipal services we should also assume the burden of marketing problems, and relieve the Federal Government of them. We are not going to relieve them, Mr. Speaker. The elevator space to there, there has been some bungling in my opinion. I think we should have gotten out a considerable greater quantity of grain, have the proper co-ordination existed between the Transport Controller and the other agencies concerned

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Needs a little planning.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — But there it is, Mr. Speaker, with ridiculous extremes we can expect the Opposition to go to in the forthcoming election, but I want to say to them that it will not save them. We are going to talk about these issues, because they are provincial issues, Mr. Speaker, that effect every one of us in this Province, not only local government, but business enterprises as well.

I would like to point out to this House that if there is any place where the Federal Government has been delinquent in their responsibility, it is in the field of agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In 1945, the de-controlled prices. The prices of everything advanced tremendously, everything but farm prices, the farm prices have been going down ever since. Yes, indeed we are caught in the 'cost-price squeeze', and the hon. members opposite don't need

March 15, 1956

to think that they are going to develop the slogan of 'tax squeeze' at all now, Mr. Speaker. Believe me this is the issue on which I intend to go to my farmer friends in the country, and just as long as the hon. members opposite endeavour to defend present Federal policies, they can expect us to make an issue of it in the country at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker.

Is that the 'tax squeeze', or is it the 'cost-price squeeze'? I am going to give just one illustration, Mr. Speaker. In the brief presented to the Select Committee recently by the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! You cannot refer to that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I have the same figures though, so it doesn't make any difference. My figures indicate, Mr. Speaker, that in 1954, the net farm income for Canada was \$1,125,000,000 and I have other figures that indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the net profit of one Corporation, that is the American and Canadian part of it, General Motors Corporation in 1955 was \$1,185,000,000. In other words, here is one huge, monopolistic, private, profit-seeking organization that made more profit after taxes, than the entire agricultural industry in Canada in 1954. Believe me, this is cause for alarm, Mr. Speaker. And it is in this direction, Mr. Speaker, where the Federal Government, by its actions in de-controlling prices generally in 1945, created the opportunity to make these huge profits at the expense of our basic industry; and furthermore, if they have failed in any other field, it is in the field of marketing, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the hon. members opposite said there is secession talk in the West. Well, I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, unless our national government very soon provides a comprehensive marketing policy for this country, we are going to have more of that kind of talk, and it is indeed disturbing to anyone. National governments have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, of seeing to it that people in all parts of the nation are treated equitably and fair, whether they are farmers, consumers, or labour people.

They are in charge of fiscal policy and have the responsibility for overall policies and they are in a position, Mr. Speaker, where they could provide the necessary funds to provide equalization of opportunity, either in the field of resource development, or in the field of farm income, or in the field of Dominion-Provincial responsibility and make possible better Provincial-Municipal relations. They are the ones that are in that position. And at any time, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government can provide sufficient purchasing power at will, and it can also provide an equitable redistribution of the revenue funds made available because of its wide powers of taxation, the income tax, tariffs, customs, sales tax, and indirect taxes and so on. The hon. members opposite like to point to all of the services and expenditures that are made by the Federal Government in the Province, and it is true, Mr. Speaker, that those services are greatly appreciated whether it is P.F.R.A., Family Allowances, or whatever it happens to be; we fought hard for these social security measures, and we welcomed them, Mr. Speaker. But, I want to remind the hon. members opposite that when they talk about how much Ottawa is spending in this Province, they also should talk about how much Ottawa is taken out of Saskatchewan in taxation.

In 1950-51 alone, Mr. Speaker, from their many sources of tax revenues, they took \$175,000,000 out of Saskatchewan, and it is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we have had Conferences on taxation agreements, and on divisions of responsibility. Our national Government, I think, Mr. Speaker, has been very backward in proceeding with constructive long-term policies that would provide employment opportunities, for the generations of tomorrow; and the one logical way, Mr. Speaker, in which that can be done is by the development of our great natural resources. We hadn't ought to have talked or argued so long about the South Saskatchewan project. It should have been proceeded with long-ago, Mr. Speaker. None of these things should be political footballs. If anyone has made them political footballs, Mr. Speaker, it is not we who are responsible, we have shown nothing but good will to go along. It has been Federal people that have made the promises and statements that they would proceed with the South Saskatchewan project, and we, like a bunch of darn fools believed them. We were willing to put up \$83 million against their smaller \$62 million, and still they wouldn't go ahead.

I think that the hon. members opposite ought to direct some of their criticism about equal sharing, and 50-50 talk towards the Federal Government, on many very important projects that are necessary to the future development of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

I only want to make one more reference, Mr. Speaker, and then I will take my seat. I regret very much to make the reference that I am going to make, but I do want to say to you how disappointed I was and discouraged I was over the statement made by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) in connection with the visit of Mrs. Sobell to Regina, when she endeavoured to enlist some support and present a case on behalf of her husband to a group of people in the City of Regina. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, that this event called for the kind of attack that was made by the hon. member for Maple Creek; particularly the nature of the attack, that had the effect of developing suspicion and intolerance. Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing that I am intolerant of, and that is intolerance itself. I am not worried about the hon. member for Maple Creek as such, who made this statement. To me he is of no significance. He has gone down tremendously in stature in the minds of many people, Mr. Speaker, but the things that I do fear and worry about is the ideas and viewpoints that he expressed in his statements, and believe me it is a matter of great concern in a country like Canada, particularly in Saskatchewan, to hear people endeavouring to stir up fears and hatreds.

He belongs to the same religious persuasion as I do, Mr. Speaker, and we pride ourselves in having a universal concept of religion and the application of this universal concept of human rights. We are people who believe that Divine Providence has created all men, and since Divine Providence has created all people, that he alone has complete and final responsibility for the direction and guidance of humanity. We believe, therefore, that we must have faith in human beings, because human beings were created in the image and likeness of this Divine Creator; and that we must have confidence in the ideals and the basic philosophy of human kindness and tolerance that our Christian founder propounded when he was on this earth. That is divine faith in human beings, and with it a tremendous resistance against any suggestion of intolerance, fear or

March 15, 1956

violence in any regard, because we have the benefit of a perfect example, Mr. Speaker, of a man who preached a philosophy, who lived it and who died in furtherance of the great cause of tolerance, goodness and human brotherhood. So it grieves me, Mr. Speaker, to hear anyone suggest that any people, or certain classes of people or people with certain political beliefs, or any religious persuasion present a threat. We need fear nothing, Mr. Speaker, if we are right with ourselves and if we are right with our Creator, and if we endeavour to incorporate and implement these basic principles as a part of our every day lives, more particularly in our commercial and economic relations. It is in that direction, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will find a solution to the problems of the world. Surely it will never be found in the type of McCarthyism that we have heard even in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to mind the hon. member for Maple Creek if he doesn't know it, that His Holiness the Pope. I think on three occasions interceded on behalf of sparing the lives of the Rosenbergs. I do not know if these people were guilty or not, I do not know if Sobel was guilty or not, but I do know that His Holiness intervened on behalf of sparing the lives of those two people who were condemned to death.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I picked up a publication in my home called 'The Catholic Worker'. It is published in eastern Canada, and I think has the blessing of the Hierarchy of the church I belong to. There is an article appearing in this particular issue of March, 1956, and the heading is 'Our Troubled Conscience'. It is an article by Robert Ludlaw. It seems to cast very serious doubt in regard to justice in the Rosenberg case. Would the hon. member for Maple Creek suggest that because His Holiness who intervened on behalf of sparing the lives of the Rosenbergs, was a Communist, or that this paper is Communist, Mr. Speaker. These people seek after justice, and wherever people are, Mr. Speaker, we should all continue to seek after justice.

Mr. Loptson: — What a bunch of bunk!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, people are influenced, even the judiciary can be influenced, by the kind of hysteria that has been created south of the line, and is the same kind of hysteria that developed in Germany from exactly the same source, and is a deterrent to the kind of justice associated with democracy. It is this kind of talk that worries me, Mr. Speaker, not the hon. member from Maple Creek. If we all engaged in this kind of talk, Mr. Speaker, we would start another Nazi situation again. We have got to believe in and practice tolerance. We have got to have faith in humanity, Mr. Speaker, and it is in that direction that I believe the solution to many of our problems can be found. I do not carry prejudices, Mr. Speaker, I don't carry strong opinions beyond this Legislature, when I castigate the hon. members opposite. I don't carry an intolerant attitude. I respect them. As people I respect their personal integrity even though we have differences of opinion, very sharp differences of opinion. I believe it is in these kind of institution, in an atmosphere of tolerance and intelligent discussion, Mr. Speaker, that we will find a solution to our problems. And I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Maple Creek didn't do his political cause any good when he said the things that he said, and I hope that he will refrain from expressing any further opinions of that kind in the future.

Mr. Speaker, before the many reasons that I have enumerated, I believe we have presented one of the best Budgets, one of the most progressive and one of the most courageous Budgets I think that has ever been presented to the Legislature in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and it indicates that this Government is not moving backwards, but forward and this Budget represents full confidence and faith in the future of this Province. I am amazed at times when I look over the hon. members here, and marvel at their courage. I probably wouldn't have had the same courage myself, Mr. Speaker, to take the same bold chances. I think that this Government has really given the kind of leadership in this Province, that the people have been looking for for over 30 years previously, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you that I will support the Budget.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed in the last part of the address by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) are my sentiments in connection with the budget.

I would like to say this I think it is another budget that looks into the future. It has an expanding budget and shows the people of Saskatchewan that this Government, under present extraordinary conditions has faith in this province and in the people who live in this province. I recall quite well, last year, when I was up in Flin Flon, after we had passed our budget here - and it was the same as it was this year. It anticipated expansion; the largest budget we had ever had, with increased grants in this province for education, and when I happened to be in that community, people came up to me and talked about depression and about what had happened in Manitoba. They pointed out that the Government in Manitoba has decreased school grants for that town to the extent of \$15,000, yet, in the same year across the border in Saskatchewan, because of the vision of this Government, we increased grants towards education.

We have heard considerable during the past few days, and there is not much that I can add to the debate; but I do have a few things that, I think, should be brought to the attention of this House. Some of them refer particularly to my constituency, and some are of broader coverage.

I wish the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) had been in his seat, because I want to make some references to speeches he has made. In any event, listening to hon. members opposite for the last few days, actually the Session began, we hear but one thing - that we haven't done enough, we should be doing more. Yet the Opposition has never told us where the money is coming from.

I have been listening, just as other members have been listening here, and I came to think that they were 'politicking' as a certain gentleman did at one time - this is a story, by the way. He came to Prince Albert and he promised a new gaol, and he said it would not cost

March 15, 1956

the people a cent. When they asked him how he was going to build it, he replied, "Well, while we are building the new one, we will keep the inmates in the old one; and then when we finish the new one we will move the inmates from the old one, and disassemble the old one for the material required for the new one."

This is as sensible as has been coming from the other side of the House, but when there is smoke we say there is some fire. So I began to think that perhaps they do have some way by which they might increase services, and then into my hands there came a copy of the speech that the hon. Leader of the Opposition made over a 'Provincial Affairs series', on May 10, 1955, and when I began to read it I saw it dealt with financing the Liberal programme. He spoke about all the things we are going to do, just as we have heard in this House for the past few days; and he said, "I am quite convinced that we can obtain all the money we require to finance the additional services promised by the platform of the Saskatchewan Liberal party."

Well, there is one way they can do it! They can do it by raising taxes. But they say taxes are too high as they are now! There, of course, is the possibility of obtaining more aid from the Federal Government, as has been suggested, for roads and things like that; and if we had such aid we could increase our budget and provide additional services for our people. But they are against that. They don't want aid from the Federal Government, and they charge that taxes are already too high, yet it is suggested - in this speech that it must be taxes because it mentions here that they will "interest industry into this province of Saskatchewan, and, therefore, there will be more money." In other words, they intend to tax those who establish industry if more money is to be obtained by the Government.

But there is one particular section here that made me think that there is more to it than just that; more than just idle talk. I am going to read this section to you, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to give you the interpretation I have taken. I will read the whole paragraph. He says here:

"The C.C.F. Government is spending huge sums of money on unnecessary administration costs." (Note that - 'unnecessary administration costs.')

"This Government has just about doubled the number of civil servants employed. There were about 2,700; now there are 5,530, and these figures do not include employees of the Crown Corporations, of the Power and Telephone Corporations, and the Government Liquor Board. They include only the ordinary employees of the departments of government, and many of these 5,530 employees are capable and efficient workers. On the other hand, a lot of them were placed on the public payroll as a reward for their political services for the C.C.F. party. Patronage was never as widespread and as unashamed in this province as it is now. Numerous old party warhorses have been put out to pasture with big salaries from the civil service. The work which many of them still do is political. Not only do these many additional servants

“receive salaries, but they have to have office space and many of them have cars and expense accounts. If you estimate the average cost of an additional 2,700 civil servants, at \$3,000 a year per person for salary, office and other costs, you have a total of \$8 million.”

There, Mr. Speaker, is where they intend to get extra money if they are going to provide additional services. The Leader of the Opposition suggests to the people of Saskatchewan that this Government is employing civil servants for political purposes, which is absolutely untrue, as the members opposite know. The Leader of the Opposition suggests in his speech that there are 2,700 civil servants who are in such a category and that, at the rate of \$3,000 a year, that would find for this treasury the sum of \$8 million. As I said, I knew there was something they had concocted and there was somebody there were going to punish. In view of all the discussions, and in view of the charges that have been made against civil servants, I now know that if the Opposition ever got into power in this House what they would do is what they have done in the past and they cannot deny it. With the change of government they would clean house and throw out thousands of capable civil servants, and the proof is right here in that speech, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot go along with the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) when he says that we can do all the things they have suggested. As a matter of fact, I am going to refer to a speech that he made, so that I don't get ahead of myself. On March 10, 1954, after the Provincial Treasurer submitted his budget and had pointed out that there were certain responsibilities on the Federal Government to contribute towards certain services that we require in this province; at that time, in his speech, the hon. member from Cannington said this:

“That is all typical of C.C.F. propaganda introduced into the budget speech. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has not unlimited powers. The Federal Government is surrounded by some restrictions as our provincial governments.”

He was interrupted by the Premier, who said “Oh”, and then he went on:

“On the largest scale, Mr. Speaker, but they are surrounded by the same restrictions. Governments do not create wealth. The only money governments have is the money they collect from you and me in the form of taxes, licenses and levies.”

And yet, today, they will say in this House that there is some other way that a province can get money to provide the services which they charge we are not providing.

I suggest that we are spending our budget money wisely and we are spending every cent that we are able to obtain either through the sources he suggests, or by assistance from the Federal Treasury. But as I

March 15, 1956

said before, I do not go along with him, because there are other methods by which we can sustain our economy. We have not the right as a provincial government to print money or obtain it from the Bank of Canada; but the Dominion Government has that power, and anybody that is acquainted with simple economics knows that if the Dominion Government needs a billion dollars, today, if required for the good of the country, it can get the billion dollars and they would not have to go to you and me to borrow it.

Secondly, I don't go along with the hon. member for Cannington when he restricts himself just to taxes and licenses, because the Federal Government, and as well the Provincial Government, does borrow money, and sometimes it may be wise to borrow if you are going to control inflation.

The reason I bring all this up, Mr. Speaker, is this, today in Saskatchewan, as was pointed out by the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams) a few days ago, there are roughly 18,000 unemployed people in this province. I think the figure he gave was 17,741. In a country which has the natural wealth, which requires roads and highways and railways and factories and industries, one province alone has 18,000 unemployed, some of them living on unemployment insurance at a point of starvation, because nobody can tell me that for \$100 you can support a family today, in these days of high costs. In these days to have so many idle people, to have the power that the Federal Government has - to put in a public works programme, and provide these people with work at decent wages - yet do nothing for its relief, I say that, someday, the people of the future generations of this country will indict the existing government of Canada for what it is doing to the people - or has failed to do in providing opportunities that they should have had.

I suggest that the Dominion Government has a responsibility, because we are doing with the money that we collect, all we can do, and nobody in this House, whether on this side or the other side, to show where another penny is going to come from for additional services. But the Federal Government has a responsibility to put people to work. They had programmes a number of years ago which they put into pigeon holes of their old offices, and these plans have never been carried out. This Government, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency initiated work programmes in the woods, as I mentioned on a former occasion, and men are working, today, under difficult conditions, in snow five-feet deep. We have provided for those that can work and are willing to work; others who cannot take advantage of this programme are secured by social aid, yet this isn't the answer. The answer should be a public works programme by those who are responsible.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Why don't you put one on?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the other day when I was listening, I thought there was a little breeze coming over from the other side, and before it was over it changed to Hurricane Hazel. The hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) as usual, with his good use of the English language, made certain charges against this Government that have no foundation in fact. I do not want to prolong the discussion in this debate, but I think that we should get the record straight. He

referred to the fact that this Government had to expropriate what was called the Prince Albert Box Factory, belonging to a party, I think, by the name of Mitchell. Mr. Speaker, I have lived in Prince Albert part of my life, and the rest of my life I have lived very close to Prince Albert, and if there is anybody in this House who knows the story of the box factory, I know that story. My nephew and friends of mine worked in that box factory for 17 cents an hour. . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Liberal labour.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, and they had no amenities whatsoever. There was no place to eat a warm lunch; there were only cracks in between the walls of the factory. The outdoor ‘privies’ were the real thing; there wasn't even a decent place for the female workers to go out into a privy. Those were the kinds of conditions there, but taking into consideration the fact that these people had to hold their jobs, and as other conditions were not satisfactory, those employees decided to organize a union. They got permission, I believe, from the Government, and they tried to organize. The manager of that particular box factory denied them that right, which was a right allowable by law set up by the former Liberal government of this province. The laws were there - not as good as they are today; but there weren't labour laws and there was the right to unionize. When these men decided to organize, what did the manager do? He fired them and denied them that right! Then he tried, again, to operate with a new staff under a different name. Is there anybody in this House, whether on this side or the other side, who would deny the working man a minimum of rights? I am not saying ‘maximum’, but I do say the minimum of rights. Can the hon. members opposite, as the member for Meadow Lake did, try to indict us for doing what is humanly just and right, and stepping into the picture and saying ‘you can't do this for these people’; when they are entitled to certain rights and should benefit from them, because it is law! Mr. Speaker, were we to allow one man, because he was in a powerful position, to go ahead and have slave labour there? If that were so, I would not be sitting here with the Government. This Government did the only thing it could do. It acted under the provisions of the Expropriation Act - and before I say that, I say this, too: that they gave the manager or the owner of the plant every opportunity to get together with the men who had been working there and arrive at some settlement. A whole year they gave him, and for a whole year he refused. He may have had some motive to refuse. Maybe he thought he would get a better financial deal in view of possible expropriation, and then later be able to use all the publicity against the C.C.F. which was the Government on this side of the House. It may have been that; I don't know; but he was given every chance to arrive at some settlement. He refused, and, so the Government acted, and the Government did the only thing that it could do. Later, the people of Saskatchewan decided not once, but more than once, that it is the only decent thing any Government could do, by re-electing this Government.

The hon. member for Meadow Lake attacked this Government for what I said in a previous debate. The Opposition is trying to find an Achilles' Heel - to scare the people with Socialism.

March 15, 1956

Mr. McCarthy: — You had better get rid of it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — They tell us that if we don't get rid of it, private business will not establish itself in this province. Well, if that is the case, if this Government, with the record that it has in honouring every agreement (which cannot be said too much about other governments) let them explain how companies have established here during the life of this Government? We have honoured every agreement and we intend to honour every agreement. If, after we have given them every possible, favourable consideration, as was the deal which was offered to Anglo-Canadian (the agreement was on file here; I think it was three years ago that I asked for it) terms that could not be obtained anywhere were contained in it; and if, after this Government has done everything possible to attract industry into this province, and such industry does not come in for some reason or other, then I still say to the hon. members on the other side that the time will come when the people of Saskatchewan are going to do it themselves, just as they did it themselves in 1944, when they kicked the Liberals out and put the C.C.F. in, and they will do it again in the field of enterprise, as they did politically.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about a few things in my constituency and the north. I have mentioned roads and highways, the need for roads and highways; I think I have mentioned that these roads and highways can be built with Federal assistance, and it should come from the Federal Government! I would like to quote something I read in the paper, the other day, talking about roads and highways. A statement was made following a report by a Special Committee of the Cabinet of the White House, April, 1955, which I think is true when applied Canada, as it is to the United States. Now this report was brought down in the White House and accepted from the Committee. Here is what it says, and I think it pertains not only to Canada, but also to Saskatchewan:

- “1. That within a short span of one generation, this country has witnessed a transportation revolution;
2. During the same period government has failed to keep pace with the change;
3. In many respects government policy at present prevents or severely limits the realization of the most economical use of one of our transportation plans.”

I submit, Mr. Speaker, these facts pertain to Canada and pertain to this province. I am not condemning, at this point, either the Federal or the Provincial government. I am just pointing out a decision that was arrived at in the United States, and I would say that, in view of the fact that the Opposition, with the exception of one member, have failed to give any constructive suggestions to this Government, have failed to suggest any alternative, or pointed out any way to make our province better, how we can have more roads, better services, then somebody on this side must do this. I am taking the responsibility to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government take another look at this whole problem of roads, because I think that we have, as was pointed out, left ourselves somewhat behind in this revolutionary change.

Mr. McCarthy: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is correct to say that we have, in some areas of the north, a waterways system which has not been affected by the change so much. We have an air transportation system which is excellent; but we need, if we are going to have development in the north, if we are going to have forest farming, if we are going to bring timber out of the area, if we are going to bring wealth out of these areas and have transportation and communication into those areas we must have some kind of programme towards building roads. We can't do it in one year, but I suggest to the Government that probably some policy can be adopted whereby we can build a few miles each year. In that way it wouldn't be too hard on our treasury. Of course, I said there is another solution. If the Federal Government, would recognize its responsibility, we could have a road through the middle of Saskatchewan, today. But you cannot do this just by talking. You have to get things done, and I am suggesting to the Government that something along the lines that I have mentioned could be done!

This is why I say these things. Just before I came to the Session, Mr. Speaker, I was up in the north, at Forbes Lake. Men are being employed there, making thousands of dollars in wages and that is unquestionably a good thing. They are cutting lines; they are bringing in equipment such as electromagnetic equipment. They are checking anomalies there, and men I spoke to feel very favourably about the area. They say “We could have a mine in this area, but we can't have mines until we get a little more support from the public; and we can't have mines unless transportation costs are cut down”. And the only way we can cut down transportation costs in that area, is to build roads. I mean all this staking and exploration is not going to do us too much good; it is going to bring some revenue into the province, but you still won't have development.

I say the same things about other areas, whether it is at Lac La Ronge, or whether it is at Foster Lake, or whether it is in the west or east. I also say the same situation pertains to the areas of standing timber. Unless we get those roads through, we are not going to accelerate the progress in this province of Saskatchewan as we would like to see it.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only right - because, after all, no one knows, I may be singing my ‘swan-song’ too - I understand that the Liberals are not going to just put up a candidate, but they are also going to send up a Conservative over there - so between the two maybe they will defeat me; although I don't think they will; but it could be; and, therefore, and I want to take this opportunity first of all to thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). I have a Local Improvement District and I have municipalities and I have found, through the past few years, that he has been very co-operative, and is highly regarded by the people for what he has done. Just to give you an illustration, I have a community which is called Paddockwood. Paddockwood, without a road, would be absolutely isolated. The road that this Government has built in that district, which cost a few thousand dollars, and, of course, is begrudged by the hon. member for Cannington. He can't understand why this Government should spend some money in the north. . .

March 15, 1956

Mr. McCarthy: — I haven't said anything like that at all.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Oh yes, he did, just the other day. In any event, that road is a lifeline. This year it was completed, built up to market road standard. It was gravelled and people have been able to travel this winter, notwithstanding the five feet of snow, and I can say that everyone that is affected certainly appreciates what has been done by this Government, and particularly appreciates the consideration from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who has worked together with the Minister of Highways to get this project completed, and I thank them both for that.

I also appreciate the fact that other things were done. We are very happy about the grid. In our north country where we have farmers on practically every quarter-section this market road grid is much more important than it may be in the southern part of the province where you have a farmer on 10 sections. Roads are something that is most urgent in the north, and we are very happy to see that the Government has adopted this policy. I can assure the Government that the municipal councils there are happy, too, and they will be undertaking programmes this year.

I do not want to go on too long, but, after all, I was in the municipality for a few years and I can remember, back in the 'thirties, only one year when we got any assistance of any account from the government of that time. I think that the reeve and myself made a trip down here to Regina, and after baking for hours we came back with \$500 for the municipality - and boy, how good that felt! Today, in the same municipality - I checked not long ago, and, last year, with the various grants they received and flood assistance, the benefits have amounted to somewhere between \$13,000 and \$14,000. I would like to point out to the hon. members here and those on the Opposition, that never before in the north have we ever had flood assistance, although we have had floods on occasion, the country being what it is. This is the first time that any government has done anything about it, and it has been a C.C.F. government. My people are not going to forget it either, when it comes down to election time.

There was one more thing I want to mention and it is this. I commend the Government as a whole, and every Minister, I particularly want to commend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) for the projects that we have in my area - the Meath Park project and others, which provides forage crops for the farmers in my constituency. It is not generally appreciated that we are quarter-section farmers, and it is very difficult to make a living on a quarter-section unless you have some other income. I have found that as a result of these programmes of the Government, quite a number of farmers can now obtain hay and they can keep a few extra head of cattle on their farms, and I just cannot tell you, Mr. Speaker, how much it means to a lot of these farmers. I can only hope that these programmes can be expanded and that we may get more projects of this nature. I think we are quite happy, as small farmers off there - there are not too many big ones yet, and I don't think there ever will be, because of the kind of country we live in; but the Government can assist us considerably and we will appreciate it if we can get more of these projects built up.

Also in connection with the Department of Agriculture I would like to point this out, and I think it affects the whole north, as

well as the northeast, that when it comes down to drainage, as was pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture in his speech just a few minutes ago, the Government has done considerable - I wish as much had been done in my constituency as has been done in the constituency of Nipawin. There you have a large project which is expensive, but where we live (and I think it goes right on to Meadow Lake), we have small areas of two and three sections which require drainage and the people, as I pointed out, have not the cash, and they cannot obtain the cash to do this work themselves, and so, they must ask for government assistance. I would suggest and hope that the Government will give consideration to carrying out work projects in those areas. I am sure that, as in the past, it will receive consideration.

Last and not least I would like to mention that I am very happy about the work the Department of Natural Resources is doing encouraging farmers up in my area to go into forest farming, and also to commend the staff. As I pointed out, there were changes made here by the Leader of the Opposition that many of our staff were not efficient, they were taking money for nothing; but I would like to say that I am acquainted with the workers in the various departments, and I have yet to see anyone who spends any of his time for political purposes. I find that they are efficient people, trying to do the best job they can; and they are doing a good job, and I know this much - if you were up there in five feet of snow and you saw these game men conscientiously trying to save in whatever way they can, the game for the sportsmen and the farmers so that they can have the meat next year, **you** would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying. They are a fine bunch of men and there is no finer anywhere than the civil servants that this Government has, and even those who do not vote for us appreciate the fact that they have certain freedoms and they have the right to speak for themselves and are well treated by superiors. They are not politicians and saboteurs as has been suggested by the members opposite, certainly not like the P.F.A.A. or the P.F.R.A. men who instead of paying attention to their work, go around the country carrying on political propaganda, and I know whereof I speak.

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, no!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The hon. member over there says “oh, no!”

Mr. Speaker, with that, I think I will conclude. I would just like to say in conclusion, that in reading the ‘Leader Post’ today it says, “The Liberals see the tide turning”. How true! They have been cast about on the shore for so long now until the tide has risen and is going to take the driftwood out into the sea where it will sink forever, and that is where it should be.

I am going to support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. T. C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to say what an interesting debate it has been, and what a high order of debate has been carried on throughout the entire discussion of the motion to go into Supply. The Opposition do not seem to find it very interesting, judging by the small number of them who have stayed in their seats, but

March 15, 1956

probably they consider that once they have unburdened themselves of their wisdom there is no longer any need to stay in this Chamber. I do want to congratulate all the members who have taken part in this debate. I think it has been one of the best budget debates to which I have ever listened.

On a previous occasion, Sir, I took occasion to express to you my personal congratulations on the splendid work you have done as Speaker of the House and I would like to, once more, say that if this should be the last Session of this Legislature, and you are not to be with us again, then on behalf of not only myself, but I am sure all members of this side, and I hope on that side, I want to say what a pleasure and honour it has been to sit under you as the presiding officer of this Assembly.

And when I say of Your Honour, I would certainly say, also, of the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Wellbelove) who has conducted the affairs of this House, and in Committee, in an orderly, decorous and dignified manner. I do not know of any member of this House who will take with him from this Legislature more respect and more love than the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley.

I believe there several other members who are proposing to retire from public life, as far as the Legislature is concerned. They are the member for Yorkton (Mr. Swallow), the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), the member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair), the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan), and also the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Corman), who indicated some months ago that he would not again be a candidate in the event of an election being held this year. I would like to say to all the members and to the constituencies which they represent how much this Legislature owes to their presence here, to the diligence they have shown in the pursuit of their duties, and to the forthright decision which they have helped to contribute in planning various government programmes.

There is always a tendency, when one is talking about governments - such as the 'Gardiner government', or the 'Anderson government' - to designate them by the name of the person who happens to be the particular leader of the government. I think, in the past 12 years, if we have succeeded in nothing else, we have succeeded in building a harmonious, closely-knit team, in which there was no leader in the sense of some person laying down the policies. All of us, whether in the Cabinet, or as private members of the Legislature, or the thousands of people out of the country, who believed in the type of society we were endeavouring to build, in which there was a greater social justice and greater economic equity, have worked together. Each of us has done his or her part in that particular position where we could make the greatest contribution, whether it was a matter of carrying the responsibilities of a portfolio, or representing a constituency, looking after the interests of a poll, or just being an active member of this Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. All of our people have worked together as a unit, like a great symphony orchestra - whether you played the drums or whether you played a fife, or piccolo, or whether, like myself, your main job was to beat time and keep everybody working on the same score. All of us have worked together.

I want to say, for myself, that no person could have had more loyalty, more co-operation, more sympathy and more understanding than I have

had from these members whom I have just mentioned. I will, on some other occasion, probably be saying more about the Attorney General. I would like to say that if ever a man has been blessed with having an advisor and counsellor and friend, I have been blessed with the Attorney General.

I should also, Mr. Speaker, like to extend my congratulations to the member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) on the very happy event which he announced, this afternoon. I think this is the third budget in which he has announced such an arrival and if this is to become a regular, annual event, not only is the Provincial Treasurer going to need bigger and better budgets, what the member for The Battlefords will need bigger and better budgets as well, if he stays with this growing expansion production programme which he has undertaken.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — It will be his last time, though.

Premier Douglas: — Well, I have heard a lot of that kind of talk, about this being the last time, from across the way. Some time or other I thought I ought to make mention of it. I have been sitting in this Legislature now for twelve years, and from across the way I have listened to exactly the same story. In 1948 it was going to be the last time, - there would be a lot of us who would not be back. In 1952, there was even more of that kind of talk. You could hardly make a speech in the House but what they were shouting across the way, "It will soon be all over; you will soon be on your way out; you're on the skids". . .

Mr. Loptson: — You came pretty close to it last time.

Premier Douglas: — Well, we were so close to it last time that the gentlemen opposite went into the election with 21 members and came out with 10 area that is how close we were.

Mr. Loptson: — But the popular vote showed. . .

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the days when I did a little bit of boxing I always used to estimate my opponents. I learned that the fellow who was always going to win before the fight was the fellow you didn't have to worry very much about. The fellow you had to take some caution with was the sort of silent fellow who got his head down and came into the ring, looking kind of meek, and then you had to take care of yourself. The fellow who was blustering about what he was going to do to you beforehand never did very much except shoot off his mouth and then usually found himself on the canvas.

I am not saying who will be back or who won't be back. That is not for the gentlemen opposite to decide, nor for us to decide. That is for the people of this province to decide.

Mr. Loptson: — Correct.

Premier Douglas: — And that, in a democracy, is as it should be.

Mr. Loptson: — Agreed.

March 15, 1956

Premier Douglas: — As far as I am concerned, I and my colleagues on this side of the House have worked hard, diligently and conscientiously to serve the people of this province. We may not have done as well as we should. We may not have done as well as some people thought we should. But with a clear conscience and a good heart we shall give an account of our stewardship and leave the decision to the people whose servants we are.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this would be a good time for me to move adjournment of the debate.

(Debate Adjourned)

Sessional Allowance To Mrs. Larsen

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

“That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that the Sessional Allowances in the sum of Three thousand Six hundred Dollars (\$3,600.00), that would have been payable to Louis William Larsen, Esquire, late Member for the Constituency of Shellbrook, on Prorogation of the present Session, be paid to his Widow, Mrs. Florence Martha Gillies Larsen, of Leask, Saskatchewan, under the provisions of Section 53 of The Legislative Assembly Act (R.S.S. 1953, c.3).”

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this is a motion similar to motions we have introduced on previous occasions when a member has deceased and the constituency which he represented has not been filled during the succeeding session of the Legislature. I think that has been a good practice, when a member has served in the Legislature and no one has been elected to succeed him, to make the indemnity which he would have received available to his widow. We have done it on a number of occasions which I can recall. Members of the Legislature, generally, are not too well blessed with this world's goods and usually have spent a good deal of money looking after their constituency and their widows are seldom left in very good circumstances. I think the custom we have followed in the past ought to be followed again in this instance.

Therefore, I make the above motion, seconded by the Honourable Mr. Fines.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, strictly speaking, this could be done by Order-in-Council, but it has generally been the custom to bring it in here as a resolution so that the Legislature itself can have a voice. That is why I submitted this motion.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I do believe there are precedents

to this on other occasions; I do not think they have ever been passed by Order-in-Council. Now I am not quite certain whether it was in the matter of a member who passed away during a session or whether he passed away in between sessions, but as far as I am concerned, I am certainly all in favour of it. I think it is a good gesture. As you said, members, generally, are not too well off.

Premier Douglas: — I believe I could answer his question, Mr. Speaker. Yes, both of them have actually happened - we have had members pass away within a few weeks, in one case, within a few days before the Legislature opened; and in either case this we have had members pass away during the session and we have followed the same practice in both cases. The law officers tell us that it can be done by Order-in-Council actually, under The Legislative Assembly Act, but it has always been the practice to bring it into the Assembly in the form of a motion.

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am pleased that the Premier has seen fit to place this motion on the Order Paper and I am sure that all members of the House will be very, very pleased to support the motion, as I realize as well as other members the circumstances of a lot of members. It costs a lot of money to be a member and undoubtedly it cost Mr. Larsen a lot of money the same as the rest of us. It is quite possible that this will be of great benefit to his widow and to his family, and I sincerely hope that all members will support the motion.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

Second Reading

Bill No. 51 - An Act to amend the Power Corporation Act

Hon. J. A. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill, except for that one clause, is just to bring the Power Corporation Act in line with other Acts; in fact, the Legislature has already, this session, passed precisely the same Bill with respect to Telephones.

The clause, section 3 of the Bill, provides for increasing the sum of \$90 million, which is the total which the Legislature has authorized to be borrowed for the purposes of the Power Corporation, \$150 million.

I might say that for a number of years now we have been, every second year, putting through such a Bill as this, just approving what appeared to be sufficient to carry the Corporation over for a two-year period, and since the proposed expenditures of the Corporation, in 1956, total - I see I was in error when I said \$27 million; it will likely be about \$33 million, this year. It can be seen that if we are going to follow that programme there is no more than sufficient here for two such programmes.

I therefore move Second Reading of the Bill.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 53 – An Act to provide for the Establishment of the Municipal Corporation of the Uranium City and District

Hon. L. F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 53 is an Act to provide for the establishment of the Municipal Corporation of Uranium City and District, and it is a rather unique piece of legislation in the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

A community planning job has just been completed in the area that now consists of Uranium city itself, and we will be preparing bylaws for the purpose of governing the future development of Uranium City. When the bylaws are prepared they will be submitted to the incoming governing body of Uranium City and area for their approval and adoption.

Section 2 of the present Act - of the proposed Bill, uses the term 'charter'. Section 3 of the Bill deals with the area that will be included in the general administration of the area by the governing body. Rather than attempt to describe the area I would like to present this map to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) and there is a legend on the side here that would indicate the location of Uranium City and the mines that are in production and mines that are being developed.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Correction. Just some of them.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Thank you. Section 5 of the Bill provides for all local activity to be in the hands of the council of the Municipal Corporation. It will provide for all services, including the operation of schools, hospitals and other health measures, as well as welfare and other services which may be of general municipal nature.

Section 7 gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council the authority to alter and amend or replace the charter that it is proposed will be passed by Order-in-Council.

Section 11 removes the area of the city and district from the administration of the northern Saskatchewan Administration Act, so that the Municipal Corporation will have complete powers to govern the area.

Section 12 provides for the transfer of the known and recorded assets and liabilities to the newly-created Municipal Corporation.

Section 13, Mr. Speaker, deals with the assumption by the Municipal Corporation of liabilities which are not recorded at the time this Act comes into force. For example, one such commitment consists of the ordering of supplies for the construction of a water and sewer system; and there may be other commitments made of a similar nature. This particular section makes provisions for the turning over of these commitments to the newly-elected governing body, and they take the responsibility of completing the commitments that have been made.

Section 14 requires the Minister of Natural Resources to make a schedule of all public works, either completely constructed, or in the process of construction. Such things as sidewalks, water and sewer system, and other installations of a local nature are covered in that particular section.

Section 15 of the Bill makes mention of when the charter under which the Municipal Corporation is to operate comes into force, the Union Hospital district and the Union Hospital Board are to go out of existence, which will then give the Municipal Corporation direct control over the operation and management of the hospital.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, this particular legislation is unique in the history of the province of Saskatchewan. I suppose, if we were setting up a city or town in the settled areas of the province we would find that there would be local government in the adjoining areas. When you move into the north and you have no local government in the adjoining area to an incorporated town it becomes necessary to make provisions for the governing of the area that is beyond the boundaries of the incorporated town, and in this particular section of the province those who are engaged in the mining business, outside of the incorporated town, are virtually interested in the services that are rendered within the corporate limits of the town and the elected officials are also vitally interested in the area that lies beyond the boundaries of the incorporated town. Many of the mining employees will be living in the incorporated area of Uranium City, and consequently it becomes necessary to create a community covering a fairly substantial area in that particular section of the province, because of the interest that the mining area and mining people will have in the development of Uranium City. This, then, constitutes a co-operative effort to develop the kind of community of interest under one governing body that we feel fits in best with that particular section of the province.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure in moving Second Reading.

Mr. S. H. Carr (Rosthern): — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would just pardon me. There was a question asked here.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — I was asking what area is within the town limits?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — It is set out on the map that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has there. It is set out in yellow.

Mr. Loptson: — But that doesn't give me the acreage.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, just a minute, I'll be over there to tell you.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — It is an unsurveyed area.

Mr. Loptson: — You have no idea what acreage there is in it. Are there any mines within the area?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — All of the mines that have been developed so far are within the area.

March 15, 1956

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — What would be the approximate population, do you know?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Well, at the present time, the estimated population - I think possibly Mr. Brockelbank would be in a better position to answer that question than I.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the population of the town itself is probably getting very close to 2,000; it is pretty hard to keep track of it and give you an accurate up to date figure, and of the whole area may very well now be close to 4,000 - some place between 3,000 and 4,000. The area is approximately 1,200 square miles. Now it is a large area, but some of the area is obviously included for the sake of getting boundaries which are easily defined; it won't make any difference in or out, but you must have a boundary that can be defined.

The mines are located within the radius of about 12 miles or 14 miles from Uranium City, the majority of them being within 6 miles of Uranium City. I was very interested in the remarks of the Minister and this Bill is unique; this is not a rural municipality, nor is it purely an urban municipality. In working on this we had to devise some new method of handling it because neither The Village Act, The Town Act or The City Act would suit the area, nor would The Rural Municipality Act, so the charter will be developed, taking from the various municipal Acts the powers and responsibilities which are applicable to the area, and adding, on account of the peculiar circumstances of the area, any further provisions that may be necessary.

A mining town and the mining community has some differences and we are, as it were, setting out on a new path in establishing this mining town or municipal corporation. The whole problem has been thoroughly discussed with the Committee at Uranium City; we have had an Advisory Committee there, which has been of considerable help to us in the Department of Natural Resources while we have had the responsibility for administration of local affairs, and we have had conferences with them and that Committee includes representatives of the mining companies. I intend to go to Uranium City soon after the session, probably before this Bill, or this Act is proclaimed, to further discuss it with them; and we will, I expect, at that time, have something on the charter as well.

Mr. Loptson: — Have they got a similar setup at Kirkland Lake?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In mining towns, as I understand it, they have had, in a good many cases, special Acts of Legislatures to deal with the local government of the mining towns, for the simple reason that the standard Acts do not fit.

Mr. Carr: — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this is a unique Act as far as Saskatchewan is concerned. It gives to the Lieutenant Governor in Council power to alter, amend or repeal the charter. The Legislature does not give the charter any consideration; it does not come before the Legislature. The laws - their charter is the law governing this corporation that is set up, but the Legislature has no voice in making that charter. With cities and towns and villages and any

amendments to the Acts governing them it comes before this Legislature, but in this case once this power is given to the Lieutenant Governor in Council the Legislature has no further say in the matter.

In Section 8 it says: "The charter in effect for the time being shall have the force of law as enacted by the Legislature. Now maybe such legislation is necessary for this area, but is it necessary? That is the question that I would like to have the Minister answer.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the charter - the proposed charter - will take under consideration portions of the Municipal Acts that will apply to the governing of that particular area there. The hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Carr) did pick out one section of the Act that is not altogether unique in the history of the province. We have a charter governing Lloydminster, for example. It is a charter because part of the town is astride the boundary of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and there is a charter governing the administration there. Any changes that might take place in that charter (and they do take place from time to time) are approved by Order-in-Council, both by the Alberta and by the Saskatchewan governments.

We have the same situation at Flin Flon and the boundary area which is astride the Manitoba boundary; and about two years ago a charter was devised and approved by the Manitoba government and the Saskatchewan government as a means of governing the area that happens to be astride the two boundaries there. The principle that is used on the two boundaries that I mentioned is the principle that is covered here by section 8 for the purpose of governing Uranium City and district, to be, in effect, governing those two towns that are astride the boundary.

The Assembly adjourned at 10.00 o'clock p.m.