

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday March 5, 1958

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members of this House that, on previous occasions, I have endeavoured to repudiate some statements made by the members on the Government side with respect to the fabulous profits of the manufacturers of agricultural implements being responsible for the increased price.

Just the other day, a member of this House . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member may make an explanation.

Mr. Loptson: — I am making an explanation. I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — But he must not refer to anything which was said in debate.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, that has been said on previous occasions and on the hustings, so I will refer to what has been said on the hustings, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member may make an explanation of his own statement regarding the matter.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I will come to that. On previous occasions the name of a company — Massey Harris Ferguson was referred to as a case in point where 15 to 50 per cent profit was made by this company . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member doesn't . . .

Mr. Loptson: — . . . I hold in my hand a statement substantiating . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

March 5, 1958

Mr. Loptson: — . . . my statement . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. gentleman, as I recollect, made a statement regarding the profits of the company and he may give a clarification of that personal statement of his, if he considers it in the interests of this House.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I will do that, then. I held in my hand a statement published in 'The Leader Post' of recent date, whereby the Massey Harris Ferguson Limited was referred to as having made 15 to 50 per cent profit. This statement particularly shows the results of their operations for the last fiscal year, ending October 31, 1957, showing a net loss of no less than \$4,737,000.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Worse than Crown Corporations, isn't it?

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, it is C.C.F. speakers who make such irresponsible statements . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — . . . that I refer to as blatherskates.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 4, 1958, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main part of my address, today, I would just like to comment briefly on what I regard to be a real accomplishment in the last year, as far as the Department of Highways and this Government is concerned. I am referring to the completion of our part of the Trans-Canada Highway. This was no mean feat considering that this was the first province to complete its section, and our section is one of the longer ones. Both Manitoba and Alberta have shorter sections, but neither they nor any other province will complete their section until 1959. Our section of the Trans-Canada Highway comprised 406 miles; Manitoba's section, 309 miles, and Alberta's 282 miles.

So it is, I repeat, very satisfying to us that we were able to complete our section almost within the allotted terms of the original agreement, which called for the completion of this entire project by December, 1956.

The cost of this road was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$27,500,000, approximately half of which was paid for by the Federal Government. The completion of this project sets out very clearly the possibilities, and the desirability of the provinces and the Federal Government continuing in projects of this nature. Unfortunately, we have not been able to persuade the Federal Government that they should continue with -projects of this kind during 1958, although I want to assure you that I have placed before the Federal Government the wishes of this province, in asking that Federal aid should be continued during the present year, or the coming year.

Last night I did mention the fact that we held, in Saskatchewan, last year, the annual meeting of the Canadian Good Roads Association, which has been referred to as the 'Parliament of Roads' for Canada. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that gathering, and the gathering which took place in this city commemorating the opening of the Trans-Canada Highway, did a great deal to offset the stigma which has been attached to Saskatchewan roads for so many years. While there has been a very distinct upgrading of the type of work which has been carried on throughout the years, our friends opposite have continued to belabour the highways of this province and to leave the impression — and they have been fairly successful in leaving the impression across Canada — that we still have the same type of roads in Saskatchewan today as we had in 1944. At that time they had the reputation of being the worst in Canada. I want to say that those two meetings I have just mentioned did a great deal to dispel that wrong impression.

In addition to the Trans-Canada, we were able to complete several other portions of our highway system that have made it possible to connect all of our cities and most of the main towns in this province by dust-free highways. The most important that we were able to complete, last year, was the north-south highway starting at North Portal and leading on to the Prince Albert National Park. Two projects completed were the ones between Weyburn and Estevan, which has now been built to Trans-Canada standard; and the section between Saskatoon and Prince Albert, part of it No. 5 Highway and part of it No. 2. With the completion of those sections you now have a dust-free, in fact, a black-top road all the way from the international border to Prince Albert National Park.

The second that I might make mention of is the dust-free road from the city of Saskatoon to Lloydminster. Last year, when we completed the oiling of the section from Battleford west, that gave us a dust-free road on that entire section of highway.

March 5, 1958

The third one I might mention is the gap that was in the blacktop between Fort Qu'Appelle and Duff, which was completed. That now gives us a complete blacktop road from No. 1 Highway on to Melville, Yorkton and on to Canora, giving the entire eastern side of the province a blacktop connection with all of the main arteries of Canada and the United States.

The next one I might mention was the completion of the blacktopping between Tuxford and Chamberlain. That gives the city of Moose Jaw a direct connection with the city of Saskatoon, over blacktop roads.

The next one I might mention was the oiling of No. 4 Highway between the Saskatchewan River and the old junction of No. 32, that giving you a dust-free Highway all the way from Saskatoon to Swift Current via Rosetown, Elrose and Kyle.

I might also mention the completion of oiling of No. 6 Highway to the international border. That now gives us two international connections with dust-free roads. We have in addition now, three interprovincial connections with dust-free roads in the province.

Those are completions, last year, which, in my opinion, will add a great deal to the economy of Saskatchewan. Not only will it make it possible for our own people to travel from one side of Saskatchewan to the other, but it is making it possible, particularly for tourists from the south of the border, to reach the parks in the northern part of Saskatchewan; and it will be a further inducement to bring these people to this province.

In addition to the blacktop roads which I have just mentioned, we have completed a number of other sections of highways which are giving connections which are also of importance. First, I would refer to that section of No. 2 Highway between Assiniboia and Moose Jaw, from Ardill to Crown's Corner. With the completion of that to a Class B standard, we now have No. 2 Highway completely rebuilt from the international border right through to the third meridian on the east side of the Prince Albert National Park. There is then a small gap between east of the third meridian and the north end of Montreal Lake still to be rebuilt; but the balance from there to Lac la Ronge has been constructed since this Government took office, so that, as far as No. 2 is concerned, we have made very good progress in the improvement of that road during the past season.

The next one I would like to mention is No. 3 Highway. Several projects were completed on that highway, last year; particularly

that portion of No. 3 east and west of Hudson Bay. Then there was a section to the west of Big River, and further on we have another completion west of Meadow Lake. With those completions we now have a road extending from Erwood in the east, to Pierceland in the west, which you can travel over, either as a blacktop or a gravelled road. During the present year, as I will announce a little later, we will complete the 11-mile section from Pierceland to the Alberta border. That, of course, gives us a connection along one of our most northern roads, and will play a very important part in the economy of the northern part of Saskatchewan.

Another one that I would like to mention is the completion of that section of No. 51 Highway from Kerrobert east, that now gives an outlet from Kerrobert and that area through to Saskatoon over gravelled or blacktop roads built to all-weather standards.

Altogether, last year, we completed some 520.1 miles of grading; 207.39 miles of asphalt surface; 81 miles of oiling and 1,267 miles of gravelling or re-gravelling, which is possibly one of the most outstanding seasons work that has ever been accomplished by this Department.

Before I leave the work that has been done this year, I think I should point out to you that, at the present time, we are carrying on brushing operations on the road from No. 5 Highway to Madge Lake. I want to mention that in particular, because there are some people in that area who are trying to fool the public by telling them that, when this road is built, we are going to abandon that portion of No. 5 Highway leading from the junction of No. 57 on. I want to say there is absolutely no truth in that statement. As a matter of fact, during the present year we will be doing the survey work on that section of No. 5 Highway south and east from the junction of No. 57 Highway.

Before I leave 1957 work, I would like to mention a few of the bridge structures which we have completed during the past year. Foremost, of course, is the work now proceeding on the project of a bridge over the North Saskatchewan River at Prince Albert. As was announced in the Speech from the Throne, we were carrying on location work, both for a bridge at Prince Albert and one at Petrofka. However, since that date we have been informed by the Federal Government that they are prepared to assume half the cost of the bridge at Prince Albert, to an extent of \$1 1/4 million. That will make it necessary for us to discontinue the work at Petrofka and concentrate on the work of the bridge at Prince Albert, which, I may say, is now under way; that is, the preliminary work. This afternoon, my Deputy Minister leaves for Ottawa to negotiate a contract with the Federal Government on this bridge.

March 5, 1958

I want to assure this Assembly that the work that has been done on location of the bridge at Petrofka is by no means lost. That work will assist us when the other bridge is finished and, as a matter of fact, I hope that before the other bridge is finished, we will be able to complete the location work at Petrofka and be in a position to continue with that bridge just as soon as the other is finished, providing that the necessary money is available.

The other two projects I would like to mention are, first, the one that is completed on No. 9 Highway south of Hudson Bay. I had the honour of being present when the bridge was officially opened, this year, and I want to say that it is a very excellent structure. I was agreeably pleased with the design of the bridge, and also agreeably pleased with the design of a similar bridge built over the White Fox River on No. 55 Highway, west of the town of White Fox. Both of these structures are of pleasing design and are a credit to our Bridge Branch, who have been responsible for the design and the supervision of the construction of the bridges.

Having said that about last year's work, what have we in mind for 1958? First of all, I want to correct a statement that was made by the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) when he spoke to this Legislature on Monday. At that time he said that the \$25 million which was being voted for the Department of Highways covered such things as the interest on debt, the cost of the Highway Traffic Board, the administration of the Gasoline Tax Act and the administration of licence tax. I want to say that that statement is absolutely incorrect. All the member had to do was to go to the Estimates which were on his desk, the day before.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If the Minister had taken the trouble to look, I was speaking of the method by which was computed the amount of \$25 million last year; and in his budget speech he listed those items. That is what I made reference to, and I asked why he changed from last year to a different method this year. They are two different years entirely.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — That is not the understanding I had, Mr. Speaker, and it certainly was not the understanding of the press, because there it is. However, I want to correct the false impression which I am sure went over this radio, that this year's Estimates of \$25 million include those items. I want to assure you that that \$25 million is for highway work and highway work alone. That statement was in keeping with many of the other statements he made, that afternoon, regarding Crown Corporations, which I hope to have the time to deal with later on today.

Mr. Cameron: — My statement is still correct.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that that \$25 million practically equals the vote which we had for highways, last year, of \$22 1/2 million, plus the contribution of the Federal Government towards the construction of Trans-Canada Highway. So, by having this vote of \$25 million, this year, we are assuring to the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly assuring those who are in the contract business, that there is going to be no let-down in the amount of work which will be carried on in 1958.

As I said earlier, I was disappointed that I was not able to interest the Federal Government in continuing to assist this Province in highway construction work after the Trans-Canada was completed; but our action in up-grading the vote of this Department, this year, is simply in keeping with the policy that has been followed by this Government throughout the years that we have been in office. As a matter of fact, I should point out to you that this vote represents three times what was voted to this Department 10 years ago, so there has been a gradual upgrading of the amount of money available to this Department in accordance with our ability to spend that money to advantage. I want to assure you that it is not advisable to vote more money that you have the staff to supervise and to properly take care of.

There are a variety of reasons, of course, why our vote should be raised from year to year. If you will examine the number of vehicles that are in operation in this province, today, as compared to 10 years ago, you will find that the number has almost doubled. In 1947, we had 156,816 motor vehicles registered in Saskatchewan; in 1957, as at the end of the year, we had 295,150 — almost double. If you take the number of motor vehicles per mile of paved road in Canada, you will find that the increase is about the same. In 1946 there were 11.6 vehicles per mile of paved road in Canada; in 1956 there were 21.4. So Saskatchewan has been following the general trend that is existing all across Canada, and I am quite sure that the trend today will continue throughout the years, and it will be necessary to keep up-grading the amount of money that is required for highway purposes in this province, and in Canada as well.

The other reason, of course, that I should mention is the fact that, throughout the last decade, we have seen almost a complete mechanization of the agricultural industry. That, in itself, raised a problem to the road builders of Saskatchewan, not only for the province, but for the municipalities as well. Of late years, of course, we now have the rapid expansion of the oil industry in Saskatchewan, and I want to assure you that that, in itself, has posed a very serious problem to those of us who are in charge of the highway system in Saskatchewan. However, it is one that I am glad to have, and I assure you that we will do out utmost to see that the requirements of that industry are met to the best of our ability.

March 5, 1958

I said, a moment ago, that we have not been able to interest the Federal Government in continuing assistance on our provincial highway system after the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway. I don't know that we can lay all the blame on the present Government. I want to point out that, in 1955, when it became evident that the provinces of Canada were not going to complete the Trans-Canada Highway, the then Minister of Public Works called the provinces to Ottawa for a conference, and he discussed with us ways and means of speeding up the work on the Trans-Canada. At that time I told him, and I told the conference, that in my opinion the best way to speed up the work on the Trans-Canada Highway was to assure the provinces that, as soon as any one province completed their portion of that project, the Federal Government prepared to enter into another agreement with them on a plan of comprehensive assistance toward the primary highway systems in the provinces. They refused to do so and, as a result, of course, we are left today without any further Federal help on our primary system, while all the other provinces of Canada, with the exception of the province of Quebec (who did not enter the Trans-Canada agreement) are receiving Federal aid. I say it is a case of gross discrimination as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned.

True, you may say that they are offering help on northern development roads; and I want to assure this House as my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) did the other day, we are very pleased to co-operate in working out a plan of Federal aid on northern development roads. But I want to point out to this Assembly that a plan for northern development roads is no substitute for aid on the primary highway system of this province, and any comprehensive plans that should be developed by Canada should include not only development roads for the north but your primary highway system as well as assistance to the municipalities for the farm-to-market roads.

You know, in this country we are lagging far behind our neighbours in the south. Just this morning there came to my desk a statement issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, showing the amount of aid that is being made available to the various States across the Union. I have marked the aid that is being given to the State of Montana to the south of us, and I find that, up to the present time on programs already underway, the 'Federal contribution' reads \$7,204,000; 'Contracts advertised but construction not started' total \$4,381,000, and on 'projects under way', \$33,320,000, making a total of \$44,905,000 that the Federal Government is paying the State of Montana and is available for them during the present construction year. Going to North Dakota, I find that the amount is \$51,770,000.

How can they expect a province such as Saskatchewan, to keep pace with those States when the Federal Government is making contributions of that size to them for highway work alone. It is not just that this is something new across the line. They have been receiving Federal aid since 1916 on a scale far greater than anything we have ever received, even during the time the Trans-Canada was being constructed. Now, of course, with their interstate Highway System under way, in which the Federal Government will pay 90 per cent of the cost, we are being left far, far behind.

Unfortunately, the present Conservative Government apparently have no more vision as far as highway construction work is concerned, than their predecessors, the Liberals, who filled the office a few years ago.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — It was not a few years ago.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — The question may be asked, "Just what right has the Federal Government to contribute to highway work?" Well, first of all, they should be interested in the general economy of the country; and no one can deny that good roads and good highways contribute to the betterment of the national economy. No one can deny that. Secondly, the Federal Government has been in the field of the Highway Users' Tax for many years. I find that, in 1955, under the Sales Tax, whereby they collected 10 per cent on cars, and the Federal Excise Tax of 10 per cent, they collected some \$172,189,762 from the Canadian people. In addition to that they collected a Gas Tax of 1.7 cents per gallon on premium gas, and one and one-half cents per gallon on non-premium gas amounting to \$45,310,563, or a total in those three items of \$217,500,325.

Mr. Speaker, when they collect that much from the highway users of this country, they have a perfect right to make the same contribution to the highway development of Canada. To give you some idea of the taxes that they are paying, I got the information today as to the amount of tax that is being paid on the low-priced cars. This is not the 20 per cent. This is now on the basis of the ten and seven per cent, because the present Government has reduced the rate on one of these taxes by three per cent. But on the new rate, 17 per cent, rather than the 20, I find that on the Dodge car you would pay \$284.27; on the Pontiac \$312.06; on a Studebaker, \$286.89; on a Ford, \$306, and a Meteor, \$339. If you go to the medium priced cars, I find in a Mercury, \$424; the Chrysler (that is the Windsor type), \$435, Chevrolet Bel Air, \$367, and the Studebaker President, \$454.

March 5, 1958

When my friends across the way complain about the taxes being paid by the farmers to the rural municipalities, I would like to point out to them that this one tax on the car alone is more than the average tax being paid on a half-section of land by the farmers of this country.

What is then the policy of the Liberals and the Conservatives in the past? Well, I have here a submission that was made to the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial relations back in 1937. I find that, when this province made a submission to Ottawa, they pointed out that they would require at least \$2,260,000 annually to properly maintain the highways in this province. That was in 1937. Now, what did they spend for maintenance that year? I find they spent less than one-third of that — \$—\$681,000 — when they themselves admitted it required \$2,260,000. And the last year they were in office, I find they spent \$970,000 on maintenance — less than one-half of what they admitted was required to give proper maintenance to the highways. So it is no wonder that the highways of this province went back under a Liberal administration.

In that same submission they stated that the Government of Canada construct and maintain a Trans-Canada Highway of a permanent type as well as permanent highways, from the Canada-U.S. borders to the National Parks of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was one Liberal Government speaking to another. Twenty-two years after that, in 1949, we were called into Ottawa to discuss with the Federal Government the Trans-Canada Highway. As a result of that discussion, we did get a Trans-Canada Highway. But it took 22 years of prodding to get action from the Federal Government at Ottawa in that respect.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — They weren't here. That is for sure. It is a lot of nonsense, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Now, what has the Conservative Government done?

Well, I find that, prior to election last year in June, Mr. Hees, who is now the Hon. Mr. Hees and Minister of Transport, speaking in Newcastle, N.B. on May 29, 1957, said that if his party was elected in June it would start on a Canada-wide program similar to the \$100 million program now under way in the U.S.A. In Saskatoon in March 30 of the same year, he said,

"It has become obvious, if the Trans-Canada is to be built in the next five years, the Federal Government must finance its construction".

In addition he said:

"Canada needs a national highway program by which the Federal Government will join the provinces in building highways which will enable development of the tourist trade and natural resources."

Then he went on to say that the Prime Minister had assured him that, if they were elected, they would get such a promise into existence. Well, as I said a moment ago, I lost no time in getting in touch with the present Federal Government, pointing out to them that, with the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway in 1957, we would appreciate an agreement for assistance in 1958. I got a complete turn-down. I was not the only one who got a complete turn-down because, in the House of Commons a short time ago, the matter of Federal aid for Highways was up for discussion. When they were asked the question as to what they were prepared to do, Mr. Green, the Federal Public Works Minister said that the Government has no plans for calling a conference of the on this matter. So there you have it. The rest of Canada has been getting the same turn-down as has the province of Saskatchewan as far as further Federal aid for Saskatchewan is concerned.

I said that I would like to give to this Legislature an account of the program which we propose to introduce during the coming year.

Commencing with No. 3 Highway from Polworth to Eldred, we will grade and gravel; from Polworth to Shellbrook, we will undertake the survey of that road, this year.

Again I want to point out to this Assembly that, in spite of the stores carried around in that area, no decision has been made as to location in that piece of road. I have been asked to consider a change in location, and I have advised the people there that I will give it the same consideration I give other requests — that it will be looked into very carefully, and these things will be decided on their merits. At the moment however, no decision has been made. In fact, no report has come to me from any member of my staff who may possibly have been in the field.

The other project is one I mentioned a moment ago — Pierceland to the Alberta boundary to be graded and gravelled.

On No. 5 Highway, from Maymont to North Battleford, bituminous surface. Bresaylor to Lashburn, bituminous surface.

March 5, 1958

On No. 6 Highway, Regina south to the junction of No. 1 (that is a short piece of road from here to the junction), bituminous surface. Southey to Raymore, part of that road will be graded and gravelled in readiness for black-topping.

Raymore to Dafoe, oil treatment Lac Vert to Melfort, bituminous surface.

No. 7 Highway, Rosetown to Brock, oil treatment. This will complete the oiling from Kindersley to No. 1 Highway and give the town of Kindersley a dust-free artery from that town east; and also No. 7 from the Alberta border, east. This is simply a short connection meeting up with the new Alberta Highway which changed its location and is now coming up the Saskatchewan border a short piece north of Alsask.

No. 8, Redvers to Fairlight, graded and gravelled; Norquay north, graded and gravelled.

No. 9 Highway, Whitewood to Stockholm, graded and gravelled.

No. 10 Highway from the Manitoba border west, graded and gravelled.

No. 13 Highway, Stoughton to Weyburn, bituminous surface; Weyburn to No. 6 Highway, graded and gravelled.

No. 14 Highway, Cold Lake to the junction of No. 6, oil treatment, and from the junction of No. 51 Highway to Wilkie, graded and gravelled.

No. 15 Highway, Ituna to Leross, graded and gravelled; Outlook to Milden, graded and gravelled.

No. 17 Highway, Lloydminster to Prairie North, this is a connection to meet with one of the Alberta roads leading from the west which will connect up with our No. 17 Highway.

Highway No. 18, Frobisher to Bienfait, graded and gravelled. I should point out here that, a few years ago, this road was constructed to a standard that would take care of the business of that area; but since that time we have had a rapid development of the oil industry in that district, and the road which was then constructed is not up to a standard that will carry heavy traffic. It is, therefore, necessary for us to build it up to a standard that will warrant black-topping, which we want to be done in the near future.

Highway No. 21, Cyprus Park to Maple Creek, graded and gravelled.

Highway No. 26, Mervin to Edam, graded and gravelled.

Highway No. 27, Junction of No. 2 to Prudhomme — graded and gravelled.

Highway No. 30, Kerrobert south, graded and gravelled.

Highway No. 32, Pennant to Shackleton, graded and gravelled.

Highway No. 33, Stoughton to Fillmore, graded and gravelled.

Highway No. 35, Tisdale to Nipawin, oil treatment, and from Creighton to Flin Flon, bituminous surface.

Highway No. 37, international boundary north, grade and gravel.

Highway No. 40, Blaine Lake to Krydor, grade and gravel.

Highway No. 42, Eyebrow to junction of No. 19 Highway, grade and gravel.

Highway No. 49, Manitoba border to Pelly, grade and gravel; and Kelvington to junction of No. 35, grade and gravel.

Highway No. 50, international boundary north. I might say that that is only a short realignment which is required because of the building of new stations at that point.

Highway No. 55, White Fox to Snowden, grade and gravel. By the way, this will complete the construction of No. 55 Highway from No. 2 Highway to No. 35.

Highway No. 57, Manitoba boundary to the junction of No. 5, grade and gravel; and the access road from 9th Avenue N.W., Moose Jaw, bituminous surface.

Including the carry-over, this program represents some 510.26 miles of grading; 488 miles of gravelling will not include the gravelling done by maintenance; base course, 151.8 miles; bituminous surfacing, 150.65 miles; and oil treatment, 138.68. In addition to that we will undertake the survey of over 1,100 miles throughout the present highway system.

March 5, 1958

Now, the Bridge Program, and I would like to mention the following:

I have already mentioned the work we are doing in the designing of the bridge at Prince Albert, and we hope to have the construction of that bridge commence during the present fiscal year;

On No. 3 Highway, the steel and concrete bridge over the Big River west of Meadow Lake; on No. 1 Highway, steel and concrete underpass at Biggar; No. 8 Highway, concrete bridge north of Torquay; No. 23 Highway, steel and concrete bridge over the Carrot River.

That completes the number of projects which we hope to undertake this year.

Today, I would like to announce something which I have not done before. We find that, in order to speed up work on Highway construction, it is desirable that a number of contracts should be let in the fall of the year, and I am going to give this Legislature a number of projects on which we hope to be able to call for tenders before the next winter sets in. The proposals which I have are as follows: No. 2 Highway, from Assiniboia to Crown's Corner, and from Radisson to Maymont, Southey to Raymore; Tisdale to Melfort, and from Bienfait to junction of No. 9 Highway, are bituminous surface projects which there is a possibility of us calling for before that time.

I had hoped also to announce a number of earth projects which might also be included, but I find that, because of the uncertainty of our earth-moving program at this particular date, I am not able to announce these. We do hope that, by next fall, we can also include a number of earth projects.

As I said earlier, the main reason for this is to give the contractors the ability to size up their equipment for the work and to get their equipment moved out onto the project before the bans are placed on the Highways. By so doing, we can save a great deal of time during the early part of the spring of the year. For that reason, I am making these announcements.

I have just one word to say about aid to the municipalities. My colleague made a very excellent job, yesterday, in setting out the work we are doing, but there are one or two items which I would like to mention, particularly as our friends across the way keep saying, and the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) did say, that this Government is absolving itself from the various services and passing them on to the municipalities. Well, I would like to remind him, and others of his colleagues across the way, that the last year they were in office, they spent the magnificent sum of \$450,000 (in fact that is a little more than they spent) on grants

to the municipalities, maintenance of secondary Highways, construction of secondary highways, bridges on municipal roads, ferries not on provincial highways and northern market roads. They spent an amount slightly below \$450,000, but during the same time, they collected from the municipalities by way of Public Revenue Tax, an amount of almost \$1,800,000 . . .

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — . . . four times as much as they gave them. Now compare that with the assistance we gave the municipalities a year ago: a total of \$5,410,500 through the Municipal Assistance Authority and \$150,000 free service given by the Department in the surveying of the Grid Road system, or over 12 times as much as they received from our friends across the way when they were in office. We also returned to them the Public Revenue Tax.

Mr. McDonald: — It took a lot of prodding.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — When you realize the amount of money that we have given them, it amounts to over 25 per cent of the entire amount of money that we collect from what is known as the Highway Users' Tax — that is the gasoline tax and car licences. Over 25 per cent has gone to the municipalities. Yet, I find, in an analysis of the traffic on the urban roads of this province, that whereas the rural roads of Saskatchewan, the municipal roads of this province carry 14 per cent of the rural traffic; the highway system carries 86 per cent. Yet the 14 per cent is receiving from this Government over 25 per cent of the revenue we collect from the Highway Users. So we are using them a great deal more fairly than the Federal Government is using the provinces, I can assure you.

I should also point out that, throughout the years, this province has been taking over more and more of the responsibilities of roads from the municipalities. Last year, we took over a number of projects that were in the so-called secondary highway system. This year (I am not in a position to name them all, but just to mention one), I could mention the road from Gravelbourg to La Fleche, which will be taken over during the present year. So the Government has been continually lifting from the shoulders of the municipalities more and more of the cost of their road systems.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion on work that might be done in assisting in snow removal services. I want to point out to this Assembly again that the snow removal equipment of the Department of Highways is always at the disposal of the rural municipalities, when it is not in use on the provincial highway system. All we are asking is that they give us the same rental, the same rate,

March 5, 1958

that we are charging ourselves for it. There is nothing unfair about that, and I want to correct the impression that has been left, that our equipment lies idle while the municipalities require the services.

Time is going on, and I want to say a word or two about Crown Corporations. Again I want to deny the statement that was made by the member for Maple Creek, when he said that the Crown Corporations, with the exception of the Timber Board, have not returned one nickel to the revenue of the province.

Mr. Cameron: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — That statement is not correct.

Mr. Cameron: — It is correct.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — All he had to do, again, was to use the last statement of the Government Finance Office and he would find that, in the past year, the return from the Crown Corporations on the money invested by this province equals 9.85 per cent. To say that is not correct is to say that the Provincial Auditor (who is not employed by this Government, but who is responsible to this Legislature and was in office when we took office, and is a man who is recognized across Saskatchewan and across Canada for his high integrity), is turning out statements which he knows are not correct.

Mr. McDonald: — That's nonsense, and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I say it is an insult to the Provincial Auditor who has an excellent standing in this province.

Mr. McDonald: — Your intelligence is an insult.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I haven't time today to go over the various Crown Corporations, but I do want to mention just briefly the one that I am responsible for, namely, the Transportation Company. That company returned 5 per cent after paying all expenses, this year, to the treasury of this province; and I want to say that that is not a bad return when you consider that this is a company not set up to make profits, but set up to give a service. If we were to operate the Saskatchewan Transportation Company on the same basis that a private organization would operate it, we would immediately eliminate possibly a third of the runs we are now running.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — You did eliminate some.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — But because we are a service organization, we are prepared to have the surplus from the better runs help to carry the load on those runs which are only able to meet the actual operating costs.

Mr. Danielson: — Hold your horses!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I want to point out that we are giving to the people of Saskatchewan, today, some of the finest bus service of anywhere on this continent. We had an examination made of this company's business by one of the outstanding men in the transportation business, and one of the remarks he made was that it was well organized, well managed and giving an excellent service.

I just want to read, very briefly a comment that appeared in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix':

"Heartiest commendation and congratulations should be sent by the citizens of this province to the Saskatchewan Transportation Company for its 10-year safety record. The operators of S.T.C. buses are especially deserving of public recognition and praise, for more than anyone else they made this impressive and enviable record possible.

"These men have driven buses almost 32,000,000 miles, during the course of which not a single life was lost and only one serious accident occurred. This achievement is all the more remarkable in that it was accomplished in a decade, when highway traffic and road accidents reached new heights.

"There is an important lesson to be drawn from the S.T.C. experience, too. The safety record just didn't happen. It came about mainly because scrupulous attention has been paid to human factors — the drivers. Only those prospective operators who can pass rigid, visual, reaction, steadiness, strength, bearing and knowledge tests have been employed as drivers."

That doesn't come from a paper that is sympathetic to the C.C.F. That comes from one which is known to support the Liberal party; but they have been fair, in most cases.

March 5, 1958

Mr. McDonald: — Wake up, Jack!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Having said that, I just want to refer to the stand of the Liberal and Conservative parties in this country in regard to Corporations.

There have been times when both these parties have been forced to bring into operation, or into being, Crown Corporations, but their attitude, generally, has been that of our friends across the way — one whereby they would like to throw them 'out the window' just as soon as possible.

Mr. McDonald: — You threw most of them out.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And you are getting a very good example of it right now. One of the best Federal-owned Crown Corporations giving a service to the people of Canada is the T.C.A., recognized across this continent as the safest, the best-managed and the best-equipped of any air outfit on this continent. Yet what do we find? We find that the Tory government now in office is going to make it possible for the C.P.R. to cut in on that business now that it has been developed, brought from a position where it did not pay to operate to now when it is well organized, well developed. They are going to allow the C.P.R. who are really the bosses, to cut in on that run. When that happens it can only have one effect, Mr. Speaker, and that is the service to the people of Canada will be reduced, and the cost will be raised.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I want to say . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Who are you referring to?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Again I would like to point out that the people of Canada have been betrayed by the Liberal Government when they were in office. Two years ago, they undertook to assist a group of American financiers to build the Trans-Canada Pipeline, which was a utility that could have been built and operated by the people of Canada to their advantage. But instead of that, what has happened? We have heard a lot about it of late, but just lately there has been a Commission appointed to look into this business, known as the Border Commission; and, believe you me, some of the things they have unearthed are not very savory.

Mr. Gardiner: — Did you get rid of your shares?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — We find that some of these men have greatly benefited in this. Mr. Tanner, for instance, admits in testimony that he has exercised his right to take up 60,000

share option by taking up 55,000 shares, which were offered at \$8 each. He still owned 30,800. He had sold 14,000 for a profit of \$200,000 and given away 10,200 shares. He also received 10,000 shares at \$1 each. These he has turned over to his wife and she still holds them. Mr. Coates, another man, is in the same position; and so you can go down the line. At that time, of course, the Conservative people, when this debate was on in the House of Commons, referred to it as a 'nefarious' scheme and a 'shameless' proposal, an 'infamous' proposal; and they referred to the men who were taking part in it as 'pampered pets' and as 'buccaneers'. But, today, what are they doing? They are making a boast of the amount of money they are putting into that section of the line which runs through New Ontario. Sure, when they were out of office they were criticizing; but now that they are in office they are part and parcel of the same old scheme — a scheme that has robbed the Canadian people of millions of dollars, and no one but the users of gas are going to pay for it.

Mr. McDonald: — Tell us about the pipe plant.

Mr. Danielson: — Have you got any shares in that?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — No, I haven't any shares in it; but I want to say this. This is another case where the Liberals and the Tories are finding it very hard to find a line of demarcation. They are so much alike that they are finding it very difficult, particularly in this campaign, and this problem of similarity is becoming very embarrassing to both these parties.

Now I see that my time is practically up, and I would like to have said a word or two about the agricultural conditions that exist in this province. Coming from one of the best agricultural areas in Saskatchewan, I feel it is my duty to protest against the program of poverty that has been introduced by the present Government in Ottawa. I can call it nothing else. I can call their new Farm Stabilization Act nothing but a program of poverty for the farmers of western Canada.

When I examine the promises made by the Conservative party before the last election, that they would see to it that the farmers of Canada would receive a fair share of the national income, and then when I examine this Bill of theirs, I say that it is a sell-out to the big interests of the east.

When I examine that program and realize that the best they are offering the farmers of Canada is that they are prepared to take 80 per cent of prices on which the farmer is now going broke, as the floor price for our goods, I say it is nothing but a sell-out. Then when you also realize that in this much-discussed Bill of theirs

March 5, 1958

they have completely left out wheat, oats and barley as far as western Canada is concerned; it is evident to me that they were selling the farmers of western Canada down the river.

Now I know we cannot blame the Conservative party; we cannot blame the Conservative party for the stocks of wheat that now exist on our farms. The blame for that must rest with the Liberal party who were then in power; but I want to say this. The Conservative party is showing no more initiative in selling that wheat than was done by their predecessors in office; not one bit more. And again I would like to remind this House that, many years ago, we advised the Federal Government of a program that would enable them to have sold this wheat, but they said at that time we didn't know what we were talking about.

Mr. Gardiner: — You sure didn't.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well, we know what happened. The Americans have adopted that plan, and they have cut the market out from under our feet. Yet the present administration is doing no more about actually selling our wheat than did their Liberal friends.

I want to say that the farmers of western Canada have been sold down the river. They realize, again, that in the marketing of our wheat, and in aid to highways, and in their trade policy, and in their protection for big business, the similarity between the Liberals and the Conservatives is very hard to determine.

Mr. Speaker, I see I have gone a few minutes over my time; and needless to say, I am going to support the budget.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I didn't want to interrupt him when he was speaking but I have the information now.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have the information to substantiate my statement that he contradicted.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is not allowed to make a speech.

Mr. Cameron: — But I have the facts here from the Budget Speech to substantiate my statement, and he turned around and said I wasn't correct. The facts substantiate what I said.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Minister who has just taken his seat has made certain statements that are not in accordance with the facts. Surely to goodness, the member has . . .

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Could we have order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — . . . has the opportunity to correct those statements.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member has already had the opportunity, when the Minister was speaking.

Mr. Cameron: — I said at that time, Mr. Speaker, I did not have the information. The Minister said just now that my statement is still not correct. He made the statement just now, and I am rising on a point of privilege to point out that, on page 26 of the Provincial Treasurer's Budget Speech of last year, in estimating his highway expenditures, he took highways, municipal road assistance, interest on the highway debt, \$1,933,000; Highway Traffic Board, \$338,000 . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, who has the floor?

Mr. Cameron: — Collection of the gas and vehicle licences is included in this; and my statement was correct.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member from Maple Creek has simply repeated what he said on his previous point of order.

Mr. Danielson: — No.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this debate, I want to congratulate those speakers who have preceded me. I can even be generous, enough, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), because he did more than anyone else to prove that this budget was an excellent budget with the very dismal attempt he made in trying to attack it.

March 5, 1958

I want to say that this budget is a builder's budget, and I am very proud of it, and want to congratulate our hon. Provincial Treasurer on his stewardship in his office. I realize that his office is a difficult one to hold, especially when you watch the methods of the Opposition and other individuals throughout the province attacking him. They know very well they can't attack him on the basis of his ability as a Treasurer, so they use the usual McCarthy tactics of 'smear'. I sincerely hope the Provincial Treasurer will reconsider the statement he made in this House, a short time ago, that he is going to resign from public office at the end of 1960, and will not contest another election. I hope he will reconsider that.

I notice the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) went on with the same old cracked record. What makes it so difficult for us to debate the budget as a budget, is because they give us nothing to reply to. We still have the same old cracked record that has been played for years by the Opposition. In fact, as someone said in the House here the other day, it sounded very much like the famous Ross Thatcher record — that is, the record of Ross Thatcher's swan song. I must say that the hon. member for Maple Creek has probably memorized his lyrics a little better.

Now, on behalf of the people of the Battlefords, I would like to translate this budget, Mr. Speaker, as to how it affects the people of my constituency. I think that is the job we must do as members. I am sure that The Battleford constituency, and the population of northwestern Saskatchewan, generally, is very happy with this budget as they have been with previous budgets. The thing that makes me pleased as a member is the fact that, according to the program that I was elected on, both in 1952 and 1956, I can go back to these people and say that we can report progress on every single point of our election program.

I am sure the people of The Battlefords are very happy to see the tremendous improvement program on No. 5 Highway, both east and west; the hard-topping program, and again the additional assurance of the Minister today that not only are we going to have hard top from Maymont to North Battleford west, but we also have a real hope now of a continuance of a hard-topping program from Maymont to Radisson. I am sure that the people in that area and other areas of Saskatchewan are pleased, because we are in a mobile age, and there are a good many people in Saskatchewan and Canada, generally, who will make good use of those highways. Further, Mr. Speaker, No. 40 highway east was rebuilt for 21 miles, last summer, to a good standard, and the farmers and travellers generally in that area are very happy with the highway progress made.

I think it was rather a red letter day when they rebuilt No. 40 Highway last summer, because that was the last of the seven highways leading into the city of North Battleford, that had not been rebuilt since 1944 completely.

Mr. Danielson: — 14 years!

Mr. Kramer: — So we can say today that we have completed our highway program in the immediate North Battleford area. I am pleased, also, with the progress of No. 26 to Meota. Of course, I don't suppose we will ever hear anything from the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) about that, though that happens to be in his constituency; nor will we hear anything from him about the continuance of No. 26 up to Edam that the Minister has just mentioned. He says very little about the things that are done, and harps continually about the little items that he might find that are not done.

Before I go into the budget pie, I want to thank the Department of Public Works on the provision for a new administration building in North Battleford, which will house all the offices of the Provincial Government under one roof, in a respectable building. And I am going to be very happy. Mr. Speaker, when I see the people of The Battlefords, and north-west, have a decent building to go to when they come to North Battleford — a home for all the provincial offices, instead of ducking into rented buildings here and there, up and down main street, and off in different comers of the city. I think that is a credit to the Government, and it certainly is a credit to the city of North Battleford.

I was pleased, too, to see that we are going to have assistance in some of the urban streets that are a part of the highway program.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the way this budget has been allocated — the budget pie that I mentioned a bit earlier — I think it has been allocated very fairly and the criticism that has been levelled at us, saying that the agricultural section of the population, the farmers of Saskatchewan, are not getting a fair share of this budget, is so ridiculous that it should not require debating. However, I think that some things have to be pointed out. We have a vast section of this, some 20 per cent of the budget is allocated for public health — nearly 21 per cent. Of course, no farmers ever become ill, Mr. Speaker; it is always the city folks that are cluttering up our hospitals, and we never have farmers benefitting from the health program. Neither do the municipalities ever benefit from the 75 per cent that is paid for social welfare cases, and in welfare programs generally. There are never any of our elderly people

March 5, 1958

ever go into some of the pioneer homes that have been built, at the instigation and with considerable assistance from the Provincial Department of Social Welfare. Farmers never benefit. The people of Neilburg, for instance, did not benefit at all. The farmers in the municipality surrounding North Battleford don't stand any chance of ever getting into the proposed pioneer residence that is going to be built next year in the city of North Battleford. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is ridiculous and I would suggest that that both the approximately 10 per cent and approximately 21 per cent of the budget that is allocated to health and welfare is of direct benefit to agriculture, and to farmers generally, in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we see another 20 per cent of the budget allocated to education. We see better than \$3 million being allocated this year in educational grants, and of course, the farmers' kids never go to school, Mr. Speaker — they never could possibly benefit from these additional grants. However, the figures that I have present a slightly different argument, and I will give one of the larger units in my area, an area close to North Battleford — the one in which I pay taxes, and in which my ranch is located, and if there were not assistance, provincial assistance of any kind whatever, I would have to pay 44 mills more on my taxation. That is related and translated into a mill rate, Mr. Speaker — that's what the provincial assistance amounts to in the Medstead larger unit. So I say, Mr. Speaker, again this is a tremendous benefit to agriculture.

I go now to highways. Of course, farmers never get out on to the highways; they're always back there riding around the pasture on a saddle horse! They never get out on the highway, so that couldn't possibly be of any benefit to farmers. However, I think that they are wrong on that count, too, as they have been wrong on every count. I would like to give you an example of what the actual benefit of a good highway is to a farming community, and I will take, for example, the 13 miles of highway north of North Battleford, No. 4 Highway. We have traffic counts now established, Mr. Speaker, over a period of years, and the average traffic count last year showed that 14,000 vehicles per day travelled over that road, and that road has been in existence now for 10 years, built and hard-topped by the hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) who has just sat down — under his stewardship.

Mr. Danielson: — 14,000 a day?

Mr. Kramer: — 1,400 a day, I'm sorry. Thank you very much.

Mr. Cameron: — Why correct him?

Mr. Kramer: — Now, working that out on a long-term average, Mr. Speaker, we find that we will be on the safe side. We know that the vehicle mileage is going up, but from the best figures obtainable on traffic counts, we find that an average of 885 vehicles have been travelling over that highway over the last 10 years, per day — 885. If you multiply that and take it on an annual average, and realizing a modest saving of two cents a mile — the difference between a hard-top road and a gravelled or municipal road — two cents per mile, Mr. Speaker, is a very modest saving, and I don't think anyone in this House would disagree that when they put their vehicle on to a hard-top highway, there is a saving, whether it is a truck or a car. Cars will probably be less, trucks will be more, and I say an average saving of two cents per mile. This, Mr. Speaker, has net in actual savings the people that travel that 13 miles of highway, just on that 13 miles alone over the entire length and breadth of the province of Saskatchewan; I am just taking 13 miles of it, in my locality and area — the people in my constituency know about — a saving annually to the people that use that road, of \$84,000. That's what they save; it isn't what a Government actually takes from you in taxes, and what they provide you with in return, but what you save through the programs of a government, I think, Mr. Speaker, are what are also important. This is the savings that the motorists have gotten for themselves over that period of time.

If you took the \$84,000 and I presume anyone again will agree with me, that half the people that use that road are rural people — you take an average of that; that's \$42,000 and if you multiplied that by the 10 years the highway has been in existence, there's an actual saving of \$840,000 to the people that use that 13 miles of road, and a saving to the farmers in that area of one half million dollars — just on 13 miles of highway, Mr. Speaker.

If you reduced it to the individual farmer on the basis of the average in that area, you will find there is a saving of some \$60 a year which will pay both his truck and his car licence, and these people opposite have the nerve to talk about a slight increase in automobile licence rates and so on, when one 13-mile section of highway, Mr. Speaker, will actually save them that amount in one year alone, and they don't only travel that 13 miles — they travel other highways as well.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the highway program is of tremendous benefit to farmers, and if you took the figures I have just given you and translated them over the length and breadth of the highway system of Saskatchewan, you would find what tremendous benefit the highway program that is being budgeted for here is to the rural population of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker

March 5, 1958

Mr. Danielson: — Keep right on; you're wrong anyway!

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I think we can go right on and take a look at all of these allocations and find that they are certainly very fair to the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. I want to say, too, that the people of my constituency happens to be half urban and half rural — and I am sure that the working people, the union people in my area, are very happy, too, with the provisions that are made here for them. They, too, benefit as the rural people do, from every single segment of this budget pie, and I am very proud, on behalf of the people of the Battlefords, to be able to be part of a Government and represent this side of the House, when a budget of this type is brought down.

I think our Hospital plan is one we can be proud of. I notice there it; an increase here provided for the hospital plan, our hospital plan is one that is without equal, anywhere in Canada. I wonder, when I look at the amount of money that is being spent on health and welfare, Mr. Speaker, why some members of this House, especially across the way, like to refer to other provinces. I wonder if they have ever stopped to think, for instance, when we look at what has happened — when we look at the fiasco, Mr. Speaker, of the \$22 and \$28 annual bonus that was paid to the people of Alberta and British Columbia — so-called dividends — \$22 in Alberta a year; that's our nearest neighbour, we might as well mention that one. We know that they haven't equalled us as far as the provision of hospital beds. We know in Alberta there are countless people — I believe the last figure I received was some 400,000 people that are not covered with an adequate hospitalization plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in Saskatchewan when people talk of dividends — I suggest the people of Saskatchewan have been getting a dividend ever since the Provincial treasury started to make contributions to the hospital plan, to make up for the deficit that was not covered by the compulsory payment. This is the duty of a government. The duty of a Government, Mr. Speaker, is not to collect taxes and then disperse it in small payments here and there, in a so-called dividend. The duty of a Government is to collect taxes and to provide service, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this budget indicates that this is what this Government is doing, and that we are not participating in a grandiose give-away program, accomplishing exactly nothing, as they have done in Alberta and B.C. I suggest their money could be better spent to provide pioneer homes, nursing homes and hospitals, and better education facilities. So that when anyone suggests that we are not giving from our mineral resources, and so on, as good a deal that the people of Alberta are getting, I suggest they are wrong, and I think a gradual steady building and provision for the needy of this province is an excellent one, and I think that the Cabinet and the Provincial Treasurer should be congratulated on the method in which they have handled this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a bit more about the North Battleford area, and again will go back to the rural field. I wonder if the monies allocated to the Department of Municipal Affairs on the market road grid is not of benefit to the farmers, and I wonder if the some \$62,000 that was allocated to the municipalities in my constituency in equalization and in the market road grid plan, is not going to be of direct benefit to the municipalities, like some of the hon. members opposite to go up and try to convince any of the councils in any of the municipalities in that area that this was not a direct benefit to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about various things; there is so much to be said as to what the benefit of this particular budget is to the rural people of Saskatchewan, that we could take up a great deal of time. However, I am not going to indulge in a talkathon, like the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has already done during this Session. I suggest that if he wants to participate in one of those with me, he would be out of his league, because that's my business . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — It's mine, too.

Mr. Kramer: — But I don't think the valuable time of this House should be taken up with non-essentials. I think I have dealt with this budget; I have answered some of the criticism of the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), the financial critic, and with that, I shall say I am very, very proud and pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support the budget.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the Budget Debate, I would like to extend congratulations to the previous speakers, and particularly to the financial critic for the Official Opposition, the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I am certain the difficulty that faced the Provincial Treasurer in delivering the Budget on Budget day, and his challenges, was definitely met by the official critic for the Opposition,

I am going to deal with only one or two aspects of the budget which we have before us this afternoon, because of the fact that there will be other members from both the Opposition and Government sides of the House, speaking to the question before us at the present moment.

There have been many statements made in this debate, and I believe possibly also in previous budget debates, usually emanating from the Government side of the House, with regard to the past. So,

March 5, 1958

if once or twice in the course of my remarks, I turn back to reference to things that have taken place in regard to budgets of the past, I hope that I will be excused for so doing.

In my opening remarks I would like to deal first with what I believe to be the most important problem which the Government of this province, and the people of this province, have to deal with at the present time; a problem which, during the last few days, we have recognized in this House by a very lengthy discussion on the question of education. I am pleased to see that at least some extra assistance has been given in the budget, and that another increase in the grants to our school districts has been made. I would like to turn back, because, after all, it isn't what happens in one budget, but what happens in a continuation of budgets, which affects the conditions of a particular department of government, or a particular phase of government in this province, such as education.

In looking back to the past, to the budgets of some of the years gone by, which have been referred to by other members of this House back as far as 1935-36, we find that, in that particular year, 21 per cent of the total budget of the province went towards education. Then we come down to the period when the present Government came to office, and we find that they started off in their first year by providing 14 per cent of the total budget for the purposes of education, and they run along at about the same percentage up until the year 1952. I have made the statement on previous occasions in this House and throughout the country, that there was no practical increase in the contribution of this Government towards education before the year 1952. In that year we find the percentage of the budget of this province contributed towards education remained at 14 per cent in the year 1952, and the first increase of any extent was to be found in 1953.

I contend that the position we find ourselves in in this province today with regard to education was due to the fact that there were no increases during that period of eight years when educational costs were increasing in the schools of this province, and no further portion of the budget was dedicated to the assistance of those who were dealing with matters relating to education in the province.

On many occasions we have heard references to the problem of education as it stands at the present moment, as if possibly we haven't had to face in past years many of those same problems. I have heard, during the present budget debate and in

past years, the statement that at the present time we are facing a particular problem with regard to the largeness of classes in this province. I find, however, in looking up the Report of the Department of Education that, in the year 1937, there were more students taking high school grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 in the province of Saskatchewan than there are in this present year, and at that particular time there was very little difference, figuratively speaking, in the population of our province as between that year and the present time. There were 3,000 more students attending high school in the year 1937 than there are at the present date. So I say that, when people contend that there has been an improvement in our educational system, that there has been an enlargement in the numbers taking high school work, the facts don't quite bear out the statements made in this regard. In the years gone by as many, if not more, of our young people have gone into our high schools, and have gone through our high schools.

Just here, today, I was handed a Return that came down from the Minister with regard to high school examinations, which bears out exactly the same thing. There has been very little improvement in education in this province down through the years, whether it be in regard to the numbers receiving education in our schools, or whether it be in connection with the type of education they are receiving in our schools, because the results handed down here today, in the Grades 11 and 12 vary very little over the period of years from 1929-30 down to the present time with regard to the successes or failures of students in the schools of our province.

I believe that in the past number of years from 1944 (when this Government took office) to the present day, had the contribution of the Government been continued at a level equal to at least 20 per cent of the budget, as it had been in most cases in previous years; if it had been maintained at least at that level then we would not be in the position we are at the present time, concerning which members on the Government side and on this side state that we have a problem with regard to education in the province of Saskatchewan. I maintain that, at the present time, if that policy had been followed, if the required amount of funds had been provided by this Government during the past years for educational purposes, we would not be facing the financial crisis we are at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member has said that at least 30 times. I've counted them.

Mr. McCarthy: — At least he's saying something. You are not!

March 5, 1958

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, with regard to speeches on the other side both today and in the past addresses during this debate, a great deal has been said with regard to the Crown Corporations. I know my hon. friend across the way will say that this is repetition, but I can assure him that anything that is worthwhile saying is worthwhile repeating, just to remind him of the mistakes and errors of the Government across the way.

With regard to Crown Corporations, we heard the Provincial Treasurer, in the course of his budget address, making claim to the fact that, because of the results of the operations and the Corporations that have been established by the Government of this province that the people have derived many benefits from those operations.

Mr. Speaker, the profits of the smaller corporations are handed down from year to year, but some of the facts and information with regard to those profits are not made available, in most cases, to the people of this province. The fact is that, in two instances, the proper expenses that should be allocated to these Crown Corporations are not so allocated in the reports, when the reports are being made by members of this Government to the people of the province. One, of course, is with regard to the advances made to the various Crown Corporations for capital purposes. We have discovered that, I would say in most cases, about half of the advances that have been made interest-free have not been for capital purposes, but have been for purposes of working expenses throughout the year, in order to maintain inventory and for other purposes of that type, money which the Crown Corporations had been receiving free of any interest charges.

During this past year we find the interest that should have been charged on these advances would amount to some \$113,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, to get a proper perspective as far as the Corporations' profits are concerned, you would have to reduce the profit in this one instance, as reported by the Provincial Treasurer, by the sum of \$113,000 which should have been paid out by these organizations in interest charges.

Then we find that one of the main items running through most of the Corporations, which helps to contribute to the profits that are shown, is a sale of capital assets of those organizations. I would feel that, in the sale of the capital assets of the Corporation, this money should be turned back, not included as a profit of that organization. It should be turned back to the Government Finance Office to apply on the capital advances made by the Government to that particular corporation. If this were done again, we would find that the profits of these various corporations would be reduced immeasurably.

Now, to turn to the third reason why I feel that the people of this province, when the Provincial Treasurer states that the Crown Corporations are adding to the benefits of the people of this province, the third reason I say his figures are not quite correct is this. He usually fails to tell the people of this province that many of these Crown Corporations (and I have a list of them all here), are doing business with the Government, in other words, the profits are coming mainly out of the pockets of the people of this province through expenditures of the Government.

We find, in looking down the list of these Crown Corporations, that since this Government came into office we have had the establishment of 20 Crown Corporations. Out of those 20, nine have gone broke; nine of them are no longer with us. That is almost 50 per cent of them, and half of the tenth corporation went 'out the window' this past summer with the closing of the Bishopric plant. So we find that 50 per cent of the Corporations established since 1946 — a short period of 12 years — have had their services dispensed with by the Government, due to their failure to produce any benefits to the people of this province.

We find that, of the ones remaining, the Saskatchewan Forest Products, the Timber Board division is where the main profits shown by the Government in their Crown Corporations result from: the Timber Board operations of this province. But one thing we must remember in the operations of this Board is that it is a compulsory organization in which the lumber operators in the northern part of this province must deliver their produce, and then the Corporation can go out and sell that produce, and whatever they make over and above what they pay the producer; it doesn't go back, as it does to the fisherman. I wondered quite often, Mr. Speaker, what the difference is between a fisherman, a lumberman and a farm producer. We find that this Government has made a difference between producers of various raw products in this province. The fishermen have a Board, which is fairly closely related to the Board which is established for the farmers — a Producers Marketing Board in the position of the Fish Board as it stands today. This wasn't true originally, as the Fish Board originally also was a compulsory organization. But since this Government has come into office, it set up the Board in that time, and then actually dispensed with that organization as well, because it has changed from a compulsory board to a voluntary board to which the fishermen could sell their products or not as they decided themselves. But the Timber Board to this date has been retained as a compulsory organization under which the Government of this province can make money at the expense of the producers of timber in the

March 5, 1958

northern part of this province. Then they come to us and say, "Look at the success we've had with our Crown Corporations. We've made \$499,000 in the Timber Board." That was the figure they quoted; but with the interest charges on the capital advances taken off, it would be somewhere in the of \$400,000 this past year — money taken out of the pockets of the timber producers in the north part of this province.

Then we come down to the Fish Marketing Division, the Fur Marketing Division and the Government Trades Division. All three branches are comparatively small. The Fish Marketing, when interest on working capital is taken off, would have a profit of \$369; the Fur Marketing Division would have a profit of \$5,140 and the Trading Division would have a profit of about \$7,335. But here again, Mr. Speaker, we find an example of the Government, in a large percentage of the work done in these three branches, doing business once again with itself, providing funds to show a profit for these Crown Corporations.

Then we came to some of the larger Corporations. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office is another instance of the practice of the Government to claim success for their organizations, due to the fact that the people of this province are forced to pay in premiums to them without any commission being received by anyone in this province. In this connection, in the last year alone, if you were to take a normal commission from the sales of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to the Government, to schools, hospitals, and other organizations, you would find that it would cost them \$208,000, normally, in order to look after the sale of the business that has been done in that way. That is money that has been put into the treasury of the Government Insurance Office at the expense of the people of this province, and, if taken out, would show not a profit over the past year, but a loss of some \$36,000 over the operations of the present year, if you took off a very reasonable commission, which is more reasonable than most of the commissions allowed to the agents on ordinary business for the Government Insurance Office. If that had to be paid on that business, it would be the difference of \$208,000 to the final surplus or profits of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office.

Now, to continue with the various branches, we came down to the Saskatchewan Government Printing Company. This is another one that proves quite successful and has proved successful over the past years, because we (the members here) are voting the money that is going to be spent to provide the profits to this particular Corporation. It isn't in competition with anyone.

If the Government of this province finds that it can't look after its own printing, then it will go out on to the ordinary market and have other printers do the business for them; but if it finds that the Government Printing Office can look after all their printing, then they can go out and charge what rates they want, because they are the only ones that use the services of the particular Corporation. They can charge what rates they want, and show any type of profit they want at the end of the particular year that the Corporation is reporting for. So again, the Saskatchewan Printing Company shows a success, but only because of the fact that the people of this province, up to the present, have agreed that they can show it by the Government providing themselves the profits for this particular Corporation.

The Saskatchewan Transportation Company is one I don't think anyone in this province has any particular complaint with. The Minister in charge this afternoon spoke for a few moments with regard to the operation of this particular Corporation. I am going to say here that I think he is operating this particular corporation in the same way as ordinary business does operate. He has made changes in most cases where business hasn't warranted full coverage for that particular area by the Transportation Company, and he has not made changes in routes. He has cut out some lines. I understand he has turned some lines back to private enterprises as well, which the Saskatchewan Transportation Company found that it could not operate economically itself. So I say that, even here, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company is not, as he says, a service organization, but is half-and-half. Those, he feels, or the Corporation feels, are making use of the service, will get service, just as under any other private company. Those they feel are not holding up their end with regard to the provision of this service will have it either discontinued, or else the Government will get out of the business in that particular field, and let someone else take it over who can make a profit, and make that line economical.

So, Mr. Speaker, in running through practically all of the Corporations that still exist today, we find that almost without exception, the only reason they are showing a profit at the present time is for the three reasons that were originally mentioned:

March 5, 1958

(1) because they don't have to pay interest on the majority of loans as ordinary business does nor the loans they make for operating purposes;

(2) because they have shown the sale of assets, which were made possible through capital loans without interest from the people of this province, as part of the profit statement of those Corporations, and

(3) of course, the fact that, almost without exception each one depends on either force or compulsion on the part of the Government in order to make its operation successful.

I might say that, if it takes force on the part of the Government to attempt to prove the policies of Socialism, I think it's about time, and I think the people of this province are realizing it's about time, that this Government was relieved of its responsibility and that a new Government was set up to take its place, and to look after the affairs of the people of this province.

There is one other branch of government I wish to make reference to, this afternoon, and that has to do with the statement in the budget address which was made by the Provincial Treasurer on budget day. This is the statement that was made by the Provincial Treasurer, to be found on page 23 of his Budget Address:

"Despite our concentration on local government problems and measures to strengthen the economy of Saskatchewan, care has been taken in the formulation of this budget to ensure that our basic and long-standing concern, the welfare of the Province's citizens, has not been neglected. The 1958-59 budget provides for further advances in health and welfare to maintain Saskatchewan's outstanding leadership in Canada in these fields. A gross amount of nearly \$50,000,000 will be devoted" (he didn't state the exact figure) "to the programs of these two departments next year."

I find, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer has found a very good way to bring about statements in his address on the budget.

Looking at the summary of estimated expenditures for the year 1958-59, we find that, in regard to Public Health, there has been a reduction, not an increase; not a gain for health, but a reduction in the estimated expenditures for Public Health of \$491,200. Then he has picked up some of it by transferring the expenditure for Public Health to Social Welfare. He increases Social Welfare by some \$756,300. In other words, he takes from one of the Social Welfare departments and gives to the other, in order to prove the statement that he has made in his budget address.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to correct that. The hon. member just left out one little word, the word 'gross'. I spoke of the 'gross' amount of nearly \$50 million. He referred to the fact that the total expenditures for health had been reduced. That statement is not true. The total expenditures, the gross expenditures, are to be found on the bottom of page 36 of the printed estimates, and are up from \$28 million, an increase of \$4.8 million. I'm sure he would like to be accurate in his facts.

Mr. Gardiner: — Where did you find that figure, please?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Page 36 in the printed estimates. The bottom of the page shows 'Gross Expenditures for Health'.

Mr. Cameron: — Why bother with one misstatement?

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, if I've made an error in that regard, I should have probably mentioned that it was to the revenue statement that I was making reference, and with regard to expenditures on the revenue statement, the expenditures are divided in the way that I said — a reduction in the expenditures under the Department of Public Health, and an increase in the Department of Social Welfare. So, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been any great increase if we were to take the capital figures, as requested by the Provincial Treasurer . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct this again. It is not a question of capital expenditure. We are talking of gross expenditure, which means the total amount of money spent, before the reimbursements. The total shown on page 36 is \$32.9 million, and for Social Welfare, on page 42, the total is \$16.1 million. If you add those together it gives you \$49.1 million; that's where I got the figure of nearly \$50 million.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, that was just your figure in reference to that, yes. I didn't realize that was after

March 5, 1958

reimbursements are made . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Before reimbursements; this the gross expenditure, before the reimbursements.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the statement that the Provincial Treasurer has made now, there is not great increase, as he would like people to believe, in expenditures for health and social services in the budget that has been presented to us by himself. I will be prepared to admit, as I said previously, that there has been a small increase in this particular field; but the impression he left with me in making his address, and I am sure with the people of this province, too, was that there was a great increase being made, this coming year, in the field of social welfare.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the increase is \$6.8 million out of \$42 million.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, you've made your speech. I'll make mine.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Stick to the facts.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I'll never bother you as long as they're true.

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, in regard to public health and in regard to health services, there have been statements made by certain members on the other side of the House, and I would like to say, in connection with public health, and particularly hospitalization, that the people of this province are definitely paying the greatest part of the cost of the hospitalization scheme as it exists at the present time, due to the fact that they are paying not only to the Education and Hospital tax one per cent by which it has been increased since this Government came into office for that purpose, but also through the coming into force of the hospital card system, which also contributes a large percentage to the cost and operation of the hospital scheme in this province. So, I believe we could say that the credit for the success in the present operations of the hospital scheme in this province must go to the people to whom it has always belonged since the beginning of this province, because, long before the present Government came into office, men who have sat this House played a big part in working out the formulation of the early municipal schemes in this province, to make possible the eventual plans that were put into effect in this province in 1947. I don't think there is anyone who will deny the fact that the people of this province, the men along with the government of the day, worked together to make possible the success in the field of health that this province had prior to the time this present Government came into office.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, in bringing my remarks to a close (and before closing I would like to leave this thought), that after the report of the Department of Highways, this afternoon, I was busy at the time the statement was made, and missed the statement of the Minister with regard to highway work in the various constituencies. However, on speaking to him afterwards, I find that, as I expected, there was no work contemplated in my constituency during the present year. I had hoped there would be some. Last year during the Session I made reference to one of the highways in my constituency which the candidate in the last provincial election promised would be re-constructed following the election of a C.C.F. Government in this province. Since two years have now gone by, I fully expected the promise would be carried out; but, since the Minister of Highways has brought down his statement this afternoon, and states there will be no extensive work done on Highway No. 22 the present year, I must take it this means he has the same opinion as last year, namely that the road is not in condition to warrant reconstruction and repair job being done in this present year.

I hope that, at least before the next election, he may see fit to carry out the promise that was made by his particular candidate prior to the last campaign in this province. I might state also that the money was even voted for the work that was to be done on that particular highway. I don't know what it was spent on when it wasn't used there, but the money must have been spent some place else, either in his department, or in other departments of government. So I hope and trust that, before the next election he will see fit to return that appropriation to the place it was voted for, and that he will see that a reconstruction job is done on at least that section of the road that was promised to the people, prior to the last election campaign.

In connection with the work of the Department of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I received the impression, and I am sure that most municipal men in the province did, and in spite of stories that have been told by members on the Government side today about the great things the Government is doing in various fields. Those are things that have been done down throughout history, and haven't claimed to have been done particularly for the municipalities. Contributions have been made by Governments to all the fields mentioned by the members on the Government side of the House, down through the years in these various branches, and no one has claimed they were particularly labelled for the services of the municipalities of this province. I got the direct impression, and I am sure most municipal men in this province did when they listened to the address of the Provincial Treasurer, both in his voice and in the words he used, that, until the municipalities of this province are prepared to knuckle down to the orders and the directions of the Government of this province

March 5, 1958

with regard to reorganization, there will be no sizable assistance handed out to the municipalities for them to use as they will in regard to their own business and their own responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to education, as I stated last year, I felt, and still feel, that the Government of this province should accept at least 50 per cent of the cost of education in this province. I also stated that I felt that they should accept a greater share of the cost of the construction and also maintenance of the grid road system of this province. For those two reasons, if for no other, and because of the fact that they have failed, in the budget in those two fields to the extent required at the present time, I will have to vote against the budget.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down would he mind telling me what year he was referring to when these expenditures were 23 per cent. I took down 1935-36, is that right?

Mr. Gardiner: — 1935-36.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I wonder where you got that figure.

Mr. Gardiner: — Right from 1935-36, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I think you'd better check it again. It doesn't seem right.

Mr. Gardiner: — I got it from the Budget Address.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It is for 1932-33.

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend the Mental Hygiene Act — be now read a second time.

Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, because of the additional mental health clinics that we have established throughout the province, it is necessary to have these amendments made as they relate to the overall program of the operation of our mental institutions. With that explanation, I move second reading.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I think is so great that it amounts almost to a change of principle. Now, there might be something that the Minister has failed to point out that might change this aspect of it, but it appears to me that this proposed amendment takes away the right of an individual who has lived in the province of Saskatchewan for a period of 30 days to be admitted into one of our mental institutions, and that time has now extended from 30 days to a period of 12 months. As I understand it, even under the Hospitalization Act, only a period of six months is the required period of rest in the province, and as I understand it, that has been changed by an Act which we gave third reading to just a very short time ago. So that now as long as someone is truly a resident of the Province of Saskatchewan, he or she has the right to be admitted, and to have the benefit of our laws, and the treatment that we can give them in the hospital for a physical ailment.

On the other hand, for a mental ailment or for drug addiction, or alcohol addiction which surely, Mr. Speaker, is just as serious an ailment, we discriminate against these people to a far greater degree. On the physical aspect we are taking away that qualification of six months' rest, and are making it open to everybody who is a resident of the province, and then on the other hand, in mental illness, which we are trying to make people realize is an illness, like a physical illness, and not to be socially discriminated against, and which this Government has done fine work, I think, in perpetrating this idea of trying to make people not scorn and look down on mental patients; yet we are passing an amendment and making it necessary for someone to reside in the province of Saskatchewan for the period of one whole year, instead of the usual 30 days, before being able to take advantage of our facilities.

March 5, 1958

I think that is very wrong and entirely repugnant to everything the Department of Health has professed to be doing for mental patients. Surely it is against everything various organizations in Saskatchewan have been trying to do for the benefit of mental patients, and I think year after year it has become clearer to all our people that alcohol addiction, or drug addiction is a very serious condition, and one that certainly needs help. These people and their families are liable to become dependents of the Government, whereas they are apt to cost us a lot more money in the final cumulative respect, if they don't get immediate treatment, and I certainly am against any type of discrimination, particularly discrimination to the point of making it necessary for them to reside in this province for one year. I can see no reason for it at all, and will certainly oppose this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the hon. member that this constitutes discrimination at all, because we presume that the other provinces to which these patients are returned, have, if not the equal facilities that we have in Saskatchewan, certainly facilities to take care of these people for whom they have the responsibility. As a matter of fact, this amendment coincides with the practice that has been followed; this is reciprocal arrangement, that we have with the provinces to return, unless the person is a resident in this province for a year, the province from which he has come; likewise any resident of Saskatchewan outside our borders who becomes mentally ill, who within a period of 12 months becomes mentally ill, is returned to Saskatchewan. We are simply asking that that be put into legislation. I would suggest that it does not constitute discrimination, whatsoever.

(Referred to Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 60 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — As hon. members of the House know, there has been a very active organization known as the Uniformity Commissioners, dealing with making uniform throughout Canada the insurance law. The Uniformity Commission meets once a year and any changes suggested in one province are dealt with by the Commission, and if approved by the Commission, are then sent to all the provinces for adoption. The only legislation which we have proposed, this year, for the Insurance Act, is the legislation which is being adopted in the other provinces on the recommendations of the Uniformity Commission. I move Second Reading the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

(Referred to Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act — carries some amendments, largely recommended by the rural municipal associations. It has been suggested to the Government that the indemnity for attending meetings be increased from \$8 to \$10; and that the mileage allowance be increased from 10 to 11 cents per mile.

It was also suggested to us that in view of the large amount of money handled by rural municipal secretary-treasurers that their bonds should be increased from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Provisions are also made for the licensing of the operator of trailer parks and camps, the same suggestion that was made for consideration by the Assembly in the other urban Act.

The rural municipalities also suggested that they would like to have definite authority to issue permits on roads that are carrying a weight limit. In other words, if someone comes along with a truck with a load in excess of the load limit allowed on that road by the municipality, then the municipalities suggested they would like to have the authority of issuing a permit and deciding on what the permit should cost the person it is issued to.

Provisions are made for the removal of obstructions from an area — or should I say, from 150 feet from the centre of the road, in order that those roads may be reasonable free of snow and other obstructions.

You will probably recall, a year or so ago, we put a section in the Rural Municipal Act under the heading of 'Weather Modifications'. The experience of the group of co-operators interested in this, during the first year, was such that they suggested some modification to the section dealing with weather modification; and as mentioned when given Second Reading to the Urban Act we are making provisions, also, in the Rural Municipal Act for a change in the basis of assessing grain elevators.

We are also acting on the suggestion of the elevator companies and endorsed by the rural municipal people that the elevator tax list be sent out — the first list at the commencement of the new crop year and the revised list in January, with a further revised list in April. This has been brought about, I think, largely as a result of the basis and methods of delivering grain

March 5, 1958

under the quota system that we have at the present time.

Then there is another amendment to the obligation, or the liability of the municipality in connection with the flood damages that might be levied against a municipality by a ratepayer who is of the opinion that the municipality might be responsible for obstructions that have caused flooding of his land.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving Second Reading of an Act to amend The Rural Municipal Act.

(Referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.