

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
17th Day

Friday, March 7, 1958

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
Before the Orders of the Day:

WELCOMING STUDENTS

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Health): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the House a group of high school students from Milestone, Grade IX class, whom I am sure we all welcome here this afternoon. It is my hope that this afternoon will prove both enjoyable and educational to them. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that their presence here is entirely coincidental with my adjournment of the debate last night.

WELCOMING STUDENTS

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to introduce to the House a group of fine pupils in the gallery who come from my school accompanied by their principal, Mr. Vickery. He has just come out from England recently to take charge of our school, and we are very happy to have him there. On behalf of the House, I am sure everyone will join me in welcoming these fine young people to the Assembly, and I hope it will prove instructive and educational to them.

PRODUCT OF SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members that I have had, by permission of the Speaker, placed on your desks something that looks like yeast cakes, but actually it is a product of Saskatchewan. It is northern poplar that has been processed overseas and made into what is called chipboard. The hon. members might be interested to note the fine quality material, which doesn't warp or shrink, and which is excellent for the building trade.

March 7, 1958

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Thursday, March 6, 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).

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks yesterday I congratulated the Provincial Treasurer on his budget, and expressed the hope that he will remain with us for many years to come. I also congratulated the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), the financial critic of the Opposition. I also dealt briefly on the expansion which has taken place in this province since the coming into power of a C.C.F. Government, and it is on this theme, among other things, that I now continue the rest of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, when one considers the great development that has occurred with respect to oil and uranium which I mentioned yesterday, the developing of the two huge potash plants, one at Saskatoon, and the other at Esterhazy, who have until now spent \$50 million to bring these two plants into production; the smaller industries that have been established, such as the Saskatchewan Cement Company as well as the now \$3 million pipe steel plant in Regina, the \$2 million vitrified products plant, producing sewer pipe and sewer line, and at Weyburn a cable and wire factory, and recently a \$2 million factory to produce the first mobile homes in Saskatchewan, a now \$3 million fibre board plant at Saskatoon, utilizing straw as the basic material — then the proposed building of a plant at the Steelman Oil field — a plant to process casinghead gas into commercial fuel, such as propane, butane, natural gasoline, sulphur and dry residue gas. Besides these there have been many other smaller industries established, among them being the one the Premier mentioned before the Orders of the Day yesterday, which are making tremendous contributions to our industrial progress in this province.

I mention these, Mr. Speaker, to show at what pace industrial progress has been taking place in Saskatchewan, and this progress I submit, eloquently subjects the confidence and faith that private enterprise has in this administration.

Co-operative enterprise since 1944 has grown by leaps and bounds and Saskatchewan has become the leading co-operative province in Canada. The C.C.F. Government early recognized the importance of co-operative development in a province like Saskatchewan, and by setting up the Department of Co-operation, early indicated the need for government participation in such a vital function.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that, when people are given the opportunity to work and strive collectively together, they can move the proverbial mountains. An example of the power of co-operation — look at the Saskatchewan Pool elevators, which number some 1,141, whose membership hauls 50 per cent of the grains grown in Saskatchewan to those elevators. The sprawling Co-op Refinery that had its inception in the midst of depression and adversity, but with resolute purpose and supreme faith in the co-operative principle, has grown into a veritable giant, with a net capital investment of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10 million, and capable of refining 16 million barrels of oil per day. In addition, the Co-op Refineries are adding a \$1,300,000 plant for the purpose of manufacturing petroleum coke. That plant has begun construction recently.

From the 41 co-operative oil wells, the Co-op Refineries receive now 15 per cent of their oil requirements. Consumer Co-operatives have experienced phenomenal growth as well since 1944, and today they number 393 associations, with a membership in excess of 176,000 people. And credit, Mr. Speaker, is where it rightly belongs, and that is in the hands of the people — being provided increasingly through Credit Unions. The number of Credit Unions in Saskatchewan has grown from 163 in 1944 to 284 in 1957.

Probably the best example of the magnitude of Co-operative enterprise in Saskatchewan is best recognized when one considers the fact that co-operative enterprises in Saskatchewan in 1956 transacted some \$436,201,507 million worth of business.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to public enterprise. The principal of public ownership has long been recognized by every government throughout the world. It is recognized by the Federal Government, and has been for many years, and why the Liberal party in Saskatchewan should become so exercised about public enterprise in our province presents at once a conundrum and a baffling contradiction. I am inclined to think that the attitude of the Opposition to public ownership in Saskatchewan arises out of a guilt complex. For 34 years, the Liberal party sat on this side of the House, inert, inept and in sweet oblivion. The gentlemen to your left, Mr. Speaker, are very sensitive to the conditions or things which widen the gap between their position in this House and to that of becoming the Government of Saskatchewan. I suggest that the record of the C.C.F. Government in public enterprise has continued to widen that gap.

As the Provincial Treasurer pointed out in his address, the total volume of sales and services of the Crown Corporations increased by 11 per cent over last year, rising to more than \$63 million, and at the end of December, 1957, there were 5,144 men and women employed in the various Crown Corporations, and the total payroll for the year amounted to more than \$18 million. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is a big

March 7, 1958

operation in any language. The net surpluses, after interest, as we know, amounts to some \$4 1/2 million. But, Mr. Speaker, the justification for public ownership lies not solely in the profits that can be shown; it lies in the fact that certain services can best be rendered by public ownership, when such ownership otherwise could constitute a monopoly to the detriment of society as a whole.

The justification for public ownership lies also in the fact that where private enterprise fails to render the services required to the community, or fails to develop a resource, the materials of which are essential to industry, then I submit it is the responsibility of the Government to provide such services, and to develop such resources.

Mr. Speaker, with this concept in mind, the C.C.F. Government embarked on a program of public ownership soon after its election to office in 1944. I am not going to belabour this House with the financial operations of the Crown Corporations, except to refer the hon. members of the Opposition to page 11 of the budget address, where they will find a 'Summary of Results of Operations of Crown Corporations for the Years ending in 1957'. I would exhort also the hon. gentlemen to diligently attend the Crown Corporations where they can secure a wealth of information and facts from the Crown Corporations. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations concerning the effects of public ownership: by the setting up of the Timber Board, the ruthless exploitation of our forest resources that had threatened to denude our vast timber stand to the extent that, according to experts, would require 100 years to re-grow, came to an end,. The policy for the orderly cutting of our timber was instituted, as well as a program for conservation and reforestation, thereby assuring succeeding generations of their timber requirements.

A Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, sat on this side of the House when this ruthless exploitation was at its peak, and what did they do about it? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they did not do as much as Nero; at least he fiddled while Rome burned! The Fish and Fur Marketing Services have had a stabilizing effect on those industries, and together with government trading in northern Saskatchewan, have put an end to the exploiters of the natives, and the fast-buck operators have put them out of business entirely, or have limited their operations. The Saskatchewan Government Airways was set up primarily to service our northern area. This Corporation has contributed immeasurably to the opening and the development of our northern areas. I suggest that its record of performance and safety has been an enviable one, indeed.

The development of the sodium sulphate industry in Saskatchewan is an interesting one, because it is an example of where private enterprise failed to develop a rich resources and a lucrative industry. Over 10 per cent of all the known sulphate deposits on the

continent are found in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great pride and satisfaction that this industry not only provided work for Saskatchewan citizens, but has returned gratifying surpluses to the treasury, as well. In 1946, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office was set up under legislation. The then Liberal Opposition called it 'the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon a unsuspecting people by a Government'. Now, Mr. Speaker, this hoax has saved the Saskatchewan motorist, property owner, farmer and city dweller alike, millions of dollars in premiums. Moreover, millions of premium dollars have remained in Saskatchewan, where otherwise they have been going to the head offices of insurance companies in Toronto and Montreal, and elsewhere.

But what is most significant here, Mr. Speaker, is that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has restored, at least to Saskatchewan, the ancient art of competitions and that accounts for the lowest insurance rates anywhere in the Dominion of Canada.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation was established because here again, private enterprise was either not prepared, or was unable to develop a program of rural electrification of such magnitude that it was necessary to bring power to all of our farmers, small villages and towns in Saskatchewan. The Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, that sat in office here prior to 1944, apparently was quite content that the acme of progress had been reached with the coal oil lamp and lantern!

Like yourself, Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer and I believe you will agree that there is not much vision with a lantern on a dark and windy night. Sometimes the lantern goes out, and you stand in darkness. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that neither of us have carried a lantern for a long time, but the experience that it has presented presents a nearly perfect analogy to the Liberal Party. Even when rural electrification was being undertaken by this Government, the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner discredited it, by saying it was too costly, and urged farmers to install windchargers, instead.

Mr. Speaker, no one can tell you better than the farmer what electrification has meant to him. For years he has carried a lantern, and for years his wife did her evening work by the dim light of a coal oil lamp. They will tell you that power has not only lighted up their homes, but their hearts. How the many menial tasks have been lightened, and the burdens eased. How life on the farm has taken on real meaning, in that the amenities of modern living have been brought to their homes.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation, as everyone knows, has now hooked up some 47,000 farms and all towns and villages in Saskatchewan, as well as bringing power to numerous industries, and

March 7, 1958

the oil fields. I submit that only through public ownership was electrification program of this magnitude possible. But in this regard, the Liberal Party, I must say, apparently had a change of heart, for when rural electrification really got rolling by 1952, they thought public ownership was a good thing — so good, in fact that in the 1952 election they promised the farmers that, if elected, they would install power free of charge on the farm.

There are other Crown Corporations that I could mention, and the real contribution that each has made to our economy, but the foregoing, which I have briefly reviewed, together with the operations and activities of private and co-operative enterprise will indicate, I am sure, that Saskatchewan has come a long way indeed, from the time when she was only famous for her wheat.

I would suggest to the hon. members to your left, Mr. Speaker, that they look up and around and try to rediscover Saskatchewan. I can assure my hon. friends, Mr. Speaker, that if they make a conscientious evaluation of the industrial progress that has taken place in the last 10 years or so, and what it has meant to our province. It would provide a real lift to their despondent and jaded spirit. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one who is sincerely interested in the growth and development of our province can fail to feel pride in what has taken place with respect to industrialization and our progress. Nor can they fail to give expression to a confident hope of a great future of Saskatchewan.

I should like to briefly comment on some aspects of the Department of Public Health, over which it is my privilege and honour to preside. It will be seen from a perusal of the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1957, that the Department of Public Health accounts for the largest total for ordinary expenditure to be voted of any department of Government — some \$27,179,840. This figure does not at all suggest that the Provincial Treasurer had some special deference for my department. This figure, amounting to almost as much money as the total provincial budget in 1943, reflects the real concern this Government has for the health and well-being of the people of this province. It also suggests the magnitude of the health programs originated by this administration since 1944.

The modern health department, in a democratic society, no longer confines itself largely to the enforcement of regulations, nor does it work in virtual isolation from the community. Our health department, Mr. Speaker, seeks to gain its objective of higher standards of individual community and health, by working in close co-operation with the public it serves. To achieve this co-operation, the Department of Public Health has been most fortunate in engaging men and women highly trained in special skills that are required to administer and interpret the many health programs that affect the community at large.

I submit that the success of any program depends upon the kind of people that carry it out, and I want to say here that the outstanding success of our health program in Saskatchewan is due, not only to the high degree of training of our doctors, nurses and technicians and health educators, and so on, but to their dedication to public health and an inordinate sense of devotion to duty. I want to publicly express my appreciation to those fine and devoted people down from my Deputy Minister, Dr. Roth, to the nurses in the remotest areas, for the excellent job they have done. May I say, in addition, Mr. Speaker, that they constitute the finest health organizations in Canada.

The Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan enjoys the same high endorsement it has received through previous years. Like everything else, hospital operations and hospital maintenance has not been immune to inflation. Hospital services costs have continued to rise through the removal of price control. For example, the average cost per patient day for care of adults or children has risen from \$4.65 to \$13.13 per patient day in 1957. However, notwithstanding the depressed financial condition of the rural areas, the plan provides protection against hospitalization costs for between 97 and 98 per cent of the population eligible to participate in the plan. Since there has been a lot of talk recently about national hospital insurance, it might be well to review at this time what the Saskatchewan Hospital Services plan has done for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it has largely removed the economic barrier to hospital care for most of the residents of this province, thereby making it possible for them to obtain hospital care when necessary. Provision of hospital care for many persons has changed considerably, in that it is now based on medical necessity for such care, rather than on the ability to pay for it. It assures Saskatchewan's public general hospitals of regular payments and adequate revenue; thereby making it possible for them to provide essential services of high quality. It has been a major factor in stimulating hospital construction in Saskatchewan, to a point where the needs of the province, with respect to such accommodation is directly related to the accommodation available. During the past 11 years of operation, moreover, the standards of hospital services available to the residents of the province have greatly improved.

The plan has also made it possible for municipalities to insure against the cost of hospital care required by their indigent residents, in that municipalities are required to pay the hospitalization tax on behalf of their indigent residents; and they may also pay on behalf of any of their residents. The advantage to municipalities in this regard is explained by the fact that the proceeds from the hospitalization tax represents less than one-half of the total hospitalization

March 7, 1958

for the plan. Statistical data obtained from the plan's experience has enabled the province to plan the construction of hospital facilities in accordance with the actual needs of the areas involved.

Mr. Speaker, I think it not presumptuous to say that were it not for the fact that we have demonstrated in Saskatchewan that hospital insurance was not only possible, but workable, and had we not consistently here and at Ottawa constantly carried on a battle — a relentless fight for national health insurance, thereby creating public demand, the national hospital insurance plan would not be in the state in the Parliament of Canada as it is now.

We view with regret, that national hospital insurance was not brought down at the last Session of Parliament. Both the former Federal Liberal Government and the present Government deliberately stalled on this issue so that one can only conclude that certain political motives underlie these stalling tactics. National Hospital Insurance, as it now stands — we have only the word of the Minister of National Health and Welfare for Canada — who says he is prepared at the next Session to recommend an amendment to Bill No. 320, and fix the starting date at July 1, after signing an agreement with the participating provinces.

We view with regret that mental hospitals and T.B. sanatoria were not included in the cost-sharing principal of Bill 320. The present Federal Government, when in Opposition, was loud in its condemnation of this unwarranted and inexcusable exclusion. Now that they are in office, they have become Liberals in this regard. Mr. Speaker, by excluding mental hospitals and T.B. Sanatoria. The C.C.F. members of the House of Commons had consistently asked that mental hospitals and T.B. Sanatoria be included in any national Hospital insurance plan. Just as consistently, Mr. Speaker, it has been refused. One-half of all the beds - hospital beds in Canada, are comprised of mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanatoria, and I suggest to exclude these from the benefits of national hospital insurance, it is nothing short of rank discrimination.

Like the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, the provision of cancer services in Saskatchewan has removed the economic barrier of cancer treatment for every resident suffering from cancer. Legislation passed by the C.C.F. Government in 1944 made this the first free diagnosis and free treatment program on the continent. One of the notable features of our Saskatchewan program is that the services are provided by a full-time staff of medical specialists. The Saskatchewan Cancer Commission, which reports to me as Minister of Health, operates two full-time clinics. These are the Dr. Allan Blair Clinic in Regina, and the clinic located in the University Hospital at Saskatoon.

In addition to the full-time staff of medical specialists and nurses at each clinic, the Commission employs a consulting physicist, as well as a physicist in each clinic, a consulting diagnostic radiologist and a consulting pathologist. The closest collaboration is maintained with the University of Saskatchewan. Our consulting physicist, who is a university professor, supervises the operation of the emanation plant which produces radon.

In this province we have a unique system of follow-up in all cases at the clinics. The Cancer Commission works very closely and cordially with the general practitioner; especially the family doctor, who refers his patients to the clinic in the first instance, and as a result we are able to keep in touch with patients for many years subsequent to their treatment. Such information is proving of great value, especially in cancer diagnosis and treatment. The co-operation of the patient in this regard must not be overlooked. Much of their understanding is due, I am sure, to the excellent educational work being done by the voluntary organization known as the Saskatchewan Division of the Cancer Society. This Society co-operates with the health education division of our Department in lay education, and it also provides funds for research. A social worker is attached to each clinic. The operation of two full-time clinics, Mr. Speaker, is not cheap, but neither is it expensive in relation to the value or the services provided here. The cost is about \$250 per patient admitted to the clinics for diagnosis and treatment. The total cost in recent years has amounted to somewhat over \$1 million. To give hon. members an idea of the number of patients in these clinics — new patients appearing at the clinics since January, 1957 were 5,426 and the total reviews made of these patients that have been submitted to our clinics number 15,193. This gives us an idea of the magnitude of the work that is being carried on by these two clinics.

As the Provincial Treasurer indicated in his address, the budget continues to emphasize the crucial importance of public health programs. Indeed, the underlying aim of the Department of Public Health is the preservation of life, the prevention of disease, and the promotion of good health. To this end the health regions were developed for the purpose of bringing to the smaller communities and rural districts the essential public health services which they could not provide for themselves. The basic or essential health services cover a wide field of services — communicable disease control, maternal care, infant and pre-school services, school health services mental hygiene, psychiatric services, public health nursing, sanitation, health education, nutrition and statistics. Once the basic services as I have outlined have been established in a health region, the health region board may, subject to the approval of the Minister, develop one or more additional programs for additional government-aided services, such as the preventative dental health program and the general medical service, such as in the Swift Current health region.

March 7, 1958

Up to the present time we have established nine health regions in Saskatchewan. Recently there was a merger of the Meadow Lake health region with that of the Battleford health region. As the Provincial Treasurer indicated in his address, provision has been made for the establishment of another health region in the province this year. The value of these health services to the municipalities within the health regions far exceed their cost. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that only one-third of the cost is born by the region; the other two-thirds of the cost being born by the Government, plus any amount in excess of the fifty cents tax that the municipalities are authorized to levy on their property holders.

Session in and session out, Mr. Speaker, we have been listening to the Opposition members that this Government is not doing enough for the municipality. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of record that more and more municipalities are being relieved of their responsibilities that are theirs by the Government. The record has been read to my friends by chapter and by verse. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to give them the facts, with the hope that, inasmuch as repetition wears away rock, we will eventually be able to get through to them.

Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, health services have been the responsibility of the municipality, and I trust my hon. friends to your left, will not try to dispute that fact too much. They well remember that the tens of thousands of dollars that the municipalities were required to pay for hospital care rendered to their indigent residents during the depression of the 1930's. As I pointed out in reviewing the hospital services plan, the municipalities are now able to pay the hospital tax on behalf of those indigent residents, or for any resident whose hospital care they wish or may become responsible for. The hospital tax they do pay represents less than half the hospitalization cost based on the 1957 per capita cost of \$28.92.

It would be impossible to review to any appreciable extent every activity of the department of public health this afternoon, but I would like to make a few observations on the work performed by two divisions of the Department of Public Health, sanitation and health education. Much of the work of the division of sanitation has been devoted to the education of the public in those aspects of our environment which are either definitely or potentially harmful to the well-being of the people. The sanitation services provided by the Department are designed to control to the greatest extent possible those factors that may directly or indirectly lead to the transmission of communicable diseases. For example, typhoid fever, that great scourge of mankind is today a rarity due to the application of sanitary measures that have been instituted through the years.

Sanitary officers of our Department are concerned with the day-to-day problems of food sanitation, waste disposal, hotel and restaurant inspection, plumbing, camps, recreational areas, and so on. During the year the Department of Public Health employed 46 fully trained and qualified sanitary inspectors, who carried out a total of 72,000 inspections in connection with their educational program. The division also provides technical consultative service to the rural municipalities and to the health region offices. It is also directly concerned with milk processing and milk pasteurization, and employs four milk sanatorias, whose work is directed solely to the pasteurization of milk and milk quality.

Probably there is no other food consumed by human beings that constitutes such an excellent media, in which harmful and deadly bacteria can thrive on as milk. It is obvious, therefore, why the Department of Public Health is so concerned that only pasteurized milk be consumed. It cannot be too strongly urged, Mr. Speaker, that those areas who have not access to pasteurized milk ought to pasteurize all raw milk that is intended for consumption. Perhaps the major activity of the division — that is, the sanitation division, is in the water and sewage work field. In addition to routine supervision of municipal water and treatment facilities, the division is responsible for the suitability of design of water works and sewage systems.

In recent years there has been much activity in urban modernization as well as in improvements in existing utilities. Ten years ago, the division dealt with 55 applications in this connection. Five years ago, 80 applications were processed; in 1957 there were 145 applications. Construction value represented by these applications increased from \$2 million ten years ago to over \$14 million in 1957. The division also provides free engineering services to the rural municipalities contemplating a modernization program. The service includes preliminary surveys, designs, estimates and comprehensive report. In the last five years, such work was undertaken by 35 municipalities, and of this number, 16 municipalities subsequently proceeded with the installation of water-works and/or sewage systems.

Engineers of the divisions provide the interpretation on some 8,000 water analysis conducted annually by the provincial laboratories. In addition, they exercise supervision of water supplies provided by the rural municipalities operating public water-works systems. This includes fluoridation. Seven municipalities are now adding fluorides to their drinking water, and such water is now available to some 125,000 residents of Saskatchewan.

March 7, 1958

Our health education division, Mr. Speaker, and the health educators who are attached to health regions are probably the most active in Canada, and enjoy an international reputation for the breadth of their work, and the effectiveness of their method. The health educators are necessarily concerned with every activity of the Department and deal with problems from prenatal care to the poor nutritional habits, let us say, of their grandparents. However, their concerns go even farther than this, in that they spearhead programs and develop public interest in now and unmet problems.

One of these unmet problems about which I want to speak is accidents and their prevention. When one considers that in Saskatchewan alone there are an estimated 30,000 accidents yearly, in which people are killed or hurt — that accidents are the leading cause of deaths in age groups from 1 to 35; accidents kill more than 400 Saskatchewan residents, and put more than 13,000 persons in hospital every year in our province alone, one gets some idea of the burden of sorrow, pain and economic waste on Canada as a whole. We see the burden of waste on the large sums we pay out through the Hospital Services Plan. So far we can only guess at the total load when costs for medical care, loss of income and earning power, loss of production and public assistance are taken into consideration. No one can measure the sorrow of a child mutilated or disfigured for life, or the unhappiness of a farmer who is forced to give up his land not by the cost-price squeeze, but by being disabled in an accident that might have been prevented. In 1957, 56 farm residents lost their lives in farm work accidents. We know of these 13,662 persons that accidents and injuries sent to hospitals in the province last year, 4,000 were hurt in home accidents, and 2,784 were injured in farm work. These are the two leading categories.

Of course we have been properly concerned with vehicle mishaps, but when it comes to assessing the problem as a whole, by numbers involved, we find that our homes and farms are more dangerous than our highways. An analysis of the farm accidents which put people in hospitals last year brings out some surprising facts. Animals figured in 646 such cases; for all our mechanization on the land, Mr. Speaker, horses injured 206. There were 321 people hurt handling machinery, not including tractors, which alone accounted for 156 accidents. Tractors, too, killed at least 15 persons, including several young children last year. Now, it may be seen then that accidents place a very heavy burden in loss of life, suffering, inefficiency and waste on our agricultural economy.

What have we done about this problem? Our health education division was given the task of changing this unhappy

picture and it tackled the job with vigour and with imagination. No health department, Mr. Speaker, can keep people from sickness or accidents. The best it can do is to hope to make people aware of these hazards, and help them to avoid them by bringing about changes in their environment and changes in their living and working habits.

The attack on home accidents has been placed on the well-known truism, that to reach people's minds, one must go to their hearts first. That, Mr. Speaker, seems to be the difficulty we have on this side of getting across to the Opposition.

The chief emphasis, Mr. Speaker, has been given to the tragic number of accidents involving children. One of the devices employed by the education division is our annual Child Safety Day. Similarly, in developing the farm safety program, we have found our annual farm safety week a valuable media for concentrated attacks. I bring these events to attention, not because one day or one week of safer living is going to change the situation materially, but because these special events give fresh impetus to year-round endeavours. The key-note, of course, of this work, is the involvement of the people concerned with their own safety promotion. It has been most encouraging to note that in the six years since we began our Home and Farm Safety education program there have been year-to-year decreases in the number of accidental deaths, with an overall reduction of about 30 per cent. With regard to the non-fatal accidents which result in need for hospitalization we try to pinpoint our attack on this type of accident with the confidence that we can reduce the volume of hospital care attributable to these preventable accidents.

A new and complex problem is developing, and that is the problem of our aging population. As was evident from the Saskatchewan Hospital Services report for 1957, the problem is now with us and will likely increase. The covered population of age 70 or over increased by 60.5 per cent since 1947; while these people comprised only 9.3 per cent of the covered population, they accounted for almost one-third of the hospital beds. When one counts the number of this older age group who are in mental hospitals, and geriatric centres of social welfare and in private nursing homes, the extent of care required by this group is very considerable. The situation is going to increase in magnitude for reasons that more people are saved in infancy and young adulthood to reach this age. Medical care for them is becoming better, and life is being prolonged, as a result.

March 7, 1958

A concentrated study of the whole problem of age and chronic disease is highly indicated, to bring the situation into focus. Our present society knows relatively little about this group of people — their social and health habits, and the kind of facilities that we will need to meet this growing problem. It should be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that all over North America governments and interested people of our society are just beginning to recognize that there is a problem. The steps that must be taken are many: better case finding of early disease; encouragement of older people to seek medical attention; greater attention by health personnel, doctors, hospitals, and so on; intensive treatment of chronic disease in the early stages; more attention to the prevention of the degenerative diseases, with emphasis on better nutrition, more research into the causes of diseases, and the influence of activity on the home life of older people; their breakdown whether this be physical or mental.

To successfully meet the complex problem of our aged population, Mr. Speaker, it will call upon our financial resources, our best application of medical and scientific knowledge, and above all, our best humanitarian instincts.

Another problem coming to the forefront has to do with occupational and environmental health. The Department of Public Health is not merely concerned with safe working conditions, but with healthy working conditions, as well. With the ever-increasing industrialization of the province it is clear that new problems will arise from day to day, affecting the health of those people engaged in mining and manufacturing. For example, the growing incidence of lung cancer may not be attributable to cigarettes alone. There is a considerable body of opinion that holds that certain fumes, gas, tars and the general pollution of the atmosphere is responsible for this disease as well. The interest of the Department of Public Health must be educational drawing to the attention of the people the hazards of industry, as well as of agriculture, using insecticides and chemicals. To carry out this procedure requires highly-trained medical personnel, with specialized skills that will enable them to prevent real and potential hazards, and to suggest remedial measures.

The Department of Public Health is becoming more and more concerned about radiation. The public has become very concerned and even fearful about radiation from fall-out of nuclear explosions. The Federal Government, of course, is keeping a close check on the fallouts, keeping our Department informed about it. So far, however, Mr. Speaker, there is no cause for immediate alarm. There is, however, cause for concern about the use of X-rays for medical purposes. It is conservatively estimated that the population as a whole received a much larger proportion of radiation from X-rays than from any man-made source.

The Department of Public Health is working with the medical profession to minimize the amount of exposure to patients and workers. In order to meet the foregoing problems, the occupational health branch was formed, and it is believed that in this area a real contribution to the health and well-being of our people can be made. Being a farmer, Mr. Speaker, representing one of the finest agricultural constituencies in Saskatchewan. I wish to associate myself with what has been said by members on this side of the House concerning the plight of the agricultural economy.

First, I want to say that the hon. members to your left, all of whom represent rural constituencies, judging from their speeches in this House, have a dismal appreciation of the agricultural crisis. They endeavour to lay the onus of responsibility for the situation of agriculture on the Provincial Government. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias) in his speech yesterday, said: "increased taxes and ever-mounting liabilities to municipalities and school districts and private individuals are bringing our country to ruin". Well, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, like the Bourbons, have learned nothing and they have forgotten nothing. In the first place, there are two lines of responsibility for agriculture — provincial and federal. Recently the Provincial Government has the responsibility for the extension services, improvement programs, pest control, regulation of trade of agricultural products within the province. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to find markets for grain, regulate trade in agricultural products between the sale of grain, the provinces and for exports, and to provide a general economic climate under which agriculture may prosper, Mr. Speaker.

As far as taxes are concerned, Mr. Speaker, which the hon. member for Rosthern contends are ruining the farmer, I submit that if all the taxes — school and municipal taxes were wiped out, we would have about 10 to 15 cents per bushel for wheat. I wonder, does that suggest, Mr. Speaker, this 10 or 15 cents would stabilize the agricultural industry and make the farmer prosperous?

That is why I said our friends to your left have a dismal appreciation for the real cause of the depression in agriculture. The position of the C.C.F., Government members of this Legislature, and the C.C.F. member of the House of Commons respecting the crisis in agriculture today, has been stated over and over, and it is clear and has remained constant. It represents an agricultural policy that would, if implemented, immediately begin to solve the problem of the wheat surpluses and the cost-price squeeze that, day by day, is bringing the farmer and the small business man closer and closer to complete bankruptcy and financial ruin. The former Liberal Government had failed utterly to come to grips with the problems facing agriculture; there is no more eloquent evident to support this

March 7, 1958

statement, Mr. Speaker, than to observe what happened to the Liberal Party in western Canada on June 10 last. Eight members elected west of the Great Lakes!

The fact that more C.C.F. members, Mr. Speaker, west of the Great Lakes were elected to Parliament than any other party is a clear indication that the C.C.F. policy for agriculture has the support and endorsement of the western farmer. The present Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, like the former one, has done literally nothing in formulating a policy that would move more wheat and stabilize the agricultural industry.

Mr. Cameron: — We have no Liberal government.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — I'm sorry — the present Federal Government. You fellows have been so guilty for so many years that I cannot get accustomed that there is another Government in office. The interest-free cash advance authorized by the Conservative government through the Wheat Board last fall, while it did help to put some needed cash in the farmers' hands, did not even remotely begin to solve the farmers' real problem, and that is the cost-price squeeze. The Farm Price Stabilization Bill that sets the floor of 80 per cent of the 10-year running average price of such commodities as eggs, butter, cheese, cattle, hogs, and so on, is as synonymous, Mr. Speaker, with depression, as is the Conservative Party.

Wheat, oats and barley grown in western Canada are excluded from this munificent Tory price stabilization. Mr. Speaker, I submit that, unless a policy for agriculture such as advocated by the C.C.F., parity price structure for agricultural products, expansion of markets for agricultural production, acceptance of foreign currency, barter arrangements, long-term credit arrangements with importing countries, encouragement of a freer multilateral trade agreement — unless this is done and implemented soon, by whatever party that forms the next Government at Ottawa, the complete collapse of western agriculture is only a matter of time.

In view of the fact that the budget indicates careful planning and judicious allocation of funds, that it assures the continuation of those programmes so vital to the well-being and to the growth of this province, and above all, in that it is in keeping with the best traditions of humanitarian government — it is with utmost pride, Mr. Speaker, when I say, I shall support the budget.

Mr. Cliff H. Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I first want to join with previous speakers in congratulating the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on the Budget he presented to this House.

Not only do I congratulate him for the able and fluent manner in which he presented the Budget, but also for its contents. To me it not only was a flowery speech, but one that contained a great deal of 'meat and potatoes'.

Mr. Speaker, representing a rural constituency as I do, it is only natural that I should be interested in looking at the budget to see how it affects the farmers. I can say that at a first glance, one sees only 4.24 per cent out of the total budget for the Department of Agriculture, and this may look somewhat alarming; but a further study shows that a considerable amount, or a large percentage, of the budget aids the farmer and his family directly. It is true that only \$5 1/2 million of the budget is to be spent by the Department of Agriculture, but I think it is also true that you cannot spend over \$5 million for municipal road assistance, \$25 million for highways, \$26 million for education, \$27 million for health, \$12 million for social welfare, without aiding the farmers. I am sure that if this were figured out on a per capita basis, it would show that the farmer has received his fair share of the money to be spent this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have always understood that by our constitution, it was the responsibility of Provincial Governments to aid in matters of production, and the responsibility rests with the Federal Government in dealing with markets and prices and interprovincial trade. To me, this budget does aid in helping the farmer to maintain or increase his production. It emphasizes further extension services, expansion of pasture and forage development, extended calf-vaccination program for the control and eradication of Bang's disease; they have set up this agricultural administration, the machinery administration. I believe that the testing of farm machinery will be of great assistance to the farmer, particularly if it is done by experienced and capable personnel.

I am not too concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the existing machine companies, who are putting implements out, but I am quite concerned by the fly-by-night companies that can come in and put machines on the market without being tested, and I am sure that this commission will be of great assistance to the farmers and customers of such machines.

I should also like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) on his grasshopper program. The Minister reported to Public Accounts on this program. He stated that by the Department buying up large stocks of chemicals, they were able to make a saving on this program. By 1949 it was estimated that the cost per acre was \$3. This year the municipality can purchase this chemical from the Department of Agriculture for less than 20 cents an acre. I suggest that that will be of great assistance to the farmers of this province, particularly if we have an extended outbreak of grasshoppers

March 7, 1958

this spring.

As I mentioned before, the budget estimates only \$5 1/2 million to be spent by the Department of Agriculture, and I suggest if this amount were doubled or even tripled, it would not solve the problems of markets and prices. To me, sir, that is the big problem facing us today.

Now, there has been a lot said in and out of this House about taxes. It has been said that this Government, by its policies are to blame for the agricultural slump that we find ourselves in. It has been suggested that this Government is working a hardship on the farmers by overcharging them for their truck licenses and the insurance premiums charged thereof.

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — You certainly are!

Mr. Thurston: — It has been suggested that our gasoline tax is high and above all, that the land tax is what is breaking the farmer.

Mr. McDonald: — That is right.

Mr. Thurston: — Mr. Speaker, in preparing material for my talk today, I thought I would check and get some figures to see if this accusation was right. I have a set of figures comparing the truck licence fees for the three prairie provinces. The farm-truck registration for 1957 for Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan — first, we will turn to Alberta, where maximum gross weight does not exceed 4,000 pounds, \$4; where it exceeds 4,000 pounds but does not exceed 6,000 pounds, \$15; where it exceeds 6,000 pounds but does not exceed 12,000 pounds, \$25; and where it exceeds 12,000 pounds, \$35. Turning to Manitoba for the registration of trucks, according to combined weight and carrying capacity, not over three tones or 6,000 pounds, \$12.50, with an additional half-ton or portion thereof an additional \$2.50. A little simple arithmetic will show that the trucks with a carrying capacity of over 12,000 pounds will cost \$27.50.

Turning to Saskatchewan, for any farm truck up to, and including 1946 — \$10; for a year model 1947, or later up to 5,000 pounds, \$10; 5,000 to 7,500 pounds, \$12.50; 7,500 to 10,000 pounds, \$15 and 10,000 to 12,000 pounds, \$17.50. I would like to pause here, Mr. Speaker, just to make a little comparison. In Manitoba, the 12,000 pound truck, \$27.50; Alberta, \$25 and \$17.50 in Saskatchewan.

The scale keeps going on up until we get the costs exceeding 32,000 pounds, \$40. I would like at this point to suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that he check and see how many farm trucks are affected in the latter categories. Personally I do not think the loss would be too much to the province, if they cut out the last few categories, because particularly in the 1957 models, I doubt whether there are too many of these big trucks.

Now, let us take a look at the insurance rates. I have here a comparison of farm truck insurance rates in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Using as an example a 1956 one-ton truck, comparing the coverages in the two provinces first, a standard coverage policy in Manitoba or Alberta, compared with the Automobile Insurance Act and Package Policy in Saskatchewan — first, the bodily injury. In Manitoba or Alberta, \$50,000-\$100,000; Saskatchewan, \$50,000-\$120,000, property damage, \$10,000 in both cases; collision \$25 deductible, the same in both cases; comprehensive full coverage, except \$25 deductible on glass; with the exception that in Saskatchewan we are covered under Part 2 of the Act which is not covered in Alberta or Manitoba.

Let us take a look at the basic rates, that is, not eligible for no-claim discounts. In rural Manitoba, \$55.40; rural Alberta, \$85.40; anywhere in Saskatchewan under the Act, \$6. The package policy, \$21 — a total of \$27. Rural Manitoba, \$55.40 and rural Alberta, \$85.40; Saskatchewan \$27. For the three-year no-claim rate, Manitoba, \$40.80; Alberta, \$43; Saskatchewan, under the Act, \$6 the package policy \$15 — or a total of \$21.

I would just like to say here, Mr. Speaker. I heard the hon. member from Rosthern yesterday speaking of dividends, and I thought when I was checking these figures over, we make a pretty fair dividend here.

While I am on the insurance rates it might be interesting to the members to know that the rate for a standard policy in Saskatchewan is \$57.24 basic and \$43 for a three-year-no-claim.

Turning now to the gasoline tax. What is the situation regarding gasoline tax in the three prairie provinces? Manitoba, 12 cents per gallon; Saskatchewan, 12 cents per gallon; Alberta 11 cents. To me the gas tax does not tell the complete story. I think we must also take a look at the road mileage in the three provinces to see what the expenditure load must be, and I find that Manitoba has 3,851 miles of first and secondary highways, 16,476 miles of local or municipal roads making a total of 20,328 miles. Alberta has 6,546 miles of main roads and secondary roads, and 80,838 miles of district and local roads, making a total of 86,384 miles,, while in Saskatchewan we

March 7, 1958

have 8,239 miles of provincial highways, municipal and local roads 152,473 miles and of this amount over 90,000 miles are improved, or semi-improved; 2,248 miles of developed road making a total of 162,969.

Regarding the land tax, I will not weary the House by making going into the other provinces as the Minister of Municipal Affairs did that very well the other afternoon. But I will try and show that the land tax is now what is breaking the Saskatchewan farmer. Using my own municipality, Sherwood No. 159 as an example, the tax for municipal purposes for 1957 was nine mills; the school tax was one mill, making a total of 10 mills on 5,000 assessed land of \$50 per quarter-section. I think that all the members will agree that this was not a particularly high tax, nor does it place a very high burden on any of the farmers of the Regina district.

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): — Is that the maximum or minimum?

Mr. Thurston: — I could say that the members of this area are having a hard time due to the lack of cash and working capital. I am very greatly concerned, Mr. Speaker, at the number of farmers, particularly the young farmers . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — One mill school tax?

Mr. Thurston: — . . . who are finding it necessary to leave the farms to supplement their incomes. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the fault of the Provincial Government, because as I said a moment ago, I do not think that we could hope to ask for any tax less than \$50 per quarter-section. So it is easy to see, that the root goes much deeper than taxes.

I have shown that the farm truck licences are only about half the cost in Saskatchewan to what they are in Manitoba or Alberta. Insurance premiums on farm trucks are less than half that is charged in the two provinces. I might say that the rate for cars is just as favourable as I have used for the trucks. I have shown that the road mileage is nearly double that of Manitoba and Alberta combined. The gas tax is the same as in Manitoba, and only one cent more than in Alberta. I think it only reasonable that, with this terrific road mileage that the gas tax is not too high. To me it is a fair tax. Those people who use the roads most pay the most, and I think that is a sound principle.

I have shown in my own municipality that the Land Tax is not what is breaking the farmer. I think that all the hon. members will agree that the serious conditions facing the farmers today, is due to the lack of markets and parity prices. It may be true that

some members will say that that is not their problem; their problem is flooding and the lack of crops.

I should also like to say that the time is long overdue when we have a comprehensive crop insurance plan set up in Saskatchewan. Looking at the budget, Mr. Speaker, and taking \$130 million to be presented this year, I suggest we can throw it all into the pot and still we, as farmers, are going to go broke if the cost-price squeeze still continues.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thurston: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many other things which I would like to have dealt with in sharing the radio time this afternoon, but I would just like to, before I sit down, say one thing on the grid roads. The Minister dealt very effectively with that the other afternoon, but I would like to congratulate the municipalities within Lumsden constituency that have gone ahead with this grid road program. I had the opportunity, last fall, in the early winter months, of travelling over many miles that were built in this area. I want to say to those responsible, to the councillors and to the contractors, that not only have they proved to themselves that it can be done with great benefit to the community, but it is a boon to the whole country, and I certainly wish them success in their further development of their roads.

In certain areas of this constituency of mine, the grid roads will let people out that never had the opportunity of getting to the market centres, except during certain periods of the year.

In closing, because this budget recognizes the problems that are facing the rural people; because it recognizes the need to put first things first, giving priority to the human and educational needs; because I believe it is a 'humanity first' budget, a budget that will be supported by the majority of the people of this province, I take great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, once again this House has been privileged in receiving the outline of a Budget from our Provincial Treasurer, which I think we can all say is optimistic, positive, and certainly encouraging to the people of this province. The one fact that appears to me, and I think to this House, very clearly is that, even though Saskatchewan's agriculture is in a collapse, yet the Government can continue with the kind of services that it has been

March 7, 1958

elected to give, and the only reason that I can see how this has been possible is, as has been indicated in this House on numerous occasions, through the terrific development we have had industrially and otherwise, in this province. Only the wisdom of a Government such as the C.C.F. could have made it possible to survive such an economic catastrophe as the agricultural people are experiencing, today.

This is exactly what I want to discuss. I know it has been brought to the attention of this House, but I do want to say a few more things in connection with cost-price squeeze. I want to point out to the members of this Assembly, and to those who were here before the year 1956 — the fact that I mentioned in this House, in 1952-53 that there was a depression setting in among the agricultural people. I recall quite clearly, at that time, the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) pointing out that the farmers of Saskatchewan were better off than ever before in the history of Canada; they were driving around in Cadillac cars. Well, I thought maybe I was wrong, insofar as certain parts of Saskatchewan were concerned; there are areas where you have big farms; they have great numbers of cattle and maybe they didn't feel the pinch as we were beginning to feel the pinch up in our part of the country. But the surprising thing is, that this same argument was presented to this House, that the farmers were getting worse off and worse off, over the year, and the hon. members opposite have, on every occasion, replied that the farmers were not hard up — that there was nothing to worry about. They were concerned, I think, in the main, to sustain the 'laissez faire' party, the Liberal party, in Ottawa, and that was the reason I think, for their stand.

I certainly suggest to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that the Opposition were not fair to the people of Saskatchewan over these past few years. The worst of all was what we heard in this House during the session when the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner), on making his harangue, on one occasion pointed out to this House that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must not refer to something which was said in the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am not quoting; I said it has been said in this House that the farmers are obtaining fair prices for their products. Now, I would like to ask the farmers of Saskatchewan whether they agree with the statement of the hon. member for Melville — whether they are getting fair prices or not. How can anybody say that the farmers are getting fair prices when, on the quota basis, an average farmer in Saskatchewan, with about three-quarters of land; on the average I suppose he would have about 300 acres under cultivation. He can only

sell, at the maximum, about \$2,000 or \$3,000 worth of grain. An ordinary individual, Mr. Speaker, requires that much to sustain himself and his family on the farm, before even considering any expenses. These farmers, who are only able to sell \$2,000 or \$3,000 worth of grain, find that when they pay up their expenses for farming, which means gasoline, oil, repairs, truck costs, automobile costs, fertilizer and other expenses; (I have the facts — I have seen them) and they find that they have spent \$1,000 more than they were able to sell grain for.

I know in my own case, and I keep proper records, my income from the farm was \$3,000 last year, and my expenses were \$4,000 and the hon. members opposite say that the farmers are well off and getting fair prices.

Mr. McDonald: — Nobody ever said such a thing.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I will let the records of this House decide whether it was said here or not. The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) made a very clear statement that the farmers are well off and were getting fair prices.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the statement that I made at that particular time was that the prices for the products that I was speaking about were higher than the prices quoted in either the Stabilization Bill of the present Government, or the Farm Price Support Bill under the past Government.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I really think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member did not want to say what he did say; but he was making such a long speech, and I question whether he knew what he was talking about.

Mr. McDonald: — It's obvious that you don't know.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Referring to this present depression in the agricultural industry, we often hear the argument through the press, and from the various political parties, particularly the Liberal party and the Conservative party, that the whole trouble in Canada is inflation. Now, Mr. Speaker, inflation to me — and I think to every member in this House, means too much money in this country. Then, of course, being a farmer, and hearing this argument all over the country, every day, from both Mr. Diefenbaker and all us cohorts, Mr. Pearson and others, that there is so much inflation in this country. I have tried to find some of this inflation to find some of this 'too much' money, and the tragedy of it all is, that I can't find where that money is. It certainly isn't in the

March 7, 1958

hands of the working, people and it certainly isn't in the hands of the small businessman.

Mr. Gardiner: — Look at the Public Accounts!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The hon. members opposite know quite well where it is.

Mr. Korchinski: — Look at your Estimates.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is in the hands of big monopoly business.

Mr. Gardiner: — Your Crown Corporations.

Mr. Berezowsky: — The only reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Government of Canada, today, whether it is a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government, is afraid to put more money into circulation, is because they know, as has been pointed out by writers in MacLean's and elsewhere, that if the present policies of the Government of Canada are followed, Canada will go bankrupt; and that is why they are afraid to put more money into circulation. They are afraid because private enterprise, monopoly enterprise, today has seized control of all the means of production, excepting the agricultural industry. There is where the danger lies. It isn't dangerous to have the necessary amount of money in circulation; the big danger to this country is the fact that the wealth, the natural resources, have gone into the hands of big business; and I think the hon. members presently recognize that fact.

Mr. Gardiner: — Crown Corporations!

Mr. Berezowsky: — That's very silly, I think.

Mr. McDonald: — Your whole speech is.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I think the members on this side know who the enemies of the working people and the farmers are. They are the people I pointed out, who have seized control of the wealth of this country — big business. The unfortunate thing is that many people in this country, and I presume some of the members opposite, foster the artificial propaganda of free enterprise also propagated by Diefenbakers and Gardeners over this province, and over this country.

Mr. Coderre: — Don't you want business to come into the province?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I submit that since the end of the last war, it has been known to the Government at Ottawa that there was a recession coning in due course of time; certainly in the

agricultural industry. They knew quite well that there were dangerous inflationary tendencies throughout the country. I submit further that the Government which superseded the Liberals in June, 1957, was also aware of the rapidly changing economy that we are living in; and I further submit that neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives did anything about it; and to that extent, Mr. Speaker, they have failed the people of Canada.

Some Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — One of the reasons I think, that is so is this: that governments, being what they are made up of human beings, as members of a Cabinet; they do not know all the answers and so they have advisors, just as we have advisors here — Planning Boards, and so on, but in Ottawa they have the greatest bureaucracy you have seen on this continent — the Treasury Board . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Outside Saskatchewan.

Mr. Berezowsky: — This Treasury Board, which is a Committee of the Cabinet in Ottawa, obtains its advice from men such as the head of the Bank of Canada, and men of that type, who indicate to the Government what the fiscal policy should be; and instead of listening to organizations, such as farm organizations and labour unions and other small mercantile organizations, they follow the dictates of their advisors, and they have led our country into the position in which it finds itself, today. I say it is an indictment against our way of life, in this so-called free enterprise, to see hunger and distress amidst plenty. I think that we fail to remember that following the Second World War, production in our province mid country, as well as all over the world, made a remarkable recovery from destruction and disruption of war. During that time, Mr. Speaker, production of peaceful as well as defence materials was higher than ever before; and the development in the field of natural resources, of petroleum and hard rock minerals in our country rose beyond the nation's fondest hopes, and this development and stimulation has worked towards the building of a higher standard of living and stability of the Canadian economy.

Had the Federal Government been wise and continued the controls that we had during the war and immediately following the war, this prosperity could have continued to this day, and we would not be in the dilemma we find ourselves in, today.

Mr. Gardiner: — You're the only one in a dilemma.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, we have heard accusations from the other side of the House from time to time that we are just terrible. I thought that, last year, we had heard the last of it, but we heard the same charges from the hon. member from

March 7, 1958

Pelly (Mr. Barrie) this year, and from one or two others. I propose, today, to read to you the Manifesto of free enterprise, and also the Manifesto of the socialists who sit on this side of the House.

Mr. McCarthy: — Take it as read!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I would like the hon. members to listen. This quotation is taken from the Idaho 'Leader', August 26, 1920, printed in the 'Bankers' Magazine', and I quote: Here is what the free enterprise and private enterprise says:

"Capital must protect itself in every possible manner through combination and legislation. Debts must be collected; bonds and mortgages must be foreclosed as rapidly as possible. When, through a process of law, the common people have lost their homes, they will be more tractable, and more easily governed through the influence of the strong arm of the government, applied by a central power of wealth under the control of leading financiers. A people without homes will not quarrel with their leaders . . ."

Mr. McDonald: — The iron fist!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The quote goes on:

"History repeats it-self in regular cycles. This truth is well-known among our principal men now engaged in forming an imperialism of capital to govern the world . . . by thus dividing the voters we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance to us except as teachers (I would say, traitors) of the common herd. Thus, by discreet action we can secure for ourselves what has been generously planned and successfully accomplished."

Fascism, Mr. Speaker, of the highest order! That is free enterprise! This is no accident, it is a rather cold and calculating greed-crazed planning to rob the people of their rights, their homes, and their privileges.

This is, as I said, a quotation which you will find in the Idaho 'Leader', August 26, 1920, taken from a Bankers' Magazine. That is what the bankers say. That is what they consider free enterprise to be.

Mr. McCarthy: — What Bankers' magazine?

Mr. Gardiner: — Where is Idaho?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He told you.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, he said it was taken from a Bankers' magazine. Give us the date of the Bankers' magazine.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That in the name of it, 'Bankers' Magazine'.

Mr. McCarthy: — Where is it published?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He has already told you.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You can get it from the transcript. Now, I said that I would compare . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quoting, and we should know from what he is quoting. He said the Bankers' magazine, what date, what issue?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Page 61 of — excerpt from 'A War on Poverty', by Partridge, of Sinaluta. The quotation is from the I 'Idaho 'Leader', August 26, 1920, which is printed in the Bankers' Magazine.

Mr. Korchinski: — One of the C.C.F. prophets!

Mr. Berezowsky: — If you don't like it, I can't help it.

Mr. Gardiner: — It's about as out-dated as you are!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that men who consider the people with whom they live should defend the rights, the dignity and the privileges of their neighbours; the same stand that Keir Hardy took. Keir Hardy, as some of the members opposite may know, was originally the leader of the labour movement, in the old country, Great Britain.

Mr. McDonald: — What about Peer Gynt?

Mr. Berezowsky: — He issued a Manifesto in 1888. At that time a Liberal Government was in power in the old country, and here is what he said:

March 7, 1958

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what does the year 1888 have to do with this budget debate?

Premier Douglas: — You've been living in that age for years! He just wants to go back to the years you know something about.

Mr. McCarthy: — What a ramble - this is good.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I just want to point out to the hon. members how far behind you are — and here it is:

"The attitude of the officials Liberals makes it unmistakably clear they care nothing for the interests of labour, except insofar as it can be made subservient to those of the class. The Liberals are eager to use our political power as a weapon against Tory landlords but they are afraid that in the hands of consistent and independent men the same weapon may be turned against the social injustice of which labour is the prey.

"We do not intend, any longer, to be merely tools of political tricksters . . . "

That is what Mr. Hardy says; and that is what the C.C.F. says, today.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The Liberals and Conservatives in Canada, today, are no more than political tricksters. When they are in office, they will do nothing — 'laissez faire' — when they are out of office, they promise everything.

Mr. Gardiner: — You must have listened to Tim Buck!

Mr. Berezowsky: — And we have wakened up. We have been fooled long enough with this political trickery. If they are sincere about the welfare of the people of this country, would they have stood for a thing like this?

Mr. McDonald: — What's that?

Mr. Berezowsky: — The 'Telegram', Toronto, Friday, February 21: "\$2 1/2 million Trans-Canada probe reveals" — that is for Mr. Tanner and associates. And no taxes! If the Government of Canada was concerned with the welfare of the people of Canada, would they not at least have seen to it that these people

who were able to make \$2 1/2 million of capital gain — would they not at least have made some effort to see that taxes were paid into the treasury of the Federal Government?

Mr. Danielson: — That's about the same thing as the cement plant over here.

Mr. Klein: — What about your oil deals?

Mr. Gardiner: — How about the box factory? What about that one?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Having said that, and because listening to an hon. member confess, the other day, when he pointed out that after all, he was very proud of the fact that there were industries in Saskatchewan and that they were making progress, I do not intend to punish the Opposition any longer.

I will now deal with a few matters that pertain particularly to my constituency. One of these is natural resources, and of course these natural resources I am referring to certainly affect other constituencies, as well. We have heard in the Budget Speech that there will be about \$3,190,000 spent for northern development roads. I think this is most commendable. I also commend the Government for spending money on the building of winter roads. These access roads, together with the roads that the Saskatchewan Timber Board has built and that the operators in the bush have built, are more and more opening up the forestry resources in that particular area. I have taken the liberty today, to show you that even some of what is considered an inferior species of timber — the ordinary aspen poplar when processed properly can make the finest material for building that you can find anywhere. This is what we call 'chip board'. I understand that the Research Branch of one of the Crown Corporations has shipped out some poplar from northern Saskatchewan and had it processed as an experiment to see the type of material it would make. I think there is a tremendous future in it.

These roads are opening up all kinds of timber and evergreens, and of course, deciduous trees can produce different materials. Access roads, of course, will permit more exploration. We, of course, have no railways as yet; I hope the time will come when railways will be built, but trucks can do quite a good job in taking out the resources.

I also wish to commend the Government and its corporations, for carrying on the various programs in the north, because as I pointed out, our farming industry has been tremendously hit. Just to indicate again to you, Mr. Speaker, recently, when I flew over a northern area I could see only about one farm out of five occupied, where five or six years ago you would see nearly every farm being

March 7, 1958

occupied; and the only reason why they are not occupied today is because the farmers have gone broke, and they have gone into the woods and they have gone into the lumber camps, and into the mining camps for work. The responsibility for the situation, as I pointed out, rests directly on the shoulders of the Federal authorities for their fiscal policy, and for lack of consideration of the needs of the agricultural people.

I might point out, too, that this summer, when I was up in the north at Lynn Lake, I met with a number of people working in the mines and I would say that the majority of these young people were from the farms — not only from Saskatchewan, as sometimes said. I met one chap and asked him where he was from. He replied that he was from Dauphin, and when I asked him what he did at Dauphin, he said he operated a half-section of land. He said it was excellent land, and he had all his machinery and everything. "What are you doing down here?" I asked him. He replied that he was going broke farming, and he thought he might as well close up the farm; he put his machinery into sheds and was working in the mine for \$6,000 a year, which he maintained was much better than going broke on his farm.

This is the story right across the north. It is much, much worse than some of our good friends in the south — certain friends in the south — try to indicate. It is a very sorry spectacle; I only wish that, as members of the Legislature, everyone could go around the province and see what has happened, and then maybe we could co-operate just a little better, for the good of the people in this province.

Surveys in the north indicate, as you will see from the Natural Resources Report, that we have about 15 billion board feet measure of trees, 10 inches in diameter and over, and about 84 million cords of trees below this; we have one-quarter billion board feet measure of valuable white spruce, which is excellent for the building trade; and about 46 million cords of softwood. Then we have 55 million cords of black spruce and pine, which is in high demand for pulp and newsprint. Having referred to our inventory in the Annual Report, I would like to say this, that I regret exceedingly, as I do believe that every member of this House and every citizen of Saskatchewan regrets, that no immediate decision has been made to build a pulp mill, say in Prince Albert, or elsewhere. This Government has had a conservation program protecting the forest resources; we have been very fortunate in not having had fires there; we have a resource here ready to be processed, and it is very regrettable that the situation has arisen in Canada again which has not been encouraging industry to open up new businesses, and particularly we are disappointed in the fact that we may have to wait some time for a pulp mill.

Mr. Loptson: — They have a new pulp mill in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That may be so. These comparisons are sometimes not very proper, because different conditions persist; for example, Nova Scotia has ships from Europe sail right up close to the source of the resource, while down here the hon. member must remember we would have to ship the same material thousands of miles. For example, I recall quite well the argument that we had when the Anglo Pulp Mill pulled out of the province. I don't blame the Anglo-Canadian people at all. Sure they paid more dues in Ontario than they had to pay here; I think the Government here was very generous with the company insofar as the dues were concerned; and the Company was very pleased. But when they took the freight rates into consideration, and even at the cost of the higher wages, they had to pay in Ontario, they still found they could probably save \$3 per ton of sulphate pulp; they could produce a ton of sulphate pulp cheaper in Ontario to the extent of about \$3 than they could here. Even if it was \$1 a ton, would you blame a company producing a million cords a year from establishing its plant where they could make an extra million dollars? We are very fortunate, being in the central part of Canada as we are, that we have no freight concessions in connection with these resources.

Mr. Loptson: — They've got a mill in Alberta.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Of course, there again I can give you an argument, but I don't intend to spend my time doing just that. There again the conditions are different than they are here; but I do say this, Mr. Speaker, that we have the resources, and I do say this, that in studying certain reports such as the Stanford Research Institute report, the scientists tell us, and all the people know pretty well, who are informed on these matters, that within the next 20 or 25 years, the demand for sulphate pulp and for newsprint will double; and we know that a pulp mill will come to us in a very short time.

But I will say this, that if for some reason we have to wait, I can say what I said before, that the Government of this province should make some extra effort to try and find markets; because I believe, very sincerely that the only reason why the Government of Saskatchewan, through its Crown Corporations, hasn't found it desirable to start a pulp mill is because of the fact that it is difficult to find markets. I recognize this — markets have disappeared at the present time because of surpluses to the extent of 15 per cent, but within a year's time, the market will come back. If news reports are correct, I think the Government should continue to investigate, and if necessary, (I have said this before) I think they should assist either

March 7, 1958

co-operatives or private industry with say borrowing of money as we have done with the Cement Plant, or some other way, to see this plant established.

The reason I say this is that we have the resource; we have protected that resource; it belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, and we as a Government have a responsibility to see that that resource is wisely utilized. I would hate to see the day when it might either rot or burn, after all, we had put into protecting and looking after it. I think that something should be done. Probably a start could be made by establishing say, a small Chip Board plant. I don't know too much about these industries, but I do know that in making chip board, I have been told that you use just about every part of the tree except the leaf — it may be a good start; we could find out the market conditions for it, and see how we could operate with private industry.

I would just like to add one more thing for the information of the hon. members in connection with the pulp industry. The demand is coming back, and I understand the profits in that industry have been good; they are not like the Massey-Harris-Ferguson, as somebody indicated, suffering a loss; the pulp industry has been making, over the years, an average of 25 to 35 per cent profit, net profit, before paying taxes; and that is a considerable amount when you consider that a ton of pulp is worth about \$160 f.o.b. shipping point. If we only made 10 per cent . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — What about the box plant?

Mr. Berezowsky: — If that was true, that we were inefficient, as has been said by those opposite, and which is not true, because I think it can be proven that we are more efficient than private industry is, as has been indicated in the last year or two — but even if we weren't, \$16 on a ton of pulp means about \$10 on a cord of pulpwood, which would remain with the people of Saskatchewan as an earning, if the plant belonged to the public.

Mr. Gardiner: — What about the box plant, Bill?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I would like to congratulate the Minister of Highways, (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas), and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) for their part in seeing that roads are being rig built in the north, and that grants are being made to municipalities. Notwithstanding what hon. members to your left may say, the fact remains that under former Liberal administration in the part of the province — at least where I live, if we obtained a grant once in four or five years, of say \$200 to \$500, we felt we had really achieved something, and yet this same municipality that

was able to get \$400 in one particular year, and that was one of the best grants they ever got from the Liberals, last year obtained, through the various grants, over \$25,000 — a six-township municipality. I am very proud of this Government for having assisted them to that extent.

I should also have commended the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) because in areas such as Cumberland House and other areas of the north, roads are being built even if they are only to accommodate the people to travel from one community to the next community three or four miles away. In particular, a road has been built from Lac la Ronge — it is not my constituency, with apologies to the member from Athabaska (Mr. Harrop) — but I must mention it; a road has been built from Lac la Ronge down to English Bay. I was over it last fall, and I wish to say to the Minister of Natural Resources that it is going to be an excellent tourist road. It is well built, and I am proud, again, of the Government, for having extended No. 2 Highway a little further into the north.

Another thing I wish to commend the Government for — and I see that it is going to be continued under the present budget, is bringing power into these little northern villages. Northern people have been, as has been mentioned in this House on a number of occasions, left behind. Governments in the past have not done too much to help them; they have been paternalistic, but this Government has not only brought schools into those areas, but has recently been bringing in power plants. I understand that power plants are already underway at Cumberland House, Pelican Narrows, and other places up in the north. I think it is my duty to say, on behalf of the people who live in those communities, that we appreciate very much what the Power Corporation has done, and I give my thanks and the thanks of the people to the Minister of the Branch.

Mr. Gardiner: — Tell us about the box plant.

Mr. Berezowsky: — One of the things that you must remember, if we are going to help the people in the northern constituencies, is the fact that we must endeavour to do everything possible to bring the best returns for the products they produce. We have considerable fishing and trapping, and as has been mentioned in this House, the people, particularly this last year, have not been too fortunate insofar as trapping is concerned; but I am very proud of the fact that by having the kind of organizations that we have — the Fish Marketing Service, and the Fur Marketing Service, we are bringing to the people of the north anywhere from say 10, 15 to 100 per cent more than they would get from private enterprise.

March 7, 1958

I would like to refer hon. members to the fact that we obtain about 7,000 pounds of sturgeon on Cumberland Lake and that the Fish Marketing Service was able to obtain a price for fishermen of over \$1.10 a pound for those sturgeon, and believe me, \$7,000 or more is very beneficial to the living standards of that community; it means considerable to those people. For a few people, \$7,000 is very meaningful.

At the same time, I noticed in the questions that have been asked by members of the Opposition, that down in Turtle Lake, the same Fish Marketing Service was able to obtain for the fishermen in that area as high as 52 cents per pound for jumbo whitefish. I would like to see any fish dealer show me that he has paid a similar amount in the year 1957. The figures that I have obtained from fishermen in that general area that have been paid by private dealers, amounted to 15, 20 or 18 cents — nothing near the price that we were able to obtain through the Fish Marketing Service.

I feel as one of the northern representatives, there is one point I would like to present to the Government as a recommendation. We have people working in established mines in the north, and yet I am afraid that some of the rights that Labour has in the south do not pertain there. For example, I do know that in Uranium City men work double shifts, and in this day, when there is so much unemployment, when we would desire to see our young men obtain employment so that conditions may correct themselves, I think that the Minister of Labour of this Government should see to it; discuss it with the Cabinet, and have regulations pertain to those areas. I do not see why any person should be required to work 16 hours in a day. I know the Companies will insist that the men want to do that; they want to make that extra money; they probably will insist that it is more efficient that way, but I think as a general principle, the same laws we have in the rest of the province of Saskatchewan should pertain in places like Uranium City. As a matter of fact, they do pertain, I think, in Creighton, where we have mines; and I cannot understand why the same regulations do not apply at Uranium City.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I might mention that there was a Bill given Third Reading just a few days ago, which will give the Minister of Labour the power to limit the hours of work in any place of employment to 12 hours per day. There is no such legislation in effect at the present time; it is pretty much up to the employer and the individual where they work these double shifts. Certainly we do not agree with it, and I doubt very much if any of the Unions agree with it; but when this Bill is assented to, we will have that power.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am very glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

I notice that I have spoken longer than I intended to, and I am sure that I shall have further opportunities to bring some of the problems of my community to the Legislature — of my constituency, I mean. So, adding it all up and taking into consideration what this Government has done, and what this Government proposes to do for education, for agriculture, for social welfare and all the things that we are responsible for, I certainly feel that I am more than justified in supporting the budget.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, entering the debate at this late date, I am not going to extend the usual congratulations that are extended to previous speakers. I agree with them all.

Entering the debate at a late date has some advantages, and it has some disadvantages. Some of the things I was going to say a while ago, have already been said, and I am not going to worry you by repeating them; and I assure you I am not going to talk very long.

There are, however, one or two matters I felt I would like to place before this House. I could not help but be struck by some of the language used in the Budget Speech. I have read the Provincial Treasurer's Budget speeches over the years. In fact I checked them over again, last night, and he has been very practical. But for some peculiar reason, whether it is the time we are living in or something else, there seems to be quite a bit of political propaganda in this one.

Hon. Mr. Brown (Provincial Secretary): — Oh, bosh!

Mr. McCarthy: — I suppose it is the times we are in. Everybody is thinking about politics, and he couldn't resist taking a little shot at some of the other political parties. I hope that, if he is here with us, next year, he will again go back to his original form of giving us the facts of the budget, because I think it is more in keeping with his position.

Having taken that little excursion into the realm of politics, Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to confine the balance of my remarks to the province, and to two or three matters of provincial interest. The subject, of course, that I am very much interested in is municipal affairs, and I would like, for a few minutes, to discuss municipal affairs and roads as they appear now. You would think, to hear some of the chaps on the other side talk, that the Government was just throwing money at the municipalities — the best there ever was! They remind me of a fellow, a preacher, who went out one day in

March 7, 1958

the early horse-and-buggy days. He went to a place for dinner. The lady of the house didn't have dinner quite ready, so he went to look around the pasture; he was very, interested in cows. There was a very fine pair of milk cows there, and the preacher said to the farmer: "That is a nice pair of milk cows". The farmer said: "Yep, that is the best cow in Saskatchewan; and this is a better one." So that is just about the position they take over there.

Mr. Gardiner: — Hear! Hear'. I have to agree with you, Ross.

Mr. McCarthy: — There are several things this Government is doing, and whether they are doing them intentionally, or whether they know they are doing them or not, there are a lot of things they are doing which could stand a very great amount of correcting at this time.

Of their ever-increasing budget, for instance, percentage-wise they are not giving the municipalities as much as they did last year. Since they started the grid road system, of course, they can work up the percentages, but I am just going to give you the figures, percentage-wise, that they have been giving to the municipalities in the last few years. In 1958, they gave 4.3 percentage-wise, of the budget to the municipalities. That was a little higher than this year. I don't know why they dropped it down, but apparently they did. When you get into 1956, they gave 3.58 percentage-wise, of their budget to the municipalities, of course, that was after the grid road started. But if you look at 1955, percentage-wise, they gave .91 per cent of the budget to the municipalities for roads. Now, you would never know that when you listen to these gentlemen talk here, Mr. Speaker. You would think it was 91 per cent of the budget they were giving. Then, if you go back a year or two before that; if you go back to the year 1954 and 1953, there was less than one-half of one per cent of the budget given to the municipalities. Approximately one-half million dollars is what they gave the municipalities in those years. Those were the years when for some reason or the other, they decided the municipalities didn't amount to much, and 134 of them didn't get anything for three years.

This Government started out with a good program — I think it was in 1947 . . .

Hon. Mr. Willis (Minister of Public Works): —: What about the Public Revenue Tax?

Mr. McCarthy: — I'm not talking about the Public Revenue Tax. In 1947, this Government started out with a good policy, and I have said so before, and I say so again. They started out and said: "We are going to give the municipalities something so that they will know what they are going to get each year." This was

similar to your Ottawa agreement — and how would you fellows over there like it if the Dominion Government said: "All right, we'll shove you a little bit this year, and we'll take it away next year." How would you run your business? Well, how do you expect the municipalities to run their business under similar circumstances? That is exactly what you are doing.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is the way the Liberals treated the municipalities.

Mr. McCarthy: — That is exactly what you are doing. In these three years you didn't give anything to 134 of them, and the rest of them were treated according to your own good judgment, or something like that. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that they did have a good formula when they said: "You are going to get \$500, and then we are going to take a lot of other things into consideration and pay you an equalization grant on those factors." That is the first time this province ever had a formula like that. But the funny thing about it was that when they carried that program out, they had \$1 1/4 million left by another Government for another purpose, and when they used that \$1 1/4 million up, they ceased to pay the equalization grant, and they also ceased to pay the \$500 grant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we regarded our money spent on roads as an investment, because it is an investment, and the sooner we can get away from regarding it as a political expenditure, the better off we will be, both in highways and in municipalities. We have in this province, a Road Users' Tax. That is, if I go down that road, I pay half a cent a mile to use that road, in the Users' Tax; and why is that Users' Tax there? It doesn't matter — you may not think so; but if you go down a road here, today, you do a certain amount of damage to that road. The peculiar thing about it is that the poorer the road is, the more damage you do; but you have to pay more taxes, because the gasoline tax from the average-sized motor car amounts to about half a cent a mile per mile travelled. If you are in a truck, it amounts to about a cent a mile per mile travelled, and that is a Users' Tax, and it is a fair tax. I remember being at the municipal convention when that tax was first put on, and it was put on to be used wholly for road purposes, with the municipalities getting a fair share. But what are we doing now? The municipalities are building the roads and maintaining them, and the Government is collecting the tax; they give it back just as they see fit — very often politically.

Our grid road system that has been set up — and I want to say that, since the grid road system was set up, your percentage, budget-wise, does show up better on paper; but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that those grid roads, or so-called grid roads, should never be the responsibility of the municipalities at all — only a portion of them. We have had in this province, for a number of years, what was

March 7, 1958

called a highway system built by former governments, and maintained by them. But when this Government came in, they dropped off a few here and there. They had some left; but the reason they were designated, to start with, as secondary highways was because the traffic that was carried on those roads went from one municipality to the other.

In the early days of this province, all the municipality had to do was build their own roads for their own people, and possibly an odd one had to go through another municipality; but our travel habits have changed, and now the traffic is so mobile that it travels very often miles from the municipality where it originates. So these secondary roads were set up, not to highway standards, but they were set up to a lower standard. The Government built them and maintained them with the hope that, when circumstances changed, they would go into the highway system — and they should still be in the highway system, Mr. Speaker. There may be an odd change here and there . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, it depends on what it is.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I will ask it, and then you can decide whether I may or not.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, I don't have to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No. I know that. I just wondered if the hon. member knew the relationship of mileage of the secondary highways to the 12,000 miles of grid road. Does he know that it is 900 miles, approximately, of secondary highways as against 12,000 miles of grid?

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, who is making this speech, you or I?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I wondered if you knew that. The question is, do you know that?

Mr. McCarthy: — Yes. I knew it. Certainly I know it and I knew something else, too, and it is that you put over 100 miles of what should be marked 'highway' into your grid road system and said it is a rural responsibility. Now, take that! Roads that run from the international boundary right up to the bush — little pieces left in them, and this Government didn't have the courage or the fortitude to build them; but they say, "There, that is yours". These roads are carrying a tremendous amount of traffic; and you are sitting there, collecting the Users' Tax from them.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy: — Your grid system — true, the municipalities asked for it; but they didn't think they were going to get what you gave them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They weren't used to getting what they asked for.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, that's all right You haven't anything to be proud of in the last ten years, until you put this grid road system in. You were more political than any other government ever was in this province with both your highways and your municipal; and we had a beautiful example of that here, the other day — a beautiful example! A member over there got up and said the Government had rebuilt every mile of highway in his constituency since they came into power. He was proud of that. Well, what happened to the rest of the constituencies? Down where I live they haven't done nearly as well as that and the roads down there were built before this Government's time and they are good roads; and you haven't done a thing with half of them, and yet we are still using them now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I entered politics, I got a pretty good start. I went in a by-election and they talk about politics and roads. I really was introduced to the political game in a pretty rough way. I went in the by-election in 1949, and they came down there. They had a member for every seven polls, and they said, "Now, look! You vote C.C.F. and we'll give you \$200,000 for roads; if you vote Liberal, you don't get any." And that is one promise they kept — we didn't get any!

They even went down there and set the stakes up and down No. 13 Highway along by Manor and Redvers and down there; and those stakes rotted, Mr. Speaker, because the people down there didn't vote C.C.F. They kept their promise.

Premier Douglas: — Those are Liberal tactics.

Mr. McCarthy: — They came along a little later when it got near another election, and they dangled a few miles of highway here and there, and said: "Now vote C.C.F. and we will build this little bit of highway for you." Well, they didn't do so well, but it got to be so bad that they darned well had to fix those highways, because their own people wouldn't stand for it. But today, Mr. Speaker, I estimate that I have 300 miles of highway in my own constituency. It is only a rough estimate, and I don't want anybody to check me up, but half of them have been rebuilt, and the other half were built in the early 'twenties. They are thirty years old, and

March 7, 1958

they haven't been rebuilt yet; and there is no appropriation for No. 16 today. They built No. 16 from the border to Kipling. They built it from here out. They left a piece there that is just a canal; but next election they will come along and dangle a little piece and say, "Well, come on, boys! Vote C.C.F., and we'll build that for you."

So you don't need to talk to me about politics and all the rest of it. That is why I said, a while ago, that the quicker we look upon our road expenditures as an investment, set up on a business basis, and get away from this nonsense of political expenditure of public money, the better it will be for everybody including the Government, who are sitting on that side, whoever they may be. If we are going to run this province, let's run it on a business-like basis.

Now, that is about all I wanted to say on that at the moment.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Before the hon. member leaves that question, I would like to inform him that . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Do you want to ask a question, or make a speech? Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I just wanted to inform the hon. member . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — You wanted to inform me what?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — No. 16 highway has not been built to the border. It is three miles north.

Mr. McCarthy: — Three miles short, yes. That is a darned fool thing, too. I am glad you mentioned it. That is one thing I had forgotten. You should be the last one to over mention that. You shouldn't be proud of it. Here you go, down to a place three miles from the Manitoba border, and stop there, and the people on the other side are stopped, too. They say that they don't know which way to come out because they don't know which way you are going. For gracious sakes, if you haven't got the courage to build it, tell them where you are going, when you do build it!

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to mention just for a few minutes because it is a very serious matter in my district. The member for Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) mentioned it, the other day; and some other member mentioned it here. I have just forgotten who it was. It is the matter of snow plows. I can quite understand some of you chaps who live in the southwest where you get lots of Chinook winds probably aren't too much interested,

but on the east side of this province and across the north end of its it is a very, very serious problem. As I said before, our mode of travel has changed; our mode of being has changed. More particularly, our schools have changed and these snow plows are very important things. In the little town that I live in, we have five snow plow clubs. Those clubs are organized on a voluntary basis under the regulations of the co-operatives, but it is all voluntary subscription, Mr. Speaker. We get some help from the Larger School Unit, but again those are the people who are paying the taxes. You know, a lot of people think, or at least some of them think, that that should be a municipal responsibility. I don't think so. I am very much opposed to making it a municipal responsibility for this reason. You see, in a municipality we have something over 450, 460, or 470 (I have just forgotten the figure) miles of road. Now, it isn't possible to keep all those roads open. It is a physical impossibility. So if you are going to put it on a municipal basis, you are going to tax the people for it. There are only certain roads that you can use a snow plow on, and it isn't fair, if I happen to live on a road that it is possible to plow, to tax a chap over six miles away, who will get no advantage of it. So, it isn't possible economically, or it isn't right or fair, to put on a tax. But we have to have these snow plows. I think we have five buses coming into our little town, and even this year — I make some donations to it sometimes; I don't belong to the Club, but I got a reminder the other day, that they needed a little more money, so they are now out of money. Now, what has happened. A lot of the people down there don't have horses. Nearly all of them use their motor cars and they need the roads open. The fact of the matter is that, because these snow plows are running, and they are necessary, and they are operated by local donations, this Government collects the Users' Tax, and every time a car goes down the road they donate almost a cent a mile in the wintertime, and that tax money goes to this Government. So I would suggest to this Government that they take a very close look at this snow plow deal, as it really is quite important to the people living in the rural areas of this province.

Now, I want to go back, just for a minute and say another word or two about our grid roads. As I said before, they are a good thing; but the Government has just kind of slipped it over the municipalities a little bit. The boys are commencing to realize it now, but they didn't realize it to start with. Here is the deal. They lay out a road; they usually pick the best road in the municipality, because that is the one that has been built up over the years the market roads and the secondary highways, even the highways that are marked; that is where they put the road. Well, they will pay from 40 to 60 per cent of the cost of that road, but they don't pay anything towards the maintenance of the road, and what is going to happen is that, in ten years' time, the municipality is going to

March 7, 1958

have a half-worn-out road while the Government is going to have all the money they put into it go back to them through the Users' Tax, and there you are. So I think the municipalities should get a good share of this Users' Tax, and I think this Government should accept its responsibilities.

What they are doing is this. In nearly all instances, the grid roads have been placed on roads that should be provincial roads, and the municipality has to maintain them, and I would say that, over the course of ten years, this Government, through the gasoline tax, will have all their money back; the municipalities will have half-worn-out roads, and still have the responsibility of maintaining them and rebuilding them.

I was rather amused, the other day, at a statement made by my good friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). He was up there talking away, and making a very good job of it, in a vain effort to build up the wonderful idea of what the R.M.'s are getting today; but he just overstepped himself, in my opinion. He started out by saying, "Well, look at the increase there is in municipal assessment. We have given them the railroad tax. We have given them the gas tax. We have given them the oil tax" and (what the heck was the other one?) — the pipeline tax. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs didn't have anything to do with any of them. I'll take that back. I believe he did have something to do with helping to get the railroad tax, but the other three came there, not because of any C.C.F. Government, but in spite of them.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy: — And the municipalities are glad to have them, and they certainly did raise the assessments in a small percentage of the municipalities. But I want to point out that, where the oil wells are thick enough to have any affect on the assessment, they also have a similar problem of very heavy equipment travelling on roads that weren't built for that purpose. Consequently they have to put most of the money back in; but 80 per cent of the rural municipalities in this province have neither pipelines, gas or oil, nor railroads. So I think it was a pretty weak proposition he was trying to build up for himself, when he got down to the assessment of those few municipalities.

That was one thing. The only other thing I have seen happen over there that was supposed to be helpful to the municipalities was stupid comparisons of the grants that were given in the 'thirties, compared with what are being given today.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They are stupid — I agree with you.

Mr. McCarthy: — The budget at that time was \$16 million. Now, it is just absolutely silly to attempt to make a comparison of the grants that were made out of a \$16 million budget compared with today. I don't know who you think you are fooling. You are not fooling me. You are, not fooling anybody of my age. Some of the younger people in this province may be foolish enough to fall for it; but again I repeat, it is absolutely stupid to make those comparisons. If the gentleman did it here, today — which one of them was it? That old record keeps playing over and, for gracious sakes! Look up something better; that is worn out. It never was factual, and it isn't today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about our cattle prices. I was very glad the Provincial Treasurer, in his budget report, mentioned cattle. As far as I can find out that is the first time he ever did.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You used the word 'stupid' a while ago. I would say that is very stupid.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, all right; that makes two of us. He mentioned cattle in this report, and I was glad to see that he did because our cattle, today, in the eastern part of this province and across the north end, is the thing that is keeping our farmers going, and it is a very important industry. I often think that the members on the other side of this House probably haven't a clear idea of what goes on in this province; and some of them are inclined, I think, to lay down policies for this country of ours on the basis of what we have on the plains here, where it is all wheat. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of this Province is mixed farming. It has to be mixed farming. It can't be anything else. Over a period of years, the people who practise mixed farming stayed there; the people who didn't practise mixed farming aren't there today. So, it is a mixed farming area, and when they make this statement that has been made by very many Government members from the other side of the House, that you have to have a minimum amount of land in order to farm economically today, they are absolutely wrong. I will agree that with certain types of farming it is true; but it is not true across the province.

When our friend from Kelvington (Mr. Howe) the other day said that (quoting from memory) he thought that anyone who helped to put young man on the farms, today, were doing a disservice to those young men, I was surprised that a man who has lived all his life in this country on a farm, and has enjoyed the bounties of this province for that length of time, for political purposes would make a statement like that, because it isn't true. That is the C.C.F. propaganda, and he is spreading it.

March 7, 1958

I think, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you a little incident that happened to me, this fall, to show you how absolutely wrong these people are, when they go out peddling their propaganda that you have to have a certain acreage in order to farm economically in this country. I will admit that, if times are good like they have been for this last fifteen years (they have been exceptionally good and we have had exceptional rainfall) that the more land you have, the better off you are; but I also point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and I think you know it yourself, that in the depression years — the 'thirties that they talk about, when it kept us busy to buy clothes and food, etc., the people who went broke first were the people who were the big operators. The man who had some stock and farmed as he should do, and grew the products he used on his farm, came out much better, and when it was over, he was in better shape. So let us get this thing right. Let us not swallow a lot of propaganda just because the Baker Commission, or somebody else, said so. Let us look at the thing factually, and look at it over a period of years. After all, Mr. Speaker, the best guide to our conduct is past experience.

Now, I want to tell you people about a friend of mine who came from central Europe, I suppose in the late 'thirties. He was a man with a wife and family; he came out here, and he couldn't speak a word of English. He worked for some bachelors for a few years — not too long; then he picked himself up some old horses and equipment, and got started. Then when the banks and the loan companies and everybody else lost their nerve, and said: 'the country is no good' they wouldn't pay their taxes or anything also; in fact the municipalities sold that land very cheaply, and this man bought one of those half-sections. Today he has \$10,000 worth of buildings on it; he has good equipment and drives a good car.

Mr. Neibrandt: — How much did he pay for it?

Mr. McCarthy: — Very little, but that doesn't matter. He put \$10,000 worth of buildings on it — wait till I get through. I met him in the fall, just about the time the cash advances were coming along; and I asked him if he was going to take a cash advance. He answered, "no" and when I asked him why not, he said he didn't like borrowing money. I said, "Well, how are you making out?" He said, "Fine. I sold some cattle; I sold my calves for \$90 each." Do you know how much land that man has under cultivation, Mr. Speaker? Just 100 acres — but he has put \$10,000 worth of buildings on his land; he has money in the bank; he has equipment; and he came here without any education, without any money. Yet these fellows over here who try to propagate around that you can't make money unless you have a certain number of acres of land — it is just stupid.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — How many acres have you got?

Mr. McCarthy: — I've got too danged much.

Now, here is another thing that I would like to talk about for a few minutes, and that is our cattle market. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a clipping I cut out of the paper. It is a report from the Dominion Department on the Livestock Market. I am not going to read it all, but I would like to quote some of it. You know, we are very fortunate in this province of ours, in this Canada of ours, that we have, today, the cattle market that we have. We have doubled our cattle in the last ten years, and I think I will read just a little of this, to give you an idea about what is happening:

"The cattle market hit a record of \$2,664,000 during the year — an increase of 12 per cent over 1956." (These are 1957 figures).

"This results from an increase in the livestock production in the traditionally grain-growing provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba."

That is, the greater part of that production took place on the prairie provinces, where we are supposed to be wheat growers. It goes on to say that cattle markets were not so good during the early six months of the year, but in the following six months, owing to United States demands, our cattle were picked up, and there was never a surplus, never a ball-up at Winnipeg like we have seen in previous times.

Mr. Neibrandt: — Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? You are talking about the American market. What will we do when they start burning their carcasses over there like they did before?

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, my dear man, you had better ask the Good Man above. I don't know, but I sincerely hope it never happens. I came through the 'thirties and I sincerely hope it never happens. If it does happen, it is something that will be controlled from above, and not man-made laws and some of the situations that we are getting into, today. But the thing, that I am trying to talk about are some of the man-made laws we have in this country, today, a political party who have come out and said that they are going to take 15 per cent of our trade away from the United States. Now, if they had said they were going to increase the trade by 15 per cent, I could go along with them; but when they actually come out and advertise, and keep repeating it — I heard one of the gentleman say three times over the air that he

March 7, 1958

was going to take 15 per cent of our trade from the United States and put it other places.

Mr. Speaker. those people who are doing that are playing with fire. We grow, in this country, enough cattle to do us, and we have just a small surplus, and are very fortunate that, up until now, we have been able to sell that surplus in the United States; and in the United States for the last few years the prices have been higher than anywhere in the world. These people over here try to tell us we have lost the British market. It is all 'baloney'. The British market is there; we can enter it tomorrow, if we want to take half the price we are getting today. The dangerous part of this thing is that, if the United States decided to ban our cattle and not let us ship that particular number in there; if they decided, tomorrow, to restrict our cattle going into the United States, that surplus would have to go to the European market and the price of cattle would go down by half, the day that happened. There is a certain agitation in the United States by the to their government, and there has been for years, to stop having Canadian cattle come in there. So, any party that propagates a thing like that is really playing with fire, because as I said before, if that happened, the price of our cattle would immediately go down by half, not only in Saskatchewan, but right across the board. I did tell here what the total was — a record of \$5 million of cattle sales, in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hold up the House, but there is another matter I think I have spoken on practically every year that I have spoken in this House.

Mr. Howe (Kelvington): — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would answer a question.

Mr. McCarthy: — I'll see what the question is. Don't make a speech.

Mr. Howe: — In regard to the question of diverting trade from the United States to Great Britain, you complained about that, and I would, too; but isn't it true . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, look Mr. Speaker, I think I will carry on.

Mr. Howe: — Is it not true that people . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — It has nothing to do with municipal . . .

Mr. Howe: — Is it not true that the Liberal speakers, today, are saying: "if you can't vote Conservative, vote Liberal?"

Mr. McCarthy: — No, no, you are getting into — I suppose that is my pay-off for criticizing the gentleman. That isn't a question; it's a speech.

Mr. McDonald: — What does Benching say?

Mr. Gardiner: — Or Tim Buck?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — "Vote . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been in this House I have spoken on the subject of Bang's disease. I remember the first time I spoke in this House, as a green member and the boys over there poohed "you don't know what you're talking about — you are crazy" — and all the rest of it. But I think probably, today, that even the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) will admit that I have some slight knowledge of what I am talking about; and I want to say this, and I don't want to say it personally, to the Minister of Agriculture, because I have every respect for him; but I want to repeat that statement that I made the first time I spoke in this House that you are spending a lot of money doing a lot of work, and because you don't go far enough you are not getting any results. I said that before and the figures here today prove it. They pooh-poohed me, and said I didn't know what I was talking about; they had a set of figures worked out in percentages. This Bang's disease started in the Southeast part of the province. We had an incidence down there of 18 to 20 per cent, and they went around doing some testing, and the way they cut the percentages down was by going up here where there wasn't any Bang's disease, and they tested up there, and that brought the overall percentages down.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working at this thing, spending a lot of money, with a lot of good people putting a lot of effort into it, and we are getting nowhere. Just this summer three people in my district had to clean up their herds on account of Bang's disease. If you read this, you would think there wasn't anything to it; that we were getting along fine — but we're not. Now, fortunately, the Dominion Government is coming into the scene and they are doing what I said this Government should have done — and I still say they should have done it; but they didn't have the fortitude or the backbone to do it. The Dominion Government now are doing what this Government should have done when they started this program . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Do you mean in the last eight months?

March 7, 1958

Mr. McCarthy: — . . . and that is that they have now made provision for taking care of these reactors. It is true, they haven't got it in working order yet, but I do hope they will take advantage of this and go at it in a business-like manner. This disease is a very serious disease. It spreads like wildfire, and it is very contagious. It is transferable to humans, and it is a very, very dirty disease. The Provincial Treasurer said something about it, and it was all right, too. He said that this disease was costing us \$2,500,000 and that they were going to put \$50,000 into it, in order to work out a program. Well, I am glad to see it. It should be \$100,000 and it should have been done five years ago. It is estimated that this disease has cost the cattle raisers of Canada . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am sure the hon. member does not want to mislead the House. We have spent about that much money right along, even last year, for Bang's disease.

Mr. McCarthy: — Last year, yes. That's what I said; but I said it should have been more, and sooner. I still say, Mr. Speaker, that they spent the money, but they didn't get the results. After all, the amount of money spent is no criterion as to how successful the program is. The criterion or the success of a program is the result you get, and I still say that you didn't get any results, or at least not the results that were possible.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that is . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, say, Mr. Speaker, I think he can sit down . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Is the hon. member rising on a point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, the hon. member is misleading the House when he says no results were obtained.

Mr. McDonald: — He didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, when I took over the Department, we were testing about 600 cattle a year. That has gone up to 100,000 a year: cattle vaccination, 85,000 a year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McFarlane: — You tested them, but that's all you did.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Cattle vaccination. If the hon. member would take the plugs out of his ears, he would know what I am saying.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — Take the marbles out of your mouth.

Mr. McCarthy: — I am sorry to see the Minister of Agriculture generating so much heat, because, after all, Mr. Speaker, this should be a non-political subject. It is too serious to be kicked around politically. I told this House, and I have told the Minister every year exactly what was happening, and the figures, this year, bear it out. In 1947, we had positive reactors of 555; today we have 6,241 and that is only a fraction of them. Those people down there who shipped out their herds — you have no record of that; they just decided that things were getting so bad they had better get rid of their cattle.

Now we have, thanks to the Federal Government, a set-up whereby we can clean this disease up in five years, if we put the energy and the know-how into it. The common excuse is that we haven't veterinary services. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't need veterinary services to take those tests. Anyone can do it. All you have to do to take those tests is get a sterilized bottle, and be sure you don't touch it with your fingers; take a sample from the ear of the beast and put it in the bottle; put a cork in it and then you send it to Saskatoon. The difference between this and T.B. — a lot of people say it is similar, and it is similar, but the difference between this test and the T.B. test is that you inject the serum into an animal for a T.B. test, and then the vet. has to come back in a certain number of days and complete the test. With this, the vet comes along (it has always been done by vets so far) takes the sample and sends it to Saskatoon. When he takes the test, he puts a tag in the ear so he can identify the animal. I, as the owner, get a report, and the vet who did it get a report; but there is absolutely nothing done with those reactors. If the man has had any experience with them, he gets rid of them fast. I wouldn't have one around my place for five minutes. But there are just enough of them left kicking around this country to keep this thing alive, and unless this new program is properly administered, we are still going to be in the same shape we were before. But with proper administration — and I know vets are scarce; but I don't think they need near the number of vets they think they do, because any common layman can take that test equally as well as a vet. There is no particular skill needed to do it. The only thing you have to do is watch that you don't touch the inside of the bottle or the cork, with your fingers.

If they do that and work at this thing properly, and spend enough money, they can clean up this disease. And another thing, they can't pick out a little corner in this part of the province, and another little corner in another part. If they are going to do it, they have to start right at the southeast corner of this province and

March 7, 1958

put some energy into it, and go right across the province. If they do that, in five years they will be rid of the Bang's disease. Their vaccination program is all right; it is a wonderful thing. If we hadn't had vaccination today, our cattle population would be away down; but, on the other hand, the vaccination is only from 75 to 80 per cent efficient, under very favourable circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, it is a quarter after five; I think probably I had better dry up. I shall not support the motion. I say to this Government, get out of the horse-and-buggy days, cease looking backwards — look forward and perform your duties as a Government towards the municipalities of this province.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I have copies, Mr. Speaker, of the Budget Speeches for the hon. member from Cannington, each one of which, ever since I have started making Budget Speeches in this House, refers to cattle.

Mr. McCarthy: — I already have them all, thank you.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — I had not intended to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and when I say I am going to be brief, I am not going to be like the member for Cannington and ramble on for a quarter of an hour.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer, and I regret very much what I have seen in this House, and heard statements that have been said which assassinate his character. I happen to have been raised with Mr. Fines in the province of Manitoba, and I know his father, who spent all his lifetime as a school-teacher, who was a credit to the teaching profession to which I belong; who raised a fine family, spent all the years of his life in the teaching profession, and retired a highly respected citizen and person in the community around the vicinity of Balmoral, and I resent very much when people on the opposite side make their complaints on personal things. It is all right to criticize the C.C.F. Party, but when they go out particularly to assassinate a personal friend of mine, I think it is only right that I should stand . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Are you talking to me?

Mr. Willis: — I am talking to all of you over there, and to the disparaging remarks . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, if I have said anything disparaging about the Provincial Treasurer, I apologize.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, I enjoyed what you said.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, I hope I didn't say anything disparaging about you. Good show!

Mr. Willis: — Politics were never played in this province prior to 1944, about grants as there is being done now.

Mr. McCarthy: — On a point of privilege. I said no such thing, I said politics was always mixed up in grants — I never said any such thing.

Mr. Willis: — The member for Cannington happened at one time to live in the constituency of Elrose, Mr. Speaker, and he knows whereof I speak. For years in our constituency Highway No. 44 had signs up and the cattle rubbed them so long, they had fallen over and you couldn't find the highway.

Mr. McCarthy: — We have got some of them like that down there right now.

Mr. Willis: — . . . and he said that this Government tried to slip it over the municipalities . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — They did.

Mr. Willis: — That is not true, because municipalities were called in, and the proposition was submitted to them by the Government, sitting around the table and agreeing with the municipalities. And my friend from Cannington said, "Look what we gave the municipalities before", and I happen to have the record of Elrose constituency and in 11 years — the last ten years they were in power — they gave all the municipalities of Elrose constituency the great sum of \$9,500 — in ten years. In one year, last year, one municipality got twice that amount to build roads.

In other words, they put up the roads and if you want to stop and see, I'll take you over them, and they are fine roads too. For ten years we didn't get anything of the gasoline tax — It is not true because at the present time the municipalities are getting 25 per cent of the total gasoline tax of this province.

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Willis: — Well, these statements are made by the member who has lived in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. These are the facts and he knows them — who is he trying to kid this afternoon?

March 7, 1958

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Telephones for the fine work he completed last year and for the fine automatic change which opened in the town of Eston last year, and something that is most heartening to see is that the help this Provincial Government is giving for the need to build residences for our elderly citizens all over this province. From this fund there will be a senior home in the town of Elrose. Next year in the town of Eston, with the adjoining municipalities, will be opened a senior home there, with a bed capacity or room for 60 persons. This is a fine thing, and I do think I would be remiss in expressing on behalf of those elderly people the gratitude for the contribution that has been made by this Government to give those elderly people a place where they can live and enjoy life for the few years that are remaining for them.

Mr. Speaker, I said I was going to speak briefly, and a school-teacher is always brief — I wish to support the Budget.

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

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 66 — An Act respecting the School Secretary-Treasurers' Association of Saskatchewan

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Bill No. 66 is a Bill that will give to the School Unit Secretaries the right too organize somewhat along the same lines as the Municipal Secretary's Association.

This Bill has been perused by the Department of Education and the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) assures me that there is nothing in the bill which they are asking for that is contrary to the School Act or the Department; that it is not detrimental in any way.

I think this Bill can be well discussed in Committee when it goes in the committee stage, so I would move the second reading of the Bill, and move that it be referred to the Law Amendment Committee.

(Referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegates Powers).

ANNOUNCEMENT

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, if I may make an announcement. Within the last two weeks a complaint has been made to me regarding the conduct of Michael Edward Somers, administrator of estates. As a result of inquiries made by the Attorney General's Department, and the R.C.M.P., it has been necessary, this afternoon, to charge him in connection with misappropriation and the disposition of trust funds belonging to Peter Romanko, deceased.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m.