

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
18th Day

Monday, March 10, 1958

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Friday, March 7, 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. C.G. Willis (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal this afternoon I wish first of all to comment on the programme of the Department of Public Works. It is to be noted that the \$8,800,000 included in the budget for Public Works ranks my department fifth among the various governmental departments as a spending agency. However, considering only money allotted in capital programmes, Public Works is the second largest spender of the various departments.

Our capital programme for new construction totalling \$6.5 million is surpassed only by the \$13.7 million to be spent on Highways.

The responsibilities of the department have increased enormously when one considers that the amount spent on construction by Public Works in the year 1943-44 totalled only \$51,584. This coming year the \$6.5 million to be spent in 1958-59 will be expended in completing buildings already under way.

This past summer construction was commenced here in our Legislative grounds of a provincial laboratory building, which will be completed and occupied in 1958. This one-storey building will house the provincial laboratory, which at present is situated in the Grey Nuns Hospital here in the city. In conjunction with the provincial laboratory we are erecting a five-storey building designed to house the Departments of Health and Social Welfare. Although construction began on this building last fall, it will not be completed until 1958-59. These two structures situated just south of the Administration Building will cost approximately \$3 1/2 million when completed.

Another new building, begun in 1957, is the Saskatchewan

March 10, 1958

Boys' School. This building, situated just west of the city, off Dewdney Avenue, has recently been completed and I understand Social Welfare are moving the boys into the building today. As members are aware, this is the first stage of construction of the Boys' School and an amount of \$75,000 has been included in our estimates to provide additional facilities.

Work has been progressing all winter on the renovation of the present Boys' School. When this is completed in the spring, it will be used as geriatric and rehabilitation centre, as a physical restoration centre.

The Saskatchewan Research Laboratory building was commenced last year on the grounds of the University of Saskatchewan. A picture of this building is contained in the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works, tabled at this Session, and in the most recent annual report of the Saskatchewan Research Council. The last mentioned report also contains a layout of the floor space which should be of interest to the members. This building, costing, about \$410,000 will be completed this summer.

Good progress has been made on a new court house in Saskatoon, which was started late last summer. It is expected that this building, the total cost of which will be about \$1,300,000 will be in use this coming fall.

Plans are currently being made for a law Courts building here in Regina, which we expect will be started in 1959. The geological and core laboratory building is being constructed for the Department of Mineral Resources on Dewdney Avenue East and is near completion. The core laboratory today is presently being filled with rock core samples, which formerly had been stored at various points in the city.

The Highways office and machine shop was started at Tisdale, while a storage shed was constructed at Watson to house Highway equipment.

Work was also started last fall on the 120-bed addition to the Irrigation building at Saskatchewan Hospital, North Battleford. This should be finished within the coming year.

At North Battleford, too, we plan to commence construction of a provincial office building. This building will be a three-storey structure, with total floor space of approximately 24,000 square feet. It will house 15 government agencies, and will bring under one roof all of our governmental activity in North Battleford outside of

our Crown Corporations.

At the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn, roof alterations have been completed on the northeast wing of the main building. Space made available here is being used to house staff members. A second contract has been let for alterations to the roof of the main wing. The families dome which once graced this section of the building has been removed in line with the general plans. This new part of the building will make available various rooms for training of staff and treatment of patients, as well as offices for staff doctors. \$75,000 has been included in Public Works budget once again, in order to continue our program of re-conversion of the general wards at Saskatchewan Hospital, Weyburn. This re-conversion program is slowly but surely making over the large dismal wards which were provided when the building was originally constructed in 1921. We are transforming the former bleakness of these wards into comfortable living quarters.

At the University of Saskatchewan it is planned to commence construction this year of three new buildings. It is hoped that one, the Animal Husbandry Building and a biology building, will be far enough along not only for use next year, but also that official opening ceremonies can be part of the University's celebration of its 50th Anniversary, which will take place in 1959. Architects have been busy preparing plans for these buildings for some time.

It is hoped to start construction on the 20-bed Lac la Ronge hospital this year.

The Provincial Treasurer, in his budget address, has made reference to the contribution which our construction program has made in providing winter employment in our province. In January of this year, my department had 10 projects under way, namely, the Provincial laboratory here in Regina; the physical restoration centre, the boys' school, and the sub-surface lab and core storage building all in Regina; maintenance building at the University of Saskatchewan; Saskatchewan Research Council at the University of Saskatchewan; a Court House in Saskatoon, additional patient accommodation, Saskatchewan hospital at Weyburn, and alterations to Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn.

The work has been done by six construction firms, or I should say the work is being done by six construction firms, one project being done by Public Works crew. The maximum number employed during the period January 6 to 11 was 170 workmen, including electricians, steamfitters, plumbers, bricklayers, carpenters, tinsmiths, painters and labourers. Besides this direct effect of employing so many people on these projects, there is the other indirect effect on supplying firms, all of which will aid in keeping unemployment at a minimum, in the crucial period in which we now find ourselves.

March 10, 1958

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I gave the total cost of public buildings constructed in this province since its formation. By March 31 of this current year, the figure representing the cost of public buildings constructed by Public Works Department since 1905 will total some \$74.6 millions. Of this \$74.6 million, some \$24.2 million was the total cost of public building constructed in the period 1905 to 1944, and \$40 million the total cost of public buildings constructed after 1944 by this Government. Since the last Session I have become familiar with a pamphlet put out by the Treasury Board, entitled 'General Financial and Economic Information'. In the November, 1957, issue I came across a table showing the net direct and indirect debt of the province, and another table listing the composition of the net direct and indirect debt. In this latter table I was interested to read that the direct attributable to public building was shown as \$11,936,000 in 1957. Upon checking back, Mr. Speaker, I found the debt attributable to public buildings in 1944 was \$23.4 million. These are indeed interesting figures. From them we learn that Governments previous to 1944 paid only \$800,000 of the capital cost of public buildings erected in that period in our province. Practically all the cost of public buildings constructed before 1944 was still unpaid when this Government assumed office. Since 1944, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. have not only built public buildings to the value of \$50 million, but have also reduced that portion of the public debt attributable to public buildings from \$23.4 million in 1944 to \$11.9 million as at November, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, when the \$11.9 million of debt outstanding against public buildings has been paid off, this C.C.F. Government will be able to take credit for having paid practically the entire cost of all the public buildings constructed in this province since 1905.

At this time, too, Mr. Speaker, I should say a word about the ordinary expenditures of my department.

Mr. Loftson: — . . . that by a stroke of the pen!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — It is all too easy to emphasize the expenditure for construction of new buildings, but it seems to me that the maintenance of the approximately 700 buildings under the care of the Department is equally important. This year's estimates on ordinary accounts total \$2,289,000. Of this amount \$2,141,000 is budgeted for the maintenance of our public buildings. This appears to be a large sum, Mr. Speaker, and it is, but it shrinks in size when we compare it with the amount of \$1,512,000 expended in 1942-43 for the maintenance of the smaller number of public buildings the province then had. This coming year, the Department will maintain in good order 700 buildings, for \$2,141,000, when back in 1942-43, a period of low prices, Mr. Speaker, the former government serviced a much smaller number of buildings for \$1,512,000. One wonders, indeed, what was

included in maintenance of buildings in the 'good old days'.

In the time remaining at my disposal, I wish to comment briefly on the statement made by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) on Friday last, and I see the effort was too much for him, he hasn't been able to make it today. He's not in his seat at the present time.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Don't worry. He'll be here.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — If you keep that up, there won't be anyone here!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The member for Cannington stated that actions of this Government in making grants to municipalities were more political than those of any other government in the history of this province. I'm going to review figures, Mr. Speaker, which I have given to this Legislature before, which certainly disproves that statement. I am doing so, Mr. Speaker, not because I hope to change the hon. member's mind or opinion, or the opinion of his colleagues, but because if such statements are permitted to go unchallenged, people in the country will begin to think that maybe there is some truth in that.

Mr. Gardiner: — It's all true.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I'm doing it too, Mr. Speaker, because I want to bring them up to date and show the people of this province the large amount of assistance this budget contains for the municipalities. I have figures here showing the assistance given to the nine municipalities wholly or partly within the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. These figures cover the years from 1934-35 to 1952. First, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the record of the Liberals 10 years prior to this Government taking office, this chart shows that every one of those nine municipalities received a grant from the Provincial Government in only two out of the 10 years from 1935 to 1944. Why did they all receive grants only in two out of the 10 years? Mr. Speaker, there is a simple reason — a political reason. 1935-36 was a federal election year and grants were made to all nine municipalities. 1938-39 was an election year — a provincial election year, and grants again were made to all of the nine R.M.'s. Mr. Speaker, in five non-election years from 1935-44 the record is entirely different. In 1936, the year following the election, one municipality received a grant totalling \$10.

March 10, 1958

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — That's a cracked record!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — In 1937-38 one of the nine municipalities received a grant. This was a little better, \$1,700. In 1939-40 one of the nine municipalities again received a grant totalling \$300. In 1940-41 one of the municipalities again received a grant totalling \$300. In 1941-42 another municipality received a grant, \$105 and in 1942-43 another municipality received grant, \$65. The total for those five year, \$780 spread over nine municipalities!

What makes the record all the more damning, Mr. Speaker is that during this period the Liberal government had the municipalities collect a two-mill public revenue tax on their assessment, and hand the money over to the Provincial Government.

Mr. Danielson: — You stole it!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The nine R.M.'s in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale have a total assessment, Mr. Speaker, of \$25 million. Two mills of this amount brings in \$50,000 a year which the Liberal provincial government was taxing the ratepayers of my constituency, on one hand, and yet on the other hand turning back to them a total of \$780 in five years.

Opposition Members: — Oh, oh, oh!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Cannington had not taken the trouble to look up this 10-year Liberal record before making his statements.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't have to look it up; I lived through it.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I don't think he has looked at the record of the C.C.F. since 1944 either, Mr. Speaker. Upon assuming office the C.C.F. Government adopted the principle of paying grants to municipalities in each and every year. Soon after 1944 a formula was devised to pay grants on an equalization basis. These grants are paid as a matter of rights . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Stolen money!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . election year, or non-election year. But, says the hon. member for Cannington, 134 municipalities did not receive grants the two or three years before the grid road system was brought about. That is right, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members opposite know why. Even I think the hon. member for Cannington knows why. They know that in 1952 the Provincial Government

said to the municipalities of the province, "you will no longer have to hand over to the province the monies you collect from the two-mill public revenue tax. That may be kept for your own use." The result of that action, Mr. Speaker, as I stated, was the R.M.'s in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale received \$50,000 a year extra in taxes, taxes which they had formerly collected and turned back to the provincial government.

Mr. McCarthy: — The C.C.F. as well as the Liberals!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — However, the municipalities didn't all receive the same amount from the Public Revenue Tax, because the municipal assessments vary. The C.C.F. Government pledged that no municipality would receive from the Public Revenue Tax, less than three and one-half times what its equalization grant had been in 1952. On the other hand, municipalities receiving more than three and one half times their equalization grant as a result of the Public Revenue Tax being collected by themselves, received no equalization grant in 1953. The same total amount of grant was paid to the municipalities in 1953 as in 1952, only to a fewer number of municipalities. Six of the nine municipalities in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, Mr. Speaker, high-assessed municipalities, received no grant in 1953 as a result of this action by the provincial government. One municipality received from the return of the Public Revenue Tax, however, \$8,200. Its equalization grant formerly had been \$660, and was no longer paid. The R.M., Mr. Speaker, did not complain because of this increase in monies received from \$660 to \$8,200.

Mr. McCarthy: — You're helping out the high assessed municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, rural municipalities with low assessments received substantial grant increases. The lowest assessed municipality in my constituency received \$1,600 from the turning over of the Public Revenue Tax, and in addition received an equalization grant of \$4,558. This municipality too, was well satisfied, and yet the hon. member for Cannington calls this treatment of the rural municipalities 'political'. How absurd, Mr. Speaker!

Then what about assistance to municipalities at present? In spite of the fact that two of the municipalities in Melfort-Tisdale constituency did not participate in the grid road program, total municipal grants paid to the nine rural municipalities in my constituency amounted in 1957 to a total of \$180,209, or an average of \$20,000 per year for each municipality. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cannington should have studied the records before making irresponsible statements about grants. Does he know for instance that R.M. No. 459, the municipality of Kinistino in my constituency received a total of

March 10, 1958

\$37,294 in grants during the fiscal year in 1957-58, compared to \$300 in 1943. He certainly couldn't have known that another R.M. No, 457, the municipality of Connaught, received a total grant of \$42,661 as compared with nothing in 1943.

Even the two municipalities that did not participate in the grid road plan received a substantial assistance. One municipality, No. 199 R.M. of Lake Lenore, received an equalization grant of \$1,949. That amount in itself is bigger than the total grants paid to all nine municipalities in seven out of the 10 years prior to 1944.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's a great comparison!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The second rural municipality which did not participate in the plan, R.M. No, 428, Star City, received a bridge grant of \$10,835 last year. Nothing was received by this rural municipality in 1943. This \$10,800 is more than half of the entire amount of grants paid to the nine rural municipalities in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale in the ten-year period 1935-1944.

Mr. McCarthy: — They used to build the bridges altogether and didn't charge them back to the municipalities at all. You're all wet.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I started to refute the statement that was made by the hon. member for Cannington. I think I have done that.

Government. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I have shown that grants to rural municipalities from 1935 to 1944 were paid almost entirely in election years. I have shown that grants to rural municipalities made by this Government are based on a formula, that they are paid to the municipalities as a matter of right. The municipality of Kinistino didn't get a grant of \$32,000 because of politics; they earned the grant by constructing grid roads. The municipality of Barrier Valley didn't get an equalization grant of \$7,266 in 1957 because of politics; the amount of equalization grant was decided by means of a formula. This municipality is entitled to its equalization grant each and every year.

I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Cannington is confused. He looked at the grant record for 1935-44 and somehow or other thought that the C.C.F. were responsible.

Mr. Speaker, under this Government the rural municipalities have had a new deal. The set-up of 1935-44 has gone forever from

the scenes of Saskatchewan. Never in the history of this province have the municipalities had it so good as they have had since 1944.

Mr. McCarthy: — I suggest the Minister make that speech to the Municipal convention and see how far he gets with it!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on his \$130 million budget, and again congratulate the people of Saskatchewan on the fact that this amount will be spent, most of it within the province, on matters pertaining to their welfare. The Department of Labour's share will be \$1,090,000 and Telephones \$10,050,000 and I will, in the time allotted to me present the House with some figures as to how it will be spent. I have not too many minutes at my disposal, Mr. Speaker, and I trust you will bear with me if I appear to jump from one subject to another rather abruptly.

The Wages and Hours Branch which handles complaints in regard to non-payment of wages, or holiday pay, improper notice, and so forth, collected \$147,441 in 1957 for 2,920 employees involving 899 employers. Where it was necessary to take such matters to court, we won 20 cases and lost none. Our Conciliation Officers intervened in 154 disputes and we set up 18 Boards of Conciliation. The Apprenticeship Branch is functioning very well this year and we have 1,387 apprentices as at the end of February, compared with 1,139 at the same time last year.

Last fall I attended the annual convention of the International Association Government Labour Officials in Boise, Idaho. Driving through the state of Nebraska the day before, a filling station attendant being rather puzzled at the name of 'Saskatchewan' admitted that he had never heard of it before. Two or three hundred miles further another attendant thought it was in Alaska, which was some improvement, and when I reached over and opened one of his own road maps and showed him our province which is not too far from Nebraska, he did look rather embarrassed, but the pay-off came when I registered at the hotel in Boise and the lady clerk asked if Saskatchewan was part of British Columbia. While the location of our province was gradually being pinpointed, I was somewhat annoyed to think that it was not better known in the Western States, but no doubt the Department of Travel and Information will take care of this.

Many provinces and states were represented at the convention, including delegates from Ottawa and Washington, D.C., and a

March 10, 1958

great deal of constructive information was exchanged. We presented a paper on apprenticeship matters which was well received, and lead a discussion which followed on this important subject. It was obvious that labour legislation in many of the States, or Canadian provinces, is not comparable to legislation we have right here in Saskatchewan, where the rights of the wage earner are protected at all times without infringing on the rights of management.

Perhaps one of the outstanding pieces of labour legislation passed by this Government has been The Holidays-With-Pay Act in effect since October, 1944, which provides two weeks a year. At that time there were two, or perhaps three other provinces where one week was provided. Gradually, however, all other provinces have come up to at least one week. Manitoba now provides two weeks' holidays after two years' service, Alberta two weeks after three years' service, and British Columbia two weeks the same as ours, but 13 years later. We understand the Federal Government provides its employees with one week of holidays the first two years, and two weeks after that. Employees of our Provincial Government receive three weeks from the start.

Some employers provide three weeks' holidays after 15 years of service, Mr. Speaker, some after 10, some after five years. A number of unions have this latter provision in their contracts. With such long winters as we have on the prairies, we feel that a reasonably lengthy holiday of three weeks can well be justified and greatly appreciated by many wage-earners and their families. In addition the incentive of this extra week after five years' service could have the tendency to cause wage earners to remain in their employ for longer periods, and reduce the numbers who change jobs. (Quite often to the detriment of the employer.) Also, the employer would keep his loyal and efficient help for many more years, all to his, the employer's advantage.

Many firms, by staggering the holiday period, are not faced with a cash outlay of the cost of providing the extra week's holidays. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker. I propose to bring in legislation in a few days which will provide three weeks' holidays for employees having over five years' service with the same employer, which according to the statistics will only affect approximately 12 per cent of the labour force of this province.

I have here something that will be of interest to farmers. From time to time we hear complaints regarding farmers having difficulties during harvest season, getting repairs for farm machinery on weekends. It is claimed that employees have either all of, or Saturday afternoon off and harvesting operations are stopped until Monday morning. Actually there is nothing in our labour legislation, Mr. Speaker, that causes such an inconvenience. These firms or agencies can well

correct the situation if they care to do so, by staggering the hours or the days off, keeping a skeleton staff on Saturdays, or in a small agency, keeping the shop open themselves. The modern trend for all wage-earners is a shorter work-week and either a day and a half off, or two days off consecutively, not only in Saskatchewan but in all parts of Canada.

This, however, cannot be used as an excuse for our main industry, agriculture, being inconvenienced during the harvest season. Farmers could correct this situation by refusing to buy machinery for which they could not be guaranteed repairs quickly during the harvest season. This would soon bring the large machine companies to time, if it affected their sales.

Now something in connection with fire hazards — a very important matter, we think. We in the Government are greatly concerned over the number of fires that have occurred since the beginning of the new year, which has resulted in the loss of life of 12 children and two adults — a total of 15, which is equal to the loss of life by fire for the entire year of 1956. The cause of these fires was investigated by members of the Fire Commissioner's office, and the most probable reasons for the loss of life has been recorded as follows: faulty or substandard heating equipment resulted in the death of eight children and two adults; careless or improper use of inflammable liquids, two children and one adult; smoking and matches, two children. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to legislate against this gambling with human life.

The policy of using substandard heating equipment and the results of careless firing of heating equipment, has repeatedly been brought to the attention of Saskatchewan citizens by my Department. Recently I issued a press statement, warning people of fire hazards, including the dangers of pipes being too close to inflammable partitions and ceilings, and it was somewhat ironical that the same day it appeared in the paper, six people, five of them children, lost their lives in two separate fires in this province. Saskatchewan led Canada that week in the dubious distinction of loss of life by fire. In one of the dwellings the stove-pipe was only three inches from the ceiling, covered with a pressed paper composition board. Such pipes should be at least 18 inches from the walls or ceilings. In the other instance, parents had smelled smoke in their dwelling for several days, apparently caused by a faulty chimney but apparently had done nothing about it. The resultant fire took the lives of two children.

When will people ever learn that gasoline is for running automobiles, tractors or aeroplanes, and that cleaning clothes with it is a foolhardy act, as many people have found out. Another common practice is to light and quicken fires with coal oil — a practice which

March 10, 1958

takes an annual toll in lives each year, This wanton loss of life will continue as long as people continue to use improperly installed substandard, overloaded, electrical wiring, or refuse to clean their chimneys or pipes, and continue to allow the improper use of inflammable liquids, and permit or practice careless smoking habits. These are the main causes of fire in our province.

Investigations by members of the Fire Commissioner's office have revealed that lives could have been saved after the fire broke out, if parents planned ahead of time, with all members of the family, a method of escape from their home in the event of fire. Panic, excitement, smoke and flames are not conducive to cool and intelligent action. If citizens wait until these conditions are present, the results are usually disastrous. If all citizens would adhere to a few common sense rules, much pain and misery could be averted each year.

Turning to Telephones, Mr. Speaker — it is of interest to know that exactly 10 years ago, December 31, 1947 there were 7,739 persons waiting for phones in our province. Just at the end of last December, 1957 that list had been reduced to 1,178, or a percentage of .8 per cent and many telephone companies think if their waiting list is less than .5 per cent, they haven't got a waiting list at all, so we've done well, very well in the past 10 years.

It is also interesting to note that 10 years ago there were 58,902 telephones in service in Saskatchewan. Ten years later, at the end of 1957 we had 147,395 telephones, and that in a little over eight years we had installed more telephones than we had installed in the previous 41 years.

The most outstanding event of our 1957 program, Mr. Speaker, was the completion of the Saskatchewan portion of the Transcontinental microwave system. This was officially opened from Winnipeg to Regina on April 26 last year, Regina to Saskatoon on June 16, and from Regina to points in Alberta, November 24. The whole program is expected to be completed in June of 1958 when it will reach the Pacific Coast. The installation of this microwave system is an event of great importance in Canada's communications industry. Already it has provided large numbers of much-needed long distance circuits, and will provide many more in the future and do so economically. The microwave system will allow live television programs to be transmitted right across Canada, in fact most of Canada is covered at the present time.

Long distance circuits derived from this microwave system have made a vital contribution to the service improvements we have achieved in 1957. It has worked extremely well; the circuits we get from it are remarkably trouble-free and of high quality.

There was a decrease in net income for 1957 of approximately \$870,000 — for the following reasons: the long distance business did not increase as much as has been usual. During 1957 we made grants in lieu of taxes for buildings and property to different municipal governments in Saskatchewan amounting to approximately \$175,000 and that was greatly appreciated, Mr. Speaker, by those municipalities.

We have made heavy investment in the Transcontinental microwave system — over \$7 million. This is a long-term project, and will not produce a profit for a while yet. Many items of cost, including wages, have continued to go up.

The town of Kamsack and Eston were converted to automatic telephone service during 1957 for both local and rural subscribers, with up-to-date modern buildings at these points. The towns of Wynyard, Wadena and Shaunavon will be provided with automatic service sometime during late 1959, or the early part of 1960. The town of Unity is quite high on our list for dial service but it will be at least two years from now before it is installed, (I see the member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) is quite pleased over that statement.)

Buildings and towers, on which the amount of \$1,480,000 which will be spent in 1958; construction of a new warehouse building and a garage at a cost of approximately \$1 million for government telephones is to be proceeded with in Regina during 1958. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this building has been badly needed for quite a long time. A new building to serve the Canora exchange is estimated to cost \$150,000 for land and construction. Other items in the building program include extension to Weyburn building started in 1957, \$75,000; extension to North Battleford's building, \$135,000; various other buildings including an extension to the Uranium City office will cost another \$165,000. Steel towers at seven repeater sites for our microwave system are budgeted at \$85,000.

From time to time, Mr. Speaker, we hear complaints to the effect that the Provincial Government should assist, and in some cases it has been suggested that we should take over the rural telephone companies of which we have over 1,100 in this province, and with a total number of 52,000 rural telephones in farmers' houses. Hundreds of these companies are well run, have excellent equipment and give good service to their subscribers. On the other hand there are many companies which have poor equipment, poor lines and give indifferent service, the main reason being lack of funds in areas of the province not so productive as others.

The Saskatchewan Government Telephones is aware of the situation, and spends considerable sums of money each year in ways of assistance. Following is a list of what we do now. First, recently

arrangements have been made whereby the Government of Saskatchewan may purchase up to half the debentures issued for a rural project, provided proper approval is obtained in each case. Two, we have a Department of Rural Telephones to help the rural companies. This Department of Rural Telephones helps to organize them, and provides advice and assistance of all kinds in handling their affairs, which includes inspection and technical service. This branch has a superintendent and 12 full-time employees, and costs the Saskatchewan Government Telephones approximately \$56,000 each year. Third, when areas are converted to dial operation the Saskatchewan Government Telephones provides new and rebuilt dial telephones without cost to the rural telephone companies who are affected by the change. These new sets are fairly expensive, Mr. Speaker, costing approximately \$34 apiece. Fourth, we provide a fuse protector for better protection against crosses with power-lines where such protectors were not installed in the first instance. The Power Corporation assists in this cost. Fifth, the Saskatchewan Government Telephones when rebuilding a pole lead with rural circuits across a road, puts in poles big enough to accommodate the rural lines; the only charge here is a very low rental that is made when the rural circuits are actually put on our poles. Sixth, the Department of Rural Telephones puts on a series of short courses during the winter to train rural trouble men. Seven, we give other miscellaneous services such as repairing or reconditioning telephones in the repair shop at Regina for rural telephone companies at their cost.

Mr. Speaker, when we hear anyone say that the Saskatchewan Government Telephones does nothing for the rurals, we will be in a position to correct them. However, this does not mean that we do nothing more, because we know that many companies have a difficult time and do not provide particularly good service. At the present time we are planning to provide 24-hour service to all rural companies with 200 subscribers or more, commencing next September. The cost will be relatively high, amounting to almost \$278,000 per year, of which we expect to recover \$114,000, by placing customers in group two and some of them in group three, at slightly higher rates. With some increase in long distance calls, we estimate the net cost to the telephone company will be about \$164,000 a year.

Now I come to the unemployment situation, and I wish to take a few minutes on that. We all realize that it is unquestionably bad. The latest figures published jointly by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the Department of Labour at Ottawa, show that at January 18, the number of persons without jobs and seeking work was 520,000, which is the highest since the Government began collecting unemployment statistics after the end of the Second World War. We are told that the present situation is due to reduced activity in trade and service industries after Christmas, and through winter

slackening in construction, transportation equipment, manufacturing and agriculture. Black as it is, this picture does not tell the whole story. The unemployment situation is actually much worse, Mr. Speaker. If one looks at the statistical tables appended to the release I have referred to, we would see that the number of registrations at National Employment Service offices across Canada as at January 16 stood at the all-time high of 816,892. You have probably seen the current controversy as to which one of the two figures published by the Federal authorities, the lower or the higher one, represents more correctly the number of unemployed.

An editorial in 'The Leader-Post' on January 24 last argued that the higher figure is wrong; that it presents a distorted picture of the unemployment situation. According to 'The Leader-Post' the persons who registered for employment with the National Employment Service offices include those who are working, but who are hopeful of obtaining jobs more to their liking. Included also are persons desirous of part-time employment, as well as some who are drawing unemployment insurance benefits and who prefer waiting until employment opens up in their line. 'The Leader-Post' concludes that the national unemployment service figures exaggerate the total number of unemployed, and suggests that the lower figure, that is to say the one published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, is the correct one. I would be interested to know what the writer of this editorial in 'The Leader-Post' thought when he found out he was siding in the controversy with the Hon. George Hees, Progressive Conservative Minister of Transport, and that he was arguing against Mr. Paul Martin, former Liberal Minister of Health and Welfare.

As most of you probably know, Mr. Martin is reported to have made a speech in Hamilton on February 14, in which he claimed there were almost 900,000 job applicants in Canada, whereas Mr. Hees had claimed that Canada did not have any more than 386,000 unemployed. This controversy between prominent representatives of the two parties which are responsible for the position we are in, would have been amusing if it did not affect so gravely the lives of millions of Canadians. Our position in regard to unemployment is even worse than that of the United States, when the figure in January was 4 1/2 million and is now up to 5 million. This will be the highest figure since 1941, representing more than six per cent of the total labour force in the United States. In Canada the unemployed represents 8.8 per cent of the total labour force, if we accept that the number of unemployed is only 520,000 as estimated by the D.B.S. If the National Employment Service figure of 816,000 is used, which is the correct one, by the way, the unemployed in Canada represents 13.8 per cent of the labour force. This means that approximately one out of every five Canadian workers today is looking for a job. It also means that more than 3 million Canadian persons are suffering, in some way, the consequences of unemployment.

In Saskatchewan the number of applicants registered with the local offices of the National Employment Service as at March 7 was 26,832 — the latest figures, we just got them this morning, Mr. Speaker. The number of unemployed in Saskatchewan represents 9 per cent of our total labour force as against 13.8 per cent for Canada as a whole, better than most provinces.

It is true that our relatively favourable position in regard to unemployment is due to some extent to the large part which agriculture plays in our economy. However, it is equally true that the Government of Saskatchewan has shown foresight in this matter. Last June the Cabinet issued a directive to all government departments and agencies instructing them, among other things:

- (a) to reserve maintenance and repair work for winter months;
- (b) to time construction contracts and projects so as to produce maximum winter employment, providing that it will not jeopardize the continuity of employment of permanent government employees.

The implementation of this directive by the various departments and agencies of government has resulted in the provision of many winter jobs. The value of construction projects which are being carried on by the Department of Public Works alone amounts to \$5,700,000. My department has given active support to the winter employment campaign, which is being waged all across the province by labour unions, business groups, federal authorities and various womens' and church organizations. We have spent approximately \$2,500 on the do-it-now program in various ways — mostly newspaper advertising, radio, television, pamphlets and so forth. The results have been most gratifying and many men have had work this winter when they would otherwise have been idle. We would like to have done more, but unfortunately there are limits to the projects that the Provincial Government can undertake on its own. I would like, at this point, to thank all those organizations and all individuals for the splendid co-operation we have received from them in assisting to keep the unemployment figure as low as possible.

The responsibility for creating full employment in Canada, we all realize, I think, Mr. Speaker, lies with the federal authorities and also from the fact that many important projects in Canada affect the economies of two or more provinces. For instance, projects like the Trans-Canada Highway, the Alaska Highway, the St. Lawrence Seaway, have a bearing on the economics of several provinces at a time, yet no individual alone could embark on such an undertaking.

I see my time is almost up, Mr. Speaker, and I just have

one more point to cover, and it is this: we have had some reports of persons being required to call the Fire Department or the Police Department in a hurry, perhaps at night in the case of a prowler, when the lights turned on would scare him away. Technical difficulties make it impossible to use small numbers easy to remember, so all the person needs to do in the case of an emergency is to dial "0" — that can be done easily enough in the dark or in a hurry, if you can't look up the other number. Operators are instructed what to do and will get the message through very quickly, and you will be talking to either one of those departments inside of 15 or 20 seconds. The practice of calling "0" however, should only be used in case of real emergency.

That is all I have today, Mr. Speaker, and I take pleasure in announcing that I will support the Budget.

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, before I say a few words on the budget, I want to take a few moments to congratulate all of those who have spoken before me on both the Speech from the Throne and the Budget Speech. Although I sometimes wonder, I hope that they have tried to contribute something worthwhile in the administration of the affairs of our province.

On June 20, 1956 we were all elected by the people of the province. I felt that on that day I was elected to serve all the people of my constituency. In doing this I have made an effort to contact as many as possible, to find out what their problems were, and in doing so I have discovered some discrepancies that I think should be brought to the attention of this group, and also that these people in my area are just ordinary human beings who want a fair break — nothing extra.

While driving through the fringe areas of my constituency, the one thing that I was told about more than any of the others was the desperate need for the farmer in the fringe areas to have the right to go into the bush on a stumpage basis and take out timber so that he would own the timber after having paid the stumpage, sell it to the Timber Board if he so desired, or trade it for machinery which is much needed. That is one thing that is almost a unanimous question when travelling the fringe areas where the population is very light and the acreages are small. They feel as they used to, before the inception of the Timber Board, they could get together and go and get a few thousand feet of lumber and peddle it off, or sell it, or do as they liked, and the need for winter employment is a very great need in that area.

Secondly, the most requested thing was a relaxation of

high taxes. We hear a lot of quotations about taxes — the average taxes in Saskatchewan, and here we have — this is a quotation that came up on the floor here the other day, but I will come back to that later, anyway — but the taxes were quoted as \$68 and something for a quarter-section of land — average in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I have a quarter-section of land 23 miles from the nearest elevator, 17 miles of it on dirt road and my taxes are \$108. Thirty acres of it is recognized to be waste land — \$108! I have a group of tax notices here but they are all so far out of line that you would wonder if the statement the hon. gentleman made could be anywhere near true. Here is a quarter-section, \$230 taxes. Of that, \$117.80 is school taxes. Another one \$244.66 — of that \$120.90 is school tax; and I have here a half-section of land that is sub-marginal pasture land, fenced, seeded down for pasture, and the taxes on that half -section are \$231 with \$120.90 or 55 per cent school taxes. Now that is one — I have another one here, this one is northeast of White Fox — almost a fringe area settlement, and the taxes on a quarter-section of land, some \$187.10; of that, \$106.50 is school tax. I have another one here — this one is east of Codette, one-quarter, \$241.60 and \$124 in school taxes — 55 per cent all the way down the line, Mr. Speaker. I have another one here, \$289.48 total taxes, \$114.70 school tax; but there is telephone included in that one. Here I have three-quarters of land, \$821.16 taxes. If you take those figures, and they are not picked from my constituency, Mr. Speaker, the idea of \$86 per quarter-section of taxes would be — it would be so seldom you would ever hear of it that it would be on absolutely useless land. So regardless of what anyone says about our average tax, we in the northeast of this province are in trouble, and to a great extent it is the cost of education that is putting us in that position.

Now, while working my constituency, I happened to drop in to the hamlet of Love, and I discovered there is a sawmill there that is owned co-operatively, a bona fide Co-op. This group of men bought this mill from what we used to call 'Swedes'. Johnson brothers & Osberg had this mill and in 1948 they were refused timber. A group of interested local men got together and tried to determine whether or not they would try to buy this mill on a co-operative basis. They checked with the Timber Board, and they tell me they were promised 10 years of cutting, if they got this mill. They have had nine years of cutting. Mr. Speaker, last March when they finished working, they weren't told they wouldn't get a cut this winter, they waited until late fall trying to get a cut, and finally they were just told they were not going to get one. I think they offered them 400,000 feet. But anyway I was concerned about this, because this mill employed 29 men last winter, besides the bush crew of eight or 10. Here that doesn't sound like anything, but in support of the little hamlet of Love Siding, it is a very important thing. When I made this discovery I went to one of the key C.C.F.'ers in Nipawin, and thought if we could get a cut for these people — how we got it, I don't care. I went to this gentleman

and he contacted the manager of the Timber Board in Prince Albert, — and also the hon. member in charge, and I understand they were offered 400,000 if they would move the mill to the Carrot River area, which would be a move of approximately 50 miles. That was a ridiculous offer for the simple reason that it is a fairly big mill, and it would cost at least considerable to pay for moving and building camp. A few days after this situation I came to Regina and went to see the hon. Minister of Natural Resources in the hope of some consideration for this group of people. We talked for some considerable time together, and he said "I'll phone Prince Albert and see what can be done." So a couple of hours later the same day, the Minister and I discussed it further and he said, "I believe we are going to be able to give them a million feet a year for two years if they move to the Carrot River area." I was very pleased, and went back to my constituency and contacted the business manager of this Co-operative, and told him what I thought would be result, according to the Minister. A few later, he contacted me and he said they had offered him 400,000 feet a year — 500,000 feet, a year for two years, if they would move into the Carrot River area.

Mr. Speaker, in wondering whether or not to bring this to the attention of this Legislature, I phoned the business manager of this mill and said, "Look, what do you want me to do about it? Do you want, me to bring it up on the floor of the House? I don't want to do it if it will cause you any inconvenience." And he said, "Bring it up where you like; we can't be hurt any more than we are now."

I know it sounds ridiculous when you're talking big industry, but this little industry was very, very important to the town of Love Siding. These people, most of them lived in or around the town, and work in the mill and look after their other little chores and so on, and I think there are three private operators working in the same area and I have no quarrel with that — I don't want to be misinterpreted there, but this was a very important operation for that particular area, and I don't know; I don't think it could possibly be inefficiency that prevented them from getting a cut of timber. The only thing I can guess is that it must be a personality deal, because otherwise I cannot for the life of me see why this group of people should not get timber. They tell me they are a bona fide co-operative and in fact they even paid a small dividend to their members last year. In our area, the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), the other day, said something about one out of five are still on the land. I was pleased to hear him say that, because we have an area in the north where people, because of no winter employment have had to leave their small farms. I was not going to say one out of five weren't on the land, but over half of them have gone. Most of them are now citizens of other provinces. We cannot afford,

March 10, 1958

to lose those people. All they want is a chance to keep themselves. Before the inception of the Timber Board they have not had that chance, and in one particular area, the population has decreased by half, and regardless of political affiliation, I feel that is a shame when we lose our people when I think it could been avoided.

I want to read with your permission, Mr. Speaker, a little letter I received the other day from one of my constituents with regard to taxes:

"Just a line for you to think about, I have to pay over \$100 per quarter school taxes now and we have been reassessed last summer, and it will be higher next year. That is not all the C.C.F. are doing to put the power in here next summer and have got \$464 cash one year in advance, and the other people whose credit is not good have to pay \$514 at 5 per cent interest. On top of all this, they want us that have children going to school to pay half the cost to contribute to schools. What kind of a racket is this? If this keeps up they will have all the land for lease soon."

Mr. Danielson: — That's right.

Mr. Nicholson: — Now, that's not a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker. The tax burden is terrific.

"Having been in this country since 1911 and it is getting harder to stay here, if they don't let up soon, we'll have to move somewhere else and see if one can make a little better.

"Hope you can bring this to their attention, and see what excuse they have for this state of affairs. And we have the same school we built for nothing, many years ago."

Now, that is a letter from one of my constituents. This man is about 14 or 15 miles from town.

Mr. Speaker, further to the operation of the Timber Board, it was quoted in the House the other day that the average profit, that is between the cost paid to the contractor and the selling price, averaged 60 per cent. I know of many instances where the average is much greater, but the reason I want to mention that is because our famous Commonwealth paper came out after this talk was

made, trying to explain what happened to the money the Crown Corporations made. The member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) was speaking and this is the Commonwealth reporter's remarks:

"Have you never heard that Co-operatives sell goods at market price and make a patronage refund to their members, or that the Timber Board, like other government enterprises, puts its earnings into the Provincial Treasury for all the people of the province, including the hon. members."

Now, you go from 60 per cent down to the net profit which would equal about-\$10 a thousand stumpage, I would like for the reporter of the 'Commonwealth' to tell me where the profit has gone, because there is a terrific spread there between the purchase price from the contractor, and the average selling price. It is impossible for us, as Opposition members, to put an accurate selling price because we are repeatedly refused. When we ask in Select Committee of the price they paid for a product in a certain place — the price it was sold for, that information is not given to us, because it is not in the interests of the public. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that attitude is entirely wrong, because we definitely are representatives of the people, and this is a Saskatchewan in business. As long as we are in business, someone who represents them should have the right to know these things. If they are not a shamed of them they should be glad to produce them. There is no doubt in my mind that the operation of the Timber Board, which is the only competitive Crown Corporation that has shown a fair profit, and it, to a great extent has been at the expense of the people who live in that area.

Mr. Fred Neibrandt (Yorkton): — I wonder if the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, would answer a question.

Mr. Nicholson: — You had your speech the other day . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Ask him the question after he's off the air; give him a break.

Mr. McCarthy: — Sit down

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Nicholson: — I don't bother you when you're speaking. I want to relate one or two or three things which I think will add to proof of the administration not being too efficient. I have been told that in every little sawmill that is operating, the D.N.R. man does the marking of the stumpage, and the cruiser which is the contact man with the operator, and I understand there are at least

March 10, 1958

three inspectors who call at each mill during the course of the winter, to make sure that everybody is doing their job on the way up. Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, and I believe it to be, then there is dead wood somewhere that surely could be done away with.

Another example — this is not to do with the Timber Board, this is to do with the Department of Natural Resources. I know a time when four government employees got in their automobile (a government automobile) and drove to a point from Prince Albert north to Nipawin which equalled a round trip of about 200 miles, and what did they go there for? To tell three trappers how to set up trappers' leases. Four government employees in a government automobile, and about a 200 mile trip, I think that must indicate that we had some men some place that we were trying to find a job for.

Mr. Speaker, industrial development, as we all know, is very important and I was very pleased when I heard the hon. Premier the other day announce that another industry was coming to Saskatchewan. How he gets industry to come is a miracle to me, when his own back benchers are using radio every time they get a chance, to condemn private enterprise. I think the only way we can keep our heads above water with respect to industrial development, and I think as well in industries, we must try to keep what we have and to make it profitable for them to stay here.

I am going to refer just for a few moments to a seed plant in my constituency. This seed plant processes 21 different varieties of cereal grains and grass seeds. That means a great variety of machinery is necessary. I want to say, by the way, that I am negotiating now with one of the executive members of the Power Corporation and we are in hopes of getting something done about this case — if we don't I will take it up with the hon. Minister and see if we can't get something much more realistic than we have. This seed plant has motors and cleaners that do not operate six weeks out of the year, because they are the smaller grass seed cleaners. This man's power bill in 1954 or 1955 amounted, with the service charge, to 6 cents a kilowatt. That is an industry. This same business can ship clover seed for example, to Manitoba in the rough, and have it cleaned there, and make money rather than cleaning them at home. Every time a car-load is shipped out and cleaned in Manitoba, it costs our locality \$300 in wages. It is a very important thing, as far as I am concerned.

Certainly, in my opinion, we should have some way of changing our regulations to fit an industry such as this. A farmer has a far better break if he has a cleaning plant, because he has one type of a plant for one kind of grain. This service is a great service to our area, and certainly let's try to make the power situation near enough in a case like this so that man can stay in business, and

keep employing people in the north of our province.

I want to say just a word — I heard the other day the quotation on the per capita debenture debt of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. It is quoted here, and according to the paper this quotation is not correct, but we'll assume it is. It quoted Alberta as \$201.30 per person; that's per capita debt. Now let's stop for just a moment and see what a per capita debt means. A per capita debt naturally has to be the money needed for all of the services needed by towns and cities and municipalities. If we stopped to think that the city of Edmonton, in the last ten years has grown equal to the entire city of Saskatoon and Regina and some to spare, Mr. Speaker, I wish to goodness that the per capita debt of Saskatchewan was as large for the same reason. It would be a wonderful thing, as far as I am concerned.

Just while I'm on that — I said last winter I didn't come down here to sell Alberta, but every once in a while we hear these ridiculous statements, so I want to quote just a little out of the paper of Saturday, about the Alberta budget.

"According to the 1958-59 budget, the direct municipal assistance in Alberta will be \$99,117,200 in grants. Direct municipal assistance. Total grants for education will be \$57,524,908 — over \$57 1/2 million. In addition to that amount they will spend \$6,611,000 for university construction."

Add them together, Mr. Speaker, and the province of Alberta will pay more in direct municipal grants and for education; they will pay more than our entire budget by some \$12 million.

I want to say just a word or two on larger municipalities, Mr. Speaker. After the local Government Convention of 1956, I held a series of seven meetings within my constituency, and I told them about the program of the larger municipalities, or the county system which was under consideration. Almost invariably, the first reaction was, "Oh, we don't want it" but I talked seriously to a lot of people and I said, "If the nine-township is too small to be economical, what about 14 or 15, or whatever would be the most economical". If you place it that way before the average person, I think that most of them will agree that if nine is too small, let's make it bigger, but if we were going to jump into the county system like Alberta or any other than a voluntary basis (which it is in Alberta, by the way), I want to quote the 1956 taxes in seven counties in Alberta, and show you what our Government must be prepared to pay if they're going to have these things be a success: Grand Prairie, the total mill rate is 157.4 mills, the provincial government's share is 95.3 mills. (this is

1956 figure.) The actual mill rate including, schools and health purposes, to the taxpayer is 62.1 mills and the Government pays 95.3 mills. Now we have another one, Newell No. 4, the total mill rate is 124 mills, the taxpayers paid 42 and the Government paid 82.4 mills. Thornhill, the mill rate is 135.3, the taxpayers pay 57 mills and the Government pays 87.2 mills. If we are going to embark on the county system and its very large areas, and apparently it is more expensive to operate, we would have to be in a position to stand a lot more of the tax burden.

Since being in the Legislature last winter, Mr. Speaker, Section 4 of the Vehicles Act reads:

"Chauffeur means the driver of a public service vehicle or a person hired for the purpose of driving any other motor vehicle, provided that a person shall not be deemed to be a chauffeur by reason only if the operation by him of a motor vehicle or for the purpose of conveying children to and from school, pursuant to arrangements made by the Board, and so on."

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned this to hundreds of people since we were in this Legislature last winter, and I have never found one that would agree that any Tom, Dick or Harry should be allowed to drive our kiddies to school — the most valuable cargo in the world, and I wouldn't mind saying that if I had a seven, eight or nine-year-old child who had to get on a school bus to go 10, 15 or 20 miles with a 16 or 17 year-old at the wheel. I would defy all the authorities in the world before I would put a child of mine on a bus with a driver like that. I am not asking, Mr. Speaker, that we charge these people, the bus operators, a chauffeur's license, but I do suggest that the Government should give these people a very rigid driver's test. We have our field officers in the field all the time. Within so many days of the time they take a contract to haul children to school, they definitely should have to take a very rigid test, and our field officers could give them a good talking to, to make them realize the responsibilities that are on their shoulders. I think it is absolutely ridiculous to have any one that can get a drivers' license haul children to school unless it's their own, and then that's their own business.

I want to mention just for a moment a thing that concerns my constituency as well as the Melfort-Tisdale constituency, and that is there are a number of people north of the river, between the Choiceland-Snowden-Smeaton area who have to go, in order to get south of the river, either to Nipawin and across the bridge, or to Prince Albert and cross the bridge there. Now, I understand that the

people from Melfort, the board of Trade, met with some Ministers of the Government, asking for a ferry. I understand there used to be a ferry there at one time, that there are a couple of ferries lying idle. The Board of Trade at Melfort told me they had come to Regina and had a very good hearing, and felt that they were going to possibly get that ferry. They estimated the expenditure at about \$30,000. A couple of weeks after returning home they got a very nice letter saying they had not notion of putting a ferry in, and the reason it affects my people is because the people north of the river are in my constituency, and they definitely would like to have that outlet, if it is at all possible to get.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring up one thing. I brought it up last year, but the hon. Minister wasn't in his seat, and I want to bring it up once more. That is the people in our area and the Creighton area, the northeast part of Saskatchewan and the Flin Flon-Creighton area, have for a number of years asked for the completion of No. 35 Highway from White Fox to Creighton. I don't think it would be worth an argument if it weren't half built. Here we have this 35 miles from both ends constructed; we have approximately 84 miles in the middle that is bush pasture. That road, regardless of what some people think, would be a terrific asset to the northeast part of this province. I know we are supposed to get another road going somewhere else, but that is not too important. There is 84 miles in the middle to be completed, and the hon. Minister of Highways estimated in my presence at \$16,000 a mile — \$1,200,000. This road beyond a fraction of a doubt would be used more, I think, than the Minister thinks it would be, and it would be of great asset to our area for many reasons — one being that I live in the area where the soil is very versatile; we can grow terrific vegetables and strawberries and all those things, and I think that the Flin Flon market would be a very good market, to say nothing about the tourist business.

I want to say just a word on snow-plow clubs and snow plows. It has been mentioned on both sides of the House, snow-plowing in the municipalities is a very expensive proposition for local authorities, we all know. I think it is ridiculous to say that the government can snow-plow all the roads, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, when you stop to consider Highway No. 55, west of Nipawin, the school buses use it, the bus uses it, and it is a fairly heavily travelled road. On that road we have west of White Fox, the Hamlet of Love Siding, two and a half miles off the highway. Six miles further up we have the little village of Garrick, two and a half miles off the highway, and another six or seven miles up we have the town of Choiceland two and a half miles off the highway. Until two years ago, the Government snow-plowed the roads into those towns, because we need it, but last year they decided to quit snow-plowing those roads. I have had phone calls and have met with the men and the people in these snow-plow

clubs, and they asked for — before I go further I want to say to those who are not familiar, that this road will be moved two miles north when the new No. 55 Highway is completed, so the situation will not be the same in years to come. But I came to Regina to see the Deputy Minister of to see if we could get some assistance, and he pointed to his map and showed me several hundred places in the province where they could demand the same thing. I think this is a different situation than many of the roads into little places, but they were cut off and I came to Regina with the thought in mind, according to instructions from these people of these three snow-plow clubs, to try to get about, 50 per cent of the cost. Mr. Holmes, Deputy Minister of Highways, said he was very sorry, there was just nothing that could be done, so I had to report back that we failed on that one.

Mr. Speaker, we are financing, we are continuing to finance at, a loss or deficit of about \$50 million a year. I can't for the life of me see how it is good business for our Government to continue to go that far behind each year, when we have had good years, and for that reason, and many others, I cannot support the Budget.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this debate, I don't intend to take up too much of your time. I think that this Budget is fairly consistent with the Speech from the Throne and much of the criticism that was applied by those people who spoke on the Speech from the Throne is also applicable here, so I will not repeat myself.

I do want to mention one or two things that have come up in this debate. One of them was the fact that a number of the hon. Ministers opposite — three, I believe — found it necessary to read off the list of municipal grants in the Humboldt rural municipalities. Now I am always very pleased when Humboldt gets some attention, no matter how it is meant, so I am not complaining about that, Mr. Speaker. I didn't quite see the point in comparing the grants, starting away back in 1936, but I do want to say this — that if this was done with the intention of soothing the feelings of the local governing bodies in the Humboldt constituency and making them think that the C.C.F. Government was playing Santa Claus, I think you are a little late and I don't think you will be too effective; because, before the last provincial election there were statements distributed, I think, to everybody in the Humboldt constituency showing just how their particular municipalities had benefited in grants since the advent of the C.C.F. Government. The C.C.F. party lost around 1,400 votes as a result of those statements, so I don't think our people are too easy to confuse, or to fool. After all, they know, as do the hon. Ministers I am sure if they have the time to stop and think, that it

is very difficult and very unfair to compare grants that are given today, with those that were given fifteen, twenty and twenty-five years ago, unless at the same time you compare the revenues that the province receives. If this Government and the Ministers would only stop to think, they could tell us — or at least they would probably keep silent at this point, — if they stopped to realize what kind of grants could you give the municipalities in the Humboldt constituency, or any other constituency, today, if you only had the revenues that you get from the Federal Government, under the Federal-Provincial Tax Agreement. And that was all the Liberal Government was getting; in fact, for many years, it was getting less than you, today, receive only under that one Tax Agreement, without considering your gasoline revenue or any of the other revenues that form the larger bulk of your budget.

So it is a ridiculous comparison and not worthy of any further mention. I would like to point out that one gauge of how well things are in local government, how well things are doing in the country, which sometimes the hon. Ministers opposite seem to forget, is the tax arrears situation. We have today received a Return which shows, in the Humboldt Larger School Unit, that in 1950 our tax arrears were \$22,528. Our tax arrears, in the Humboldt Larger School Unit, in 1955, Mr. Speaker, were \$120,302. Last year they were down slightly, to \$117,510. The people in the Humboldt Larger School Unit are not people who deliberately withhold paying taxes. If they had the wherewithal to pay them they would pay them. They haven't. Therefore, your grants cannot be so all-sufficient, when our school districts have to levy more taxes than our people can pay. Because, after all, our school authorities are those who are closest to the people and they best know exactly what the traffic will bear; and they have been forced, in spite of this knowledge, to levy more taxes than our people can possibly pay. That is a bad situation.

I would like to say further, in connection with the speech of the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Elias); I was very happy that he dissociated himself from various political parties, particularly from the Liberal party, because I certainly don't want to be associated with his party — I am very proud of being a Liberal and I believe that we have a pure and non-contaminated philosophy. Certainly I don't want our parentage to be confused in any way with the wild dreams of either the socialists or the Social Crediters.

However, I could understand his feeling of gentle disgust with some of the members here when he said that we showed a 'listless type of attitude' which somehow or other, he said, bordered on the arrogant. Now I can understand the listless part; and no

matter how full of enthusiasm I am when I get here at 2:30, after listening to the speakers on your right, Mr. Speaker, listening to the reports of the Ministers and the propaganda that is being perpetrated over and over again in this House, I become rather listless, too. To the speakers who seem to be burdened with a depression psychosis, I become more than listless; I become absolutely disgusted because, Mr. Speaker, we are not living in the dirty 'thirties'. Let us stop talking about the dirty 'thirties', and thinking as if we were still there. Maybe the hon. members opposite have lost their vision, their foresight, their enthusiasm for the future that they once exhibited, but let not this entire Legislature collapse. Let us remember that even if there are lessons to be learned from the 'thirties', certainly that burden of guilt and depression should not be carried over into our every day works and plan of today.

There is another complex that is present in this House and sometimes in listening, particularly during this budget debate, I couldn't help but wonder how some of the hon. members, such the hon. member from Rosthern can bear, in their conscience, to sit here in a provincial House when, after all, the solutions for everything that is wrong in Saskatchewan seems to be with the Federal Government. Why are these hon. gentlemen not out getting themselves elected and going to Ottawa to solve these problems? Surely it must be very frustrating for you to sit here and do nothing because you keep saying the province can do nothing to remedy the situation. Is that, Mr. Speaker, why these people get themselves elected? To sit here and do nothing? Sometimes I am afraid it is.

Now quite a number of the members have demanded, and rightly so, constructive criticism. Well, last year, the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) gave this House constructive criticism, clearly defined and clearly numbered, and I see the hon. members smiling . . .

Premier Douglas: — Who wouldn't?

Mrs. Batten: — They smiled then, because this Government, Mr. Speaker, refuses to take constructive criticism. They merely use it in order to poke fun at us after we have given our sincere attention and our good thoughts to the problems that confront this Legislature. They pick out some solitary point and by minimizing it they manage to cast aspersions on both our intelligence and our good will. That doesn't make for good government; and that, I think, is one place where the back-benchers opposite, in this House, could be of service to this Government. If they won't take criticism from us surely they should take criticism from their own members, but yet, Mr. Speaker, how many back-benchers have got up and offered anything in the way of constructive criticism. One or two have and I

certainly congratulate them wholeheartedly for doing so. What about the others? There are young, men there, men who are not entirely depressed by the 'thirties'; who should still have some new ideas, some new solutions, who surely must have offered some type of planning to their constituencies before they were elected. What are they doing here now? What are they offering in the way of ideas? I have yet to hear them.

And then we come to the real problems in our budget; and it is quite simple to see from looking, even at the over-simplified pictures which are indicative of a general picture only, and are rather confusing in some respects, but it is easy to see from that that our revenues in this province, Mr. Speaker, come from good old private enterprise. They don't come from Crown Corporations. Our revenues in this province, which you people across the way boast so much about how well you spend them and how many social services you perform and you should, because that is what that money is paid by the taxpayers for — that money comes from taxpayers who earned it through private enterprise not from your socialistic experiments; and for that reason I want to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) for one thing in his budget address. There are probably many other things he should be congratulated for, but I particularly want to congratulate him because he didn't announce the birth of a new Crown Corporation. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a great relief to all the people of Saskatchewan. But I would suggest that he could do something even more for Saskatchewan. He could announce that there will be no further births of Crown Corporations in Saskatchewan. Perhaps one of the reasons that the hon. Provincial Treasurer is fed up — I think the expression was — and wants to resign his position is because he cannot give the people of this province any such guarantee.

It is quite clear that the Crown Corporations have been found wanting in many respects, and I just want to read a few lines from a press report of the speech that was made by the chief critic for the Opposition; and I don't think these things can be reiterated often enough, because I think it is very important that the members of this House should understand that Crown Corporations have not been successful, except where they have a monopoly; and we have just heard the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) at great length recite what happens to the people who are burdened by these monopolies. So I would like to just read a few lines, where he said as follows:

"On page 11 of his Budget Address he shows the net profit for the C.C.F. Crown Corporations as \$758,000, but the interesting thing is that the Timber Board accounted for \$500,000 of that profit. He agreed that on its \$3,300,000 advance from the Government this meant a 15 per cent profit, an excellent

March 10, 1958

profit indeed, but its profits are a complete monopoly. The Government sets the price it will pay producers for the timber and then sets the price at which its Corporation will sell it.

"A glance at all other C.C.F. Crown Corporations, which must compete in some way in the competitive market, tells a different story."

And these enterprises, he went on to show — showed not a 15 per cent return, but a 4 per cent return. He went on to say:

"This return paid the interest on borrowed money so thus far they have not, contributed one nickel to the revenues of the province and if we add the other costs which should be allocated to these we will find that every one of them is actually drawing money out of the province."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the record of the Crown Corporations in Saskatchewan. And the amazing part is that when you go into Committee and you try to get some information about these Crown Corporations, it is one of the most difficult tasks with which one can be confronted. I am constantly amazed to hear hon. Ministers compare members of this Legislature to directors of a company who can ascertain and who can direct these Crown Corporations. Well I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that no manager of a company would last ten minutes if he retorted to questions of directors in the manner in which the hon. Ministers have replied to those questions which we direct to them.

It is no wonder that these Corporations take losses and that the losses are well hidden, because it can be years before one can ascertain from the Ministers, through direct questioning, cross examining, or any other way, exactly what has been happening to the losses and how they have been absorbed. For instance, we ascertained, just the other day, for the first time, apparently in the history of this particular Crown Corporation, that the Timber Board, for years, has been contracting and obtaining timber, obtaining lumber, for the Box Factory later on called Wood Enterprises — I would refer you to the Shakespearean thought that 'a rose by any other name' — but during this long period of time the Timber Board has been utilizing its facilities, and because it is a monopoly, has still made money; but nobody in the Crown Corporations Committee was able to ascertain, certainly had never been advised by the Minister or by a report of that Crown Corporation, that the Box Factory wasn't paying anything towards the cost of personnel, the book work, the actual

travelling expenses of obtaining these contracts for lumber. The lumber was delivered at its door, at the price set by the Timber Board, without any cost to it at all; and in spite of all that, in spite of all that assistance by a Government monopoly, this particular enterprise, this Box Factory which was taken over from private enterprise, lost the people of this province half a million dollars. That was a sad funeral service.

Mr. McDonald: — There are one or two every year.

Mrs. Batten: — And this has happened year after year. Yet, last year, in this same Committee, discussing this same enterprise, when it was pointed out that this Box Factory didn't seem to be an economical thing, that there was a continual deficit, that there was something radically the matter with it, we were told — and I remember very distinctly the pride with which the Minister said: "After all, we must provide people with employment, and that is why we are carrying on this business." Well, it seems to me that last year was a far more difficult year for unemployment and that was the year when these employees were let out to fend for themselves, because these losses couldn't be borne, even by the patient taxpayers of Saskatchewan, for any longer period of time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing that this Government could do for Saskatchewan that would be more worthwhile than to put itself on record as admitting and resigning itself to the fact that its little socialist experiments and playthings didn't work out; that unless you have a monopoly your Government is not going to run an efficient business; that you cannot compete with private enterprise and do so efficiently; and that you will be good little boys and you won't try to do it again.

Premier Douglas: — The mother complex!

Mrs. Batten: — And then, of course, when they do fail they complain that private enterprise wasn't treating them right — or, as the hon. Minister did, this morning, complain bitterly because the federal government wasn't buying their products and helping put the company on its feet. They remind me very much of the little boy who was asked to define a cannibal; and when he was at a loss to define just what a cannibal was the teacher thought she would help him along and she said: "Well you know what a cannibal is — what would you be if you ate your father and mother?" He replied: "An orphan, please."

So these people who want to experiment, who want to throttle private enterprise, cannot very well complain when private enterprise defeats them, because they haven't got the machinery for

operating companies efficiently, because the Government is not suited and is not a good entity to perform such services. They should stay with the services for which they are intended in Saskatchewan, and the Saskatchewan taxpayer would be much better off.

For that reason I will not support the motion.

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I want, at the outset, to direct some of my remarks to conditions as stipulated in the budget that will affect the people of my own seat. First of all I want to express my opinions on what was said, this afternoon, by the hon. member from Melfort (Hon. C.G. Willis); and I am sure that the people in the country, after listening to his wonderful exhortations of services rendered by the Government, and when the people in my seat and the people in the east and I am sure the people in the north, hear that performance, this afternoon, it is no wonder, then, that they will lose votes from here on in. It just bears out some of the facts and some of the statements made on Friday afternoon by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy).

There are one or two remarks he made that I want to take up later on in the course of my remarks.

Last week when the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) brought down his Estimates for the coming year, myself, along with a number of people in my constituency, as well as a number of people from the constituency of Moose Mountain, and constituencies farther east were very concerned; because a portion of No. 16 Highway had been under construction during the past year; and we had every reason to believe that because work had been done in the east and work was being done in the west, and because of the fact that a good deal of survey work has been done during the past three years, those people, had every reason to believe that something would be done this year. I don't say at this time that the whole section of the highway should have been constructed or completed, but I would like to draw the attention of members of this House and the Minister of Highways to the fact that especially one portion of that highway should have had something done to it. I think the hon. member for Cannington referred to that section of the highway as a canal, and that is the section between Kendal and Candiac. I mention that part of the highway, Mr. Speaker, for one reason — because during the past years, that is the section of highway where we have had the most trouble in winter. It is also the section of highway where we have had the most trouble in summer. Even last Saturday morning when I went over that section of highway, in spite of the fact that we have had very little snow this winter, there was snow piled alongside the highway higher than the tops of the cars.

I point this out for two reasons — one reason is that if there is a block of highway in the centre of a main road which people cannot have access to, then that stops all further traffic from the east. The other reason is this — that No. 16 Highway takes a lot of the traffic off the main No. 1 Highway. It takes a lot of the farm produce traffic. The eastern and southeastern parts of this province are very heavily populated with livestock, and Regina, at the present time, is becoming the marketing centre for dairy products, for beef products, hogs and eggs; and a great many of the farmers, today, haul their own produce here to the city of Regina to the markets.

Now in summer time, if the road is passable, they can go through; but in the winter time, which is the heavy marketing season of the year and the season when the people of southeastern Saskatchewan need to have access to the Regina markets, if that road is blocked up, if they cannot get into Regina, then the produce must be shipped out to Manitoba, to the Winnipeg market. I say this, not only in the interests of the people in that part of the province, but also in the interests of the Government of this province and the firms who employ the people in the markets, to which this produce would ensure steady employment and steady wages. I would just ask the Minister, in all sincerity, if he would, in the near future, some time this year, consider constructing that portion at least of No. 16 Highway.

I was interested in some of the remarks made by the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) when he spoke about No. 35 Highway. As most members know No. 35 Highway starts down toward the American border and then finds its natural route north. No. 35 Highway has become a very important highway in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley seat. I am sure the hon. Premier will realize this because it comes up through his constituency. However, No. 35 Highway, as far as the highway records of this province are concerned, stops at No. 33, at Francis. And then there is the big gap from No. 33 Highway to the Trans-Canada; and as previous Liberal members from the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley seat have continually pointed out to this Government and to a former C.C.F. Government, there is a need to continue No. 35 Highway right through from Francis to the Trans-Canada and on to the Qu'Appelle lakes. However, the Government has not seen fit to put that portion on the highway system and, as a result, the municipalities concerned have had to share a large percentage of the cost in building that section of highway. Today that portion is completed. The municipalities, in co-operation with the provincial government, have completed that section; and as a result of that — and this will be very interesting to the Department of Tourist Information — at one point early last spring we had 367 reservations at Katepwa Lake from American tourists and on different Saturday nights, as I was touring and travelling down in that part of the country, it was not uncommon to see a steady stream of American tourists in their cars

heading for Katepwa Lake.

The point that I want to make here, this afternoon, is this — now that the municipalities have gone and spent a great deal of money fixing up that portion of what should have been a secondary highway, I think the Government should, in all fairness, now take over that section and be responsible for the maintenance of that road, because in all due fairness to the contractors they am made a good job of building that road and what I am afraid will happen is this — that due to the heavy tourist traffic, using that road to the lakes, the municipalities may not have sufficient funds to maintain that portion of the road and look after other grid road work and local road work in the municipalities. So I would suggest to the Government that they give serious consideration to taking over that portion of that road, placing it in the highway system of the province and save all the initial capital costs and construction costs that have gone into that section of road.

There is one more thing I want to point out in regard to Highway No. 16. We all know, few years back, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company had transportation buses on that section of highway. They saw fit, later on, to remove their buses. We have heard a great deal about some of these Crown Corporations being initiated to serve the interests of the people. They would be of benefit to the people in the form of a service. After the Saskatchewan Transportation Company had their buses on No. 16 highway for a few years they decided that route wasn't paying and I am not going to question their decision. However, after the Transportation Company left, private individuals put a bus on that route, and so far we have had wonderful service from that private organization. They have not only handled passengers, but they have handled express and other goods and it has been wonderful service to those small farming districts, especially in the spring and in the fall of the year when repairs for machines are so urgently needed. As I stated before, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company felt that they had lost money and had to curtail that service. However, private enterprise has gone ahead and so far made a success of that portion of the route and in spite of the fact the Government saw fit to take off their buses. I would sincerely urge that they give consideration to making sure that the highway is rebuilt and kept in shape and kept snow-free in winter so that we in the southeastern part of Saskatchewan can still benefit from the service of a private bus company.

This afternoon, for a few brief minutes, I want to take a look at different items of the budget, especially those items that deal with the agricultural portion of it. Before I commence my main remarks, I want to thank my hon. friend across the way, the member for Cutknife (Hon. Mr. Nollet), for the very nice document he sent over this afternoon; and I can assure him that all members on

this side have had a chance to use it and they have had a chance to really enjoy it. And I think possibly, Mr. Speaker, between the two of us we scooped — I don't, know who writes this article, but we certainly scooped him on the floor of this House.

It is always interesting when we look into Government programs, look into their Speech from the Throne and their budget, to go back and try and analyze their trend of thought. It is always interesting to go back over previous budgets, previous Speeches from the Throne, previous matters of policy laid down by different Government members, whether in the House or outside the House. By using these different announcements we can usually follow the trend of thought through their different Departments that are represented in the budget.

I just happened, this morning, when I was going through some of the information, to find a speech by the Premier of this province and it was delivered to a C.C.F. nominating convention in this city on November 22, 1956. A portion of that speech has been read from the floor of this House a good many times, but the portion that I was mostly interested in, followed the opening paragraphs; and in view of the fact that we have been dealing with Crown Corporations this past week, and in view of some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) and the remarks made on private enterprise and socialist thinking, as expounded by our member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) it was very interesting to see once again the heading paragraphs in the hon. Premier's speech at this particular nominating convention. Here again are the opening remarks:

"Premier T.C. Douglas Wednesday night decried the monopolistic societies fostered by big business, governments in Canada, Britain and the United States completely dominated and motivated by profiteering principles — the quick-buck artists and the hucksters of our economy."

It says here,

"He was addressing an enthusiastic gathering of about 500 party supporters attending the C.C.F. Federal nominating convention in the Trianon ballroom."

As has been said in this House so many times before, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Premier is addressing some of his own faithful followers the line he takes is absolutely different to what he may take when he is out on the hustings or talking to industrialists.

March 10, 1958

And that is how he opened his remarks that night. Then it goes on to say this — he has probably been talking, to some of people in that group who were interested in agriculture; and he says this a little later on, and I quote:

"We in the C.C.F. say we ought to be curtailing credit for luxury goods. And make it easily obtainable for young men wanting to start up in farming; and to finance sewage and water services essential to the community."

So that was the Premier's remarks to this nominating convention in 1956 and I would ask the Premier to point out in the Budget of this year where he is carrying that plan through in the budget.

When I look up the agricultural portion, the parts devoted to agriculture, all I see is this:

"We now have the necessary staff available to permit full establishment of an agricultural machinery administration. In 1958-59 this new service will require over \$100,000. The administration will implement regulations for the protection of the farmer and will carry out tests to help the farmer in the selection and operation of his machinery."

Now, all we see there, Mr. Speaker, is that \$100,000 is going to be voted for that particular purpose. I would ask the hon. members opposite what they have formulated in regard to plans to help the farmer select machinery. At the present time we have the different machine companies in the province putting on field days in different areas of the province. I think every farmer is more or less acquainted with the various company's make of machines. He is more or less acquainted with the records and the performance of those different machines. Now, whether this program infers that we are going to have a group of people in this province that are set up to recommend that a farmer buy one certain type of machine over another certain machine, this portion of the budget does not say. But, I do not think, in all fairness to the farmers of Saskatchewan, that an expenditure of \$100,000 in this instance, is going to do anything to help the plight that they are in today.

We had, I believe, a few years back an inquiry in this House into the costs of the agricultural situation in the province at that time. I believe there is evidence given by different machine companies. When the whole inquiry was summed up, I don't see how it has

added one cent to the pocket books of the farmers of this province.

We were told in the Speech from the Throne that this Government was going to increase the community pastures and bring in forest projects. Now, I see here, an allotment of \$385,000 for the development and operation of forest products and community pastures, which be spent in 1958-59.

Then they go on to mention the calfhood vaccination program; and I think that was well taken care of by the hon. member for Cannington, on Friday last. So I say that when these few items are summed up it isn't going to alleviate the agricultural situation in this province at the present. What are the problems facing the farmers out in the country, today? A great deal has been said here, this afternoon, about taxes — about municipal land taxes, about school taxes, etc. I was very interested to listen to the Minister of Public Works (Hon. C.G. Willis), this afternoon, when he was talking about all the grants he had had for the Melfort constituency. Just the other day I happened to have a letter sent to me from one of his own constituents and this party sent me a copy of the tax notice for his own quarter-section; and it is interesting to read this, Mr. Speaker, because it shows the tremendous increase in taxes even up in the constituency of Melfort.

Now the total taxable assessment of that quarter-section, in 1944, was \$3,300. By 1957, they had increased the assessment to \$3,700. In 1944 his municipal tax was \$19.80; by 1957 his tax had increased to \$66.60. In 1944 his school tax was \$17.16; by 1957 his school tax was \$107.30. When you add up the total amount of taxes for this one quarter-section in the Melfort constituency — in 1944 he paid \$48.56; today he is billed for \$240.39. The municipal tax — and I will give credit to the municipal men — they have managed to hold the line with only an increase of three times the amount in that period of time, but school taxes have increased, in this one particular case, over six times as much, and that doesn't take into account the education and hospitalization tax.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Would the hon. member give us the description of the quarter-section?

Mr. McFarlane: — You wouldn't understand it anyway if I gave you the description. You're not a farmer; you know.

Premier Douglas: — That is not an answer. The hon. member has quoted figures and the rules of the House require him to give the particular location of the land.

Mr. McFarlane: — The location of the land is SW 9-47-19-W 2nd — 159 acres out of 160.

Mr. McCarthy: — Those were the figures he was quoting, a while ago.

Mr. McFarlane: — That just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that all the talk you hear from this Government, and the Minister concerned talked about all the grants that were handed to his constituents, but some of them are still operating under severe hardships when they write and send us copies of their tax notices; so I am sure that with the glowing picture he painted here, this afternoon, it isn't going to help these individuals pay their taxes. So much for municipal taxes, and that is only one instance. The member for municipal taxes, and that is only one instance. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) has cited other cases in places further north.

The thing that interested me was a Return received in this House February 21, 1958, and the Return asked for the school tax mill rates for rural and urban in the various Larger School Units in Saskatchewan for the fiscal years 1950-51 to 1956-57 inclusive; and what were the arrears for the above in the same period. This is a very interesting Return, not only in the figures that are represented here, but it shows more or less the economic conditions in the province as far as agriculture is concerned for the years from 1948 to 1956. We see that in that period from 1948 to 1956 on the average, an ever-increasing arrears of taxes for school purposes. In fact, in 1948, we had arrears of taxes in this province of \$752,000; and the arrears for all schools, that is schools within the Units and outside the Units, amounted to \$799,000. By the end of eight years those total arrears had risen to, in 1956, a total of \$9,593,000 in the Units alone. Taking the rise in the Units and the schools outside the Units we find that over a period of eight years the arrears of taxes have increased 15 times — they are 15 times higher than they were eight years ago.

Then we go through and we look — we can see by the arrears of taxes that we can more or less gauge the economic conditions through that period. Looking back to the period of 1952 and 1953 in most of the districts there was possibly a little bit more money and the arrears went down a little bit; but then we can follow the pattern right through. In spite of one or two fairly good years, we find that the arrears have had the tendency to increase year by year.

Now, I am just going to use a few instances here. I will take the Unit of Oxbow — No. 1 Unit. In 1950 — this is just for the Larger Units — the tax arrears amounted to \$29,692.37, or roughly \$30,000. They went up in 1951 to \$46,000; in 1952 up to \$56,000; in 1953 up to \$92,000 (I am just using round figures); in 1954 up to \$117,000; in 1955 up to \$155,000; and then at the end of 1956,

\$159,000, or roughly \$160,000. When you check that increase over that period of years you find in that School Unit alone your arrears of taxes for school purposes have increased five times.

Then we go down to the next one at Estevan; from \$107,000 in 1950 to \$256,000 in 1956 — an increase of four times.

Then I will go down to one right close to my own home, Broadview, which is an average School Unit with an average assessment and where we have a mixed farming area; and we find that, in 1950, the arrears of taxes were \$52,600; they have increased steadily up to 1956 where, today, they are \$197,200.

Some Govt. Members: — What about Nipawin?

Mr. McFarlane: — I will come to that, too. Then in Regina east, which is my own larger School Unit they were \$30,347 in 1950 and they are now up to the point where they are \$144,977 or five times as much.

Then right across the valley from me in Melville north — \$120,000 roughly in 1950; and today over half a million — \$545,906 or an increase of 5 1/2 times.

So, Mr. Speaker, we won't mention the Speech from the Throne, but to pick up the budget, and when we see that this C.C.F. Government is talking about setting up an agricultural committee to see about the conditions in regard to machines; when they are talking about these various little items here that are more or less a bit of eyewash to put into a budget, I say to you in all sincerity that after 14 years of C.C.F. Government bungling in this province — when the next government takes over they are going to have the worst mess to clean up that any government in this province has ever had.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost impossible for the farmers of this country to clear off arrears of taxes as they stand today. The people of Saskatchewan in the Larger School Units alone are facing arrears of taxes of \$9,593,000 at the present time and under your policies, under your much talked of grants, under your education system, under your so-called help to agriculture, there is the picture in front of you. Instead of the arrears of taxes going down in this province, the arrears of taxes are going up year by year at an alarming rate. So instead of getting busy and emulating some constructive program for agriculture in this province that would have helped the farmers of the province get out of this situation, you just sit there, and this trend is increasing year by year.

So much for taxes . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Why didn't you ask . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Oh, you wouldn't answer the question anyway. On top of that Mr. Speaker, there is the mineral tax and I would suggest to you that if there is one thing that has caused more confusion among the farmers of this province than the mineral tax, I don't know what it is. Year by year these farmers are receiving their mineral tax notices and in most cases are completely ignoring them; and what is the position of arrears as far as mineral taxes are concerned in the province, today? The answer we got the other day was this: By December 31, 1957 the amount owing on current billings and arrears on the 3-cent per acre mineral tax in this province had amounted to \$932,989.20 — almost a million dollars in arrears there.

This situation is not clearing itself up. As I pointed out in this House a year ago, when travelling through parts of my own seat I will go to one farmer who will have a tax notice stating he is being charged the tax for one thing and another farmer is being charged the tax for another thing; they are completely confused and when I asked them what they did with their notices they said they threw them in the fire. When you ask them why they threw them in the fire they tell me that they have no intention of paying them.

Under the system we have at the present time — if those farmers are being taxed for something that neither they nor the Government knows they own; and if they are going to disregard paying those taxes then under the policy this Government has at the present time, any mineral rights farmers have will be forfeited to the Crown. I think that it should be pointed out, instead of that ridiculous sort of a letter that was sent out to the people in this province with arrears of taxes. I think they should have sent a constructive letter and explained to the people what these taxes were about; explained to them what the policy of the Government is; and explained to them . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Does the hon. member mean that he doesn't know whether anything like that was sent?

Mr. McFarlane: — Years ago when the oil leasing program in this province was being started up, what did this Government do? If the Government of this province had done the same as the government in the province of Manitoba then possibly there would not have been so much confusion in that department; and I would suggest to the Minister, instead of writing out letters of that type, that were sent out from his office, that he, in the future, should draft a letter, send it to these people who are being charged mineral tax; explain the situation to them and see if you cannot get the whole situation clarified. Because if it is the policy of this Government to

have the minerals revert to the Crown then it deprives the sons or the grandsons of those people from ever benefiting from their mineral rights if minerals or petroleum or valuable stone is found on their farms in the future. I don't think that is a good policy at all. I think that the individuals of the future in this province should be protected against that type of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks; the initial remarks were more or less to those in my own seat and the latter part of my remarks directed towards departments of the Government which I think should be corrected for the benefit of not only the farmers, at the present time, but to benefit of those who may take up farming, in the future; and because these conditions have not been rectified in the past; because there is no policy that would rectify the conditions in the future; and because the budget brought down by this Government, Mr. Speaker, has practically failed to recognize the serious plight of agriculture in this province at the present time; and because of the small amount allotted to agriculture which is far too inadequate to help the farmers, today, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to vote against the motion.

Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to join with the other members who preceded me in this debate and the debate on the Throne Speech in extending my congratulations to all of the previous speakers. In this feeling of good will I want to say, on behalf of the people in my constituency, thanks to one Department of government and to one Crown Corporation for programs of particular benefit forecast for 1958. I refer to the fact that natural gas will be brought to Estevan by next fall, and that a start will be made on re-building, with some hope of black-topping, No. 18 Highway east of Bienfait.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the position of the Official Opposition in this Assembly. I don't think anyone will disagree with me when I say that the members of the Official Opposition are generally critical. They find very little to praise in the Government program. I want to say that I have no objection to being criticized as one who supports this Government. The Opposition usually goes further and they imply, and sometimes they declare, that Government members have evil intentions and sinister motives. This is the reason for the failure of the Crown Corporations. This is the reason why nothing is being done to get the farmers out of their difficulty. The members of the Opposition are so busy searching for our sins that, very often, they pay little attention to the real merits, or to the inadequacy, of programs sponsored by this Government.

But worst of all, the Official Opposition insists on maintaining a position in this Assembly, and outside this Assembly, of irresponsibility.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Those are big words!

Mr. Thorson: — It not just in matters relating to this budget that is before us now. Take their position on the Time question in the province. By the time the debate on the second reading was concluded, every member . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must not refer to other debates.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I must accept your ruling. I only wanted to point out that this attitude of irresponsibility on the budget is not an isolated case. This is a characteristic . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — I'm not impressed.

Mr. Thorson: — . . . which you find in all actions and all words of the Opposition. Not one of them had a constructive proposal on the Time question, but all of them criticized it. The same is true on questions of liquor legislation in the province.

Mr. McFarlane: — Go easy, now!

Mr. Thorson: — The Leader of the Official Opposition and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), have both been quoted as having made public statements about the liquor law. Perhaps they weren't reported accurately; but nowhere in the reports I read did I find one suggestion as to what ought to be done.

Mr. McCarthy: — The Regina Chief of Police told you what to do.

Mr. Thorson: — They get into this position that there is a great deal wrong with the way liquor is consumed in the province; a great deal of sin involved (and we're all against sin), and the Government ought to do something about it. But the Opposition has no suggestions about what should be done.

Mr. McCarthy: — What are you for, over there?

Mr. Thorson: — It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that each of them, as people in public life, ought to be thoroughly ashamed. Whether they are or not doesn't really matter. What is important is this attitude of irresponsibility forever disqualifies them from forming a government in this province. This attitude characterizes their actions in the House and outside the House. You see it in every public statement they make here, or on the public platform. We had a good example of it, this afternoon. Two members of the Official Opposition spoke, this afternoon. The member for Humboldt pointed out that after all, in the 1930's the Liberal Government of the day couldn't be generous to local governments because they had no money; and she pointed out that, today, the farmers cannot pay their taxes because they have no money. She didn't ask why the farmers today have no money.

Mr. McCarthy: — You weren't born then.

Mr. Thorson: — Of course, the reason she doesn't ask why is because the only answer is that in the depression of the 1950's the Liberal Government had no money for the same reason that nobody else had money. The whole economic system had collapsed, and the Liberal party stood idly by, did nothing, to prevent it and nothing to arrest it once it had begun.

Mr. McDonald: — What are you doing, today?

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — You're so young you don't remember.

Mr. Thorson: — That is part of the purity of their heritage, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McFarlane: — The master's voice!

Mr. Thorson: — Whenever I hear the member for Humboldt speak in this Assembly I must confess, quite frankly, my heart goes out to her, because from what she says and the way she says it, I know that her feelings are hurt; and they are hurt because the government won't agree with her.

Mr. McDonald: — You just said she never made any suggestions.

Mr. McCarthy: — Start over again.

Mr. Gardiner: — You're all confused!

Mr. Thorson: — It hurts her feelings that the policy of the Government is laid down by conventions of the C.C.F. Party, and, generally speaking, members of the Liberal Party have no voice in conventions of the C.C.F. Party.

Mr. McCarthy: — How do you know?

Mr. Korchinski: — There we go again — the voice of the master!

Mrs. Batten: — . . . for responsibilities!

Mr. Thorson: — It bothers her because the Government carries out the policy that is laid down by the conventions of the C.C.F.

Opposition Members: — It never has!

Mr. McFarlane: — We'll wait and see this time.

Mr. Thorson: — When she, along with the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) was complaining about the rising tax arrears, about the fact that farmers haven't money to pay taxes, I just thought back to a week ago today, when the financial critic for the Opposition was dealing with the budget. He wept tears

March 10, 1958

because enough money isn't in the field of education. This is the kind of thing you get from the opposition. One of them says one thing, another says another, or the same person on a different occasion contradicts the statements he made previously. On one hand we've got to provide more money and provide more educational services, and on the other hand, the taxes are too high.

I noticed when the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley was speaking, he said the Government to follow this one would have the worst mess on their hands to clean up of any government that ever took office.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thorson: — But I want to put his mind at rest. This problem won't be on his hands, or the hands of any of the other members who sit with him in the Official Opposition.

Mr. Korchinski: — Don't be so sure.

Mr. Gardiner: — Don't be so sure; you're confused already!

Mr. Foley: — Talk about irresponsibility, now.

Mr. Thorson: — I want to say just a brief word about Crown Corporations. This is another area where the Official Opposition is very adept at displaying irresponsibility. They spent a good deal of time about the financial position of some of the commercial enterprises that are owned and operated by the people of the province through this Government.

Mr. Gardiner: — By the C.C.F. Government, not the people.

Mr. Thorson: — No matter what is said, it is perfectly obvious that they won't accent the fact that since this Government took office, and excluding Power and Telephones, something less than \$10 million has been invested in Crown Corporations, something like \$7.3 million has been returned in operating surpluses, and something like \$5.7 million . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Opposition Members: — No, no.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — How did you get that?

Mr. Thorson: — . . . has been returned in dues and royalties into the treasury. Now, if they don't want to accept that, it's up to them, but it seems to me that they are in a very shaky position to draw the conclusion from this, that (1) Crown Corporations are a failure, and (2) that the Provincial Government ought to liquidate all them.

Premier Douglas: — 'Out the window', they say.

Mr. McCarthy: — Not all of them.

Mr. Gardiner: — You're getting along pretty good! Keep reading.

Mr. Thorson: — When I hear them talking this way, I get the impression that this is the only Government in Canada that ever organized, initiated, or operated Crown Corporations. It is quite obvious, when looking at the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, that apparently their colleagues, when they held office in Ottawa, didn't agree with them on this question of whether or not the Government ought to get into business. If you look in the Canada Year Book for 1956 there are listed no fewer than 42 Crown Corporations owned by the Government of Canada.

Premier Douglas: — That's Socialism!

Mr. Thorson: — It's worth taking a look at some of them. Some of the more important ones are: Atomic Energy of Canada; Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; Canadian National Railways; Central Mortgage and Housing; the Eldorado Aviation, and Eldorado Mining and Refining, Ltd; Polymar Corporation, Ltd., and, of course, Trans-Canada Airlines. There are some small ones with rather unusual sort of names for Crown Corporations. Here is one called the Northwest Territories Power Commission. The National Gallery is organized as a Crown Corporation. Then there are: Halifax Relief Commission; the Crown Asset Disposal Corporation; the Canadian Maritime Commission, and the Park Steamship Co., Ltd.

Mr. Korchinski: — Not a shoe factory?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, the only point I wanted to make here is that, in spite of that has been said by the members of the Opposition — and I can always tell it is bothering them, because . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — You're bothered yourself.

Mr. Thorson: — I hear their agonized shouts . . .

Premier Douglas: — You can always tell when you hit a pup.

Mr. Thorson: — The point I want to make is . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, let's make it.

Mr. Thorson: — . . . that many governments get into commercial enterprise and only one of the reasons for doing it is the desire to make money they need for revenue for government expense.

Mr. McCarthy: — For use and not for profit.

Mr. Thorson: — There are other reasons, not only why this Government has Crown Corporations, but why the Federal Government and other governments have Crown Corporations. Certainly if they can use this as a means of raising revenue without the risk of imposing unfair indirect taxes they should do so. For instance, the Power Corporation here does not set itself up as a taxing body, but the power utility of City of Regina is an indirect taxing body; it makes a very large surplus each year. When governments get into commercial enterprises, they develop and conserve their resources, provide job opportunities for economic development. Sometimes they do it because they want to improve the quality or the quantity of the services provided to the people. Sometimes they have to do this by distributing the costs, by earning revenue on the portion of the activities which pay, and providing services in other areas that do not.

Sometimes, of course (and this is particularly true in the field where the Canadian Government owns Crown Corporations) they want to limit and control economic power that is inherent in some industries. It is unfortunate, of course, that in the matter of the Trans-Canada Pipeline, neither the Liberal Party in 1956, nor the Conservative party in 1957-58, wanted to limit and control the economic power that was inherent in this is great national transportation artery. Thus, if we are to question and ask ourselves, when we hear the Opposition members speaking about Crown Corporations . . .

Premier Douglas: — This is the one thing that never ends.

Mr. McCarthy: — . . . the important question is, what would they do if they formed the government. Notice very carefully! They criticize and say, "this is wrong and that is wrong and you shouldn't have done that", but never once do they say "we would do this" or "we would do that". They never pick out each Corporation and say, "this is we would do with it", and give their reasons why.

Mr. McCarthy: — We always said we would close them up.

Premier Douglas: — So, you'd close them up?

Mr. McCarthy: — When they didn't pay.

Mr. McDonald: — There aren't any left.

Mr. Thorson: — In spite of what the Leader of the Opposition would like to say, or might have to say, that the record of a political party does not matter, most people want to know not only what a Party says it will do, but what it has done in the past.

Mr. Korchinski: — What are you going to do?

Mr. Thorson: — Of course, we haven't too much evidence to indicate what the Liberal party in Saskatchewan might do with Crown Corporations. But there is one example in my constituency that the people

are reminded of in that area pretty well every day, they see it so often. In 1918, the Federal Government, the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Manitoba organized the Lignite Utilization Board. Its purpose was to assess the possibility of carbonizing the lignite coal and briquetting it in the Bienfait coal fields. That was in 1918. In April 1927, the same Lignite Utilization Board, after it had spent over a million dollars carrying out its responsibility and testing the possibility of making briquettes — and of that more than a million dollars, the province of Saskatchewan had put in \$267,500; after they had done this, the three governments which had organized the Lignite Utilization Board, turned the ownership of the plant and all its facilities over to a private company for the sum of \$1.00.

Mr. Howe: — What a shame!

Mr. McCarthy: — It's no shame at all.

Mr. Thorson: — Today the plant is operating at what is apparently a satisfactory commercial profit to the private operator.

Mr. McDonald: — Why haven't you taken it over?

Mr. Thorson: — The people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada were denied, and denied for only one reason — because of the action of the Liberal party in power, they were denied an opportunity to regain the money they had invested. Now I suggest that this is a clue as to what the Liberal government, if it were ever brought to power with the present Liberal party of Saskatchewan, might do. This is an indication of the fate of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, the Marketing Services, the Transportation Company, Saskatchewan Timber Board, Saskatchewan Government Airways and the Printing Office. This is what would happen if the Liberals could have their way.

Well, we can't be sure, of course, that this is what would happen, because if the things the Liberal party has done make us apprehensive and make us suspicious . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Watch out, Walter, you'll get them confused.

Mr. Thorson: — . . . then their words confuse us, and give us perhaps even greater cause for fear, because they have no declared policy on Crown Corporations. Their attitude here, as in other fields, is to criticize and offer no constructive alternative. Here, as on other issues, the question of political expediency is put before the other issues, the question of political expediency is put before the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. This is why they have no policy. This is why they continue to maintain their position of irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to examine the attitude of the Opposition towards the Budget which is before us. The financial critic, a week ago, found five areas where the Government had, in his opinion, found itself in trouble. He mentioned Education and Agriculture, loss of population, need for industrial development, and he tacked on, as an afterthought, the problems of local government, particularly financial problems. Here again, the same attitude. He says we must spend more

March 10, 1958

money, we must do more; but he does not tell us how to raise the money. He does not say, 'You have got to stop the hospitalization program (because you subsidize the hospitalization program), and spend the money on education.' He does not tell us where the money ought to come from. It is very interesting in looking at the record of that particular speech — at page 21 of the recorded transcript, here he is making a plan for more money for assistance to education, for more money in this field. One of the members of this side of the House asked, "What other services are you going to cut? Tell us."

Mr. McDonald: — Who said that?

Mr. Thorson: — The member from Maple Creek said, — and, mind this, here comes his answer: "That exemplifies the statement that I made back here at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest problem facing Saskatchewan today is the problem of the government."

Mr. McDonald: — That's right. Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — There is a simple straightforward question — at least it ought to be, but it isn't to them.

Mr. Gardiner: — I bet you he'll think he's read this speech before.

Mr. Thorson: — What services do you think you will cut if you are going to increase other services?

Mr. McDonald: — None of them.

Mr. McCarthy: — Don't be so ridiculous.

Mr. Thorson: — And this is the answer — "I think that the problem of the Government today, their inability to change their attitude with the changing conditions of the province, should go to the head of the list as the No. 1 problem in this province." As a matter of fact they know that, a week ago, they couldn't answer this question and they cannot answer it today.

Mr. McDonald: — We can put another seat over here for you.

Mr. Thorson: — Here is the position of the Opposition today: critical but not constructive. What they say is this, when asked specifically what they would do if they were left to govern this province: they say they would not be responsible. The people of Saskatchewan in 1944, in 1948, in 1952 and in 1956 took them at their word and said, "All right, if you won't be responsible, you cannot be responsible."

Mr. McCarthy: — Do we have to listen to some more of that?

It being 5.30, the House will recess until 7.30 o'clock p.m.

(Continuing at 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. Kim Thorson: — When the House rose at 5.30, I had just pointed out that the attitude of the Official Opposition is so irresponsible that they are not likely ever to be allowed by the people of Saskatchewan to form a government.

I wanted to say something in this debate about industrial and mineral development in Saskatchewan. I think we will all agree that manufacturing and mining are the kind of industries that are becoming more and more important in our Saskatchewan economy, and that we need this kind of development for the job opportunities, and for the wealth it will create. I submit that we are getting this kind of development in the province; perhaps it is not as fast as we would like, but certainly faster than most people expected a few years ago. I am not the only one who has this opinion. I want to have reference to other people who are not particularly concerned about the political welfare of the members on this side of the house. Here is a publication called 'Trade and Commerce' published in Winnipeg. The July, 1957, issues has a report on Saskatchewan, and inside there are some rather interesting statistics on the economy of the province. It says the population in 1946 was 832,000; today it is something like 880,000. They give statistics that indicate some of the other economic developments that have taken place in the province during that same 10-year period. The increase in the number of telephones in service is from 108,000 to 190,000. It shows figures for the value of manufacturing: in 1946, \$168.3 million; in 1956, \$310 million. The payroll in 1946 in Saskatchewan was 602 million; in 1956, \$1,137,000,000. Mining, in 1946 was \$24.5 million; in 1956, \$18 million. Our oil production in 1946 was only \$18,000; in 1956, \$28.6 million. Of course, it is much higher this year than it was even two years ago.

In the same magazine there is an article entitled 'Saskatchewan Offers Infinite Variety and Opportunity.' It is written by Mr. Clare Thacker, the President of the Saskatoon — no, the Saskatchewan Board of Trade.

Mr. McCarthy: — He doesn't even know who he is.

Mr. Thorson: — Well, surely he is not a C.C.F. spokesman, Mr. Speaker, and this is what he says in this article:

"While Saskatchewan is definitely on the march industrially, the rapid development of her natural resources has taken and held the spotlight. Oil production, growing by leaps and bounds, is making a tremendous impact on the economy of the province. Development in the potash industry, based on deposits estimated in the neighbourhood of one million tons, staggers the imagination. Forecasts are that the uranium production in the northern part of the province may be doubled in 1957. The continuing discovery and additions to her mineral resources all aid to the picture of the diversified and growing economy. Rapid distribution of

March 10, 1958

natural gas and substantial annual increases in electric generation by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have significance for industry in the province."

Then, in another magazine which again certainly is not biased in any other favour of the group on this side of the House: it is called 'Western Business and Industry'. The June, 1957, issue has a special section on oil and gas in western Canada. Here is one article that is entitled 'Oil and Gas in Saskatchewan':

"Oil companies spend millions in the west's latest hot spot".

I will just read the first paragraph of this article. It says:

"In terms of her oil and gas industries, Saskatchewan has only had a very short history, but it has certainly been an impressive one. There is ample evidence of this in the countless stories and statistics of fantastic development and success, soaring production graphs one sees almost daily, and the tremendous pipeline construction program . . ."

.
Further on the article continues:

"In parallel with these tremendous exploration expenditures, growth of Saskatchewan's oil production rapidly outgrew and exceeded almost all expectations in rate of increase, from virtually nothing in 1944, and only 16,500-odd barrels in 1945, up to 12 million barrels in 1955, and 21 million barrels during 1956."

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is even higher this year. Another interesting note in this same magazine a couple of pages further on says: "Manitoba Oil Picture Dim." When I saw that, I thought how could that possibly be? I was assured by the Leader of the Opposition that the three prairie provinces, had the same climate, geography and resources. Either he is wrong on that count, Mr. Speaker, or else he is also wrong when he says the reason, of course, that we don't have as much oil development in Saskatchewan as they have in Alberta, is because of the political climate. How does he explain the lack of oil development in Manitoba?

Mr. McDonald: — There isn't any . . .

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I think the budget has been presented to us recognizes the important role that the Government has to play in this kind of economic development of our manufacturing industries and our resource industries.

I have already mentioned something about the Crown Corporations and the fact that they do have a role to play in developing our resources and furthering our economic development. It is particularly true of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Government Telephones.

The Government through its Departments of Natural and Mineral Resources, conducts surveys and maintains inventories of our resources. It has what are recognized, I think generally, as fair and equitable regulations for the exploitation of some of our resources, such as oil, natural gas and some of our minerals in the north. In addition the Mineral Resources Department maintains a storehouse of core samples and information on the geology of Saskatchewan, which is helpful to industry in finding out what resources we have and where they are most likely to be found, and what would be the most advantageous method of extracting them and making use of them.

In addition (these are things that are all mentioned in the Budget), the Industrial Development Office is active in telling the story to people who have money to invest; telling the story of the resources available for utilization in the province, the markets that might be served by new companies, manufacturing products, or even just selling products as agents for other manufacturers. In addition the Provincial Government has established, and makes available through the Industrial Development Fund, loans to industries which must to establish in the province, and which will not adversely affect industries that have already established here in Saskatchewan. All of these things are mentioned in the Budget, and indicate that the Government is concerned about our future economic development, and economic expansion.

Of course, when I mention the Government's role in economic expansion, I want to mention, briefly at least, the money we spend on our highways and roads, because, if we view Saskatchewan as a large economic plant, certainly we cannot help but be convinced (if we are to develop and operate economically) that we must have improved means of communication and transportation. The money which the Provincial Government is spending in highway and road development is going to be very advantageous to all people who are concerned about our economic future.

When we think of developing our resources, we remember that education is a way of investing in the development of our human resources, and, certainly, the Budget recognizes the importance of developing these resources, and providing more and better educational services in the province.

What can be said of the Budget, in conclusion? I don't think the revenue side of the Budget needs too much comment, but I do want to point out that the revenues available from mineral and natural resources are many times higher than they were even a few short years ago. It bears out that economic expansion in our manufacturing, and particularly in our resource industries, is important not only because it makes more wealth and more jobs in the province, but also because it provides more revenue to the Provincial Government for further services.

I think, however, it is most important to examine how the

available money is spent by the Provincial Government. I think it can be said that this budget is another step forward in completing the program which the Government was elected to carry out, during the provincial election of 1956. I think it reflects on the part of the Government a conscientious and responsible attitude towards public office here in Saskatchewan. I think this budget is part of an imaginative and long-term program of social investment.

When you look at the expenditure side of the budget, you cannot help but be impressed by the fact that it is weighted very heavily in favour of providing the greatest assistance where there is the greatest need. The C.C.F. has always taken the view that the need is greatest wherever there are people who are least able to help themselves. We are not particularly entranced by the myth that somehow the 'invisible hand' of supply and demand will channel the wealth and the resources towards the people who need help the most. It doesn't provide much satisfaction to a man, who is very poor, to know that there is a law of supply and demand, and to discover that while he needs a good deal of education and his family needs education, he needs health care. It is of no satisfaction to him at all to be told that, after all, the law of supply and demand puts resources to work in their proper place.

Mr. Speaker, the budget does provide a heavy portion of the total expenditure for such things as homes for the aged, the housing and care of certain groups and people in geriatric centres, for assistance to people who need the services of qualified and trained social workers, provides heavy expenditures for the care and treatment of people in mental hospitals, and those who suffer from cancer and tuberculosis, venereal diseases and mental illness. It also provides a heavy proportion of its total expenditures for education. Indeed, there is a large increase over last year's increase in the education budget. Last year, of course, there was a very substantial increase in the education budget over the year before.

The budget also recognizes that the Government can play, better than any other agency, a very important role in the development of our economy. I mentioned the role we play in providing roads and highways through the province. I think it is worthwhile keeping in mind (by the people who are clamoring for more money being spent on highways and roads), that the Estimates show that \$24.5 million is estimated as revenue from gasoline tax and motor licences, while over \$30.2 million will be spent on highways and for the Municipal Road Grid Authority. We are spending more money on highways and roads in this province than we are collecting from the people who use highways and roads; and I think this is a measure of the importance the Government sees in providing adequate transportation facilities in the province. I think the Government recognizes that this sort of investment in economic development will pay good dividends in the future, because, if we increase the revenues available to the Provincial Government, then we can spend more on health, welfare and education, in fields where there is a greater social and individual human need.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the budget balances not

only expenditures against revenues, but needs against resources. More important, it achieves this balance by taking into account the most important needs of the people of Saskatchewan. I think this budget can be called a financial expression, (in realistic and concrete programs), of the faith which the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation has in its own philosophy. I think the philosophy is best expressed in the words of the late J.S. Woodsworth when he said. 'What we desire for ourselves, we wish for all'. Mr. Speaker, I will support this motion.

Mr. J.T. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on some of the remarks that have been made by other speakers in this House. Before doing so I would like to apologize for my enforced absence during the early days of this Session, with the result that I wasn't able to listen to all the debates in the House, although I did have the pleasure of listening to most of them, lying flat on my back with a radio beside me and I did gain some impressions. However, I won't refer to those, this evening.

I wanted to refer, for a moment, to what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) had to say about arrears of taxes. As everybody has the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, if they will turn to page 20, I think they will see evidence there that will indicate that his gloomy picture of the possibility of the tax arrears being eventually paid will be dispelled. If you will note (on page 405 I should have said) — if he will note carefully, or anyone else who is interested, they will see that tax arrears climbed steadily from 1922 to 1936 — at least from 1929 to 1936, from \$22 million odd to \$62 million; and they wavered anywhere from \$48 million to \$50 odd million by 1952, with a slight drop in 1953, and then a continual drop until 1953, indicating, I think, quite clearly, that if the farmers have the money they will pay their taxes, which, of course, brings us to the comments made by the very charming and lovely member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). Being my age I can say these things to a young lady with no ulterior motives.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Flattery will get you nowhere!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — The lady also was dealing with arrears of taxes and she mentioned the farmers' inability to pay their taxes; and she, reasoning like I have found many of her sex to reason — illogically — she reasoned that the increase in taxes in the province was the cause of the farmer's inability to pay his taxes, and hence the arrears.

Mrs Batten: — Oh, oh — my reasoning!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, possibly I didn't understand her correctly . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — That's more like it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — She explained it to us here, this afternoon, and she was laying the entire responsibility on the Government of Saskatchewan for the increase in taxes. Well I don't profess to know all the things that happen in Canada, but I notice that taxes have gone up in the Tory provinces, in the Liberal government provinces, in the Union Nationale government provinces and in the Social Credit government provinces. Everything that people have to buy has been continually going up for a number of years. As a matter of fact, economists, federal and provincial political figures, business people, farm organizations, labour people have all been decrying the tremendous increases in prices, through inflation. Obviously then, the farmers costs have gone up. Nobody denies that, I think, in this country. Everybody has said so. I haven't heard anyone deny that the farmers intake has gone down in the last few years; and when you get a combination of rising prices of the things you must buy and dropping prices of the things that you produce and must sell, then obviously you find yourself on the short end when the annual statement of your particular operation is drawn up.

That is the reason why the farmers haven't the money to pay the increased taxes of these days. Now we are again criticized by members on the other side for continually blaming these things on Ottawa. Why we are criticized for blaming them, I don't know. Mr. Pearson, the leader of the Liberals; Mr. Diefenbaker, the leader of the Conservatives, and Mr. Low, the leader of the Social Credit, as well as the leader of our own party in the national field . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Who is that?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . are all — Mr. Coldwell — one of the brightest stars in the Canadian Crown; he has more brains in his little finger and more sense of responsibility than the combined members of the Official Opposition here, or the recent Official Opposition in the House of Commons.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — It's too bad the Canadian people don't recognize that.

Mr. McCarthy: — The people don't think so.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — These people are all willing to admit — including Mr. Pearson and Mr. Diefenbaker — they are very definitely prepared to not only admit, but accept the responsibility for the farmers plight, particularly the prairie farmers; and when one sees them on TV or listens to them on the radio and reads the press reports, both of these gentlemen are claiming they are going to do great things to assist the farmer out of his difficulty. Now if they didn't

feel it was a federal responsibility to do that, sir, they wouldn't promise to do these things. Consequently, I reply to the member for Humboldt that the farmers failure to pay all their taxes is not — I agree with her that it isn't that they do not want to pay them — they have been unable to pay them simply because the Federal policies in the field of farming and farm produce and the handling of our main and principal products has been faulty and has not produced the income which the farmer should have had.

I wanted to mention another thing that the hon. member for Humboldt brought up, this afternoon. She made the statement that the C.C.F. is determined to throttle private industry.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Our happy little chum from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) claps loudly on that. Apparently he is pleased that private industry should be throttled. Well, on this side of the House we don't agree; and we don't agree with the statement by the member for Humboldt. No effort has been made whatsoever by this Government to throttle private industry.

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Mr. Lopton: — What about the Regina Manifesto?

Mr. Gardiner: — You just strangle it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Every single industry that this Government has engaged in was in a field where private enterprise had failed to undertake, or had ceased operations.

Mrs. Batten: — The Box Factory?

Mr. Cameron: — The Brick Plant? The Pulp Mill?

Mr. McDonald: — How many more do you want?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — The tannery?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, let them holler, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I don't mind; it gets it off their chest . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You don't know any better.

March 10, 1958

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . childish as it may be. It doesn't matter, unless it annoys you, sir.

I would like to point out that the Brick Plant was a private industry that had ceased to operate by private individuals; and the private individuals did not suffer by the Provincial Government starting its operations, but they were well paid for their . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You bet they were well paid.

Mr. McDonald: — You can say that again.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — To the tune of \$150,000.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — If we go west of here a ways where I have spent a great many years and where some members opposite have spent some time, and have driven over old Highway No. 1 between Moose Jaw and Swift Current — every trip over that for many, many years displayed to the driver — because you had to drive slowly in those days over those old highways — that great smelly, stinking lake south of Chaplin. If private industry had been so enterprising and so anxious to get into the business of exploiting what has developed into great riches for this country, there was not a thing to prevent them from setting up a sodium plant at that point and utilizing that industry that, up until then, had simply been an eyesore on the landscape.

Mr. Cameron: — There were four plants operating.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — If the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) would speak out loud I would reply to his comments.

Mr. McDonald: — Tell us about the Box Factory.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I never hear what he says. He just mumbles with his head hung down. If he would put up his head and say what he has to say . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Well then I'll get up on my feet and say what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Private individuals did take over that project and then the C.C.F. Government stepped in and took it away from them.

Mr. Cameron: — There were four plants operating there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to understand what he said, because what he said is so far from the truth, similar to a great many of the comments he has made formally and informally in this House.

Mr. Loftson: — I'll prove it to you in Crown Corporations, tomorrow morning.

Mr. McDonald: — He won't be there.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I'm not on that Committee.

Mr. McDonald: — That's a good way out.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — There has been no private industry hurt by the actions of this Government. I could mention some of the others. I could mention . . .

Mr. McDonald: — The Box Factory?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . the potash industry. The Provincial Government hasn't interfered with that; they have made good deals with the potash people in the development of our economy. I could mention a number of other things, but the question was raised a while ago — 'what about the Box Factory?'

Mr. Cameron: — Yeah!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well when the honourable, and very able, young gentleman from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) was speaking before supper he mentioned the number of Crown Corporations that the Federal Government engages in. He also mentioned that all provincial governments have Crown Corporations; and in the course of his remarks he mentioned that they have a variety of reasons for undertaking the operation and the ownership of Crown Corporations. And that is true. For many, years now the Federal Government of both major political stripes, so far in Canada, but one of which is rapidly disappearing, have operated a very great Crown Corporation — the Canadian National Railways. As a young man I remember them quite well. I cruised timber for old Dan Mann, in the early days of the McKenzie — McMann Construction Company, later developing into the Canadian Northern Railway. I cruised timber all across from the Cochrane country to Prince Rupert on the old Trans-continental railway and know something of the basic operations. But at that time most citizens of Canada didn't know what a glorious financial mess these people were getting into. Later on they got into such a mess it became so apparent that the only reason for taking them over was to save the bond holders, who otherwise would have lost their shirts.

Mr. McCarthy: — And saved the railway

March 10, 1958

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That's why the Federal Government operates a Crown Corporation called the Canadian National Railway . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Give service to the people.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . to save the bond holders who had attempted to destroy the value of them by extravagant and crazy activities in the building of those railways.

Mr. Cameron: — Pretty poor argument. You can't support it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I know the story as well as anybody — I lived through it.

Mr. McCarthy: — You're not telling the whole story.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — We didn't criticize on this side, because as the Opposition says, we sometimes invest public money. We do invest public money in Crown Corporations. The Federal Government not only took over the Canadian Northern Railway and all those other pieces of railroads which they finally made into the Canadian National, for the sole purpose of protecting the bond holder, but during the bad years that we were told we should forget — in the 1930's the 'dirty thirties' they voted anywhere from \$50 to \$100 million a year from the Federal treasury to be assured that the bond holders of the old broken down railways received their cut of the operations. Millions of dollars of the taxpayers of Canada have gone in to continue the operation and keep afloat the Crown Corporation, the Canadian National Railway.

Mr. Cameron: — Do you want to throw it out?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — And after a few years, Mr. Speaker, they did find that not only did the Federal Government of Canada of both political stripes vote money to pay the deficit from the Canadian National Railways, but at least on one occasion, and I believe two, they voted money to pay a deficit on the privately owned C.P.R.

Now then, the only reason this Government went into the box factory business was not to protect the bond holders, the owners. It was to protect the people working in the box factories.

Mr. Cameron: — Nonsense! They're not protected now. Is that protection when you close it down?

Mr. Gardiner: — They're out on the street now.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — We kept it going with a great endeavour for a

good many years, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to keep those people employed. The point is, and it could have been done just as justifiable, if we felt it was worthwhile and a good thing to do — just as justifiable for this Government to vote public monies to pay deficits on the Canadian National Railway, the Liberal Federal Government's Crown Corporation.

Mr. Cameron: — There's quite a difference!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't expect the members opposite are going to believe anything that they don't want to believe. They've got along with their fairy tales, and they have no appreciation or conception of realism in the world as it is today. The hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) said that we didn't keep abreast with things, and I did smile to myself because his whole speech was one that might have been incorporated in Anderson's or Grimm's fairy-tales, insofar as its relation to reality was concerned.

Mr. Gardiner: — You're getting cheaper as you go!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — A few other comments I want to make, Mr. Speaker, before I ask you to permit me to adjourn the debate. I listened to the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) the other day and if I heard him correctly (and he can correct me if I say that I understood him to make a statement which he didn't make) — I understood him to say that the Department of Social Welfare was the most extravagant agency of this Government. He went on to say that we had far too many employees, and that because of that, it cost \$18.40 to write a cheque for \$100. The hon. gentleman is a school teacher; I'm not. I had to work for a living from the time I was very young.

Mr. Gardiner: — You lived off the farmer! . . . propaganda agency.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I don't know what kind of arithmetic he used, but the actual fact is that it costs \$5.27 to write a \$100 cheque. I suppose he took the total number of our employees — he mentioned 800. I correct him there, because we anticipate that, if we have a full establishment, of employing 920 odd people in the coming year . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — That's even worse than last year.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well it may be worse, but before the debate is over, I'll give you the reasons, and the jobs these people do. However, at the moment I want to make this statement that the cost of administering the approximately slightly over \$10 million of public welfare is 5.27 per cent. He made another amazing statement. This one I think he should have discussed with the Rt. hon. J.G. Gardiner first.

March 10, 1958

He said that this Government has enough civil servants to run the whole of Canada. Well, during the Liberal regime at Ottawa there were more people in Saskatchewan employed by the Federal Government than there were employed by the Provincial Government.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh no, that's nonsense.

Mr. McCarthy: — Nonsense!

Mr. Gardiner: — He's talking about the army — you mean in the army!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Go ahead and check. I advise the hon. gentleman to really look into it and find out the truth if they want it.

Mr. McDonald: — The P.F.A.A, weren't employed! That's a ridiculous . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I am making this statement and it's my responsibility now. If there are enough civil servants here in Saskatchewan employed by the Saskatchewan Government to run the whole country what in the name of goodness are the civil servants of Canada doing that are employed by the Federal Government, to the tune of well over 100,000. People should not make irresponsible statements. Don't misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker, I am not accusing either the past or the present Federal Government of having too many civil servants. I don't know whether they have too many or not — I am not in that field at the moment. But I simply say that if any hon. member of this House says that there are enough provincial civil servants in Saskatchewan to run Canada, then obviously that is a terrible indictment on the party which he supports during their term of office.

I think it might be well just to give a brief resume. I will go into more detail later. I think for the sake of the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) he should know something about where we employ these people.

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, may the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — If it's a sensible one.

Mr. Korchinski: — It is. I made a statement that it cost \$18.41 to issue cheques for \$100, and this was based on . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Are you asking a question . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — I want to ask the minister what is the cost of administration of program services in dollars?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, in dollars, you'll find that in the estimates. You can pick that up yourself.

Mr. Korchinski: — That's where I got it.

Mr. McDonald: — The Minister doesn't know, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — You can find that out yourself — you can add.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, then, the statement I made was true.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — All these kind of questions can be answered in detail on the estimates, Mr. Speaker. They are given in detail to explain what we do with the money voted to us, and what we are asking for. I wanted to make it clear to the House, so as to clear up any misunderstanding that might have been gleaned from his remarks about our vast number of civil servants, and there is only 246 employees that are employed in the field of public welfare that is generally described — that is, our regional people, out doing the field work and the office administrative work, and looking after those folks in the field who require public assistance. The biggest number of our employees are employed in geriatric centres, where we have over 350 people, most of whom are highly trained people with professional status in the particular field of caring for people who are admitted to the geriatric centres.

We have again, our correctional institutions. These are not generally recognized as public welfare, these are institutional services. We have the four institutional correctional services and we employ 148 people in those places. We have two places where children come into our care who must be cared for, one where we must keep them for a considerable length of time, which is as close to a family spirit as possible, Embury House. And Dales House, which is a clearing house for children who come into our care and are kept prior to going into the foster homes or for adoption and so on. Then there is a balance of 154 who are employed in a number of branches. For instance, we have the Civil Defense Branch. I do not think anybody here would question the advisability of us having a Civil Defense Branch. It is done in co-operation with the Federal Government and it does a tremendous amount of useful work in the field of civil disaster and in preparation for what might become a war in the future, which, of course, we all hope will never happen. But the Civil Defense Branch is there.

We have rehabilitation activities in the field of disabled people for physical rehabilitation and for activity and for

technological training in order to get people who have become crippled in some way retrained for some new occupation. It takes a number of staff for that.

We have programs in connection with help for the Metis folk, such as the one at Willowbunch and the one at Lebret and the one at Lestock and the one at Kinistino and places of that sort. We have the Bureau on Alcoholism which absorbs some of this 154 people of our staff. While I would like to give a glowing account of our Bureau on Alcoholism, the same as I expect any other agency in the States of the Union to the south of us, would like to give, all are unable to. Still we are working with the various persons, groups, government agencies, private agencies, and so on in an effort to find an answer to this. Now certainly no one would criticize us having a Bureau on Alcoholism. If we did not and some others eventually found a way of dealing with this very serious menace then we would be properly subject to criticism for having failed to try and do our share in that field also.

Then there is the administration of the housing and the nursing home rental. It is our duty to licence the privately operated nursing homes. It is our duty to be as helpful as possible to the non-profit nursing homes. It is our duty to be as responsible and as helpful to the municipalities or groups of people who are endeavouring to establish homes for the aged such as there are so many of, in the province at the present time and into which a great deal of money was put last year and a somewhat lesser amount being provided for next year, because our program is not as extensive in the year coming as in the present year. These people are required by the municipal governments and by the private organizations to assist them, first with the planning of their institution, their housing project; second in working with them in its relationship, in its co-relationship on Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and other Federal Government Crown Corporations, Mr. Speaker. So we have people employed in that.

We have the administration of our Child Welfare Branch, which is a very important branch and which must administer the planning of the programs for approximately 2,000 people, which I will deal with later on in the debate. Then our Public Assistance Branch people have people at the head office also.

Now if the hon. member would stop and think for a moment and if he would read the Annual Report he would know this, that it is not a question of taking our total and dividing it by the cost of all people we have employed, in arriving at the kind of a figure he says we arrived at.

Now I would like to make a comment about what our hon. friend from Rosthern said the other day, when he was speaking. Now I have every respect for the hon. gentleman. I say that sincerely. I

believe he is an honest and an honourable man. I do not believe he would want to, in any way, arrive at a conclusion for himself without doing what he thought was complete research. But I must assure him that he must have overlooked something when he started to make comparisons between the amount of aid given by the Provincial Government to the municipalities some years ago and what he said 'the very small increase in percentage' at the present time.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — He failed to take into consideration I am sure, the benefits that have derived to local governments because of the Hospital Services Plan; because of the relief to municipalities; because of the health and medical services given to the more needy groups in the province and the variety of ways, including the amount of load that has been taken off of the local governments by the operation of this Department. Now, if he is going to be strict and careful in coming to his conclusions, he should take all factors into consideration and then decide for himself whether there has been or not has been any increase in assistance to the municipal government since the advent of this Government. Now I am sure that if he does take all the factors into consideration, he will find that the increase has been very notable, to put it mildly.

Now, he did say also that by using percentages, it was the only fair way to do it. I would like to again draw his attention to the fact that there are other factors which we might use in the field of paying taxes, particularly it might be worthwhile to consider not percentages but the actual cold, hard cash that the taxpayer lays on the collectors' table, That is important . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Collection tables!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . when you pay the taxes. At least I find it that way when I go to pay mine. And, I assume everybody else does. Now, I would call the hon. members' attention to the amount of cash that must be raised and laid on the tax collector's table in the three prairie provinces per acre as they were cited by my colleague and friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. L.F. McIntosh) during his speech the other day, when he pointed out that this cash which the people must lay on the tax collector's table for each acre of land that is taxable in each of the three prairie provinces. It is 31.7 cents in Alberta. It is 47.6 cents in Manitoba and 23.3 cents in Saskatchewan. These were the figures that I took down which the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs gave. Now that is equally as important, sir, as percentages because as I say, the amount of money you take out of your pocket or your bank account and put on the tax

March 10, 1958

collector's table is the amount of money that has disappeared from your pocket to pay for the public services you get from your local government.

Mr. Cameron: — That is ridiculous!

Mr. McDonald: — Sure, that is right!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — And it is a fact that the amount laid on the tax collector's table in the province of Saskatchewan for these services, compares favourably with the amount put on the table in our neighbouring provinces beside us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things I assume that I could discuss here this evening but I prefer as everybody will naturally know, to tell them to the people of Saskatchewan through the medium of the air tomorrow. So, with your consent, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this is practically the same amendment as we dealt with in the Rural Municipal Act, therefore I move second reading to Bill No. 62 which is an Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act.

(The Motion for Second Reading agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Lloydminster Municipal Amalgamation Act, 1950

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 63 is an Act to amend The Lloydminster Municipal Amalgamation Act of 1930. These amendments were suggested by the Attorney General's Department because of the change in the status of the community of Lloydminster from a town to a city. Now, the proposed Bill now before the House takes care of that change in the status of Lloydminster. There is not a principle involved here, therefore I move second reading of Bill No. 63.

(The Motion for Second Reading agreed to, and the Bill referred to Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

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