

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**17th Day**

**Friday, March 4, 1960**

The House met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day:

**REFERENCE TO DEATHS OF MR. AND MRS. MITCHELL**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I thought it very worthwhile to bring to the attention the House the passing of two outstanding Saskatchewan citizens in the persons of Mr. Alex Mitchell, of Lloydminster, Saskatchewan. Mr. Mitchell, as all members know, was known in agricultural circles throughout Canada. He was one of the outstanding Canadian Hereford breeders in Canada. In addition, he was a wonderful community worker, greatly interested in boys and girls and their activities and was known as nature's gentleman. I want to say to the House that the passing of these two people occurred within an hour of each other. I was told before I came into the House that Mr. Mitchell died of a heart attack, and an hour later Mrs. Mitchell died. These two outstanding people were widely known in their own community for their many good works of public service locally and elsewhere, and I thought it very worthwhile to bring to the attention of this House the passing of these two very fine people.

**WELCOME TO SCOUTS**

**Mr. James Gibson (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a group of Boy Scouts in the gallery to your left. They are here today, on a visit to the Buildings, with their leaders, Rev. Douglas Miller, Mr. 'Barney' Molkirk and Mr. Vernon Rowe. I am sure you and all hon. members hope they will have a profitable and enjoyable visit.

**HELIUM GAS DISCOVERY**

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the House that Texaco Oil Company has made another discovery of helium gas in a deep test well in Township 5, Range 8, West of the Third Meridian, at Mankota. Texaco has set production casings, but the company is not yet prepared to make any statement as to whether or not the helium in this well is a commercial proposition. Helium has been discovered in two other wells in significant quantities. These wells are located near Swift Current and Vidora.

**March 4, 1960**

## **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, March 3, 1960, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The Assembly go into the Committee of Supply):

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate, yesterday, I had answered some of the statements that had been issued by some of the various Opposition parties, and I was rather surprised to note, when I glanced over my notes that evening, that on one occasion, at least, I could say that I had agreed with the member for Saltcoats. You may recall at that time that he told us the Liberal Party was on the march, and I agreed with him that they were — but like Napoleon from Moscow, they are on the march to defeat and oblivion!

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I also note from the press that the new Leader of the Liberal Party had a little difficulty, the other night, trying to change his tune a little bit when he was speaking at a meeting where there were some labour people. Out in the country, these labour people are really a bunch of stinkers, but when the Liberals get back to the city these labour people are not too bad at all. I noticed he told them that the major, or most advanced, labour legislation had been brought down by the Liberal Party. Knowing something about his past on labour matters, I presume he was referring to labour legislation brought down by. 'Joey' Smallwood in Newfoundland.

However, I do not intend at this time to deal with the straw man they have set up, and kicked around quite a bit; it's getting rather dirty and a bit dusty, so I intend to deal with my own Department largely today. In doing so, I am afraid I am going to irritate the members opposite by referring to the year 1944.

**Opposition Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — But I'm going to be fair, though. I assure you I am going to describe the situation as existed then by a report which, I am afraid, I used in this House before, but I am going to use it again. It was a report which was submitted to the Special Committee of the House of Commons, in April 1944, and it reads as follows:

"According to the Department of Highways and Transportation, there are 8,390.2 miles of provincial highway that should be improved and built. Only 23.4 miles have been constructed to a standard of hard-surface requirements."

If I said nothing else, that is a terrible indictment of a party. It means the entire highway system, on their own statement, required rebuilding, and there was practically no hard-surfacing in the entire province. I will admit the 23 miles they speak of was built to a standard accepted at that time. Today, we would not accept that standard. But that is only part

of a sad story. I found there were only nine professional engineers in the entire Department of Highways to undertake the supervision of the most extensive highway system of any province in Canada. I also found there was practically nothing in the way of modern equipment, and there was no long range planning, whatsoever. But that is the type of thing this Government had to face when they took office in 1944, and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we tackled this problem with earnest, and we made a considerable amount of progress, even during the first two years we were in operation.

It might be of interest if I read to this Assembly a letter which I received from the province of Ontario in the spring of 1947. It says, in part:

"Saskatchewan's highway program for this year is causing a good deal of favourable comment throughout the provinces and in the east. Saskatchewan roads have been disgraceful for so long that I think everyone is glad to see someone finally doing something about them."

In three years' time, that is the statement which we were receiving from the party in eastern Canada at that time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who was that written by?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — It was written by Ross Thatcher!

That is only part of the picture, of course, and I should have told you that in addition to the dilapidated condition of the highway system at that time, they left a debt of \$32,800,000 which represented 37 1/2 per cent of the entire amount of money that had been spent on the provincial highway system in this province from 1905 to 1944. That includes construction and maintenance, every dollar that was spent on the entire highway system in those years.

That is quite a different picture from what we have today; if you will look up your estimates, you will find that amount has been greatly reduced. In other words, we have been paying for the work which we have done on our highway system from that day to this. We tackled the problem which was placed before us in earnest, as I said, and I wanted to point out that the main problem facing us was to get the travelling public of this province out of the mud. The other thing was to get a highway system that would give all-year travel, winter and summer. We have pretty well completed that initial problem, and we are now well advanced on the second phase of the improved highway system. I need not point out to you that already we have 25 per cent, or one-quarter of our entire highway system now dust-free, and the program, which I will announce today, will indicate to you that we are going to continue with that program, and extend those services to the people of the province.

The construction year just finished was not a very good one insofar

**March 4, 1960**

as highway construction work was concerned. Yet within that period, I find that we have had a very successful year, despite the handicaps we faced this fall, and I find that, during the season, we completed 428 1/4 miles of grade, 330 miles of gravelling, 120.8 miles of bituminous surface, and 139 miles of oil treatment. In addition to that, we re-gravelled under maintenance 825 miles, and resurfaced under maintenance 86 1/3 miles. You realize, Mr. Speaker, this was done with a budget of less than \$24 million, as we did not spend the entire amount last year. It refutes the statement that was made yesterday by the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), when he accused this Department for not spending money wisely. I want to say there is no place else in the Dominion of Canada, nor in the United States, where you will find that amount of work done with the small amount of money which we have spent in this province this last year.

I said a moment ago, we had started the second phase of our construction. That has been made necessary because of the increased traffic on our highways. It has been steadily increasing, and, if we are to provide better highways, highways that will carry heavier loads, highways that will be safe and comfortable to travel over, then we have got to increase the standards that we have been building and this we have been doing.

I might point out to you that, since 1945 when we had approximately 147,000 motor vehicles in this province, we have almost reached the 330,000 mark in 1959, and our estimate for 1980 is that we will have 570,000 motor vehicles in this province at that time. That is certainly no indication of any slackening of the growth of this province, and it certainly gives the lie to the statements being made by the Opposition Members that this province is on the down-grade under this Government. In 1945, we covered some 640,000,000 vehicle miles; by 1959, this has been increased by almost four times to 2,400,000,000 vehicle miles. Our estimates for 1980 are double that 5,500,000,000 vehicle miles. The population trend which we expect — and I may say that the figures we used in our Department are slightly lower than those used in the report which the Stanford people put out; but on that basis, we expect we will have a motor vehicle in Saskatchewan for every two people in the province. At the present time we lead all Canada in the number of motor vehicles per person in the province of Saskatchewan.

This increase in traffic has been generated from a number of causes. One, of course, is the increase in our population, and secondly, I would say, the mechanization of agriculture; and as our farms become mechanized, more and more of our people travel. There is a greater need for motor vehicles on our farms than there were even 10 years ago. Then, of course, we have the steady increase of industry in this province, which has made it necessary for more trucks to be travelling our roads. The steady increase in freight tonnage that is being transported over our highways is also one of the reasons for the increase in traffic. Not only does

it help in the increase in the number of vehicles, but it is putting a much greater strain upon our highways, because of the increased tonnage which we are now carrying as compared with five or 10 years ago.

All of these things do call for an. increase in the standard of roads which we must construct. As I said a moment ago, 25 per cent of our entire highway system is now dust-free. Today, you have dust-free connections to every city in the province. You have dust-free connections to the three international border crossings, and you have dust-free connections to three inter-provincial connections in the province of Saskatchewan.

As a matter of fact, quite a number of our highways are today carrying peak loads that are greater than is safe on a two-lane highway. We are now commencing the construction of several four-lane arteries in the province. The problem which the Department is concerned with is that if this traffic increase continues at the rate which we would expect (and in the past we have always been conservative in our estimates), we may be faced with the need of more four-lane highways than we can financially afford at this time, because this type of road calls for higher standards and a much higher cost.

A good illustration of what we can expect from higher standard roads is the increase in traffic that occurred on the Trans-Canada Highway after it was constructed. In 1957, the year that road was constructed throughout Saskatchewan, we found that the motor vehicle travel increased by some 15 per cent. The following year, it was 14 per cent, and I find that, in 1957, 18 per cent of the motor vehicle miles travelled over the entire provincial highway system was over the Trans-Canada Highway. It carried 10 per cent of the total provincial traffic. That is some idea of what you can expect when we upgrade some of these main arteries in the province, and I can assure you that it is the intention of this Government to continue the upgrading of these roads.

I said, a moment ago, that the upgrading of this system is going to cost more money, and again we have done some planning and some estimating of the cost. On the basis that a highway will last 10 years, and with the expectation of a certain amount of obsolescence, and without any extensions whatsoever to this highway system, we estimate that it will cost over \$600 million to do the job that must be done in this province during the next 20 years. I am quite satisfied it will be done. I can assure you we have the staff in the Department of Highways to undertake any work that may be required, and instead of the nine professional engineers which were in this Department when we took over in 1944, we now have a department very well staffed, although not all we would like to have; but this is a staff that can do the type of job that must be done in the building and maintaining of a modern highway system.

I think I can realize that the electorates of this province are not going to take any chances with any of the Opposition parties in this province taking over after this year, because we have heard sufficient from the

**March 4, 1960**

Opposition, in their reference to the firing of engineers, in their reference to the arrogance of the civil servants, to know what they have in the back of their minds. I can assure them the people of this province will take no chances that the very fine services which have been built up in Saskatchewan are not going to be sabotaged by the people across the way.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I said, a moment ago, that this system of highways is going to cost more money. I want to point out to this Assembly that throughout the last number of years, we have been spending more money on our highway system and on our road system than we collect from the road users' tax, namely, the gasoline tax and their car licences. A year ago I think it was something like 137 per cent of the entire amount of money collected from this source that has been expended on our roads and highways. It is the intentions of the Government to continue such a policy; but if we are to do the job that must be done over the next 20 years, then I realize that even more money than this will have to be expended, because, in addition to the present highway system, there is going to be the need of taking over and extending the system into the north, extending roads into provincial parks, and these were not included in the estimates which I gave, a moment ago, of over \$600 million required in the next 20 years.

So that brings us to the question of the need for Federal aid for our provincial highway system. I have mentioned this repeatedly; I have worked on this problem for a number of years. We were able to get support from a number of influential organizations in this country. As a matter of fact, working through the Boards of Trade in this province, we were able to get the Dominion organization, a few years ago, to take up the case for Federal assistance for roads. Working through the Prairie Road Builders' Organization, they also took the matter to their national organization, and we now have that organization pressing for a system of comprehensive Federal aid. So there is a great deal of pressure being exerted today upon the Federal Government, but it took a great deal of prodding on the part of the provinces and on the part of other organizations, before we could get the Federal Government to move even on the Trans-Canada Highway.

While I was pleased to be able to assist in that project, I want to point out that, while that project proves that you could have a plan of highway construction, assisted by Ottawa, and carried out to the satisfaction of both governments, nevertheless, it had its weaknesses. It had a weakness, inasmuch as too much money was expended on a given route at one time. That is the reason, I think, that only one province in the Dominion of Canada to date has completed this section of the road, and that is the province of Saskatchewan.

I should say, however, that when we were called into Ottawa to discuss ways and means of speeding up the work on the Trans-Canada Highway, I pointed out to the Minister in charge that if they really wanted to speed up work on

the Trans-Canada Highway, the thing for them to do was to assure the provinces that, as soon as any province could complete their portion of the road, they would continue to receive Federal aid on other projects. We could not convince them to do that, and, as a result, those provinces who saw the efforts we had made in Saskatchewan, and saw we were left holding the bag after we had co-operated with the Federal Government, they undertook to take their time in the completion of this project. I was hoping that, with the change of Government, we might have a change of policy. We had heard a great deal from the Conservatives when they were in as Opposition, as to what they were going to do when they obtained office. I have some clippings here that I think will be of interest to this Legislature:

"Mr. Hees, now Minister of Transport, speaking in Newcastle, said that if his party was elected it would start on a Canadian-wide highway program similar to the \$100 billion scheme now under way in the States. He said Progressive Conservative leader John Diefenbaker had promised to start on such a program when his party was elected."

Then, speaking in Saskatoon, and referring to the Trans-Canada Highway, he says:

"It has become obvious that if the highway is to be built in the next 5 years the Federal Government must finance its construction. Mr. Hees said in addition, Canada needs a national highway program by which the Federal Government will join with the province in building highways which will enable the development of the tourist trade, natural resources and the defence program."

And then we have Mr. Diefenbaker, after he was elected, speaking in Edmonton. Of highways, he said:

"To bring about immediately, or at the earliest possible date, a second Trans-Canada or Trans-Continental highway, starting at the present time at Winnipeg, thence to Edmonton, then through the passes west of there."

Those were fine statements when they were in Opposition, but to date they have done nothing about it. It's another case of the Conservatives repudiating the promises they made to electors before the election.

I should point out that this matter of pressure on the Federal Government of federal aid is not new. I find that, in 1937, when you had one Liberal government speaking to another — a Liberal government in Saskatchewan

**March 4, 1960**

and a Liberal government in Ottawa the brief presented to Ottawa on Dominion-Provincial Relations, page 32, states:

"The Government of Canada should construct and maintain a trans-Canada highway of a permanent type, as well as permanent highways from Canada to the U.S. border and to the several national parks of Canada."

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — They say hear, hear! over there. Well, they did nothing about it until they were prodded for 20 years. On September 24, 1943, the Federal Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, dealing with roads, on page 32 of its report on Publicly Financed Construction projects, said:

"What is needed is a careful distinction between the different types of roads and the service they perform and above all, some attempt to relate all road programs in the country to a master plan of national communications."

Those are mighty fine words; but what has either the Liberal or Conservative Governments at Ottawa done about it? At the present time, for the past number of months, we have been pressing the federal Minister of Public Works to meet with the highway ministers of Canada and up to the present time we have been unsuccessful in getting a date when he would meet with us and discuss this very pressing problem.

I want to state that the Liberal government showed very poor foresight in the original plan of the Trans-Canada Highway. At that time, the time when they originally met the provinces and we discussed this matter, it was pressed upon them that provision should be made for upgrading certain sections of this road. It was realized at that time that certain sections of the Trans-Canada would likely be out of date by the time it was completed, if it was built as a two-lane highway only. We were unable to get the Federal Government, at that time, to extend its assistance to more than two lanes, and we already have the results of that in this province where portions of this highway already are overtaxed. Already with portions of the highway constructed only a few years, they are now in need of upgrading to cope with the traffic. What is true of Saskatchewan is true of other areas, and I say it was a shortsighted policy on the part of the Federal Government.

I said, a moment ago, that there is no indication that the Federal Government had any intention of assisting with the highway system other than their northern roads, and I notice that the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, in a statement to the press, the other day, on his "roads-to-resources" program, stated this:



"Roads to resources, and I must make this clear, is not a program designed to assist the province to meet their normal highway commitments."

When I said last year that the roads-to-resources program was no substitute for an overall and comprehensive system from Ottawa, Alvin Hamilton agreed with that, and stated quite definitely that this is not a plan to help with the overall highway system of Canada.

Unfortunately, Canada today is the only major country in the world without a national highway program, and it is not something we can be proud of. I found just a year ago, when I attended the International Road Federation conference in Mexico City, that Canada was looked upon by the other nations as possibly the second road-building nation of the world; but I was rather ashamed to tell them that we did not have a national highway policy, and that the responsibility for roads and highways was left to the provinces and the municipalities concerned.

Now, I maintain that the province of Saskatchewan has had a rather raw deal from the Federal Government. After we had gone all-out to complete our section of the Trans-Canada Highway, we have been left holding the bag insofar as further federal aid is concerned. I want to say further, how we can expect to compete with our neighbouring states across the border, when they are receiving such generous treatment from their federal government? The treatment they are receiving today is not new; they have been getting federal aid across the line since 1916. I got the figures, the other day, as to what they are getting at the present time. The fiscal year for their construction period ends on June 30th, and I find that the State of Montana, for the 1960 season which will end on 30th June, they are receiving \$32.2 millions from the Federal Government and, for 1961, the year commencing July 1, they will receive \$33 million; North Dakota will receive \$17.2 million and \$16.9 million; South Dakota \$32.2 million and \$17.4 million; Wyoming \$26.6 million and \$27.5 million. In other words, the State of Wyoming will get more assistance from the Federal Government than our entire budget for highways in this province. How can we expect to compete under conditions such as these?

I would like to turn for a moment to a statement that appeared in the 'Trade Press' the other day. It is headed 'The Key to North's Hidden Wealth', and it is attributed to the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, Minister of Northern Affairs. I do not intend to spend any time on the article itself, but I do want to call the attention of this Legislature to the map included in this article, and the table. This map indicates the roads which are included in the northern roads, and for the province of Saskatchewan they show three roads, one leading from the town of Hudson Bay and towards Le Pas, known as the Ataskawin road; one leading to Flin From on No. 55 Highway, which is known as the Hanson Lake road, and the other one from Lac La Ronge to Uranium City. The table gives the total of these as 824 miles at an estimated cost of \$20 million. I want to point out to you,

**March 4, 1960**

Mr. Speaker, that this is the greatest piece of political hypocrisy that I have seen for a long while.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — In the first place they do not intend to assist all the way on that road from La Ronge to Uranium City. As a matter of fact after the Ataskawin road and the Hanson Lake road are completed, I question that there will be much more than \$3 million left to spend on that road, and it is going to cost \$22 million to build a road from La Ronge to Uranium City. Yet he leaves the impression in this article that this is the assistance they are giving to the province of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, they have gone even further than that. You may recall that a year ago, I told you I had signed an agreement with the Hon. Alvin Hamilton for the construction of a bridge across the North Saskatchewan River at Prince Albert. That agreement was signed between the Department of Highways and the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, which had nothing to do whatever with the northern roads program, but now when he writes to my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak), he tells him they are going to deduct the price of the Prince Albert Bridge from the \$13 million with which they are supposed to build these northern roads. Another case of 'welshing' on the commitments they made to the City of Prince Albert during the election campaign.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Don't look at us.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I thought you would like to have this information. Maybe you don't; but that is the type of thing. It's another case of the Federal Government 'welshing' on their plan, just as they have 'welshed' on the farmers of this province in regard getting them a fair price and a fair share of the national income. They are not a bit better than the Liberals in that respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, time is going on and I do want to announce the program for this year, before my time runs out.

Commencing with No. 1 Highway, I want to announce the construction of a 4-lane facility from Balgonie to Regina, and from east of Tompkins to Sidewood there will be some seal coating done. On No. 2 Highway from Moose Jaw to Tuxford, will be grading and bituminous surfacing, and from Young. on No. 5 Highway, bituminous surfacing, and from Prince Albert north, grading and bituminous surfacing — that is the section with the approach to the new bridge which will be completed, this fall; No. 3 Highway, from Tisdale to Naisberry corner, grading, Melfort to Weldon, oil treatment.; No. 2 Highway to Shell River, grading, and from No. 40 Highway to Polworth, Completion of grading and gravelling; No. 4 Highway, Cadillac to No. 43, oil treatment; No. 1 Highway to old No. 32, bituminous surfacing, and from Elrose to Rosetown, completion of the grading and bituminous surfacing; Battle River to Battleford, oil treatment; Cochin to Glaslyn, grading and gravelling; No. 5 Highway, Coleville to No. 7 Highway, grading and gravelling; Humboldt to Bruno corner, grading

and gravelling; No. 6 Highway, Southey to Raymore completion of bituminous surfacing; Watson to Melfort, completion of grading and gravelling; Pleasantdale to Melfort, completion of bituminous surfacing; Highway No. 7, Vanscoy to junction of new No. 14 Highway, grading and bituminous surfacing; No. 8 Highway, Swan Plain to the Porcupine Forest Reserve, completion of grading and gravelling; Churchbridge to Wroxton, grading and gravelling; Highway No. 9, Alameda to No. 13 Highway, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 49 Highway, oil treatment, and with that will be the relocation at Crystal Lake; No. 10 Highway, Manitoba border west, completion of grading and gravelling; Tonkin to Wroxton, completion of bituminous surfacing; Highway No. 11, junction of No. 6 Highway to Lumsden, grading of 4-lane facility; from 5 miles north of No. 5 Highway to Rosthern, completion of oil treatment commenced last year; west of Rosthern to Duck Lake, completion of grading and gravelling — that should be north, from Duck Lake to Highway No. 2, grading and gravelling; Highway No. 13, Carlyle to Stoughton, oil treatment; Highway No. 14, Saskatoon west, completion of grading and from Saskatoon to Hawarden, bituminous surfacing; Biggar to No. 51 Highway, oil treatment; from Wilkie to Unity, oil treatment, and west of Unity to the Alberta border, grading and gravelling (that, by the way, completes almost entirely the improvement of No. 14 from the Manitoba border to the Alberta border); No. 16 Highway, Manitoba to Maryfield, completion of grading and gravelling, Windthorst to Kendal, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 17 Highway, Lloydminster north and Lloydminster south, completion of oil treatment; No. 18 Highway, Carnduff to Glen Ewen, completion of grading and gravelling, Oxbow to Frobisher, bituminous surfacing; Frobisher west to Bienfait, completion of bituminous surfacing; No. 39 Highway to Estevan, grading, Estevan to Torquay, grading and gravelling; No. 19 Highway, from north of Vogel to No. 1 Highway, grading and gravelling; from No. 42 Highway to Elbow, grading and gravelling. This last, of course, is work under the South Saskatchewan River Dam agreement; No. 20 Highway from No. 11 to No. 22, grading and gravelling, and from Crystal Springs to Domremy, grading and gravelling; No. 22 Highway, from No. 9 Highway to No. 47, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 26 Highway, Mervin to Turtleford, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 32 Highway from Highway No. 1 to Success, oil treatment; No. 33 Highway, Richardson to No. 1, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 34 Highway, U.S. boundary to Bengough, grading and gravelling; No. 35 Highway, U.S. boundary to Tribune, grading and gravelling; Weyburn, to Cedoux, grading and gravelling; Flin Flon to Creighton, completion of grading and bituminous surfacing; No. 37 Highway, Shaunavon north, oil treatment; No. 38 Highway, Chelan to Greenwater Lake, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 39 Highway, U.S. boundary to No. 18 Highway, grading, Yellowgrass to Corinne, seal coating; No. 40 Highway, Shellbrook to No. 55, oil treatment; No. 42 Highway from the new junction of No. 2 Highway to the old junction No. 2, grading; No. 43 Highway, Gravelbourg, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 45 Highway, Birsay to South Saskatchewan River Dam, grading and gravelling — this is also under the South Saskatchewan River Dam agreement; Highway No. 49, from No. 9 Highway to Preeceville, completion of grading and oil surfacing; No. 50 Highway, Torquay south, grading and gravelling; No. 51 Highway, Kerrobert to Major, grading and gravelling; No. 55 Highway from No. 40

**March 4, 1960**

to Mount Nebo, oil treatment; No. 57 Highway, Manitoba boundary to No. 5 Highway, completion of grading and gravelling; No. 60 Highway, Pike Lake to No. 7 Highway, completion of grading and oil treatment. You will note that No. 60 Highway is a new addition to the highway system as of this year.

A summary of this work means that we will be grading 566.4 miles of road; gravelling 516.9; bituminous surfacing, 199.73, and oil treating, 221.39 miles. In addition, the following work will be undertaken by the Maintenance Branch: regravelling, 820 miles; resurfacing, 30 miles; seal coating, 25 miles.

I have not mentioned the road which we will undertake for the Northern Roads-to-Resources program from La Ronge north. We hope this year to complete the road to the Churchill River, and we also hope that, within the present month, the bridge over the Churchill River will be completed.

In addition to that, I should point out, we hope to complete roads at a very early date to Squaw Rapids, to assist in the power project which the Power people have undertaken in damming the Saskatchewan River.

I would also like to announce that we hope, early this fall, to complete the bridge across the river at Prince Albert, and we will also call for tenders and start the construction of the bridge over the North Saskatchewan River in the vicinity of Petrofka ferry.

In addition to that, I might mention that our Planning Branch will be carrying on a very extensive program. Two projects I should like to mention are: One on the meridian south of Lloydminster, where we will carry on the necessary reconnaissance and economic surveys required before we undertake to bring roads into the highway system, on that section during the present year. A similar survey will be carried out from Erwood to the Manitoba border, also during the present year. This, of course, is a continuation of No. 3 Highway.

The last few years I have adopted a policy of announcing to this Legislature a number of projects on which we would like to call for tenders during the fall and winter months. By doing this we are able to assist the contractors in getting their equipment put to the job during the winter months, before bans are placed on the roads. It also extends the work for our own Department, so we do not have as great a rush for certain types of work. This year I would like, as I have in the past, to name a few of the projects. I don't need to quote the whole program for 1961, but I would like to name a few of the projects on which we would call for tenders during the coming fall of 1960.

Starting with No. 3 Highway, Shell River to Shellbrook, would be grading and bituminous surfacing; Weldon to junction No. 2 Highway, oil treatment; Tisdale to Naisberry, bituminous surfacing and from Tisdale to Crooked River, oil treatment; Highway No. 5, from its junction with No. 6 Highway to the junction with No. 20, grading; from Humboldt to the junction of No. 22, bituminous surfacing; Highway No. 6, Dafoe to Watson, oil treatment;

Watson to Lac Vert, bituminous surfacing. I may say that these improvements on No. 6 means that we will have continuous dust-free surface all the way from the international border to Melfort. No. 13 Highway from east junction with 36 to Assiniboia, grading; No. 14 Highway, Foam Lake to junction of No. 10 Highway, oil treatment; Highway No. 15, junction No. 6 to Junction No. 20, grading; Ituna to junction No. 10, grading; Highway No. 26, Spruce Lake to St. Walburg, grading; No. 31 Highway, Kerrobert to Salvador, grading; No. 39 Highway, Estevan to U.S. border, bituminous surfacing; Blaine Like from No. 11 Highway, grading, That will give a connection between Nos. 40 and 11 Highways that will synchronize with the junction of the bridge across the river at Petrofka.

That pretty well completes the work that I propose for the Department of Highways, but before I close I would like to say that in addition to the work we have done on our highway system provision will be made for extension of the grid road program and for assistance to urban municipalities.

Again I would like to point out to the members of this Assembly, and again possibly irritate my hon. friends across the way by doing so, that grants to municipalities in 1943-44 were only \$450,000. When you compare it with 1958-59, plus about \$107,000 which was spent through the L.I.D., plus the amount of money which my Department spent in grants in the surveying of these roads, it was a lot more money than the municipalities ever expected to get from a Liberal Government — I am afraid a lot more than they ever would get if they were ever to return to power, because I could not help but think as the members across the way have been talking the past few days, when they talk about this Government bringing in a program which they cannot fulfil. We know we can fulfil it. They are basing their thinking on the facts of what would happen if they, the Liberals, were returned to power; but, of course, the people of the province are not going to take any chances.

Before I sit down I would like to say one word about the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, which I have the honour to supervise. I want to report that we have completed a very successful year, I think possibly the most successful year that we have accomplished since we commenced the organization in 1946. I want to refute the statement made by the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) that this company has never made any contribution to paying off this debt, nor has it made any contribution towards general revenues. I want to point out that we have retired \$350,000 of the moneys which were advanced to us, and in the past year, in addition, paid to treasury the surplus which we will have (it will be a very nice surplus) of over \$100,000. We have also contributed to the gasoline tax, education and hospital tax, licence fees, a total of \$52,292. We have paid to municipalities, in lieu of taxes, a sum of \$34,393.

This company, of courses was not organized to make money. It was

**March 4, 1960**

organized to give service, and today I can say that we are giving service in areas that no private company would ever undertake to service. We are giving the type of service which is the very best kind of bus service known anywhere in this country. I cannot help but compare this with the record, again, of the Conservative Government in Ottawa, who in my opinion are doing their very utmost to sabotage another Crown-owned organization known as the Trans-Canada Airways. Two years ago in this House I draw the attention of members to the fact that there was every indication that the Conservative Government of the day was intending to sabotage the Trans-Canada Airways by allowing C.P.A. to cut into that business, after the Trans-Canada Airways had built up a very substantial business, and given, I would say, the very best service of any airways on this continent.

The only result of this will be that T.C.A. must reduce their services or possibly take a loss. That is what we can expect from the Conservative Government, and I am afraid it is what we would expect from our friends across the way, who a few years ago said they would throw all these Crown Corporations out of the window, but the people of this province are not going to stand for it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's not true!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — And now, Mr. Speaker, I see my time is up. In closing, I want to say that it has been a great privilege for me to have this opportunity to vote for a budget that will undertake to provide the necessary money for the programs which have been outlined in the Speech from the Throne and again in the budget before us. And so, Mr. Speaker, needless to say, I will support the motion.

**Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) on his excellent address. I would also like to congratulate the Minister who has been in charge of the Department for the past 16 years, on a very efficient and capable department which he has established. Certainly, this department has put Saskatchewan roads in a condition that we can certainly be proud of, and today can travel all across the populated area of this province in safety and comfort. I take great pleasure in complimenting the Minister at this time, as it may be my last opportunity to do so.

Also, on this debate on the budget, I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. C.M. Fines) for presenting to this House the excellent budget which they have given to us. This budget is one which provides for continuation of past services that we will continue to enjoy. This budget also makes provision for the people of this province. I am pleased to note that it makes provision for the initiation of a medical-care program which is something we have long looked forward to, and its fulfillment will certainly be another stop in the progress of Saskatchewan.

I am also pleased to note the provision for a mental hospital at

Yorkton, and also pleased that there is a geriatric centre at Swift Current. These projects will be of immense benefit to the people of this province.

I am also pleased that this budget provides for the future of this province. Certainly, there is no better way to provide for the future than to provide for the young people and the education which they acquire. This budget provides for an increased allotment for education and a substantially increased allotment for our University. These projects will immensely help the future of this province. We must not forget the provision for the Saskatchewan Research Council and many other projects that are very worthy of mention, but I will not take time to deal with them at this time. I think the people in this province should be very satisfied that this budget makes these provisions for a larger budget with no new tax or any increase in any existent tax. Furthermore, this budget is one that indicates our net per capita debt is now down to the nominal sum of \$21.

**Opposition Member:** — You don't mean \$21.

**Mr. Johnson:** — Per capita debt. That is what I said, Mr. Speaker. \$21 per capita debt. That is what I meant.

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy:** — Why don't you take up a collection and pay for it?

**Mr. Johnson:** — Also, provision is made in the budget for new borrowings for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Saskatchewan Government Telephones. Certainly, no one can dispute the immense benefits that these Crown corporations are providing to this province.

The budget has also indicated the changing nature of our economy. It has indicated that some 66 per cent of our provincial output, last year, was derived from non-agricultural sources.

At this time, I would like to comment on the changing nature of agriculture in our province. I would first like to remark on the change in the labour force, and I would like to make comparisons between two years, on which I will give statistics from the census. In 1941, we had a farm labour force of some 187,000. This, of course, includes the farm operator, the hired help and unpaid family. In 1956, this labour force had been reduced to some 147,000. In spite of this reduction in the labour force, we have been able to cultivate more land and produce more livestock. This has been mainly due, of course, to the changing nature of the technology of our province, and the impact of mechanization on our farms. This, again, is indicated by the fact that, in 1941, the farmers owned and operated some \$142 million, which had increased in 1956 to some \$564 million which, even taking into consideration the changing value of currency, is a most substantial increase. Farmers, the past few years, have been spending million every year to purchase new machinery.

**March 4, 1960**

In term of individual farms, I will refer to results obtained through the Farm Management Division of the Agricultural Representatives Branch. As members in the House are aware, this Farm Management Division has gathered information that is of much value to us and also of great benefit to themselves. To cite a few instances; these clubs founded in the north-east portion of the province around the Carrot River Valley, farm capitalization was in the vicinity of \$16 per cultivated acre. Of course this contrasts at the other end of the capitalization in my own area of some \$10.62. But this is important and significant and is borne out by the annual cost of owning and operating machinery. In the north-east corner of the Carrot River Valley, it costs the farmers some \$6.67 per cultivated acre to own and operate his machinery. This means, if a farmer seeds half of his cultivated acreage every year, he must set aside approximately 10 bushels of wheat in order to maintain his investment in machinery and to operate it. These things, of course, indicate the importance of machinery in our province, and economy. It is of great importance, and our Department of Agriculture and Government should be congratulated in helping the farmer to maintain this standard of equipment. For certainly, as every farmer knows, it is bad enough to have a breakage at some important time in a working season, but it is many times worse to find, when you have gone to town, that there are no parts available.

The Agricultural Machinery Administration is aiding in improving the standard and quality of service available to farmers in Saskatchewan. Also, the Agricultural Machinery Administration has gone further for, in my own observation (and I am sure in the observation of many members of this House), many of the machines that have been offered for sale in this province have not been well designed nor properly built. The Machinery Testing Branch under the Agricultural Machinery Administration does just that; and even though they are only in their first year of operation, they have conducted tests that are of great interest to the farmers in the province. I would just like to cite two of the interesting and valuable tests which they have made.

The members of this House are aware that 1959 was a disastrous year for farmers, especially in the northern areas, and we are well aware, of course, of the advice, every harvest, for the farmers to harvest their grain dry. This has had the result, in many instances, of leaving it there to this day. A possible solution to this, where we have a short season is to employ grain driers. The Agricultural Machinery Administration has conducted extensive tests on the performance and durability of grain driers, and the information which they gathered and passed on to the farmers is of tremendous benefit to the agricultural industry of this province.

I would also like to cite another test which I regard as of great interest to the farmers in this province. As farming members know, a



heavy duty cultivator has become practically a universal implement on Saskatchewan farms. One of the tests conducted by the Testing Branch of the Agricultural Machinery Administration was durability tests on cultivator sweeps. They tested 7 makes of sweeps that are currently available on the market. I think the results were astonishing and most enlightening because in the value that different makes of sweeps gave, they found that some were 2 1/2 times as good as the poorest in durability per dollar value. I think this is a good indication as to which one a farmer should purchase, if he is interested durability, and also, I think, this test will prompt many of the machine companies (at least it should) to conduct more and better research on the production of their sweeps.

I would like also to comment, as I think the time is long since past, that consumers should be given more consideration by the manufacturer. An indication of the general neglect of the consumer is shown by the fact, in comparing these cultivator sweeps, there were only two of these which conformed to specifications laid by the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, which is a body which endeavours to provide conformity and standardization in various aspects of farm machinery. I think we have not the power to direct the companies to produce more standardized equipment, better equipment, but, certainly, if we as consumers are informed, we will be in a position to select most properly. Certainly, the A.M.A. is in a position to give us that help, which we very much need.

I would also like to comment on the amount of money spent by the Agricultural Machinery Administration, which I think last year was one-fifth of one per cent of the money the farmers spent in purchasing farm machinery. It is a very modest sum and certainly of immense benefit to the farmers of this province.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express appreciation for another aspect of the budget, one which provides for assistance to rural telephone companies. Certainly, to comment on the necessity and desirability of communications in this day and age would be purely unnecessary. However, in listening to the Hon. Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Williams) in this House, a couple days ago, he mentioned that there were some 952 rural telephone companies. I would like to contrast this with the telephone company that exists in my own constituency. The Kindersley Rural Telephone Company now consists of what had been some 18 smaller companies. This progressive policy of amalgamation has vastly improved the service in that, at the present day, a person can 'phone 1,600 members in his rural community without dialling long distance. I don't say that is necessarily a record, but I am indicating that it provides a very high quality of service.

I would like to comment that all this assistance from the Government is much appreciated; but there is a great deal that people can do for themselves in improving their own service, and I would like to compliment the Kindersley Rural Telephone Company for the high standard of service they are providing. Nevertheless, the amount of money that is being provided

**March 4, 1960**

for assistance to the rural telephone companies will be highly appreciated.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that I will certainly support this most excellent budget.

**Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this Budget debate, may I add my congratulations to yourself, Sir, and all the previous speakers. May I also express my regret at the retirement of several Ministers and private members. May I also express my regret to those members who may be retiring involuntarily — and I am looking across the way when I say this. I noted with interest that the member for Redberry (Mr. B.K. Korchinski) sang his swan song yesterday, and after listening to him complaining about his length of time on the air, I would suggest that he would have been better if he had said less. I understand they are recording that speech up in Redberry for the C.C.F. use in the next election.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Good!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder when I am listening to some of the attempts of the Opposition of both parties, whether they have ever heard that it is better to remain silent and be thought dull, than to open their mouth and remove all doubt.

I wish now to say a few things on behalf of this budget. First of all, I am surprised at this budget and very happily surprised. I am happily surprised at this budget because, in spite of the fact that we are in the midst of an agricultural depression in western Canada's greatest agricultural area, we are again able to increase our budget this year by some many millions of dollars, providing more extended service, better service, to the people of Saskatchewan.

It has also been brought to my attention, with regret, Mr. Speaker, that after all the fanfare and promises, after one thousand farmers went to Ottawa, last year, asking for deficiency payments which were promised by the Conservative party, the news has just come through that the Prime Minister of Canada has turned down deficiency payments.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Shame!

**Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General):** — No better than the Liberals.

**Mr. Kramer:** — This must be to the everlasting disgrace of the present Conservative party when you consider all the promises they made in the election in 1958. No better than the Liberals, is correct.

I would like to say a few words about that now, if I may. Let us

remember what the situation is: the people across the way are trying to get the farmers' eyes off the fact that the position the farmers are in today is directly the result of the inaction of the Liberal party in Ottawa over the years. There are two points about the situation we find ourselves in today. First of all, inflation. Inflation was brought about by the combined efforts of the Liberal, Tory and Social Credit parties after the war, when they combined in their efforts to remove price controls.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — They were warned by the C.C.F. party in Ottawa at that time, by Mr. Coldwell, and they were also warned, incidentally, by organized labour, that this would ruin the Canadian economy eventually. Now they are crying crocodile tears about the situation. They never thought there was inflation until the government changed at Ottawa. You never thought there was such a thing as inflation; but now the Liberal party have finally become aware of the fact that there is inflation.

Secondly, I want to point out that the agricultural situation is one of the most important problems which they face today. We hear these people again crying crocodile tears about the situation the farmer finds himself in, and they suggest that there is nothing in this budget for the farmer. Well, I am going to have a few things to say about that, a little later on. I am going to prove before I am through, Mr. Speaker, that more than 50 per cent of this budget is of direct benefit to the rural areas, of direct benefit to agriculture. My roots are deep in the soil of the farm and they are going to remain there. I think it is an everlasting disgrace that these people will take part in this debate in this house and say that nothing, or very little has been done, and cry with their carping criticism and suggest that somehow or other we are to blame for the situation.

We had better take a look at the record of the Liberal party; and let us remember, too, that the present Leader of the Liberal party chose to leave the C.C.F. party which was fighting for the farmer, and join up with the party that was going down to disgrace through disregard of the farmers in western Canada. Let us remember that he joined them right when they were refusing parity prices and refusing to do anything about western agriculture. This is when the new hero chose to leave the party that was fighting for the interests of western Canada.

This just did not happen overnight. Liberal speakers would try to suggest that this just happened lately, since the Tories took office. Well, let us take a look, in 1949, the net income to Saskatchewan farmers was \$344 million — that was an average year; then in 1953, it was about \$600 million — and what happened? The last year the Liberals had anything to do with the economy of Canada it was down to \$186 million: from \$344 million in 1949 to \$186 million in 1958. This was not the fault of the Conservatives; and don't forget, when you are talking of dollars, Mr. Speaker, that those dollars will buy a great deal less if you took the dollar comparison — \$344

**March 4, 1960**

million; \$186 million — you would find out that the farmer was getting a net income of one-third of what he received in 1949. Mr. Speaker, this has been directly the result of the policies of the Liberal party in Ottawa. The only thing we can blame the Tory government for is that they have done nothing about it, and chosen to add to the difficulties of western Canada, chosen to do nothing until, today, when they have turned down what is a legitimate demand of the Wheat Pool, the Farmers' Unions, and so on. This is the situation, and that is why I say it is surprising that this budget could be as strong as it is, and this proves that we have other sources to draw on, the sources of diversification and of industrialization.

I want to say a few words on behalf of the people of The Battlefords, and what has happened during the last few years since I was elected. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to represent the people of The Battlefords, as I have been proud during the past eight years that I have represented them. We were elected on a program that was built through the conventions of the Saskatchewan people, and when we laid that program before the people in 1956, we said we would do certain things. These things have been done, and more. North Battleford was the first of the smaller cities in Saskatchewan to receive natural gas. The power program has been extended into practically every corner of north-western Saskatchewan. The extension to the telephone system has been something tremendous, some quarter of a million has been spent in the extension of the telephone system. I am pleased to see that dial service is going to be provided to the people of the town of Battleford, and I am sure they will be quite happy to learn that this is coming about in the very near future.

We have an extensive grid road system — and yet these people across the way say we have done nothing for the farmers! Nothing for the farmers, indeed! Do, you know, Mr. Speaker, that, during the last three or four years since the grid road program was initiated, nearly \$2 million was spent in the immediate area of north-western Saskatchewan in the North Battleford trading area; \$2 million has been spent by the Department of Municipal Affairs on the grid road program, and all these gentlemen opposite can do is criticize and try to sabotage. There has been more money spent on grid roads in the Redberry constituency than probably any constituency in Saskatchewan, and yet we hear nothing but criticism.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — You should come and run in Redberry.

**Mr. Kramer:** — You can go into that part of the country, Rabbit Lake and Meeting Lake, and gradually there is a system of all-weather roads coming to reality. These people have not just one highway through the area as has been suggested by the hon. member for Redberry, but the people now have access to grid roads all the way from nil to three or four miles away from them.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Well, come and run there then.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I suggest the hon. member need not worry about a candidate.

We have a candidate for Redberry, Mr. Speaker, and there is quite a little cyclone going through that area right now, as he will realize when the next election comes along.

I am pleased to note, too, that added to all these things that I have enumerated that have been brought to the people of The Battlefords, I want to add, too, the improvement of the highways. There is not a single highway (I have said this before) that hasn't been completely rebuilt. There are seven highways to the trading areas of Battleford and North Battleford, these have all been rebuilt. No. 5, east and west has been hardtopped and maintained, and you have a good highway reaching all the way across and on into Alberta. Tragically enough, when it reaches Alberta it becomes a narrow, dangerous road, and there have been 15 deaths on that part of the road in Alberta. That's one of the reasons, I suggest, for the decrease in our population. If they would take out some of those dangerous turns in the Alberta highways instead of handing out 'funny money', they might accomplish a little more.

The people of North Battleford are quite happy that finally Railway Avenue has been brought up to standard, properly drained and paved. I want to thank the Government for providing more than \$100,000 towards that particular project. We are pleased with the new provincial building which provides service and dignity to the city of North Battleford and the surrounding area. This building is the first of its kind in Saskatchewan and, certainly, we of The Battlefords and north-western Saskatchewan are very pleased with it.

We want to express our pleasure as well for the geriatric wing at the Saskatchewan Hospital. We are also looking forward to the new park development in that area and the area further north.

One of the stellar things about this budget is the fact that we are going to bring in farm improvements, sewer and water to farms. This is only a start, not large to begin with, it is true; but I am sure that this is going to be a boon, especially to the mothers and the housewives who will have the disadvantages that our people should have. When I think of the thousands of buckets of slop that the farm wives have carried over the years, I know that this progress is going to be accepted with enthusiasm. Also the program of water assistance to towns and villages. A good many farmers will also participate in this as many of them now live in the towns and villages. Mr. Speaker, these people across the way continue on with the old air, 'nothing for the farmers'.

The health plan: I am very happy that this is coming in, and I want to suggest that this is going to be a real boon to the people of Saskatchewan. Some people say that private schemes can do this work better than an over-all provincial scheme. I would like to give you an instance of what a private scheme can do. Not so long ago, not too far out of North Battleford, there was a case of a small child, commonly known as a 'blue baby'. The child

**March 4, 1960**

was two years old; the parents were hired help on a farm and they didn't have too much, but they did have medical services. They were paid-up members in Medical Services. They took this child to the specialist in Saskatoon and the specialist suggested that this child should go to Chicago, the only place they could perform the very delicate operation that was necessary. This would cost about \$1,000. They applied to M.S.I, but the 'fine print' said, "no, it can't be done". The doctor and the mother got in touch with the Red Cross and the Red Cross made arrangements to pay for the operation in Chicago. Finally, the Department of Social Welfare in North Battleford heard of this. They knew that the child would need transportation as well as the mother, also keep while they were down there. So they provided the cost of the transportation and care for this child and mother. Contributions from the neighbours in that area provided further assistance.

This is the kind of thing I think about when I contemplate a medical-care program. These are the things that you don't get in private plans. What we want is a system of universal care under which everyone has health security. Private plans do not offer complete coverage.

I want to go over a few more things in my constituency and point out the tremendous benefits. I would like to suggest in the three larger units that are wholly or partly in my constituency, as well as the city of North Battleford, that education grants in those three areas alone have amounted to over \$3 million in the past 4 years. Take, for instance in the city of North Battleford alone, the grants have been doubled in the past 4 years. Mr. Speaker, what is a grant? Is it nothing for the farmers? Well, a grant, in this instance for education, means that it is going to keep the tax rate down, especially in areas, in the lower assessed areas.

I can suggest to you that in the area where it is somewhat submarginal, northeast of North Battleford, in the Medstead Unit, last year, if there had been no grant paid, farmers in that area would have paid 47 mills more taxes, if it had not been for the grants to education. The budget indicates grants will again go up, and probably permit the Larger Units to hold the line against rising costs without tax increase.

Let us take a look at the Department of Health, and what happened to the people of Battleford as far as health was concerned. We have two hospitals in the Battlefords area — the small hospital in Borden, and the larger Notre Dame city hospital, which is run by the Sisters and very well run, I might say. The Department, through the Hospital Services Plan paid out last year \$671,000 in those two hospitals alone. Now let us take a look at what is happening in the Health Regions, and this is during the years 1955-56 to 1959-60. Child health services, where they took care of half a million infants and children, prenatal classes were held and some 7,000 expectant mothers were taken care of. School services and school visits and pupils inspected numbered 220,000. In the immunization program — (of course there would not be any farmers taking part in this immunization

program — the farmers never even think of this thing), smallpox and Salk vaccine, more than one million in the North Battleford Health Region during the last four years. The total number of visits for communicable disease and other reasons, again more than one million. Sanitation services, public inspection visits, water and sewage, providing health protection, 227,000 inspections by the sanitary officers. Of course, all that goes with this program never benefits any, farmer!

I would like to get back to the grid road program and point out that the four municipal units which are wholly or partly in The Battlefords constituency received nearly \$300,000 in grants. Then we come to a somewhat larger item. We have in the North Battlefords constituency an amount of some \$2 million spent on highways, during the last four years. Of course, the farmers never get on to these highways at all! It might be noted, however, that the count of cattle trucks going to Saskatoon market and the market in North Battleford are somewhat tremendous because that area produces more cattle than any area in Saskatchewan. If these stockmen were travelling on those good old Liberal highways, trying to truck their cattle, they would not only be stuck in the mud, but the cattle would starve to death before they got there, to say nothing of the higher trucking rates.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — They'd be all shaken to pieces!

**Mr. Kramer:** — They'd be all shook up; that's for sure. But if they could get them there, they would probably be paying two to three times as much for hauling service. Either that, or they would remain at home at the mercy of the old cattle buyer who used to cow around before, buying at his own price! Two million dollars for highways in The Battlefords, and that is not one of the largest constituencies.

I would like to go over the Public Works projects, as far as finance is concerned. I mentioned telephones before, and coupling telephones with the work done at the Provincial Hospital and the provincial office building, nearly \$2 million again was spent in The Battlefords on public buildings. Of course, the farmers never get away from home; they never visit a provincial park; never go on a holiday; but the \$750,000 which was spent on provincial parks throughout this province this year, I suggest was a great boon to the farmer and his family, Another \$750,000 was spent on recreation service.

I heard our friend from Rosthern (Mr. Elias) going on about how wonderful things were in Alberta, the other day. It is strange again that, under the management of this Government in Saskatchewan, it happened to be the only place in Canada where you can still make a nickel telephone call. Thinking of the nickel, I was reminded of a trip I took into Alberta last summer, visiting a niece of mine at Innisfail. We crossed the border, and the kids were kind of hard to keep occupied, so I started a little game. I said to the kids, "Now, every time you see a farm with a power pole, a transformer in it, I will give you a nickel." They were having quite a contest spotting these farms, and it became quite monotonous, because I only

**March 4, 1960**

spent 30 cents in the first 100 miles, going in to Alberta.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — What kind of a highway were you on?

**Mr. Kramer:** — I was on the highway from Alsask west. A very good highway, much better than Lloydminster west.

Also on my trip to Alberta, we visited a few friends. You know, it was surprising to hear the hon. members who represent Social Credit get up on their feet, when they were talking about purple gas, and suggest that purple gas should be allowed in farm trucks. We hold three political conventions, last summer, and the purple gas question was brought up, and discussed. When it was discussed, it was voted down almost unanimously with about two or three, possibly dissenting in our political convention made up mostly of farmers. For instance, for the benefit of the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) I would like to say that we had 263 farm delegates at that convention. I would suggest that those people who would say Alberta is allowing farmers to use purple gas ought to take a good look at some of the other things. Maybe they would like to have those, too, I have a friend in Alberta. His name (if you would like to make a note of this, and write him a letter, you may) is George Illingworth. He lives in Clive, Alberta, which is a farm community, Two years ago I was visiting there, and he had just sent in his money for the power. He had just sent in a cheque for \$1,495. That was his cost of power for the same thing that we get for an average of around \$500. Not only that; after that line had been built he was stuck for the maintenance, as well. This is the good deal that the farmers of Alberta are receiving. It will take an awful lot of purple gas to pay for that power.

**Premier Douglas:** — What about their car insurance?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Not only that, yes, the car insurance as well. Their car insurance in Alberta is double the amount, but they did come back on the one hand with their purple gas tax remission and allow their friends, the insurance companies to take it away with the other.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Two and three times over.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Yes, and a little more besides. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we are very appreciative of this budget. I could go on to great lengths and tell you a lot of the other things that are being done, and the reasons I have for supporting the Budget. However, I think I have said sufficient, and I have given every indication that I am going to support the Budget. I am going to support it, as I said at the outset, because it does a great deal for agriculture. In fact, this budget could be criticized in some areas, because it is weighted in favour of agriculture. I think it should be, because the rural areas, due to the neglect (as I said at the outset) of past Liberal Federal Governments and the present Tory Government, do need more help than some of the urban areas. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am very proud to support this budget.



**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, to remove any doubt or worry on the part of any of the members, let me say that I am going to support the motion. I am sure that the hon. members would be quite satisfied if I said that, and stopped — that is my hon. friends opposite; but I just cannot do that on this occasion. I have a few things I would like to say.

One of the things I would like to say is how proud I have been of the work of our Provincial Treasurer over these 16 years. I have had occasion to travel across Canada to different parts, and to meet people in business and in financial business, and I have heard a great many compliments as to his ability in financial affairs. That ability, combined with a realization of the meaning of the dollars when they are interpreted in terms of human well-being, is a very important combination.

I also want to say that I am very proud of the speeches that the members from this side of the House have made. They have set forth clearly and with good logic, their reasons for supporting the budget. The hon. members opposite have made some good speeches, except that some of their logic was rather weak. They made up for it with noise, and with some of their facts and assumptions which were far from being correct. We should not be too critical of them, because we must realize they are in rather a difficult position.

One of their objectives during this Session has been that they have been trying to talk away the facts in regard to the mineral development which has taken place in this province over the past 10 to 16 years. They would like to talk that away. They would like to forget it. They would like not to see it any more. It is like a bad spectre or a ghost that haunts them, and they have to do something to try to get rid of it. I have no doubt that every night when they say their prayers, they also say, "I saw a man upon the stairs; a little man who wasn't there. He wasn't there again today; I wish that man would go away."

**Mrs. Batten:** — At least we say our prayers, which is more than I can say of some of you.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The development that has taken place over the province of Saskatchewan over the years. I am afraid, will not go away. It is here. It is a fact, and it will continue to grow. The hon. members opposite remind me, in regard to their attitude toward this development, of what, I believe, has been said about the Bourbons of France. They learn nothing; they forget nothing!

Let us have a look at the facts. First, mineral production value for 1943, the total value of mineral production in this province was \$26 million. That was produced in wartime, at high pressure, when all metals that could be produced were needed, and there was all kinds of pressure on the mines to produce all of the metals they could.

I notice in 'The Leader-Post' for Thursday night, one of the Liberal

**March 4, 1960**

candidates said: "The C.C.F. friends have declared they planted the province's natural resources in the ground in the first place." Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious we didn't. We have never claimed it; but my hon. friends over there would like the people of this province to believe that the resources were just not here when they were in power. I want to disclaim any credit for having put the resources here in this province.

In 1943, under wartime pressure, \$26 million was the total value of minerals produced in the province; in 1959, an estimated \$210 million, over eight times as much. This measure in 1959 is not a measure at high prices. The prices of minerals, of oil, are all down from what they were a few years ago, so this figure of \$210 million at the high prices of a few years ago could have been many millions higher. It is not an inflated figure.

Crude oil production; in 1947, Saskatchewan produced about half a million barrels of crude oil. That was less than one-tenth of the crude oil that was produced in Alberta during that year. In 1955, Saskatchewan produced approximately 11 million barrels of crude oil which was over one-tenth of what was produced in Alberta during that year. In 1956, our production was 21 million barrels of crude oil, or over one-seventh of the production which had taken place in the province of Alberta. In 1957, we produced 37 million barrels of crude oil, which was over one-quarter of the production in Alberta. In 1958, our production was 44,600,000 barrels, over one-third of the Alberta production. In 1959, our production is estimated to be close to 49 million barrels, a little more than one-third of what was produced in Alberta for the same year.

We should also remember that Alberta has about two and one-half times as much by volume of sedimentary rock as Saskatchewan has. The sediments are much deeper, and over a greater area. Their sedimentary area extends right through to the north of the province, going on away down to the Mackenzie River Valley. I do not think that either Social Credit, Liberals, or C.C.F. or Conservatives had any responsibility for putting those sediments there.

The footage of drilling that has taken place (and I hope my hon. friends will listen to this) in 1943, 33,700 feet of drilling. Actually that was just a few post-holes. In 1946, 107,000; in 1950, there were 239,000 feet of drilling done, in 1954, the drilling amounted to two and one-half million feet, in 1957, the drilling amounted to over five million feet, and in 1959, it was still 3,200,000 feet, or almost 100 times the amount of drilling that was done in this province in 1943. I don't know what my hon. friends expect, as that has been quite a substantial increase in activity.

I have mentioned before the importance of revenue for the people of Saskatchewan from minerals. I want to mention that again. In 1944-45,

the revenue was less than one-quarter million. Our peak year for revenue from mineral resources was in 1957-58, when there was almost \$25 million in revenue from mineral resources. In the last complete fiscal years 1958-59, the revenue was approximately \$22,500,000 and the estimate for the coming year of this revenue is now under \$20 million.

My hon. friends say it's all gone. It may not do any good to explain to them, but I'm going to try once again, Mr. Speaker. When there are oil strikes — and certainly we had them here in Saskatchewan in rapid succession at Smiley and Fosterton in the Swift Current area, and then one after another in Frobisher, Steelman, Weyburn and Midale, and Carnduff, and so on, down in the southeast of the province this Government had the foresight to set aside certain lands as Crown reserves, so that when there were a lot of discoveries and there were fields proven up, we had some very valuable lands to sell at lease sales. In those years we got a very high return. That situation can only happen when two things prevail; first of all, when there is a general boom in the oil business, and, secondly, when you have discoveries in the new fields, For the last couple of years, I am sorry to say, there have been no new major discoveries in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Why?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — One of my hon. friends asks why. How many major discoveries were there in the province of Saskatchewan prior to 1944? Why?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Ah!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member for Cannington says 'Ah'. He doesn't like it. He doesn't want to believe that little man upon the stairs; the little man that wasn't there." That is a bad ghost!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I don't care. I was here long before that!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Nothing was done. Nothing was accomplished, but I am not blaming the government of that day for that. But my friends opposite are absolutely dishonest when they blame the Government because there has been a couple of years without any major discoveries here.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You've been blaming us for that, right along.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You're absolutely dishonest when you do that. I have never blamed the government. I have only drawn the comparison. It was my hon. friend's conscience that was hurting him. Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, they never learn. They would certainly like to forget.

The production of practically all minerals today is in surplus.

**March 4, 1960**

There is more copper, more zinc, more nickel, more iron that could be produced and go to market than there is a market for, today. There could be more oil produced, a lot more oil produced, than is being produced today. In Saskatchewan we could produce nearly 50 per cent more oil than we are producing at the present time, if there was a market. That is not the fault of the Government. In the province of Alberta, they could produce 100 per cent more oil than they are producing today. That is not the fault of the Alberta government. Prices are lower. Prices of crude oil have gone down; prices of metals have gone down; and, naturally, under these circumstances, exploration generally has slowed down. I never denied that.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Why don't you tell the Minister of Agriculture about that?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is taking place not only here. In all other parts of Canada and the United States, the same situation exists. Production in some places is down, as well as exploration, but not in Saskatchewan. Our production has been going up, or holding its own. Our oil production is up; but in Alberta, as I mentioned, they are only producing half of what they could produce. In Ontario, they are talking about ghost mining towns today. There isn't the market. There isn't the demand for it to be produced, and they are going to shut down, as they have over the years shut down many mines in the province of Ontario. In a situation like this it is very natural that companies should endeavour to make all the economics they can under these circumstances. That is true. It is happening all over the country.

The Leader of the Liberal Party has been naming off the list of companies, but I wasn't able to get them until they were made public in 'The Leader-Post' last night, and I feel grateful to 'The Leader-Post' for having published that list of companies. I want to run over that list of 14 companies which the Leader of the Liberal Party said had moved out, lock, stock, and barrel. It is true that some of them have moved their offices from Regina. That is one of the risks that the City of Regina never ran when there was a Liberal Government. There was no danger that they would ever lose an oil company; they didn't have any to lose! Of these 14 oil companies which have moved from Regina, I want to point out that two had never had an office in Regina.

**Mr. McDonald:** — What about California Standard?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — California Standard has a staff of 18, approximately. Sinclair of Canada Oil Company moved in 1959, and their over-all acreage of land increased by about 150,000 acres in permits and leases. The Pan-American Oil Company moved in January of this year, and their acreage is down in permits, but they have assigned that acreage to United Canso Oil and Gas Company, Limited. The 14th one, Canadian Superior Oil of California is still here, and have a little more acreage than they had before.

So to sum up, of the 14, two never had an office in Regina, two are still here, three have more acreage now than they had before, and a couple of them never had land in Saskatchewan at all. That is the great disaster which has befallen this province!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — No wonder these people didn't want Thatcher for the leadership!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They don't want him in the House, obviously, because none of them were jumping up and down offering him a chance to get into the House, last fall.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You were afraid to open a seat . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Cannington is a nice chap.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Thank you!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I kind of like him, but I never thought he was so simple — so simple as to think that another political party would open a seat for his leader. What was the matter with him? Why didn't he open Cannington? Didn't he think his leader would be elected in Cannington? Didn't he want his leader in the, House?

**Opposition Members:** — We're in no hurry; but you are!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Our leader was in the House of Commons right up to the time of the election campaign, right up to then.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, he was playing politics and drawing his indemnity!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We had a government in office at that time, and you didn't know when they were going to call an election. They didn't call an election for six years. I didn't resign because I was trying to do just the same job that my hon. friend is trying to do over there in this Legislature, and, Mr. Speaker, I think I was doing a better job of it, too. I hope so!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Your real leader was overseas fighting a war. You stole it away from him.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, let us get back and talk about the oil industry just a little more. In the province of Saskatchewan we have better provisions for giving credit against rentals on either permits or leases, or refunds of those rentals, for work, either exploration work or drilling as the case may require, than any other province

**March 4, 1960**

or any other jurisdiction. Again. I want to point out that, over the years, these credits and refunds have amounted to \$12 1/2 million — a 12 1/2 million credit of rentals towards the doing of the work, toward exploration and the drilling of wells. That does not look like we were being unreasonable with the oil companies.

I want to say also, that more than one oil man phoned me after this fiasco took place in the Trianon, the other night. They were pretty mad about what was said about the oil companies. They don't like that. The only reason that they are not doing more here is exactly the same reason that they are not doing more in other places across Canada.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Would the hon. Minister be prepared to give the names of the oil companies that phoned him? Or are you just dragging up some old shadow that you saw on the stairs, but you wouldn't name him. I say nobody phoned you!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have listened, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members opposite . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — There's the man on the stairs. He had a little dream!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . talking about what somebody told them. I have listened to them all during this Session. They never present any names in evidence, and if they don't want to believe that the oil companies don't like this kind of thing, they don't need to, it isn't helping them any to keep on with this kind of stuff.

Another thing, we have established here in Saskatchewan the best system of keeping correlating, and supplying geological information to the companies that are doing the exploring, through our core and sample laboratory on Dewdney Avenue.

**Mrs. Batten:** — That's not what the Stanford Report says.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word or two about industrial development. This is the last issue of the magazine, 'Trade and Commerce', February, 1960. It is headed 'Saskatchewan Sees Busy Summer Ahead for 1960', and it starts out:

"Saskatchewan's big building spree continued during 1959 with only minor setbacks, our research department learned through 26 completed questionnaires filled in, after 28 major communities were contacted.

"Nipawin saw five times as much spent on new homes in 1959 as in 1958, Canora, Lloydminster, Melfort and Shaunavon doubled their mark over the previous year.

"The growing towns of Weyburn and Yorkton have now topped the 81 million mark, and again building construction in Saskatchewan in 1959 reached peak level, with a number of major provincial centres reporting the biggest building year in their history.

"The outlook is for another busy construction year in 1960 with several big money projects or the drafting board."

It doesn't look exactly like a complete failure! You know, if people would read the papers, even 'The Leader-Post' they would find out what is going on. I pick up this issue of 'The Leader-Post', and I find under the dateline 'Weyburn' the assessment roll for 1960 has been approved at \$6 million. Last year, the figure was \$5.7 million, and in 1957, it was \$4.9 million. This is an increase in the value of the buildings and property in Weyburn, indicating the building that has been going on.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They've had a re-assessment.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, here is North Battleford, A new \$500,000 Safeway store has been announced for the city of North Battleford. That doesn't look as though things are completely going to the dogs, when that kind of thing is taking place. So, I think this question has been well dealt with, this question of industrial development. The people all over the province of Saskatchewan can see what is happening. They don't have to listen, and they certainly don't pay much attention to the gloomy stories told by my hon. friends opposite.

It may be true that, according to Parliamentary rules, the budget debate is no place to discuss the internal affairs of a political party; but apparently we have had a little bit of that here, and I would like to say just a few words on the question of political parties. The concern for the welfare of the C.C.F. which is shown by the Liberals and by others is extremely touching. It is hard to know what they are getting at. I didn't think they were concerned about the welfare of the C.C.F. so much, but obviously they really do care. They just don't want us to get into any trouble at all. Here was the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) making a speech — no, it was in Regina. This was taken from 'The Leader-Post' of August 20, 1959, and I think he was out on an election campaign about that time.

**Mr. Foley:** — That's old history now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, it is almost old history. As a matter of fact, it is older than they think! The headline says: 'Dissension Among the C.C.F. Says Foley'. I would suggest, first of all, that we do appreciate the sympathy and concern which the Liberals feel for us, but don't be too worried about that dissension. You may have in your own

**March 4, 1960**

ranks come dissension that may need a little attention. As a matter of fact, it is a good thing to have some dissension and difference of opinion, but I never worry about that. But one thing that doesn't look good is when a political party gets what is obviously a prepared program, and they adopt it just like that, on one convention. The Social Credit candidate for one of the constituencies — and again this is 'The Leader-Post', February 24, 1960 — says this, at Yorkton:

"Amalgamation of the C.C.F. and labour is the biggest threat we are facing, not only in Saskatchewan, but also in Canada. It is time for everyone to join forces and fight evil."

Since when were farmers and labour people evil? I want to know. I want to know since when it was evil for farmers and labour to organize to work together. I don't think it is. I don't agree about that at all.

The Liberals have indicated, too, that they think this proposed joining up of labour forces and farmers is a bad thing and a dangerous thing. They have been talking about it, and the leader of the Liberal Party says that the main issue in this election is as to whether or not farmers and labourers should work together. Mr. Speaker, I have here 'The Leader-Post'.

"Liberals believe," he said, "that one of the vital issues in the coming campaign is the proposed amalgamation."

But wait a minute:

"The Liberal leader dismissed the prepaid medical plan proposed by the Government as a smokescreen, behind which the C.C.F. hopes to hide its many . . . but the vital issue is this merger in question."

**Opposition Members:** — Where's the farmer?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to tell the leader of the Liberal Party that it is not his business whether the farmers and the labour people want to get together in a political party or not. The only thing that hurts him, and hurts my friends opposite, is the fact that if this succeeds, they can't have them. That is the trouble; and they have been telling both farmer and labour people all through the years, "Come into our party; we can look after your interests whether you are farmer or labour". But they say, "Oh, these people simply couldn't work together in a political party of their own"; but if big business runs it, like it runs the Liberal party, they will be all right there. This is the kind of malarkey they have been trying to give to the people

What is this new party that they talk about, anyway? Well, it



is nothing else but exactly what we have had in the province of Saskatchewan for the last 20 years. We have had here labour and farmer and white-collared worker, professional people, small business people, all working together in a political party. It is the rest of Canada again looking to Saskatchewan in the lead to try to copy this, and to get these working people all across Canada on the farms, in the factories and in the mines, co-operating in a political party to look after their interests and the interests of this country.

Douglas Fisher, in the House of Commons for the C.C.F. has been quoted in this House before, and I think it is proper that he should be quoted again. It is (of all places) on the editorial pages of 'The Leader Post', and it is just a short quotation. Listen:

"Some people, usually opponents of the new party, have argued that a principle is negated if an economic association, that is, the labour movement, takes political action through a specific political vehicle. There is no need to consider this seriously, he says.

"Of course, there is the widely mooted North American tradition in labour against such action. This is not inviolable nor sacred any more than is the contrary tradition to labour political action in Great Britain."

Again he says:

"Both the Conservatives and the Liberals behave as if the main role of a political party is to follow, not lead, the nation."

The trouble is, they followed too far behind.

"Each is beleaguered or enveloped by the mystic phrase of free enterprise, not knowing, as yet, that the nation could not afford free enterprise, as a first consideration, even if we did have it, rather than a corporation monopoly enterprise of the present. Ironically these monoliths are as futile in their structure as a medieval duchy and as bureaucratic as any government.

Just one more short quotation:

"The central difficulty of the labour movement in politics is that so many union people have swallowed the folklore of capitalists — even that part of the lore which limns labour as the irresponsible and destructive element which prevents the perfect working of the system."

**March 4, 1960**

Even that part they have swallowed in the past. My friends opposite are afraid that something will happen, and that the labour people will see that this just does not work for them.

A lot of nasty things have been said about some of the labour leaders on this continent, but my hon. friends opposite have never taken trouble to say any nice things about any labour leaders. So I want to read a short quotation from an address by James E. Ruth, Chairman of the Board, and President of the Pittston Company, before the New York Society of Security Analysts, November 5, 1959. The Pittston Company is one of the largest coal companies in the United States, and they have other interests as well. He says:

Finally, I would recommend to you an article written by Mr. Donald I. Rogers, business and financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune, September 16, 1959."

This is from the article:

"Much of the credit for the bituminous coal industry being able to give wage increases and at the same time not adding to the inflationary spiral by increasing the price of its products, can be attributed to John L. Lewis and his associates of the United Mine Workers of America. Mr. Lewis has been far-sighted enough to see that only through modernization and the resulting higher productivity can the operator pay the high wages and benefits that the miners receive today. He has encouraged mechanization, and demanded his share of the profits which I have no dispute with. He has not condoned or allowed featherbedding in any form or manner, and he has co-operated with the operators financially and otherwise, to maintain and increase our markets."

That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is enough from that quotation.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Have you got one on Hoffa there too?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have another clipping here from the 'Star-Phoenix', January 29, and the headline is 'Grit M.L.A. says Provincial Affairs in Critical Shape'. It says:

"We are paying something like \$17 million annually for interest payments alone."

When there are so many irresponsible Grits making speeches around the country, somebody has got to keep track of them, Mr. Speaker. The member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) made the statement — conditions are critical, we are paying \$17 million a year in interest. Well, he knows very well there is over \$300 million invested in Power and Telephones. What would he do? Would he

have the people of Saskatchewan do without power and telephones or would he prefer to let private enterprise organize the companies to put in this service?

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Might I ask, is the hon. Minister denying the truth of the statement or simply complaining because they made it?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, that wasn't a point of privilege, but in fact was only a short speech — thank goodness for that! I don't know which he would do; whether he would sooner see the people go without the service or have private enterprise do the job. But, if he had private enterprise do the job, the Power company and the Telephone company (and it could be done, you know), they would have to finance this operation through common stock in the company, through bonds and debentures which they would sell, and they would have to sell them at a higher interest rate than the Government bonds, and the shareholders would expect a bigger return on their common stock than just the bare interest rates. There would be the same debt to create the same system of power and telephones, and the same people would have to pay it off, except that the debt would be a little bit bigger. When the hon. member goes out leaving the impression that this is an ordinary provincial debt, it isn't very honest to do that kind of, to try to make the taxpayers of this province think they have to pay off this kind of debt.

I was very interested in the convention that took place, and in one particular statement made by one candidate. You will find it on Page 3; 'Fred Johnston described C.C.F.ers as a sanctimonious group of Pharisees'. That is very interesting. You know, there are nearly 35,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan who are paid-up members of the C.C.F. Those are the 'sanctimonious group of Pharisees'.

**Mrs. Batten:** — He only described those C.C.F. members of the Government.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You can't welsh on this one. No, he wasn't. That is what the paper says. That is what my hon. friends over them applauded and the people of Saskatchewan will be very interested to hear this opinion. For example, here is a whole list of the people in my constituency, who in February took out memberships in the C.C.F. and there are 102 of them. They will be interested to know that my hon. friends think that they are 'sanctimonious Pharisees'.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister has accused me . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member must have a point of privilege.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The hon. Minister has accused me of dishonesty. I made a statement that we had a provincial gross debt in excess of \$300 million, and that the total interest payments were in excess of \$17 million. I believe

**March 4, 1960**

that statement is correct and can be verified. I would like the Minister to withdraw his remarks . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I deplore the use of this word 'dishonesty' across the floor of the House. I think there are other words that could be used perfectly well.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think I said the word 'dishonesty'.

**Opposition Members:** — Yes, you did.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Just a minute. I didn't interrupt when the hon. member was speaking, and if he hasn't got the good manners to sit still . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You're a fine one to talk about good manners.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think I used the word 'dishonest' in this connection, anyway. I think what I said was, 'that was not very honest'. If that offends my hon. friends I will withdraw it. I'm sorry.

This budget that we have before us, Mr. Speaker, is certainly one of the best, if not the best, that has ever been presented in this House. I say that because it provides for programs which we need for better living in Saskatchewan; because it has in it the beginning of a medical-care program which has been one of the dreams of the people of Saskatchewan for a long, long time, The Liberal Minister of Public Health, in 1934, speaking to the delegates at the S.A.R.M. Convention, promised state medicine. He said, "State medicine is the only thing," on that occasion. Every time they got into a pinch they talked about it a little bit. In 1944, they didn't do anything, but they passed an Act about it, but it was too late. This Farm Home Improvement Act is one which can hardly be over-estimated, and, likewise, the improvement of urban homes in the small towns and villages, Lack of good sanitation in the thickly-settled areas is even worse than lack of good sanitation when you are living in isolation, so I think both these programs will be very much appreciated.

The extension and progress that will be made in regard to power and natural gas is also going to be appreciated. The highways and roads — these are things that are going to make living better, and the people in the far north have not been forgotten. Further co-operative actions, the housing in the north — this is going to help those people to do things for themselves, together with the opportunities they got for education, to fit them to take their places in our country, as they will some day be able to do.

This budget also provides for the growth of Saskatchewan's economy. Highways make a great contribution to that growth, and the power and gas; also in other lines — the additional geological surveys that are provided for; the assistance and encouragement shown in industrial development, our tourist

trade has been increasing year by year. There are provisions in this budget to further increase that trade — the construction of our northern roads. These are all the things which are going to help build the economy of Saskatchewan. So, it is because I want the people of Saskatchewan to live well, and I want the economy of the province of Saskatchewan to grow and develop, that. I will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to spend a few minutes on a few topics that have been brought up before I adjourn the debate. I want, with the rest of the hon. members to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for your services and thank you very much for your fairness during my years in the Legislature. I also am sorry to see a number of the older members, on both sides of the House, volunteering to back out of the picture. In some cases I think they would be out anyway after the next election, but I have enjoyed the association with these people on both sides of the House, and I have received very nice co-operation from them all.

At the moment, I hear an awful lot about purple gas in farm trucks. As I recall, until this winter, I believe I have been the only man in this House to advocate highway tax-free gasoline for farm trucks, since I came into the Legislature. I tell you why I have done this. I realize, as well as anyone, that there is a huge difference in the amount of farm trucks used on highways, but I want to relate the situation as it exists in my constituency, and possibly the constituency of the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources, and in Cumberland constituency in the north area. I did at random interview 40 farmers in my constituency, and asked them how many miles per year they drove their farm trucks on highways. The average was less than 200 miles.

The hon. Minister of Highways the other day said he wanted to be fair. If a person is going to be fair, it certainly is not fair for a farmer to pay 12 cents a gallon for highway tax to haul his grain from his combine to his bin. He must do that, because if he happens to be going along the highway with purple gas in his truck, he is liable to be fined for it. I don't feel it is fair for a farmer to have to pay 12 cents per gallon highway tax, when he is hauling grain from his combine to his bins, and in many instances, to his local elevator. In most instances, in our country particularly, he does not use the highway. He uses a municipal road which is taxed to keep up. I actually tried to find out in my area, and I want to repeat that I interviewed 40 farmers at random, and the average driven per year on the highway with their trucks was less than 200 miles.

Now, let us follow that through just a little bit further. If a man has a large four-wheeled trailer and even possibly a diesel tractor he can haul his grain from his combine to his bin and also to his elevator and use diesel fuel to do it. So I cannot see that, if we are going to be fair, that situation should exist. I am going to be honest in this respect. I do

**March 4, 1960**

believe a lot of truck owners nearer to our cities do use the highway. I also believe that, if a farm truck is using the highway to any great extent, they should pay the highway gas tax. Therefore, that is the reason we advocate purchase in bulk. That way, if a man leaves home and is going a distance with his truck, he is going to have to fill up, and I feel, should pay the highway gas tax; but in his locality where very little, if any, travelling is on a highway, then I believe it is being misused.

I got rather a kick out of the hon. member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) this afternoon, condemning the highways of Alberta. I happened to have been out there last summer myself; but when he said he went on to No. 9 highway at Alsask, and he condemned that highway, that highway, I believe, is equal to our No. 1 Trans-Canada from the Saskatchewan border West. Coming back from Calgary, I was on this particular highway, and it was about 36 feet of beautiful blacktop, and all of a sudden you come to a sign which says 'Welcome To Saskatchewan.' You don't need the signs because the highway will tell you that it is certainly in Saskatchewan. Certainly there have been some improvements, I am not going to say there have not been; but a highway programs, like anything else, the more you can do, the more people are going to be served by it.

There is just one other little reference I want to make before I adjourn the debate, and that is to the cost of power in Alberta as compared with Saskatchewan. It seems funny to me that it would cost \$1,400 in the province of Alberta for power, and \$500 in Saskatchewan, when no doubt the equipment, the holes, the wires, all the things that go into this power project, would cost basically the same price in both places. It is a case of who is going to pay for it, not what it costs, whether it is \$500 or \$1,400. I have checked this situation, and I find that in Alberta, they pay it out and they own it. The co-operative, the company or group or whatever you call it, in the specified area, pay it out, and, first of all, they go to the Government and borrow 85 per cent of the cost of the project. Then the farmers can pay it out in cash, or get individual loans from the Government to pay it out.

I noticed the hon. member for The Battlefords mentioned his friend paid \$1,400 cash. I wonder how he got \$1,400 cash. Very few of our farmers would be able to do that. Anyway, the point is this. In this House, two years ago, the same thing came out, that it cost \$550 in Saskatchewan, and in Select Committee, the hon. Minister of Power said that we paid \$750. I asked who "we" were, and he said, "the Government". I said, "Who eventually pays that, \$750?" He said, "the users of power". So who is going to pay for that power before that debenture has been paid for? The users of power; and to start with, the minimum charge of \$2.15 more here than it is in Alberta in the rural areas.

Those are two or three little things I wanted to mention. I thought there was another speaker going to get up this evening, so I was not prepared to speak too long. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the Debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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