

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

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

On the Orders of the Day:

TRIPS MADE BY CABINET MINISTERS

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wonder if I might ask the Premier or the responsible minister when I might expect an answer to Return No. 10, February 19, respecting the number of trips made outside the province by the Premier and members of the cabinet at government expense.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the return was passed on February 21, I believe, and we certainly will do everything we can to make it available at the earliest possible moment.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS FROM QUILL LAKE

Mr. E.A. Johnson (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like, on your behalf, to welcome a group of students to this legislature. These students are in the Speaker's gallery and they are Grade 12 students and some Grade 11 students from Quill Lake. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ken Chekley and Mr. G. Josefson, and the bus driver, Mr. Frank Rands. On behalf of the house, I would like to wish to the students that they have a pleasant and educational stay in Regina.

WELCOME TO MEMBERS OF VOCATIONAL UP-GRADING CLASS

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to introduce to the house a class of students that are taking the vocational up-grading class for the unemployed. I think this is the first time such a class has attended the house and I think they should be complimented on taking such an interest

in the civic affairs of Saskatchewan. These people are taking classes at the junior high school level in Regina and are visiting the legislature this afternoon and are now in the Speaker's gallery and have been in charge of their instructor and he is now with them up there in the Speaker's gallery. I am sure that we all wish to them that they have a pleasant and informative stay in the house.

REPORT OF GEORGE S. MAY COMPANY

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, some little time ago the Leader of the Opposition asked if he might have access to the report of the George S. May Company following some work which they did with the government several years ago. This — you will recall that I mentioned at the time — is a report which was made in 1945, which was quite some time ago. I find on checking that there was not any final or summary sort of report made so the report is really in the form of a series of monthly reports plus a few working papers. I find, further, that there is only one copy available as far as we have been able to locate them. I have acquired these from the budget bureau. My proposal is that I place them in the custody of the Clerk and that the Leader of the Opposition have access to them in that way.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS FROM PRINCESS ALEX SCHOOL, SASKATOON

Mrs. G. Strum (Saskatoon City): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to welcome on your behalf to this house a fine group of students who have just now come into the west gallery from the Princess Alex School in Saskatoon, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Thiessen, and I am sure you would want to wish them a happy day and a safe return.

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, before continuing with my remarks on the budget, I have a correction to make to the house, and maybe an apology to make to the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak), the Minister of Mineral Resources. I believe I left the impression with him that I had suggested that he had gone over to Sweden and was running around Europe at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayer. And if I did leave this impression, I apologize now,

Mr. Speaker. I believe that I said that it cost the taxpayers \$271 to send him to New York to talk to the Swedish pulp interests. I now have in my hand a return that shows that I made a slight error in suggesting that it cost \$271, it cost \$381 to send him down to New York to talk to the Swedish pulp interests, and of course, I suppose he was down there getting that long awaited pulp mill.

I made considerable comment yesterday afternoon about some of the things that were said by the members who sit opposite and some of the things that were say by the former Premier, the former national leader of the CCF, and resolutions that had gone before and passed CCF conventions, about the cost of government members, government cabinet ministers travelling around the country and around the world at government expense.

I would like to quote at this time, Mr. Speaker, one more quotation from a man who was in the opposition before 1944 who now sits as the Provincial Treasurer; he had this to say about the expenses of cabinet ministers, and I quote Mr. J.H. Brockelbank, February 24, 28 and 29 radio broadcast and March 1, 1944, as reported in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth, and, of course, you people over there will all believe that if it came out in the Commonwealth it is authentic. Here's what the present Provincial Treasurer had to say at that time.

This Liberal government believes in the licence which allows a cabinet minister to take \$15 a day living expenses and only pay two or three cents per meal for relief to a boy or girl whose father has been thrown out of work by their insane economy.

This is what this man thought back in 1944. You will realize now, Mr. Speaker, why I asked the question before the orders of the day. I wanted to have this information to know how much it costs the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to keep you people flying around this country and around the world for the last year. I have here on my desk a return for 1961, I believe for nine months of 1961, that gives you a little idea of how much it cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to keep some of the cabinet ministers circulating around this country. Of course, we know that some of these trips are very necessary, some of them have been made and I don't think we have got very much out of the trip. I will take first, for this nine-month period, it cost the taxpayer \$751 to keep the then Provincial Treasurer travelling for nine months, and among his travels was a trip to Toronto to attend a meeting of the petro-chemical interests. I suppose that was when he was out to get his petro-chemical plant for Saskatchewan.

The same year the present Provincial Treasurer, in the same period of time, spent about a similar amount of money.

That same year the present Minister of Mineral Resources spent \$1,138 travelling around this country and down to the United States on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayers. And among other trips he made a trip to New York, the trip that I mentioned before, to get the pulp mill for Saskatchewan.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker — oh, there is one more here. One made by the present Minister of Industry and Information. He was also down to New York to talk to the Swedish pulp interests. I noticed that in a return that I got the year before that it cost us here in the province \$1,675 for one trip that the present Minister of Industry and Information went on over to Europe, and after reading the resolution that was passed back before this government came into power in 1944, passed by your own people, I wonder, then it costs \$1,675.20 to take this minister over there, I often wonder if he lived in the YMCA while he was over there. This is what was suggested by the people who support your party. I don't want to go back now and repeat the quotation but it is suggested that cabinet ministers should have the same living allowance as the people who elect them to office, who are the poor farmers and the poor workers of the province. This is not the case, Mr. Speaker, and it just goes to show one more item where the people who sit opposite today certainly do not follow the thinking that they thought they followed in 1944.

Before adjourning the debate last evening, Mr. Speaker, I made considerable reference to statements made by my friends who sit opposite, statements and promises made before the 1944 election. I quoted from radio broadcasts, the speeches made at public meetings, as reported in the press, as well as promises made by the present Provincial Treasurer and other socialist members of the legislature in speeches they made in this house prior to the election of 1944. I believe I proved beyond a doubt that either they didn't know what they were talking about at that time, or else they were a bunch of liars.

I would like to quote from one more speech made by the present Provincial Treasurer in the house, as reported on March 2, 1944, address by J.H. Brockelbank in the legislature, and I quote:

The Liberal system of financing, the Liberal economic system has no prospect of doing anything else but continuing the burden of public debt on the people. The people of the province are convinced that debt in total cannot be paid off under this system. A CCF government in Saskatchewan can liquidate the provincial debt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the figures in the back of the budget speech you will readily realize that they have not liquidated the debt, but it's about three times as high as it was when they came into office. And about the only thing that they are doing is liquidating the people of Saskatchewan.

I also mentioned something about taxes. The member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) read into the records the fact that we are the highest per capita taxed people in Canada. And no socialist can refute this. He quoted the most authentic source, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Other speakers, like the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) will get up and try to refute these statements. He will take one particular tax, like he did last year in the budget debate, like the gasoline tax, or some other, it will be some choice of his own, and by swinging his arms will try to prove that we aren't the highest taxed province in Canada. But he proves nothing, Mr. Speaker. Facts are facts. The member for Canora amuses himself by comparing Saskatchewan to Newfoundland or New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — A point of order. The hon. member is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. Gallagher: — I don't think, Mr. Speaker, there is anything wrong with me referring to a previous debate as long as it wasn't the throne speech debate.

Mr. Speaker: — He was referring to a debate in a previous session which is permissible.

Mr. Gallagher: — I have, for the Minister of Agriculture, vol. 19 and vol. 20 of last year's budget debate and if he wants to read it after I am done with it I will send it across the floor to him.

I said facts are facts, when the Minister of Agriculture interrupted me a moment ago. If the member for Canora wants to be fair, I would suggest that he compare Saskatchewan with our neighbors on either side of us, Manitoba or Alberta. Our resources are similar, our populations are more similar than are Quebec or Newfoundland, and the services we require are similar because of our location. He likes comparing Saskatchewan to Liberal Quebec. May I remind the member for Canora that from the time the socialists gained power in Saskatchewan, up until two and one-half years ago, Quebec did not have a Liberal government. They lost 20 years before Lesage upset the Duplessis government, just like we here in Saskatchewan have lost the last 20 years under the socialists.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a moment to some of the problems of my own constituency, and I would like to once again congratulate the former Minister of Public Works, the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) for being able to get the mental hospital built in Yorkton. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that it was a local firm that got the contract to build this institution. All the people in the Yorkton area are very happy about this. It means more employment to local people.

I would like at this time to say a word or two about some of the highways in my constituency. We appreciate the construction that was done on our highways last year, and heaven knows, it was time that some of it was done because some of it should have been done before 1950, but the trouble was we had a CCF member from the constituency of Yorkton and I think they thought people in Yorkton would put up with this forever and forever. I mentioned yesterday that the roads that were graded, reconstruction of no. 9, the reconstruction of no. 52, were roads that were worn out quite some time ago, and I hope that the Minister of Highways, when he brings down his budget for highways this year will give very serious consideration to having no. 9 highway from Yorkton south hardtopped. This is a highway that has a lot of traffic on it and I am sure that if the traffic count is looked into that this will warrant black-top.

I think I would be remiss in my duties to my constituency, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't put in a plug here for a vocational training school for Yorkton, and especially when the federal program is going to be coming to an end at the 31st of March unless something is done before the 31st of March. The same thing exists today, the same conditions exist today, Yorkton is in the same position as they were a year ago when I put up a plea for a vocational training school in that part of the province. We are in the centre of a densely populated part of the province, in a part where farms are small and quite often many of the young people from the farms, the young men, cannot get themselves established on the farm, and a vocational training school there would certainly be an asset, not only to our area but to the whole eastern side of Saskatchewan.

I might mention at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the grasshopper problem up in our part of Saskatchewan was quite a bit worse last year than in most parts of the province and the prospects for grasshoppers next year are even worse. In fact, I noticed a map the other day that shows us as about the worst part of Saskatchewan. And I would like to plead with the Minister of Agriculture at this time to see to it that we have a grasshopper poison depot set up in Yorkton. You know, there were people, farmers, around the area last year who had to drive down to Moose Jaw to get grasshopper bait, and when they got to Moose Jaw they didn't find it and they had to go up to Rosetown. I think that surely a government that believes in

social planning could have a better kind of social planning than to have grasshopper bait in one part of the province when it is needed in the other part. It is not going to cost the Minister of Agriculture very much money to rent a warehouse and put in a stock of grasshopper poison for that part of the province. I might also suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I think it would be only fair that the provincial Department of Agriculture bore some greater part of the cost of the grasshopper poison.

Now, many of the problems that faced the people of my area of the province last year still face them today. We have no relief from high property taxes, both school and municipal taxes. Nor do we see in the foreseeable future any relief as long as the socialist government to your right is in power. I have heard members of the government speak about all the help this government has given to our people. They talk about the sewer and water program. I would like to remind the members on the other side of this house that there are many people in my constituency who can't afford to replace old, worn-out welling, let alone provide sewer and water for themselves. And there are many others who have spent thousands of dollars trying to find water, to locate water for their livestock, and they never got a nickel's help from this government.

Another thing that I would like to mention at this time is something about grid roads. I remember the member from Lumsden (Mr. Thurston) a year ago boasting about the grid road program. I realize that there are many municipalities that have benefited greatly from the grid road program. But time and again members of this government have claimed to be the defencers of the weak and the helpers of the under-privileged and just in regard to the grid road program I want to remind my friends that those who need the help most are getting the least help.

One of the poorest municipalities in my constituency, and I believe, according to the annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker, it was the second least assessed municipality in my constituency, was only able to build between eight and nine miles of road last year. And none of it was grid road. Most of it was second and third class road, and by building between eight and nine miles of road they had a deficit of \$1,600. And I can tell you, these people don't appreciate the kind of help they are getting from this socialist government. I was just figuring up, it is going to take these people, at the rate that they went last year, if they have a bigger deficit every year, at the present rate of taxation, just to build half the roads in that particular municipality is going to take them 41 years. Well, I'm afraid there's going to be a lot of them dead before their road is built.

March 6, 1963

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — What's the number of this municipality?

Mr. Gallagher: — It's Calder municipality, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Calder.

Mr. Gallagher: — I can assure this house, Mr. Speaker, that if they think that they are going to subdue these people, and that's what it seems to me they are trying to do, into going into a county system of government, if they think that they are going to subdue these people, they are not going to. These people have suffered for 19 years because of this government and they are willing to suffer for another year or a year and a half, and they are going to help to kick this government out of office.

I see that my air time is going very fast, Mr. Speaker, but I would have liked to have said a word or two about social aid. I notice the Minister of Social Welfare is out of his seat at this time. I should say just a word or two in this connection. I have a file on my desk here of about a dozen letters that I would have liked to have read out to this house, but at this time I see that I am going to be infringing upon somebody else's air time so I am not going to be able to do that.

I would only like to say this. It seems to me that there are two classes of social aid recipients in this province. There's the person who lives in the city and there is the poor country brother. If you are living on a farm you almost have to be destitute before you can get social aid, but if you are living in the city you can have bought a house, made a down payment on a house, you can buy a frig. and a television set and a deep freeze, and a hi-fi, and heaven knows what more, and as soon as you are eligible for social aid the government will help you to pay for your house and they will pick up all your monthly payments so that by the time you get off social aid you can have your house quite well furnished.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a crying shame. I think that we need a complete revision of the rules and regulations or else a complete overhaul of the Department of Social Welfare.

I would like for a moment to make some reference to the speech that was made last Friday afternoon by the Provincial Treasurer. I noticed when he started out he was talking about our people being very proud of their schools, their electric power and their roads, etc. etc. Well, I am sure they have

something to be proud of. But the people who are proud of the schools and the roads paid for the schools and the roads themselves, and they paid for their electric power too, Mr. Speaker. I noticed that on page 7 he mentioned something when he was talking about farm income, he mentioned something about prairie farm assistance and wheat board payments, and he said a significant part of this total of over \$140 million represented higher wheat board payments for wheat and barley, and larger PFAA payments. Well, I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer has finally given some credit to the Liberal party of Canada. We were the people who set up the wheat board and we were the people who set up the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

Some Hon. Members: — No, no.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — I would like also to make short reference to the summary results of operations of crown corporations for the financial year ending in 1962 on page 11 of the budget speech. I notice here that the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service made \$1,092, which is not too much on an advance of \$100,000. The Saskatchewan Timber Board made almost a quarter of a million, according to this. About the Saskatchewan Timber Board, I would like to say this. If the Saskatchewan Timber Board is such a good thing — these socialists who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, set this timber board up to develop the timber areas of the province, to provide the people of Saskatchewan with cheaper lumber — surely the people from my area of the province shouldn't have to go over into Manitoba to buy lumber cheaper than they can buy it from the timber board. And this is exactly what is happening.

Then we go on to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. I think the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) covered this pretty thoroughly the other day. I only want to add this. Besides fire-proof government buildings, which don't need to be insured, which weren't insured by other governments, this government has the monopoly on a lot more insurance; hospitals, schools, other institutions that are forced to buy insurance because they get grants from the government. When you consider the number of government cars, I don't know just how many there are — we can't keep track of how many there are because there are more every year — when you consider the number of government cars that are on the road that are insured under the government insurance office. If you took the government buildings, the public buildings and the government cars away from this business, away from the government insurance office, they wouldn't be showing too sizeable a surplus I don't think.

Well, it should be clear by now, Mr. Speaker, from the statements that I have made this afternoon and from statements I made yesterday while I was speaking on this debate, that I will not be able to support the budget. I believe that I should have proven even to the members who sit opposite, from promises that they made before 1944 when they assumed office, that they are people who are not to be trusted. Although there are some things in this budget that I agree with, I think there are a few things that are sound, and one of them I might commend the Minister of Agriculture on is his community pasture project these are some of the things that we have pressed for for 15 or 18 years. But from this government's record of past performance we know that we cannot trust the socialists. I cannot therefore, support this budget. The Provincial Treasurer in his closing paragraph was talking about freedom of the individual. Mr. Speaker, this is almost a mockery coming from the people who believe in socialist principles. I would like to quote from one of the greatest Americans of all time, a man who was a champion of freedom and liberty, and he had this to say. I would like to now quote Mr. Abraham Lincoln:

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men; you cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; nor can you establish security on borrowed money.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what the people who sit on your right seem to think that they can do. I cannot, therefore, support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question now that he has finished with his address. I would like to ask the hon. member if he is not aware of the fact . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member has indicated he will not permit a question.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the budget debate, I would first of all like to sincerely congratulate our financial critic, the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) on his tremendous presentation on Monday last. I feel that in his critical analysis of the revenues and expenditures of this province he did a tremendous service to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Foley: — I would also at this time like to congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer upon the presentation of his first budget, and all the previous speakers in this debate.

After having listened to the budget debate speech of the Hon. Provincial Treasurer last Friday, one could not help but be depressed by the tremendous increase in taxation levels in this province. One could not help but recognize how serious some of our revenue problems are becoming. When you note that consumption taxes brought in revenues of \$5 million more than was budgeted for; the education and health tax \$2 million more; gasoline tax \$2 million surplus; the liquor profits \$1 million more than was budgeted for; that in total this government raised by the taxation of the people nearly \$16.5 million in excess of budget requirements, and at the same time found it impossible to find any means of reducing taxation, then the financial plight of this province has indeed become critical. The Provincial Treasurer told us that he was going to borrow \$72.5 million, and that the gross debt of the province will exceed \$560 million this year. When we couple this with the serious unemployment problem in Saskatchewan and the rapidly rising cost of essential services, especially public health, the situation is even more alarming.

The report on medicare on page 263 estimates that the cost for medical care insurance will rise from about \$21.5 million now, to about \$30 million in a ten-year period, that hospitalization, mental health, drugs, rehabilitation are all rising, that the total cost for these services are now about \$77 million, and that in ten years time they will approach \$125 million; that the health budget alone could, within a few years, exceed the total revenues of the province, then I think we realize the tremendous burden which is being placed on the people of this province.

We realize the tremendous responsibility that we as legislators and those who sit on the treasury benches to your right, Mr. Speaker, have to the people of this province. I am very pleased to see the large number of students visiting our legislature this afternoon. I think it is very fitting that they should be here during education week, and as a teacher-member of the legislature, I sincerely welcome them and I hope that many more student groups throughout the province will find it possible to visit the session before it is closed.

I would like to extend at this time a word of greeting to all those educators, teachers and students, educational officials throughout the province who are meeting the ever-increasing challenge inherent in education today. In this rapidly changing world of electronic computers, programmed learning, closed circuit television instruction, the role of the teacher was never more important and all we who

are educators must be ever responsible to improved techniques and ideas to keep our educational curriculums abreast of the times and the challenges of this modern world.

The performance of those who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, with regard to educational finances, is far removed from their promises of 1944. Instead of relieving local governments of the costs of education, local taxes on land and property in 1962 are more than four times what they were when this government took office. School taxes have been a conspicuous factor in increasing taxes on the land of the farmers and on the homes of the people until these taxes have become almost intolerable. And indication of this is seen in the heavy arrears of school taxes which have exceeded \$12 million — more than three times what they were when this government took office. The whole system of school and educational finances in this province rests mainly on the uncertain foundation of taxes on land and property. Two or three years of unfavorable crops could create a major crisis.

While increased educational grants again this year will be welcomed by school officials, they do not adequately deal with the overall problem of financing education in Saskatchewan. A change in the grant system is essential. Grants, originally paid on a per classroom basis, later on an equalization factor, and finally supplemented by per pupil allowances, all have merit but they do not properly measure the local effort of our communities and our school districts throughout the province and thus they do not represent a true equalization of costs with equivalent total resources to all school districts.

The constituency of Turtleford this year, Mr. Speaker, has been fortunate in having adequate snowfall and prospects of good crops are welcomed this coming summer. I know that my constituents will share the concern of the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), our financial critic, in the lowering of beef prices this past two months by nine cents per 100 pounds. I share with him, too, my concern at the seeming disinterest of the Minister of Agriculture regarding this important matter, and I would urge on behalf of the area that I represent, one of the finest cattle-raising areas of this province, that all possible be done by this government to bolster the cattle markets in this province.

In reading through the budget I notice that the Provincial Treasurer mentioned net surpluses for the corporation of about \$8.5 million, with power and telephone earnings up considerably. At the same time, however, I fail to note any mention of some of the serious problems which we have in north-western Saskatchewan which are crying for attention and for government assistance. Once again, I must make it plain to the Minister of Telephones that he must increase grants to

rural telephone companies and do much more to increase rural telephone service in those parts of the province which not yet enjoy this important utility.

I was amazed, after noting a surplus of almost \$14 million over budgeted revenues for last year, that, in view of this, the Hon. Attorney General found it necessary to increase automobile insurance rates by some ten percent, or about \$4 an automobile. It is almost incomprehensible, Mr. Speaker.

While we all regret the operating losses which were suffered last year, nevertheless the loss of \$916,000 seems like a mere pittance when one looks at the total expenditures forecast by the Provincial Treasurer in his budget speech this year. I feel that this government could well have held the line on automobile insurance rates without much difficulty.

The Hon. Provincial Treasurer, in his remarks, went on at some length to quote what he proposed to do in the fields of education and health, and at each interval he asked, do these expenditures destroy the rights of individuals? Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but feel, after the third or fourth time he said this, that he "protesteth too much" and obviously felt very guilty about the very real loss of freedom and personal rights suffered by many people in this province in the past several years. It was not, therefore, surprising to me to find that the Hon. Premier, addressing the Regina Labor Council, was quoted in the press last Saturday as attempting in some manner or other to allay fears among his audience when he said:

We must admit that many rights are denied too many people.

The Premier has evidently undergone a conversion and he and the Provincial Treasurer should get together a little bit. He went on to say:

The removal of remaining barriers is a continual responsibility of those who seek to guarantee maximum freedom.

For once the Premier has admitted that there are serious barriers to freedom in this province, and I know we on this side of the house have been pointing it out to him for a good long time. He said, and I quote again:

We need an acceptance of public responsibility, government responsibility, if you like, as a defender of the rights and the equalities of the individuals. Preventing the state from taking away liberties is necessary.

Isn't it unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that he could not have been in this frame of mind last July during the tremendous medicare crisis in this province. And I wonder how he can reconcile these sentiments expressed now; it sounds to me like deathbed repentance, Mr. Speaker. You will pardon me if I have some doubts as to the sincerity of the hon. gentleman opposite.

And on the subject of the rights of individuals, does not the Hon. Provincial Treasurer feel that the heavy and increasing burden of taxation in this province has certainly reduced the purchasing power of people, has certainly increased the burden of worry and concern in the small farmers and the small businessmen in the rural areas as to whether or not they are going to be able to stay on their farms and meet their many obligations? For him to say that the budget which he brought down is not hampering the rights of individuals cannot be seriously agreed with by many.

He quoted from the hon. gentleman who was the former premier of this province, Mr. Douglas, when in 1944 he said: "Freedom is more than the mere absence of restraint. It is the presence of opportunity". The Hon. Provincial Treasurer read in glowing terms. Mr. Speaker, when we consider, on this side of the house, the increasing government competition and interference cutting into the fields of free enterprise in this province, what does the Hon. Mr. Douglas mean when he says "absence from restraint". Restraint has been growing and growing in this province and is one of the main reasons why it is absolutely necessary that this government be replaced in the next general election. Mr. Speaker.

And on the subject of opportunities, one could say a great deal because, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, without burdening the house with details of population loss and the loss of many hundreds of our trained young people to other provinces, one wonders just exactly how much opportunity is left in this province.

Then the Hon. Provincial Treasurer went on to state that the first function of government is to make man feel more magnificent. In fact he said this is why the CCF was formed in the first place. Mr. Speaker, I would think the Hon. Provincial Treasurer, in the light of the tremendous taxation burden in this province, in the light of the tremendous problems which our rural people are facing, such as the need for market roads, the need for more public utilities, the need for a sensible snow plow policy by this government who for years have pushed off their rightful responsibility in the field of snow plowing our market and grid roads, in the field of building access roads to our tourist resorts, have pushed all of those things off their shoulders onto those of local government who are ill-prepared in many cases to meet them — how magnificent

does the Hon. Provincial Treasurer feel Mr. Speaker, when any of our municipal councillors in the province, who want to hire a snow plow, are told by the government, we'll snow plow your little school road, or your market road, but we'll charge you \$19.75 an hour. Rather than magnificent, I think the Provincial Treasurer should feel very humble, very humble indeed and should instead recognize his tremendous responsibilities to this legislature and to the people of the province for the greatest possible economy in his administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a few moments ago that this is education week. In education week our thoughts naturally turn to some of the best reading of the day, and I would like to recommend to the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, a book entitled "Douglas in Saskatchewan". Some of them may have heard about it. I am just going to read a couple of little excerpts from the book, Mr. Speaker, just in case they haven't had a chance to read it. And I quote from the book:

The great expectations of 1944 were never realized. Seventeen years after the government came into power in Saskatchewan, the province was in distress with an ailing economy, a depleted population, a pinched treasury and a mounting load of taxation.

Would you not say, Mr. Speaker, that the author was a man of some discernment in these matters? And finally, Mr. Speaker, just a small quote from the end of the book:

One message that the year 1962 communicated clearly. The political citadel erected in Saskatchewan by the Hon. Mr. Douglas was beginning to show signs of stress and strain.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the cracks are widening greatly and that the edifice on your right will soon crumble, never to be heard of again in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Foley: — Now I know there have been hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house who have questioned the veracity of the author of this book. They have said he was distorting the situation. Mr. Douglas said in the by-election in Burnaby-Coquitlam that this book was a scurrilous personal attack on his integrity. It seemed strange to me that Mr. Douglas has undergone such a change in a short period of time because the gentleman who wrote this book, Mr. Speaker, wrote another book also. It is titled "Along the Highway", and Mr. Douglas wrote the preface for this book, and this is what he had to say about the author, Mr. Speaker, and may I but quote a few lines. He says,

“The author is one of the best newspapermen I have ever known”. He says, “His stories about Saskatchewan have an authentic ring”. And he closes by saying, Mr. Speaker, “I recommend this book to all those who seek a better understanding of Saskatchewan and its people”.

As a little project for education week, Mr. Speaker, may I recommend to those who sit on your right that they spend a few quiet hours in silent meditation with the two volumes I have here on my desk.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with all those members in this house who welcomed the announcement that a grant is being made on behalf of a veterinary college in this province. I would like to especially congratulate the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and those in the Liberal opposition who instigated this movement for a veterinary college in this province. I regret that the hon. minister opposite did not see fit in his remarks to pay credit where credit is due, Mr. Speaker. While I sincerely hope that a veterinary college will be built in Saskatoon, regardless of what site is finally chosen, I trust that it will be supported by all the western provinces. I feel it will make a most significant contribution to agriculture in the west.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I note in the budget address the prediction by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer that he will set aside \$2 million for a Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation; that he will set aside \$1 million for a Saskatchewan Public Administration Foundation; and for a royal commission on taxation, and an industrial advisory council. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that many of these suggestions on the part of the government may have merit. But I cannot help but feel there is considerable overlapping of government service, when one examines the Department of Industry and Information, the budget bureau and all the other dozens of agencies and bureaus and boards that this government has set up over the years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many more topics which I would like to cover today but my time is limited. I note that the Deputy Minister of Highways, in his report this year, states that “economic conditions have indicated a relatively lesser emphasis on provincial highways”. He goes on to say that “this lesser emphasis has produced a pause or a coasting in highway development”. Many of the folds in this province, particularly those in the northern parts, will not be happy that the Department of Highways is coasting, as far as higher development is concerned. And I would like at this time to again urge the government to proceed with all haste in the reconstruction and grading and black-topping of some of the major highways in my part of the province, no. 4 highway, North Battleford north; no. 26 highway. North Battleford through

Meota, Mervin and Turtleford north; and more attention to no. 3 highway and no. 24. I don't believe the government has any reason to become complacent or to coast, as far as highway development in the northern part of the province is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one final remark. The financial critic on this side of the house made a very important statement the other day when he said:

About one year from now when the government brings in an election budget, I wouldn't be surprised to see the sales tax reduced, for one year; for them to lop off the head tax, for one year.

This is what this government on your right have done with hospitalization premiums and with car insurance premiums. But the cuts only lasted, Mr. Speaker, until the ballots were counted. Surely this raises the question, Mr. Speaker, of the political morality of the socialists who sit on your right. Surely this is politically immoral, to bribe the electorates with large tax cuts before an election and increase them immediately after. Surely to goodness we must be concerned when this group of people who sit on your right can be so politically immoral that they will distort the debt structure of this province, that they will try to tell us we are out of debt when in reality we are in deeper than we ever were before, to the tune of nearly \$700 million. So, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to those opposite that in the few months left to this administration they attempt to deal with the affairs of this province in a just and a truthful and a more fashion, to serve the people of this province, which, after all, is the reason for them being there, and no other — not the aggrandizement of a political party.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I again reiterate the words of the financial critic when he mentioned that during the last 15 years provincial taxation has gone from \$13 to \$96 per person, municipal taxation from \$23 to \$92 a person. Mr. Speaker, because of the increasing burden of taxation inherent in this budget, because there is no relief in sight, I certainly cannot support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — In rising to take part in this debate, I am not going to spend any time in discussing anything that was said by the previous speaker. His treatment of my radio time just pretty well shows the type of honesty that he shows in everything else, and especially what was contained in the speech, certainly about his statements that have been made in the budget.

Mr. Foley: — I demand that he withdraw . . .

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — Well, Mr. Chairman, everyone can see the clock but if he prefers that that be withdrawn, that's fine.

Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer on the budget which he has placed before this house. This historic document, contrary to what has been said by some of the previous speakers, can be hailed as a document that shows progress, initiative in this province of Saskatchewan. I note that the new member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) is not here. I would like to welcome him and also recognize his bereavement — I understand that he lost a brother.

Mr. Speaker, there is another new seat on the opposition side of the house which is also worthy of some comment, the new Liberal member for Milestone (Mr. Erb). I wonder how many members in this house realize how unique this particular member is in going from one party to another he was able to improve both parties. This, Mr. Speaker, is a mutual benefit deal. Everybody ought to be happy. I think everybody is happy except the hon. member from Milestone. He hasn't been able to sleep a wink in that seat since he moved over there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker suggested that there was something to be said for a veterinary college and we wholeheartedly agree. The total complex of university has always been planned, as the members of the opposition noted. But, you know, I think they ought to realize their problems are not going to be solved with a veterinary college. Veterinarians only take care of whole horses, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) carried on, last Monday, in the usual Thatcherite tradition, attempting to smear and belittle in every way possible the tremendous progress that has been made and the tremendous progress that this budget indicates. And the provincial critic talked about a "new look" on this side of the house. Well, I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that there was a pretty sick look on that side of the house when that budget was brought down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — And all their tactics have changed, at least the tactics of the hon. financial critic; I don't know whether this wins approval, but now they want to help us, Mr. Speaker. They wheedled away, "We want to help you; if there is anything that we can do to rectify", not wreck as they usually want to do, "We want to help you".

Well, Mr. Speaker, with the kind of help that they have been giving us as far as industrial development has been concerned

for the last 15 to 18 years, God help us when they try to hinder us. Mr. Speaker, with friends like the Thatcherites, as far as industrial development is concerned, we don't need enemies. Is it any wonder that the Minister of Industry and Information is very reticent to even announce any new development until he is mighty sure it is coming because if these people opposite, Mr. Speaker, knew where these industries were that were planning to come here, they would move heaven and earth in an effort to prevent it. They have gone up and down the length and breadth of this province, not only Saskatchewan but also Canada and the United States, blackening the name of Saskatchewan.

Their attitudes, their speeches, which amount to nothing but outright sabotage, have cost us millions of dollars and, in spite of this, Saskatchewan is striding rapidly forward economically as this budget indicates, despite the geographical location and climatic difficulties that Saskatchewan has always had to fight, certainly as far as industrial development is concerned.

The financial critic also made a remark — don't go out, Hammy — about the two-faced ex-premier. Well, if the leader of the New Democratic Party, the Hon. Tommy Douglas, is two-faced, I'll still take his face ahead of anything I can see across the way, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure of one thing, that the hon. financial critic is not two-faced. If he had another face he wouldn't be showing up around here with the one he has got. The hon. financial critic also had something to say on the worn-out arguments about population growth. The arguments he used are the same ones the Thatcherites have been using right along, completely ignoring the facts as always, that there has been an agricultural revolution — that of the three prairie provinces, Saskatchewan had more than half the agricultural population, and Mr. Speaker, naturally when farm mechanization took place, when the Liberal robbed Saskatchewan and the prairie provinces of industry and took it all down east where their big shot friends are, naturally we lost more population. We had twice as many farmers when the agricultural revolution took place naturally we would lose twice as many. But they ignore the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba, even during the thirties, were developing power, privately and publicly, in both provinces, irrigation, all the things that industry needs in order to develop — certainly the things that are needed before industry can think of coming to any province.

While this development was going on in Alberta and Manitoba, we had a premier in Saskatchewan, later he was the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, who went about the country saying, "Well, all you need as far as power development in Saskatchewan are wind chargers. Wind chargers are the ideal thing for power development in Saskatchewan". Yes, I don't wonder that the late

Hon. J.G. Gardiner thought that wind chargers were good, he had a lot of wind to operate these things, and certainly with the source of supply he had right in his own family, they were bound to work.

Some Hon. Members: — Disrespectful! Disrespectful!

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had had the proper sources of power and the proper development when development would have been cheap, when material was cheap, when labor was crying for work, the development that Saskatchewan has seen in the last two decades would have proceeded at twice the pace.

Any sensible person will refuse to accept the arguments on population loss. Everybody knows that the farmer in Saskatchewan today is farming land that used to support four or five families as well as hired help. One of the reasons that the opposition has been able to kid the public as far as the true situation in Saskatchewan is concerned is that most people don't even realize that we have twice the rural settled area, twice the agricultural area of Manitoba or Alberta.

They again choose to ignore the fact that two of the top five cities that are the fastest growing cities in Canada are here in this province. Not a word, and very little in our news media; McLean's Magazine featured this article certainly this is something to be proud of and an indication that industrial development is going forth apace.

Well, now the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) also said something about job opportunities. The Liberal party should be the last one to talk about job opportunity, Mr. Speaker; both federally and provincially. The provinces that are governed by Liberals today have the highest unemployment rates, or among the highest unemployment rate anywhere in this country. And as some of the speakers did previously here today, the hon. member from Moosomin went on to talk about our terrible provincial debt. I wonder if he realized how tired people are getting of that Thatcherite tune. There are too many people who have benefited from Saskatchewan power and gas and the building up of our telephone system to believe that the debt that is created by the building fees is not a good and a self-liquidating debt.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a member I have heard the arguments going back and forth across this floor about dead-weight debt and self-liquidating debt. Well, it isn't too difficult to establish what is a dead-weight debt, or to understand it. Dead-weight debt is all those dead horses that the Liberals left laying around for us to pay for when they were kicked out of office in 1944. Money that was borrowed for roads that were obsolete – in some cases for roads that were

not even built. Money that was borrowed for buildings that were nearly obsolete and a hundred and one other dead horses that the taxpayer in the last two decades has had to pay for, and he has paid for them. The amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, that while he has paid off all these old mortgages, he has also built the best highway system, school system, municipal grid road system, public buildings throughout the length and breadth of this province, a university complex at Saskatoon that is the envy of the nation, another one starting down here at Wascana. All these things have been built in the way of public works since this government took office and while the taxpayers, that these people are crying crocodile tears over, have been able to pay off the old mortgages as well. A tremendous feat, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a tremendous amount of credit to this government, but they did supply the leadership, Mr. Speaker. They provided the leadership whereby these things could be done and that is the only thing a government should do.

The taxpayers deserve the credit. They have done the job. Not only have they done this, Mr. Speaker, they have also built better homes, they have furnished their homes, they have electrified them, they have changed the total way of life and the total face of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and it is of tremendous credit to the people of Saskatchewan that they could do all these things in spite of all such cried of stagnation that are coming from the cowering Thatcherites across the way.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — CCF's.

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — Yes, we heard the false to scream coming from across the way about the \$475.5 million worth of public debt, which is not a public debt as far as I'm concerned. Now, Mr. Speaker, a public debt is one thing but if you don't own a telephone or if you don't use any light and power, I'd like to have these people show me where the people that aren't using these things are going to pay for them. I would like to suggest that if this is wrong, then every farmer who borrows money for a tractor, every young farmer who goes to the credit corporation or the family farm credit scheme, any businessman who borrows money for expansion, development, all these people had better either take a good look at their business practice or take a look at what the Thatcherites are telling them about the people of Saskatchewan being in debt and the financing and borrowing programs of this province.

If the opposition is correct, Mr. Speaker, in the assumption that this type of borrowing is wrong, I suggest that every single businessman, every farmer, every homeowner

who has borrowed money for long-term projects must also be wrong. I'll leave it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm getting pretty tired of this ridiculous argument about the public debt. In order to show how ridiculous this thing is, let us assume for a moment that we will sell Saskatchewan Power and Telephones. This is what the boys across the way would like to do for a dollar, probably like they have done in the past. But we will sell them, and if they had a good auctioneer on the job, probably they would bet a billion for them, but we will put it right down to a conservative estimate, Mr. Speaker; we will put it at \$750 million; that is the rock bottom that they are worth as going concerns. Well, if we did this, the people of Saskatchewan would have \$750 million in cold cash. They could pay off this \$475 million tomorrow, and they would have \$275 million left, clear money, to run the province for one year without even charging any tax. Possibly this is what they suggest. Is this the terrible public debt, Mr. Speaker, that these people are crying about and cowering in the corner? With this kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, this kind of leadership, we would have still been cowering in the sod shacks and the cabins, wishing for wind chargers; if we were yet accepting the thinking that is being put forth on the other side of the house.

Mr. Speaker, to carry this argument further, it is obvious that the companies that bought these corporations would in turn have to do some financing. They in turn would have to reimburse their leaders with interest plus profit for shareholders in their companies, which is not the case as far as Saskatchewan Telephones and Power are concerned. It is true that we are paying considerable amounts of interest but if these companies were privately owned, we would not only be paying interest, we would have to be paying dividends to shareholders as well. After we had paid the interest for ten or twenty years and the companies finally retired their debts, these corporations would belong to a few pear-shaped stockholders, something like the Leader of the Opposition over on the other side of the house. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to sell the power and telephones. The Thatcherites are not going to get the opportunity to do so either. People of Saskatchewan have too much sense for that.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that over in Alberta, they have Calgary Light and Power, they have Canadian Utilities. These companies too have borrowed money. The same people are going to pay off the debt, but when the debt is paid off in Alberta, it is going to belong to the stockholders; when the people of Saskatchewan pay off this debt it is going to belong to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — This is the public debt. The only reason these people are crying about the public debt is because they object to the people of Saskatchewan owning anything, Mr. Speaker. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition will refrain in the future from this particular silly argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to matters that are more directly related to my department. Let us say how proud I am to have been given the portfolio of natural resources. I only hope that I can do half as well, Mr. Speaker, as the ministers who preceded me in the past 18 years. Everywhere in this department you see evidence of sound administrative policies and imaginative leadership. What is more important, you see in every branch dedicated, hard-working staff, doing their level best to improve the services in their chosen field; not only for the people of Saskatchewan today but for the people of Saskatchewan and Canada tomorrow.

The constant, cowardly attacks by the Thatcherites on our civil servants are grossly unfair, and certainly do little to sustain the respect that the public should have for these good people who have offered their public service. Small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that young people do hesitate today in choosing careers in government service when they see those already so employed are subject to the type of smear that is constantly emanating from the people across the way.

The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) had something to say about wild life insurance and hunting accidents. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the problems raised by the hon. member were of no great concern some 15 or 20 years ago, when the game in this province was reduced to practically nil. Good conservation practices have improved the situation to a point where admittedly game sometimes becomes a threat to farmers' crops. We do not want to see the farmer or anyone else in a position where his livelihood is endangered. However, in the interests of recreation, tourism, sportsmanship, we certainly must keep the game at a level where it is sufficient for the hunter and yet not damaging farmers' crops.

We have done a great deal, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the criticism, to try and alleviate this problem. There are certain things that you can't do anything about immediately. Now, the hon. financial critic the other day, instead of recognizing that an attempt had been made with wild life crop damage insurance. Certainly Saskatchewan has done more than other provinces have — in some cases practically nothing has been done. Manitoba has an insurance program. They've got a package similar to ours. Alberta has accepted one; they started it this year, exactly the same plan as ours but they are charging three percent and we are charging two percent.

An Hon. Member: — You are charging five percent.

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — The hon. member says we are charging five percent. Again this shows how much information these people have at their disposal. The charge for wild life crop damage insurance is two percent. It has been since 1956, Mr. Speaker. Well, that is the way it is, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) went out in the woods and saw a woodpecker hole in the tree, he wouldn't know whether it was drilled, punched, or eaten out by ants.

You don't like it, do you?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have, for instance, the sand hill crane problem north of Long Lake, which we are definitely attempting, both provincially and federally, to do something about. While federal wild life people have put exploders out in the field there to try and chase the game off the farmers' crops, the unfortunate thing happens — there is no place for them to go. So our department has purchased habitat lands. We are going to seed lure crops in an attempt to have a sanctuary where these birds can come when they are being forced off by the exploders, and we hope that this will work. If it works a continuation of this program will be looked at and looked forward to. The wild life crop damage insurance — just a little more information, Mr. Speaker, for these gentlemen opposite — was introduced in 1952. At that time, the member for Athabaska was right in 1952, but he is now behind the time, it was five percent. It was changed to two percent in 1956. It started out very small. There were 18 premiums sold for \$1,065 to the farmers. But the hunters, Mr. Speaker, contributed \$81,000 that year. This continued. In 1956, the farmers' premium was reduced to two percent, but the hunters still pay \$1.00 each. In 1961 — let's just take a look at what has happened here. Two hundred and eighty-five policies were sold at a cost of \$9,911 to the farmers; the same year the hunters contributed \$85,000. At the end of 1961, 2,723 policies had been written at a cost of \$69,000 to the farmers — those are round figures — while the hunters contribute \$824,000. One thousand, one hundred and ninety-nine claims have been paid covering losses of \$471,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, the farmer paid \$69,000, they received \$471,000, and the hon. financial critic says, "it doesn't work"; "it is no good", "it's not doing the farmers any good". What does he expect, Mr. Speaker? What does he expect?

We believe that it is good management to retain sufficient monies to take care of any catastrophic year. For example, in 1959 some 407 policies were written on which 275 claims were paid. The amount of \$161,000 was paid to farmers, which is naturally more than we took in. The following year, and this is always true in insurance business, premiums bought

by farmers amounted to 822, but if the history and the risk had been as great and the damage had been as great as the previous year, the monies that were in the fund would have been completely wiped out, so we just cannot afford to have this fund drop below \$300,000. As I said before, Alberta has now implemented a similar scheme to ours, and they are charging three percent compared to our two percent.

And this was mentioned by the financial critic — hunters going out in the field more and more every year; the toll of hunting accidents continuing to mount. In 1961 there were 87 accidents of which ten were fatal. Many of these accidents, of course, are not hunting accidents. They are accidents with firearms — about an equal amount of non-hunting and hunting accidents. Over the past several years our department has carried on a limited hunter safety program. We train instructors who in turn train students and young people in the handling of firearms. To date some 3,576 young people have been trained and received certificates in this manner. They have been trained by some 915 trained instructors, all volunteers. This is a tremendous credit to these people; a tremendous credit to the Fish and Game League, the South Saskatchewan Wild Life Association, and lot of individuals for their dedicated work. Mr. Speaker.

Now, because we do recognize the complaints of the hon. financial critic the other day and realize that this danger is here and something should be done about it; we are going to institute a firearm safety program this year; we are going to ask for funds through a change in the Game Act, which will provide monies so that this training can be kept right on and expended. I certainly hope we receive the co-operation of all members of this house, Mr. Speaker, for this very necessary thing.

The hon. financial critic, Mr. Speaker, again wasn't satisfied. He could have got the information — our people are very co-operative. He said that first of all we have got to do away with these high-powered rifles. Well, what would happen if we had done away with the high-powered rifles? I am rather surprised at this gentleman talking about doing away with high-powered rifles. You know this will interfere with business, and I am sure his leader isn't going to agree with this. In fact, next thing he is going to suggest we do away with high-powered cars — they kill people, three, four, five times as many, and that many at a time, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that some of their friends down in eastern Canada aren't going to like that.

The next thing he is going to do, Mr. Speaker, he is going to suggest we shouldn't have Bomarcs, they kill people too, and I am sure that their bosses down in the United States are not going to like that either.

But getting back to hunting accidents. Eighty-five percent of the hunting accidents occurred at distances of less than ten yards from the shooter. Now, the suggestion that we use shotguns or slugs, as suggested by the hon. financial critic, couldn't have done anything but make a bigger hole. Only four people out of 46 would have been safer if it had been a slug or a shotgun rather than a rifle.

I am getting a little tired of this reckless criticism. If these people would just take the trouble to be sure of their facts before they come here and open their big mouths, things would be much better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the fur conservation, indications are, again, that our conservation policies are paying off. They have paid off over the years. In fact, the same type of criticism that is being levelled at new programs of the government today was levelled at the conservation program back in the time from 1944 to 1948, when Mr. Phelps instituted many of these conservation programs. Today these same programs and their results are a God-send to the people of the north and the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kramer: — History is repeating itself, Mr. Speaker. Five hundred beaver pelts were harvested in 1945; between 50 and 60,000 beaver pelts are expected every year throughout the next ten years, as has been the case for the past five or six years — the result of good conservation policies, a credit to one of my predecessors in this department.

Turning to forestry, Mr. Speaker, we have opened a new forest nursery in Prince Albert; and plantings of jack pine and spruce are going to be taking place there in considerable numbers by 1965 and 1966. 1961 was a bad fire year and, again, Mr. Speaker, a credit to the people of this department — the firefighters. We never hear any compliments coming from the other side of this house. If it hadn't been for well-trained staff we wouldn't have spent \$1.5 million; it would probably have been a great deal more, and our losses would have doubled, if we hadn't had a well-trained forestry staff to take care of our forests. Smoke-jumpers, unheard of in other places, are unique in Saskatchewan. These people, last year alone, jumped on 29 fires and took preventive action in seven others. We also found that the use of helicopters is very helpful, Mr. Speaker. Again we are going to have two helicopters on call for fire-fighting next year. Again, a credit to the versatility of our staff in the construction branch and the forestry branch who developed a dozer carrying tremendous tanks, 700 gallons of water, which proved very successful in fighting fires. They are building two more, two more next year. This is an indication of the versatility, the ingenuity of the people of the north.

Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan is still the tops, as far as the producers of white fish and lake trout are concerned. Three million, over \$3,165,000 worth of lake trout and whitefish were produced last year — double that of 12 years ago and still going strong. All in all, with the Indian fishing, fish used by mink ranchers, a total of 22 million pounds of fish were produced in Saskatchewan last year.

Wardley Brine Shrimp Corporation, another new industry on Little Manitou Lake is setting up and expanding. This is a corporation that is producing pet food for fish and other pet food hobbyists. At our Fort Qu'Appelle Fish Culture Station, and I would like the members of the opposition, if they have not been there, to visit the fish culture station at Qu'Appelle, a tremendous job is being done by our people. Seventy million fry are produced according to the following schedule — pickerel 50 million; northern pike 4 million; lake trout 500,000; kokanee 300,000; arctic graylings 500,000; rainbow trout 200,000; eastern brook trout 200,000; whitefish 15 million; a total of 70 million; and over 16 million fry fingerling and adult fish were stocked in the waters of the province this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about tourists and tourist development, in spite of cooler weather in Saskatchewan last year, 2,200 more cars visited our various parks than the year before, and this in spite of the members in the opposition, the efforts of the members of the opposition last July and some of their friends to keep people out, warning them to stay out of Saskatchewan. It's still going up. Records show that 1.4 million people made use of our recreational facilities during the year. Our highway picnic site program is proving its worth by continued increasing use. We now have 78 picnic sites and 113 camping sites. Our regional parks program, commenced three years ago in co-operation with municipal bodies in Saskatchewan, we feel provides the answer for the short-run picnicker and day tripper. Several such parks have been established throughout Saskatchewan with the province providing 60 percent of the capital cost. This program, I suggest, is meeting with tremendous approval throughout the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have 37 percent of Saskatchewan's population, some 375,000 people, living in a triangle joining Saskatoon, Swift Current, Regina and Moose Jaw. In 1959 when we began our capital recreation program, people in this area had only 16 acres of provincial park available to them — Katepwa. Less than one percent of the shoreline of the main water bodies in the area were open to public access. Since then we have purchased over 4,000 acres of Pike Lake, Rowan's Ravine, Echo Valley, Crooked Lake and Buffalo Pound, at which point provincial parks are under construction.

The South Saskatchewan Reservoir will support three provincial parks on the main dam, the Qu'Appelle Arm dam or the Summit dam. The land acquisition to meet most of our need at these points will be completed in 1963. Planning of these parks, which started in 1962, will continue in 1963 with three park planners devoting full time to this project. Tree planting will start in 1963 when some 75,000 trees will be planted in a number of areas. Public demand for more and better facilities for outdoor recreation continues to increase. Accordingly, expenditures for recreational development will be increased in capital budget for recreational development. Of this amount, \$362,000 is being allocated for land acquisition to provide areas for future development, and the balance, \$801,500 for construction of new facilities. Under land acquisition, an amount of \$250,000 is being set aside to complete land purchases for the proposed parks on the South Saskatchewan Reservoir. The balance will be spent on purchases of other recreational lands in the southern part of the province and for the purchase of land for wild life habitat. It is hoped that the federal government will share the cost of acquiring these wild life lands under the ARDA program.

Under the recreation construction program work will be continued to improve and enlarge facilities in our older parks. An amount of \$182,400 has been allocated for this purpose. Major programs consist of construction of new staff quarters at Moose Mountain Park, continuation of the golf course construction at Duck Mountain Park, the installation of the new water system at Pike Lake Park, improvement to the core area and extension of the water system at Cypress Hills, and the construction of a new modern restroom at Katepwa. An amount of \$292,500 is being allocated for construction of new parks. Major developments are scheduled for Buffalo Pound Park and The Battlefords Park. Up until now these parks have only limited facilities and expenditures have been minimum. It is planned to spend some \$90,000 at Buffalo Pound and \$109,000 at The Battlefords on water systems, irrigation systems, maintenance buildings, landscape improvement and beach improvement. Combination bath-change house and concession building will be constructed at The Battlefords Park.

A major development will also be undertaken at Meadow Lake Park and some limited work at Echo Valley Park. Preliminary planning work will be continued on the South Saskatchewan Reservoir, the main project being the construction of a holding plantation to provide sufficient trees for transplanting purposes. Work will be continued to expand and improve campsites, picnic sites and historic sites in the southern part of the province. An amount of \$232,600 will be spent for the purpose, with the major expense of \$192,000 going towards Trans-Canada highway sites. These sites, to which the federal government contributes half the cost, have been proven enormously popular with the travelling public. In 1963-64, two campsites, McLean and Besant, will be in full operation and, in addition, McLean campsite will be expanded.

Further improvement will be carried out at the South Saskatchewan campsite and new sites will be constructed at Boundary Dam, Borden Bridge and Valeport, as well as a number of highway sites and historic sites. Will not as elaborate as the Trans-Canada sites, they will provide excellent camping and picnicking facilities at points of interest to the travelling public. An amount of \$84,000 will be spent to improve recreational facilities in the forest areas of the province. In these areas there is an abundance of good natural sites which only need a minimum of expenditure to provide good facilities. In particular, new campsites will be provided along the Hanson Lake road, since this project has opened up a whole area for the travelling public. Work will also be carried out to improve the commercial facilities at Cypress Hills Park.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous amount that has been done here, a tremendous amount programmed. We have budgeted for \$4,215,750; for the recreation and the purchase of recreational lands and construction facilities thereon, \$1,163,500; for field headquarters and forest nursery buildings, \$59,600; for the construction of new roads and rebuilding of some of the older ones to give access to our resources and assist in their development, \$1,009,000. Oh, I can assure the hon. members that this money will be spent conscientiously and efficiently, Mr. Speaker. I can further assure them that this budget, not only does it take care of resources and the people who are concerned with resources, it also takes care of a good many other people, in fact all the people of Saskatchewan. It takes care, more or less completely, and has certainly taken cognizance of 1960 programs, the program we were elected on. Every single plank in this program has been given attention and because it lives up to the promises that were made in 1960 when we campaigned for office, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the budget is a forward-looking budget, that the recommendations contained in the budget speech are good for Saskatchewan and will do much to encourage not only industrial development but all other manners of economic and social growth within the province and I want to compliment the Hon. Provincial Treasurer for the able manner in which the speech and the budget were drafted and in the manner in which he delivered it.

As I have sat in the house, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amazed by the liberties that are sometimes taken by members and I was quite amazed today when I heard the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) follow up a line that the

hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) had taken some time ago where the two of them have either stated or left the impression that the Liberal party is responsible for the magnificent growth of the co-operatives in the province and today the hon. member for Yorkton said the Liberals established the wheat board.

Now I haven't studied this question as closely as I might but I think even a cursory study of the facts will reveal that the Liberals did no such thing. I, as I recall the situation, in the first time that any step was made to provide a different system of marketing, rather than the free market system, was in 1917 when by Order-in-Council of the federal government, the board of grain supervisors was created and these were given monopoly rights in the marketing of grain. The problem that was facing Canada at that time was the price of grain was rising so high in the open market that it was endangering some of Canada's markets and the government of the day took this action. In 1920 we returned to the open market.

In 1922 federal legislation was proposed and the federal government passed an act but said that it wouldn't be operative, as I recall, unless all the provincial governments passed a similar type of legislation, and Manitoba did not so pass this legislation, and therefore it was non-operative.

During this same period of time, the co-operatives decided that their legislative quest wasn't bearing any fruit and so they organized the wheat pool. In 1924, when the wheat pool finally got rolling well, until 1929, a number of agencies were created, among which was the central selling agency which was controlled by the pool, operated on a non-profit basis, had offices, as I recall, in Europe and was in the business of selling wheat. Now the over-payment was made in 1929-30 roughly, in that period of time. The amount was not \$25 million, nor was it loaned by a Liberal party, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley said, to the wheat pool, wasn't even loaned by the Liberal government. The government that was in power in Saskatchewan at this time was the Anderson government . . .

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Is he referring to this debate or is he referring to some other debate?

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Not at all, what I am doing is proving the liberties that these gentlemen make use of and straying from the truth and distorting facts, twisting it to their own particular use.

The government of the day wasn't a Liberal government, it was the Anderson government. No single prairie government endorsed the bank loans and guaranteed the bank loans but, as I recall it, it was three prairie government, and yet these men continue to just simply toss this off as if it were a fact. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) leaned across and consulted with the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), I am sure he could have found the facts because they are quite well known.

After the wheat board was established by Bennett, when John A. McFarlane took over the central selling agency, this was the first wheat board after the 1917 effort, the Tories then proposed a Canadian Wheat Board Act that, I recall, was proposed around 1935. This was watered down to the point, by attacks by the Liberal opposition, King was the leader of the opposition at this time, so that it was a voluntary sort of affair, and when the Liberals were returned in 1936, I remember the Turgeon Commission going up and down the land holding hearings and endeavoring to upset the whole legislation.

And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I am astounded by both the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) who, in broad sweeping statements, simply say the Liberals gave Saskatchewan all this. This is entirely incorrect, and I think it does no service to them, particularly, and it certainly is not in accordance with the facts and serves no useful purpose.

I don't propose to enter into a blow by blow description and point and counterpoint that have been made by various speakers of the house. I take it that the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) made a slip when he said we had allocated certain sums of money in the estimates to establish a royal commission on education — I presume he was referring to the royal commission on taxation. There is no royal commission to be established on education as far as I am aware.

Mr. Foley: — I said, at least I believe I said, royal commission on taxation.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — I accept that as a slip of the tongue. We are all human and those things may slip out.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I think that the budget is a forward-looking budget. It is an aggressive budget. It holds promise of development in Saskatchewan. I fail to see how it can be attacked.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) who wore his red tie for one day, even though it is a traditional color of the Liberals, of course, and some other speakers have attempted to go back over the years, by looking backwards, by quoting old political speeches, have endeavored to say that we have broken faith, that we don't have the answer to the questions of the day, and that we can do nothing but wreck havoc in Saskatchewan. I find this line of argument a little hard to follow.

I don't think there is anybody on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker, that claims that we have all the answers to all the economic problems, but this I do know, that the capitalism that once existed in Canada, to which our friends the Liberals once subscribed, no longer exists. What we find today is an emerging joint effort between government, private enterprise and co-operative enterprise. It will take all the imagination that society can muster to work out the checks and balances between government and the new form of corporate control that is evolving in western nations. I think, primarily, the best work that has been done is in the European Common Market area where a new concept of economic development is giving some leadership to all western countries. It is interesting for the hon. members here to realize that some of the designers of the European Common Market are now no longer in government but are outstanding socialists, and I can name a number of them who are well-known to us all — Henri Spaak, Jean-Paul Philippe, Monet, and others. What these gentlemen are trying to do is trying to merge the concept of the public good with the concept of what may be described as good for the corporation itself. To the credit of the people that are in charge of the various corporations, the Coal and Steel Community, the other transportation communities of Europe, as I was saying, to the credit of these people, they themselves have realized that what is in the best interest of the corporation in terms of maximizing profits may not be in the best interests of society. They themselves have agreed to become part of an overall planning agency which has the power to issue orders, which have the effect of being laws which will set up an overall plan in terms of areas of economic interest and the prime function of motivation is in the hands of government.

This budget that we are proposing attempts to go in this direction insofar as it is possible for a province to do. We have here the concept of economic planning; we have here in Saskatchewan the goodwill of the business community; we are in daily contact with the leaders of the business community. I think it is a tribute to them, and it certainly is a pleasure for us on this side of the government to have such cordial and forward-looking meetings as we sit down together in order to evolve a better economy in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — As you all well know, and I say this to all the members, Mr. Speaker, I am not a professional person in matters of education. I am a wheat farmer. And, therefore, in occupying the chair as Minister of Education I do it in all humility. I do not propose to have the answers to many of the complex and involved educational problems; I conduct my business on the basis of listening closely to professional and local governing groups that are part of the educational community. I will attempt to offer some leadership, and with the good workings of many men in the department, I am sure that education can continue to go forward in Saskatchewan in the next ten years as it has done in the last 15 to 18.

If we are successful, and I think we shall be in many respects, none of the credit shall go to the minister; part of it shall go to the government generally for providing leadership and providing funds; a good deal of it will go to the teachers, to the parents and to the trustees. I find that in working with these groups they are just as anxious as anybody else, and I am speaking of the three groups, of evolving a better educational system designed to meet the challenges of the world of tomorrow.

The great problem that is facing all education, as I see it and as I am advised, is to design a system which will turn out a graduate for a world that does not yet even exist. When a student comes into our educational system at the age of eight or nine, and will finally emerge in Grade 10 or in the trades or the vocations, there is no one here in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, can forecast what type of a world it will be or how exactly that pupil should be trained. The reason for this, of course, is to be found in the rate of technological development and scientific advancement. It is an astounding fact, Mr. Speaker, to read such statements as, 90 percent of all the scientists that have ever lived are living now. It is an astounding fact to see within one generation, my father's generation, to see the whole world as he knew it revolutionized from a walking plow and a horse and buggy to sputniks and astronauts.

It is an astounding thing, Mr. Speaker, to see the whole development in the biological sciences. We see and read a good deal about the physical sciences because they are spectacular, but the revolution that faces society in the biological sciences I believe will challenge us just as sharply and severely as has already been done through new research and development in the physical sciences. By and large, therefore, the policy of the department shall be to provide the best possible training in basic skills for all students, and these are the reading skills, the writing skills, the basic number skills, and, in addition, we must devise a more flexible approach

so that the teachers have more opportunities for individual instruction, so that the capacities of individual students have more opportunities and the ones who have great ability can progress farther and more quickly than those who have less academic ability.

We have a new job in the terms of general education of the whole society, because somehow or the other, we have built up the image of the university graduate and all people endeavor, it seems to me, to raise the image before their children and to hope that their children will fulfil their high school training and finally emerge as a university graduate.

This status symbol has to be changed a bit because we now know that more than 55 to 60 percent of our high school students never get to Grade 12, and the great revolution that is going to happen in Saskatchewan education is going to be in the secondary school system.

Part of this has already been discussed and I will have more to say about this tomorrow in the vocational and technical training field. I think all provinces are delighted that Canadians had enough sense to get around the constitutional questions of providing financial assistance in education by the agreements that have been established between federal and provincial governments in respect to providing grants for capital and operating in vocational and technical development.

What we are doing though is merely scratching the surface. Canada literally has to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in the secondary education system and at the university level. When I look at the forecast that is designed, projected by our university board of governors, I am amazed at the growth that we face in Saskatchewan. And when I look into the secondary school system and see the nature of the role that the schools will have to play, the manner in which teachers will have to be trained, the type of training we will have to give in the physical sciences and in the mathematics field, and this is in the academic sense, not in the vocational and technical sense, I realize that there is a revolution facing us in the whole field of education. And there are some profound dangers in this, Mr. Speaker; the danger is that society may fall into the same general direction that a totalitarian state might fall into, in which they display little regard to the total educational factor, where they, where we may end up concentrating more on training a skill with a view to employment of manpower and sacrificing the broader aspects of education by which the pupil and the student may rise to a more perfect development.

This is essentially a tremendously complex question and I propose to grapple with it carefully with the co-operation of such important voluntary organizations as Home and School, parents groups, trustees and teachers. Our problem is that the

rate of change is quicker than we seem to be able to go along with. The totalitarian areas of the world aren't apparently plagued with this type of a problem, they are spending a great deal more money on education. They are able to impose vigorous sets of exams so that they arbitrarily screen these people out. Western Europe, Japan, Scandinavian countries are not quite in that extreme, but you are all familiar with the 11-plus exams that are in existence now in England, and when a student takes this exam he, at that point, indicates whether he is going on to further academic training or becoming a tradesman.

We will attempt to evolve a system that will allow the screening of the high school population and the possibility of the student re-entering, that is to say, if he goes out from the academic side over to the vocational, technical, or over into the trades, we will not lock him in that position. We will attempt to allow him to stream back over, in case he should be a person who develops slowly or in case the guidance has been wrong. However, Mr. Speaker, there will be some problems in this and there will be, most likely, the loss of a year as the student moves back over.

I have one other minor point to make, Mr. Speaker, and that is in respect to the use of the latest teacher aids. We propose this year to make use of the forward-looking program that is offered to us in the budget, to move some distance in this, particularly in the field of television. And we are now in active discussion with the trustees and with the teachers in respect to the best method of increasing use of television in the schools. I want to be very careful and to make it perfectly clear that the department agrees that television is to be considered as a teacher's aid, and there is really no substitute for a good teacher.

The use of television in the schools, will, I expect, introduce some new effects. There are possibilities, of course, that are immediately apparent. The possibility of seeing a Shakespearian drama by professional acting group is not to be compared with the attempts of an individual teacher simply lecturing from the book, as many of us had when we went to school.

The program in the arts, literature, can be very much richer. The possibility of using top flight lecturers in some new fields offers some interesting ideas. Some of you may have heard of the new mathematics course that is being introduced this next fall at the Grade 9 level. I have seen one or two letters to the editor in some papers, Mr. Speaker, which have suggested that we haven't done too good a job in public relations in getting the idea across to parents, as to what this new mathematics course will do — because the letters have suggested that somehow this is a totally new

concept of mathematics, and subtraction, addition and multiplication will be no longer required. But, of course, this is not true. This is actually written by somebody who totally misunderstands or has distorted facts. All that is being done is to introduce at an earlier age mathematical concepts that are now being used, and the concepts of positive and negative values, the concepts of inequality, the concepts of ratio and proportion and the concepts of variability, all of which are the keystones in the basis of higher mathematics and can be introduced at an earlier age. If the student is going into the technologies, he will find use for them; if he is going into the professional line, he will have use for them.

And when it comes to training teachers to use a slightly different technique, we propose to hold a series of seminars for those teachers who are going to use television in the schools, and, in addition to that, we have the best mathematic people in Saskatchewan who have already taped a series of lectures on video tape so that when we introduce the program next year, we hope to offer it as a comprehensive package, so that the television sets plus the lectures, plus the teacher who has had some instruction, will be offered to the school boards. In the final analysis the direction to move into new areas in education must be left with parents and school boards. In a democratic country it can't be any other way. This will cause delays, but I do think that the mistakes that undoubtedly will be made, and there will be some, have the best chance of being minimized and ironed out by this type of a process.

In view of the few remarks I have made, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the revolution, as we see it, in the secondary schools, the possibilities that are offered to the Department of Education, you can see that I interpret the forward-looking budget that has been offered by the Provincial Treasurer, in such a way that we can offer a reorientation of education, and we hope to be able to offer, starting this year, some new concepts which we hope will prove attractive to teachers and to school boards.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Bill No. 2

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank for second reading of Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1961.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I have one or two words to say about this particular bill. It proposes certain amendments to the Income Tax Act.

M.L.A.s in the opposition certainly believe that there should be amendments made, but perhaps they are not the particular ones which my hon. friend the minister suggests. Income tax time is coming up in the next few weeks and everyone in Saskatchewan is starting to fill out these T1 forms.

Mr. Speaker, when most of our citizens take a look at these T1 forms this year, they are going to get a shock. Because when you get down to page 2 and start looking at provincial income tax, you find that once again this government has a "first". It now has the highest income tax rates in this dominion with the exception of, apparently, Manitoba. It mentions Quebec income tax separately. I got the statutes to see just how Quebec rates were. As far as I can figure it out, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are the highest.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in Manitoba the provincial rate is 22 percent as it is here, but in Manitoba that extra money goes for hospitalization; they haven't got a five percent sales tax as we have in this province.

My mind today goes back two or three years ago again when we were talking about medicare. At that time, all over this province, ministers were making speeches. I remember in my own constituency of Morse someone got up at a meeting and asked the Premier a very simple question. The farmer asked, "Suppose we have this medicare, granted it may be a good thing, how are we going to pay for it?" The Premier, according to the newspaper report in the Moose Jaw Times, said that the money would come from resources development.

I remember another statement made while this dispute was going on. This appeared in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth, "just as we have made education available to all, the time has come when we must make all the benefits of medical science available to all without money, without price". You can give dozens of these quotations. When we were talking about medicare a year or so ago, my hon. friends opposite were striving to pretend to the people of Saskatchewan that it would be free. Yet here now we have an income tax bill which shows part of the price that we must pay for these various items.

I want to quote from page 2 of the T1 form, which is put out by the income tax department. Everybody in Canada pays the same tax pretty well until they get down to provincial income tax. Then you get down to that particular levy and you find that Manitoba and Saskatchewan have 22 percent basic tax added, all the other provinces with the exception of Quebec, have only 16 percent.

Once again we are seeing the penalty the people of Saskatchewan are paying for socialism, as we fill out our income tax. The people of Saskatchewan are paying this government six percent more than taxpayers in other provinces. Now,

March 6, 1963

Mr. Speaker, every time we get up and talk about taxes, the Premier says, "Oh, we are not the highest". Here is another example which proves that usually we are the highest.

So it is in dozens of other fields. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, since this government took office, 600 completely new taxes and levies — 650 increases in taxes.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition when his oratory is so full and free flowing, but may I submit that he is probably out of order, as he is not discussing in any sense whatsoever the bill that is before the house.

Mr. Speaker: — I am trying to give the speaker latitude to tie it into the motion. I do agree that he has been straying considerably from the principle of the bill, and I do hope that he will state the principle of his . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Very respectfully, the Income Tax Act, Bill No. 2, is now before the house, and I suggest that when the bill has been opened, I am privileged to speak on any aspect of it. That is the rule, as you know, Sir, in Beauchesne, and the Premier knows so also.

Mr. Speaker: — I agree that you can speak on any aspect of this bill, but some of your statements were away from this bill, and I hope you will tie your remarks into the bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I was making, Mr. Speaker, as we discuss this bill again, is that here is another first for my hon. friends. In 1959, Mr. Speaker, out of all the income tax that was paid in Canada, 69 percent of those taxes were paid by those earning \$10,000 a year or less. In other words, income taxes in Canada are paid for the most part by the little man. Here is this government, who professes to be so sympathetic toward the little man, going out and gouging every taxpayer by six percent more than taxpayers elsewhere in the dominion of Canada are paying. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house maintain that this was not necessary, because in the budget the government brought in a \$5 million surplus. They brought in \$16.5 million more in revenue than it estimated a year ago.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think these statements are getting away from the bill when you refer to other revenues that way.

Mr. Thatcher: — The point I want to make is that we could have balanced the budget without this surtax that the government is now bringing forward. We didn't need it to pay for medical care.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order. There is no tax increase . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I can read.

Premier Lloyd: — There is no tax increase proposed in this particular bill, none whatsoever. The hon. member is deliberately — well, he is certainly squeezing a reasonable interpretation of the rules pretty far.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to sit down. All I am going to say is that every taxpayer in Saskatchewan, as they fill out this income tax form in the weeks ahead, will learn about one more penalty that he is paying for having a socialist administration like my hon. friends across.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 5

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker for second reading of Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend the Farm Security Act.

Mr. Thatcher: — I was holding up the debate on this particular bill for one of my colleagues. I now find that he doesn't want to speak on it so I'm prepared to see it go through.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend the Conservation and Development Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet moved second reading of Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend the Conservation and Development Act.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, in giving second reading to this bill to amend the Conservation and Development Act, I should inform the hon. members that one amendment has to do with providing authority under which the boundaries of a conservation and development area may be extended. At the present time the minister may establish a conservation development area, but there was no procedure under which the boundaries of such an area could be established.

The other amendment is to permit the acquisition of lands for right-of-ways, that is for ditches, by way of easement rather than expropriation and ownership of the right-of-way itself. We feel this is the preferable way of acquiring land control rather than actual ownership of the lands.

The other amendment is merely a clarification and the other amendment is to give rural municipal secretaries more time to prepare tax rolls and the subsequent change to permit the secretary of the area authority to submit his tax roll after the assessment commission has cleared them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by an oversight it was neglected, but this is a money bill and I must beg leave to inform the assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it to the consideration of the assembly.

I would move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend the Provincial Lands Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet moved second reading of Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend the Provincial Lands Act.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The explanation on second reading here, Mr. Speaker, is, it would permit or authorize the lands branch in the administration of crown lands to make provision for a levy against crown lands, where drainage works or other works are established, and also authority to assess some of the benefits to any lessee who may have possession of the lands.

The other amendment is for clarification, but it does stress, it provides that a receipt received, or a notification that a person has an allocation, is not conclusive authority to such a person to enter into and take possession of land, particularly where the land is subject to a lease agreement, but where a lease agreement is not called for, then a receipt will be evidence of authority to that person to enter into the land and take possession of it for the purposes intended.

The other amendment is to extend, actually it was to extend and include the Co-operative Trust Company as an agency that the land branch could assign title to, where a lessee who intends to purchase crown lands obtains a loan, either from the federal credit corporation or another government agency, we could assign title to that agency, and be cleared of an agreement of sale ourselves.

Again, here, Mr. Speaker, by an oversight, the house wasn't informed and I do now beg to inform the assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it to the consideration of the assembly, and I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Turnbull moved second reading of Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act.

There are five main purposes to be achieved by the amendments, one is to change the method determining an allowance from an annuity and service plan which now exists, to a percentage salary plan, in order to provide for more adequate pensions for teachers, and, we think, to allow a little closer co-ordination with the public service pension plan which will be useful in terms of portability. The question of portability is one that always has been inadequately dealt with. We hope by this basic change that the way will be cleared to make the other types of adjustment, which up to this point in time have stood in the way of teachers who wish to go from one province to another and who might be in danger of losing their pension.

We hope to further amend the question of the amount of money that the teacher has to forfeit, in such a way so that all the capital that he will have contributed will be returned to him, instead of the way in which it is now done, which is retaining four percent of the salary for the first two years, and we would have a sliding scale of forfeiture in respect to the interest accrued. This is a new principle and we would suggest a sliding scale that reduces the amount of forfeiture in terms of interest accrued, as the length of service lengthens.

The fourth point is that we would change the dependency clause, which now stands as requiring the teacher to pay a premium and after the teacher has served for ten years. We would eliminate the question of the premium, and make it automatic after the ten years of service have been achieved.

We also propose to amend the act in such a way so that reciprocal agreements can be made with other provinces.

I would beg to inform the house that I have a house amendment which changes the word "ten" to "eight" on section 28A, as it appears on page 2, and the sentence in which it appears is "Where section 28 does not apply the allowance to which a teacher is entitled shall be calculated upon the average yearly of the teacher during the eight years of highest salary". As it appears in the printed form of the bill it was "ten", and the other amendment would be on item 11, section 38, item B1 on page 4.

As you look under section 38, item B1, you see that it reads "At the time of his death one has ten or more years service to his credit, or" — and we will change the word "or" and substitute the word "and".

I now move second reading of the bill.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — I have a comment or two I would like to make on this bill, having entered the teaching profession myself in the thirties, having experienced something of the struggle of those days, when the teachers were attempting to lay the foundation for a teachers' federation and the foundation for pension rights for the teacher upon his retirement, and having seen the progress towards this over the years, where each government in turn has made some step forward in this direction.

I am happy to see that this bill now has brought the pension in line with many other pension plans. This is something that I know that every teacher has been petitioning the government to do, probably for the past five years at least, and I am happy to note that at last we got around to doing it. This is not, Mr. Speaker, I would point out, any special privilege granted to the teachers as such because they are a professional body, but it is bringing the teachers or giving them the same consideration in pension rights as now enjoyed by the civil servants in the province, and similar to the pension rights now enjoyed by the members of the legislature. In that reason it is a move in the right direction.

I think, too, it will have a further incentive that it will induce men and women of high calibre to enter the teaching profession. It will retain their services longer in the teaching profession, and, likewise, too, I think the idea is that portable pensions, which gives our teachers of Saskatchewan the right to retain their pension rights if they should move, for instance, to British Columbia, or any other province, with which we have reciprocal agreements. It is a move that we welcome also.

I think, too, that this right to portable pensions will make us take a look at our educational system and to see that teachers' conditions and teachers' salaries are in line with salaries offered to them in other provinces, because if we don't we may have an exodus of teachers from the province.

I point this out in connection with this bill so that the minister and those in charge of education would be aware of this situation in the event that we don't attempt to retain our teachers by having teachers' schedules equal to those of other provinces. If we do, we may have an influx of teachers into the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is

proper legislation, it is in line with other pension rights, it is not a bonus or a gift to the teaching profession, it is removing the inequalities and injustices in the act and putting it in line with other pension acts. For this reason I am certain that we are prepared to support this bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) has spoken for this group and in principle we support the bill. I have one question I should like to ask the minister. If he can't answer it now, perhaps he would be good enough to do so in committee. If the legislature should pass Bill 22, could he tell the house what, specifically, the legislation would cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan during the coming year. I would like to know whether his figure is a guess or whether it has been figured out on an actuarial basis, or a sound basis.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister closes the debate, I, too, as a teacher-member of the legislature, would like to speak in support of this legislation. I made a study of the way it would affect some of the superannuates in the area that I represent and also the effect the legislation would have with regard to numbers of year's salary to be taken into consideration. The bill, as it is now worded, states that a base of two percent of the average salary over a ten year period will be used. In the brief which the teachers' federation presented to the government, they asked for a seven-year period. I notice that comparing a seven-year and a ten-year period would indicate considerable difference. The ten-year average in the first salary bracket over a ten-year period, \$3,510, the average salary of an eight-year period would be \$3,662 — I am taking one particular unit here — and it's comparable in the three units in the area that I represent. In other words, if it were possible to reduce the ten-year average to eight years or seven years, it would make considerable difference. The seven-year average would raise this to \$3,750, and if, of course, it were a six-year average, comparable to the public service pension plan, again it would create another raise. In other words, beginning then with the ten-year average, \$3,510; eight-year average, \$3,662; seven-year average, \$3,750; six-year average, \$3,866. This, of course, indicates that the salaries have been revised upwards, particularly from 1957 on, and, therefore, it would be definitely in the interests of some of our superannuates if the hon. minister and the government could give some consideration to bringing down this ten-year average to six or seven.

Now, on February 1, 1961, there were, according to the information I have, about 65 teachers who were receiving a pension of about \$775 yearly. Now, for that reason, of course, I am particularly interested as a teacher in the clause with regard to the minimum pension of \$1,020, which I feel will be

an improvement over the present situation. Also, 24 teachers were receiving about \$1,200, 86 teachers about \$1,043, and 594 teachers, as of February 1, 1961, about \$1,684. I trust the minimum pension will be raised to \$1,500 in the near future. Thus, for many of our senior group of superannuates, if this act is implemented, it will increase their pension by a considerable amount.

One other important feature of the bill will allow teachers to count years in excess of 35, at least up to age 65. And this will be again an advantage of many of our teachers.

For these reasons, then, Mr. Speaker, because the bill will be of considerable assistance, particularly to those teachers who pioneered our profession and who are in their senior years today, I am happy to support the bill on second reading.

Mr. Thatcher: — Just before the minister answers my question — I asked him for the specific cost for this year. I was wondering if he might project ahead for say five years, each year annually.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe some of these details should not be argued on second reading but will be better in committee, but is the house ready for the question?

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — I can give the hon. member for Morse . . .

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to inform the members that the mover is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak they must do so now.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Our calculation is that this will be of little extra cost in the next immediate few years. I am unable to determine what it will be exactly once you move past the immediate year because we don't know the number of teachers that are going to be dropping out. Once you get past one or two years you are in the area of probability; and you have to look back on what has occurred in the past. This puts us in a position of a straight lineal projection which may or may not be in accordance with the facts.

We don't anticipate any extra cost this year at all, nor in the next one or two years. It is conceivable, of course, depending on the rate at which salaries increase and the rate at which teachers superannuate, that there may be no extra cost over the existing plan. I don't think we have any accurate studies; we are attempting to speed up and better the process by putting calculations onto program in the computer so that we

can extract data a good deal more quickly than we can with the methods that are now being used. In respect to the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley), I am not sure whether he was in the house or not, Mr. Speaker, when I told the house I would be introducing a house amendment reducing the number of years from ten to eight.

Mr. Speaker: — I would just like to draw to the minister's attention that house amendments should come in committee, not be given on second reading.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Thank you. This question has been decided upon by the mutual agreement of the S.T.F. and the department. In respect to a minimum level, our position is that we are not going to raise it up to the \$1,500 but we will leave these levels as they exist now. We will consider this as the question arises and guarantee to attempt to give an undertaking to individual teachers that they would not receive less under the new plan than they would have under the existing one. We don't expect there will be many teachers in this capacity, although when we work it through, there may be some particular teacher who has a long period of service and who has been unfortunate enough to serve under very low salaries where this condition might arise. I do think that if such a condition did arise, that it would be quite proper for us to consider that on an individual basis. This does not mean that these matters will not be considered the following year, and I would like all hon. members to know that the amendment to the Teachers' Superannuation Act, as it appears in Bill 22, and the other matters that I have now mentioned to the house have been discussed thoroughly with the S.T.F. and we have met unanimous decision in agreement on it. Basically, we have agreed that we will take the basic change first and then we will move through the individual problems in succeeding years.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m.