

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Thirteenth Legislature
32nd Day

Tuesday, March 31, 1959

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

On the Orders of the Day:

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL TAX CONFERENCE

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 24, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson:

“That this Assembly request the Government of Saskatchewan to again urge the Government of Canada to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference at which special attention will be given to establishing a policy whereby the Provinces receive a larger share and a more equitable distribution of funds from the Government of Canada within the framework of the Tax-Rental Agreements.”

and this proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McCarthy:

“That the following words be added to the motion:

‘and we urge the Government of Saskatchewan to give consideration to allotting a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax-Rental Agreements to the payment of unconditional grants to the municipalities’”.

and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

- (1) That the word ‘urge’ in the first line be deleted, and the word ‘commend’ substituted therefore;
- (2) That the words ‘to give consideration to allotting’ be deleted, and the following words substituted therefore: ‘for giving’.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the members of the House in allowing this motion to stand, last Thursday, when it was impossible for me to attend the sitting.

However, I would like to point out that I believe the Government now finds itself in a very embarrassing position because of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment which have been moved with respect to the original motion. I am sure that all members in the House – as a matter of fact, all Saskatchewan citizens – would like to give their support to the resolution as it was first moved by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson). I am one of those who believe that the original amendment and the amendment to the amendment should have been ruled out of order. I have said so many times on previous similar occasions. It has always been my contention that ‘double-barreled’ amendments ought not to be allowed, because they place a member in the position that he would probably like to support part of the resolution, but cannot support it in its entirety. Therefore, I think it is unfortunate that that either the amendment or the amendment to the amendment have been allowed to be placed on the Order Paper.

I would like to refer to some of the remarks made by the Provincial Treasurer when he was speaking in this debate, when he said there was a good deal of confusion in the minds of Saskatchewan people as to the amount of money that Saskatchewan received, each year, under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreement. Probably one reason that estimates with respect to Saskatchewan’s share under these agreements are often out is because the population of Saskatchewan has either been decreasing at a much higher rate than the population of other parts of Canada, or it has been increasing at a much slower rate than in other parts of Canada; and, of course, one cannot quarrel with the Minister of Finance for Canada if he has been unable, in the past, to estimate the stagnation that has been taking place in Saskatchewan.

This forecast has also been aggravated by the fact that other provinces of Canada have been growing population-wise at a much faster rate than was anticipated by the Minister of Finance and most other people.

However, I find that our people are not only confused as to the amount of money we receive under the Taxation Agreement, but they are also confused about the amount of money claimed by the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier as having been spent by the Province on municipal aids or transfers of responsibility from the municipalities to the Province, over the last year or two. Very conflicting reports have come from the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. In 1956, the Provincial Treasurer addressed a C.C.F. group in the city of Saskatoon and he claimed that some \$30,800,000 was being spent by the Province on these aids or transfers. Then at the Provincial Local Government Conference he used the figure of \$37,471,000; then in the Budget Speech of 1957, the Provincial Treasurer used the figure of \$38,000,000.

Then when the Premier of the Province was speaking to the S.A.R.M. Convention in the City of Saskatoon just a few weeks ago, he used the figure of \$36,000,000. Well then, lo and behold! When the Provincial Treasurer brought in his Budget in 1958, he was almost as exuberant as he was a few days ago when he moved the amendment to the amendment of this particular resolution, and he had a real nightmare! He came out with a figure – not of

\$30,800,000, not \$36,000,000, not \$30,000,000, not \$37,000,000, not \$38,000,000, but a figure of \$59,000,000; and I refer to the Budget Speech, which I have here. He said it, not me.

I have here a copy of the Budget Speech for 1958 and this is what the Provincial Treasurer said:

“A statement of provincial aid to local governments would hardly be complete without some mention of services now provided at the provincial level which were, until recently, local responsibilities in Saskatchewan, and which are, in some provinces, still supported as local responsibilities. I am referring to services such as our Hospitalization Plan. If this service can be considered as an indirect aid to local governments – and quite frankly I believe it can – then a further budgetary expenditure of \$16.6 million can well be added to the \$42 million of direct provincial assistance to local governments in 1958-59, and this would make a total of \$59 million.”

Is it any wonder, that we have confusion, first, insofar as the amount of money that Saskatchewan received under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreement, because of the tremendous growth that has taken place in some parts of Canada, and the stagnation that has taken place in some parts of Canada, and the stagnation that has taken place in Saskatchewan. That has been the reason for the fact that there has been a variation in the estimated amounts that we would receive under the Taxation Agreement.

Then, as far as aid to municipalities is concerned – well, of course, they are not unconditional grants. The Government that sits opposite has never, on any occasion, made unconditional grants to the municipalities of this province. Perhaps some people would consider that the \$500 that was made available to rural municipalities for that period from 1947 to 1952 is an unconditional grant, but the Provincial Government was only giving back to the municipalities their own money, and at no time has this Government paid unconditional grants to the municipalities. And yet the Provincial Treasurer moved an amendment to an amendment, and wants this House to stand up and support something that is a deliberate lie, which any member who has any conscience could not humanly possibly support.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, in order that we might keep the records straight, will the hon. gentleman please, at your request, obey the rules of the House! It is not the right of anyone to refer to any statement as a “deliberate.”

Mr. McDonald: I will withdraw the ‘deliberate lie’ Mr. Speaker, but I will say that it is a lie, and so it is.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, may I say . . .

March 31, 1959

Mr. McDonald: This Government has never paid unconditional grants . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. McDonald: Well, then I will withdraw that, and I will say that it is an untruth.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that that, too, is out of order according to the rules.

Mr. McDonald: Then I will withdraw that and I will say it is a figment of the imagination. Mr. Speaker, the programs that are claimed by the Provincial Treasurer and his seatmate to be municipal responsibilities and things that through time the Province has paid its share of the total cost, cannot, under any stretch of the imagination, be considered to be unconditional grants.

The present administration is endeavoring to include many programs that have long been considered the responsibility of the Provincial Government. I could refer to no better example than the ferries that we have in operation throughout the province. I cannot ever remember (and I am 40 years of age, unfortunately) of a ferry being a municipal responsibility. Perhaps they were back before my time; but, as I say, it has long been the practice of the Province of Saskatchewan to pay this particular cost.

One could go into a long list of items that the Provincial Treasurer and his colleagues are calling provincial responsibilities, and they claim that they have lifted these responsibilities from the shoulders of the municipalities, and they have added up an expenditure of some \$59 million a year. But that is only half the story. Then the Provincial Treasurer goes on and tries to convey to this House and to the people of the province, that he, as Provincial Treasurer, is only receiving a paltry sum of some \$30 million from the Federal Government of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to add up all of the items that the Provincial Treasurer claims are municipal responsibilities and give him credit for lifting these responsibilities from the shoulders of the municipalities then I think we should add up all of the payments that are made into the province of Saskatchewan by the Government of Canada to pay for what, under our constitution, are provincial responsibilities. This wouldn't be \$30 million, Mr. Speaker; it would be many hundreds of millions.

Premier Douglas: Would you enumerate those hundreds of millions.

Mr. McDonald: Yes, I will. Just sit still. We will enumerate the hundreds of millions coming into this province paid by the Government of Canada . . .

Premier Douglas: For provincial responsibilities?

Mr. McDonald: . . . for what, under the constitution of Canada, makes them provincial responsibilities.

Premier Douglas: Let's have them!

Mr. McDonald: You'll get them and you won't like them when you do. I want, before I go into that end of my remarks to refer to something the Provincial Treasurer said during this debate.

He attempted to point out to the House and to the people of this province that we had said that it was 'rubbish', the contribution that the Province was making to the municipalities. Well in the first place, Mr. Speaker, it was not the contribution that I was referring to when I used the word 'rubbish', because any handout from the Provincial Government to the municipalities, no matter how meager it may be, I am sure is most welcome, I was talking about the speech that the Provincial Treasurer was making, and it was rubbish from beginning to when he attempted to convey to this House – and I will read part of his speech.

He said:

“The total increase under the Dominion-Provincial grant was only \$4 million; it went up to \$34 million; and we gave that much of an increase this year; last year, \$3 million; and in the last four years we have more than doubled the grants for education.”

Then he went on to say that out of every dollar or every additional dollar that was received from the Government at Ottawa – just a minute until I get this straight; I don't want to misquote him. He said that \$4.00 went to the municipality from the Provincial Government for every additional dollar that was received from the Government of Canada.

That is utter nonsense, pure unadulterated nonsense! Now, let us look at the list of contributions made to this province and other provinces of Canada by the Government of Canada for what are the responsibilities of provincial governments throughout Canada, and if I were to read the Act, Mr. Speaker, I would be here until midnight. But if I were to do that I would be putting myself in as ridiculous a position as the Provincial Treasurer now finds himself in; and I don't care to do that. So I will only refer to a few.

We can take the year 1957-58 to express this point. During that year the Provincial Government received, under the Taxation Agreement and the subsidy, a sum of \$36,503,000. Now I don't believe that that was the amount that we should have received for one particular year under that arrangement; but that was the amount we received, part for this particular year and part for the year previous, but the amount that was received, in Public Accounts, page 583, for the year 1958, was \$56,503,421.

March 31, 1959

Hon. Mr. Fines: You mean \$36 million.

Mr. McDonald: I am sorry – \$36,503,421. But that is only the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: May I ask my hon. friend; is that what my hon. friend says come to use for provincial responsibilities?

Mr. McDonald: No, this is your unconditional grant, and it is part of this amount that you ought to be using to give to the municipalities unconditional grants, which you refuse to do. But you get an unconditional grant. You have given up certain tax fields and in lieu of those tax revenues you get this grant, and there are no strings attached to it; you can use it for whatever purpose you like.

But we have to add to that, Mr. Speaker, health grants. Is Public Health, under Canada's constitution, a Federal responsibility? Is it? No, it isn't. They received \$2½ million in health grants. What about Old Age Assistance? Are pensions the responsibility of the Government of Canada? Are they?

Hon. Mr. Fines: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: They are now, but only because the Government of Canada was prepared to enter into an agreement with the provinces which would make it possible for them to pay it. But under Canada's constitution they did not have the authority or the right to pay pensions. Under that plan Old Age Assistance – approximately \$1½ million.

What about blind persons' allowances? The blind people, under Canada's constitution, are the responsibility of the Provincial Government. There is an expenditure there of \$176,000.

What about disabled persons' allowances? Again, in agreement between the Government of Canada and the Province of Saskatchewan and the other provinces, and I have no complaint with those agreements, I am glad to see that the Government of Canada has adopted this attitude. I only wish that the Provincial Government would adopt a similar attitude with respect to our municipalities, and not only lift some of the burdens from the backs of the municipalities in the manner that they are doing at the moment, in a similar manner that Ottawa has adopted in respect to the list that I am now reading, but, in addition to that, pay to the municipalities an unconditional grant the same as Ottawa is prepared to pay to the Provinces. In any case, disabled persons' allowance – about \$317,000.

What about Social Aid? Is social aid the responsibility of the Government of Canada? I ask you, is it? You have a payment here for Social Aid of \$558,000.

What about Vocational Education? When did education become a responsibility of Canada? The Premier, himself, said it was the responsibility of the Province, and that he would accept that responsibility. Well, he has been here now for too long – whatever it is – 14 years; and he has

gone about 10 per cent of the distance he promised to go 14 years ago. Now the Federal Government is under the plan, and they contributed, last year, for Vocational Education, \$174,000.

What about Apprenticeship Trades? Another \$121,000 has come towards that. It is a provincial responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

What about the Trans-Canada Highway? Now I suppose that the Government of Canada has some responsibility for highways – under the B.N.A. Act, I suppose! Here in the year 1957-58, the Government of Canada contributed \$1,748,000 to Saskatchewan on the Trans-Canada Highway. In addition to that – we have a total there, of just those few, of \$43½ million, and we haven't come to the big ones yet.

What about Old Age Security Pensions? Here, a provincial responsibility – and you can laugh until you fall out of your seats, but it was only by an agreement of the Government of Canada with you and other Premiers that it was made possible for the Government of Canada to pay this. In 1957-58, you received \$22 million.

What about Family Allowances? I suppose it is a Federal responsibility to look after the children, too! Well, Saskatchewan got \$21 million there. If you want to add that on, you will have a total of \$86½ million.

But let us move to some of the larger expenditures. What about P.F.A.A.? What is P.F.A.A., Mr. Speaker? My friends opposite can sit over there and snicker all they like; it just shows how ignorant they really are. If they would go back and examine the expenditures of governments of this province prior to the inception of P.F.A.A. they would find that 50 per cent of the budget of this province was used for direct relief, P.F.A.A. has meant, in many instances that the Province of Saskatchewan and other provinces have not had to pay those huge sums in direct relief. The Federal Government came to the rescue of the provinces and in the year 1957-58 under P.F.A.A., there was some \$9,920,000 came into the province of Saskatchewan, but we must take, of course, from that the one per cent levy that the farmers of this province contributed to P.F.A.A., which amounted to about \$6,100,000. But you had a Federal contribution of approximately \$3,800,000, – something which, if it had not been for the Government of Canada accepting this responsibility, we in this Legislature would have been faced with and would have had to deal with.

We can go to P.F.R.A. – reclamation, conservation – a provincial responsibility, Mr. Speaker. It always has been, but it is something which the Government of Canada has lifted from the shoulders of this Province. And what contribution did they pay in 1957-58? They were not in a position to pay for this, and the Government at Ottawa realized that and faced up to their responsibilities – something that you are not prepared to do. Last year, what was the contribution under P.F.A.A.? About \$5½ million to the province of Saskatchewan.

No one can honestly say that, if the Government of Canada was not making this expenditure in Saskatchewan, we as a province, would not be faced with greater responsibilities. No one can honestly say that.

March 31, 1959

Now let us go to some of the larger fields. What about Unemployment Insurance? It took an amendment to Canada's constitution to give Canada the power and the right to pay unemployment insurance. This is a provincial responsibility, just as much as ferries are a municipal responsibility. Not only that, but now we have this generous Government that sits opposite taking part of the highway system and making it a municipality responsibility!

Let's turn to housing. Property and civil rights are certainly the responsibility of the Province. But who has loaned the hundreds of millions of dollars for housing development? Has it been our friends opposite? Not very likely! It has been the Government of Canada.

What about hospitalization? Next year we will receive, in Saskatchewan, \$13½ million under the Hospitalization Plan. So, if you wanted to add up all of the expenditures that could be considered to be provincial responsibilities and are being shared by the Government of Canada and the Province, just as much as is the 'lift' that is presented by the Provincial Treasurer of the municipal responsibilities which have been lifted by the Provincial Government.

If I were to go on and enumerate all of the different things I would be here all day, and I have a figure here now of approximately \$100 million; but as I say, it is hundreds of millions of dollars, if we were to take into consideration all of those projects that, in actual fact, are or were the responsibility of the provinces and have now been taken over by the Government of Canada. I sincerely hope that the Government of Canada will see fit to take over some of the other burdens and problems that we find ourselves in Saskatchewan and other provinces, faced with at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Why not add the Wheat Board payments to the farmers for their wheat?

Mr. McDonald: You don't like it; I know that. You don't like it a bit; and I am not one of those who is going to be so ridiculous as you have been, and put myself in the position of saying: "Well, all of these are unconditional grants." That would be fantastic! That would be copying the Provincial Treasurer – and God forbid! I never want to put myself in that position.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: Now I want to turn to some more of the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer when he ended the debate, the other day. I want to quote:

"I see no reason why our hon. friends opposite cannot change their ways, repent and support when they have been shown, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has been so generous; when they see facts and figures which are indisputable."

‘Indisputable’ is the most ridiculous arrangement of figures that have ever been presented in this Legislature, or any place else, where I have ever had the misfortune of having to listen.

Hon. Mr. Fines: You couldn’t understand them, anyway.

Mr. McDonald: He said: “We are giving \$4.00 to the local governments for every \$1.00 which we received from Ottawa.” That statement is not so! I have just demonstrated to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is far from true. The facts are there. They cannot be denied. The municipalities of this province and the councillors and the reeves have been denying this statement daily, and anyone who wants to be fair and to look at both sides of the picture would have to deny them, because they certainly do not represent the case as it exists. He said:

“I would like to suggest that we now get together.”

Again, I don’t want to have anything to do with the Provincial Treasurer, let alone getting together with him. Did we get together and pass the first part? I had no objection to passing the first part, none whatever; and I don’t think there is a citizen in Saskatchewan, I don’t care what political party he supports, who would not want to support the first part of this resolution.

Then he went on to say:

“ . . . calling upon Ottawa to give a greater share to Saskatchewan.”

That is fine; we will all support that. But then he went on to say:

“ . . . and also commending the Provincial Government for being as generous as they have been, as generous as has been possible with the limited amount of funds at their disposal.”

As generous as possible! With \$36 million, according to him, or something in the neighbourhood of \$30 million, when in actual fact they are getting hundreds of millions! Apparently they haven’t even taken time out to figure out what they do get from the Government of Canada.

It was most embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, to take this stand when we, on this side of the House, happened to come from the same political party as the Government of Canada used to be; but the shoe is on another foot now. I don’t think the Tories would want me to endeavour to straighten these people out on the fact, and I have no desire to stand up for the actions of the Tory Government at Ottawa – none whatever. I don’t care who the Government at Ottawa is, what political party they represent. These are facts and figures and they cannot be disputed. I hope that, no matter who the Government at Canada is, they will continue to recognize the burdensome responsibilities that they are now doing, and that they will take steps, year by year, to improve this situation and to have a more equal division of the tax money of Canada, not only between the Government of Canada and the provinces, but

between the provinces and the municipalities. We have three levels of government in Canada, not two; and this division must go all the way down the line, from our national government to our municipal government.

That is what this Government has refused to do, and by moving the amendment to the amendment, they have again said that they are not prepared to meet the request (which I believe is a reasonable request) of municipal governments in this province that they get unconditional grants.

We on this side of the House are certainly not in a position to support (as I mentioned earlier) an amendment which is not in accordance with the facts. Therefore, we will be forced to vote against that amendment, and I feel that it is most unfortunate that this House has been placed in a position where they cannot give unanimous support to the resolution originally moved, or even with the originally moved, or even with the original amendment to that motion.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, may I first make a reference to something which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) said, the other day, when he began his remarks. He made some comment about not having his files handy, and this was because of the niggardliness of the Government in providing adequate accommodation and services to the Leader of the Opposition. I think that was a most unkind and most uncalled for comment and I just want to mention it in passing.

When the hon. gentleman assumed the high responsibility which he has now, I offered to do anything the Government could by way of secretarial staff or any other services which the hon. gentleman required, but never, to the best of my knowledge, has he intimated to me or to the Minister of Public Works that he wanted more space or more staff, and certainly if he had . . .

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Let's get the record straight. When I became Leader of the Liberal Party and Leader of the Official Opposition in this House, I went to the Premier and asked for better accommodation for staff. The answer that I was given was that a secretary would be made available to me not only when the House was in session but throughout the year, and that the facilities of the Industrial Development Office, the Government Finance Office, the Economic Advisory Planning Board, and a bunch of other departments, would be made available to me. That is not what I asked for, Mr. Speaker. I asked for a secretary, a staff, to be made available to the Opposition, and accommodation to be provided for that staff and myself.

Premier Douglas: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that if my hon. friend is talking about a research staff that is more than any of the Ministers have. We use the same research staff that is available to him.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege. I outlined what I thought that the Opposition should be provided with at that time, and what I asked for was a secretary, an accountant, a lawyer and one or two others. The only Opposition in the Dominion of Canada that is being provided with it is a C.C.F. Opposition.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): What about our secretary down in the Library?

Premier Douglas: What about it?

Mr. McCarthy: What about the years we have had our stenographer down in the Library, when you didn't have a place for our stenographer.

Premier Douglas: Well, as a matter of fact, I am not going to make any odious comparisons, but I think that the members of the Opposition have a great deal more service now than we had when we were in Opposition.

Mr. McCarthy: That's beside the point.

Premier Douglas: I am willing to discuss this matter with my friends at any time, but I think for my hon. friend to try to make, as an excuse for his performance in the House either today or any other day, the lack of adequate facilities, seems to me a pretty weak alibi.

Mr. McDonald: We don't need any excuses. You answer.

Premier Douglas: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has raised two main points. He has raised, first of all, his objections to the statements made by Provincial Treasurer regarding the assistance which has been given by this Government to local governing bodies. He does a great deal of yelling about "rubbish" and calling "ridiculous" at statements that are made, but the fact is that he has not, in any way proved that the statement is incorrect.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again . . .

Premier Douglas: If my hon. friend will just sit down . . .

Mr. McDonald: On a point of privilege . . .

Premier Douglas: There is a no point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: There is a point of privilege. I have been misquoted by the Premier and I want to keep the records straight. I never complained about the Provincial Treasurer giving the figures. I said they are not 'unconditional grants'.

Premier Douglas: You said his statement was absolutely ridiculous – the most ridiculous statement you had ever heard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is, of course that the local governing bodies of this province are getting more financial assistance today from this Government than they have ever received in their history . . .

Mr. McDonald: I would hope so.

Premier Douglas: . . . not only in absolute terms, but in terms of the total amount of revenue that is available to the Provincial Government. If my friend takes the grants which are made by this Government

to local governing bodies for each of the years back to 1945-46, and you take them in the Estimates for the coming year, you will find: market roads, bridge grants, \$4.7 million; municipal bridges, \$621,000; municipal social aid, for which we have taken 100 per cent responsibility, amounting to \$1.6 million; grants to homes for the aged, \$615,000; grants to veterinary districts, our urban assistance program, direct grants to municipalities, our grants to public and community libraries, our highway urban assistance of \$500,000; our municipal medical care grants of \$97,000; our grants, through loans, to hospitals and health centres of \$690,000; T.B. control, \$375,000; agricultural grants to local governments, \$328,000; pure-bred sire areas, \$12,000; land clearance and pasture development, \$600,000; market road grants, \$160,000; secondary highways . . .

Mr. McCarthy: You had better not read that one. You took that out.

Premier Douglas: Recreation grants, grants to L.I.D.'s, education grants, health regional grants and regional libraries, making a total, in this year's budget, of \$35,904,000. Now if you take the same items in the various years this is what you will find. In the year 1956-57, our contribution to local governments for these various things – agricultural grants, health grants, health region grants, libraries, education, municipal roads, bridges – was \$20,600,000. In 1957-58 it was \$27,100,000. In 1958-59, the year we are just finishing, \$30,200,000; and as I have just read out, for this coming fiscal year, \$35,904,000.

I want to draw the attention of the House to two facts. The first is that this represents 27 per cent of the Government's total budget. Of the total current budget we are bringing down, 27 per cent is going out in payments to the local governments. I want to draw attention to something even more important, and that is that, from 1956-57 to the coming fiscal year, this represents an increase of over \$15 million.

Under the present Taxation Agreement and in the first two years of the agreement, 1957-58 and 1958-59, there was represented an increase in payments to us over a two-year period of \$14 million. In 1956-57 it was \$6.8 million; in 1958-59 it was \$7.2 million. There is \$14 million additional revenue which we have received in the first two years of this Dominion-Provincial Agreement, and in that same two-year period we have paid out in additional grants to local governing bodies, \$16,100,000. In other words, in the first two years of the Agreement, we have paid out to local governing bodies \$2,100,000 more than we got in increased payments under the Tax Rental Agreement.

What is even more significant is that, in the coming fiscal year which starts tomorrow, it is anticipated that under the Tax Sharing Agreement we will get \$1½ million more, but under the Estimates which are before the House we will pay out to local governing bodies \$5½ million more. In other words, in this coming year we will pay out to local governing bodies \$4 million more than the additional revenue which we will get from the Government of Canada. I say that never in the history of this province has as much money been paid out to local governments, or has as large a percentage of the total current budget been paid out to local governments, as is being done at the present time.

We can go back and check the grants which have been paid out in education, which have gone up by leaps and bounds from some \$3 million when

we took office to \$24 million in this coming year, representing an increase from 21 per cent of the total educational bill to an estimated 45 per cent. We can see the increased grants to schools in towns and cities which, since 1955-56, have jumped from \$1.8 million until this coming year they will be \$5.8 million, an increase of \$4 million in the cities and non-School Unit communities. Our percentage in urban centres for education will go up from 16.9 per cent in 1955-56 to 24.3 per cent in this coming year. Assistance to urban municipalities for roads and streets and bridges, which were practically non-existent a few years ago, will be, in this coming year, some \$1,393,000.

The Leader of the Opposition talked a great deal about fantastic statements and has today, himself, indulged in a type of arithmetic somersaults which would stagger one, especially anyone who was familiar with what are Federal and Provincial responsibilities.

May I just take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to point out what is the constitutional setup as regards the responsibilities and areas of taxation in Canada. The member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), for instance, the other day pointed out that the provinces were in exactly the same position to the Government of Canada as the municipalities are to the Provincial Government. (He nods his approval so I assume that I am quoting him correctly.) Of course, this is an entirely erroneous analysis.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's what you think.

Premier Douglas: It is not what I think. My hon. friend is close to a very able and competent lawyer and she will straighten him out.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): I am glad you changed your opinion since last year.

Premier Douglas: She is reasonably competent, except in giving opinions on the breathalyzer test.

Mrs. Batten: I had enough judges agree with me to make my opinion fairly valuable.

Premier Douglas: The fact is, of course, that the municipalities are creatures of the Provincial Legislature. They are created by the Provincial Legislature. Their areas are devised and set by the Provincial Legislature. But this, of course, is not true of the Provinces. The Provinces are not the creatures of the Federal Parliament. As a matter of fact, several of the Provinces existed before there was a Federal Parliament and the Provinces came together to make the Parliament of Canada and that was, of course, set up under our constitution, known as The British North America Act. In that Act the governments were each recognized as having fields of jurisdiction and also sources of revenue and certain rights of taxation. Those were set and they cannot be altered except by amending The British North America Act. The Parliament of Canada, tomorrow, could not decide to abolish a provincial boundary or to curtail a Province's right to collect taxes in fields which are already set out in The British North America Act. Section 91 of The British North America Act sets out the Federal powers, and section 92 very clearly sets out the provincial responsibilities and the provincial powers.

Now, because of that, the Provinces have certain inalienable rights, and they also have certain indisputable responsibilities. The rights which the Provinces have, as members know, in the matter of taxation is the right to collect direct taxes. The Federal Government has the right to collect direct taxes and indirect taxes.

What has been a bone of contention for a good many years is the fact that the Federal Government has more and more been invading the field of direct taxation. For a long time the Federal Government contented itself with mainly raising its money in the field of indirect taxation; and for many, many years they got their money from customs duty and excise taxes and indirect sales tax and so on. As hon. members know it was not until 1917 that the Government of Canada invaded the income and the corporation tax fields. Up until that time the Provinces had enjoyed this field wholly to themselves and a few municipalities, in some of the larger metropolitan cities, had also collected an income tax.

In 1917, Mr. Fielding, who was the Minister of Finance at that time, introduced The War Time Income and Tax Corporation Tax Act. I remember, as a matter of fact, going to the House of Commons when an amendment came up to this Act, and I remember asking one of the members of the House why it was called a "Wartime Income Tax Act", and a Wartime Corporation Tax Act, because this was 1936 and we were not at war. He said: "This is an Act that was passed in 1917 with the idea that it would be rescinded at the end of the war, but the Federal Government has stayed on in this field." Well, they not only stayed on in the field, of course, but whenever they have had to meet very heavy commitments they have invaded the field further and further. When the Second World War came along taxation agreements were entered into because it was recognized that the Federal Government had to have an increasingly large share of the income tax field and the corporation tax field.

Following the war, the Federal Government convened a Dominion-Provincial Conference at which time an agreement was entered into for sharing this tax field, trying to share it on some reasonably equitable basis, and also, incidentally, with the idea of avoiding duplicate taxation. I would not want to weary members with the various conferences which have taken place, trying to evolve a more satisfactory way of dividing these three tax fields – income tax, corporation tax and succession duty. Hon. members will know, of course, that we on this side of the House and, I think also the members on the opposite side of the House (certainly, their Party) supported the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois Commission, who wanted the payments under a tax-sharing arrangement paid out on a basis of fiscal need. We were never able to get that, but this is the situation in which the Province is finding itself. Today, of the total amount of money being collected in three fields of taxation, which are, under our constitution, jointly occupied by the Federal and Provincial Governments, the Federal Government is retaining approximately 80 per cent of all the funds collected and is paying out to the provinces approximately 20 per cent. If my friends want the exact figures they are 79.1 per cent and 20.9 per cent, or roughly 80 per cent and 20 per cent. In other words, out of every \$5 which is collected from these three fields of taxation the Federal Government retains \$4 and pays to the provinces \$1.

May I recall that is in a field of taxation that belongs jointly to both groups. And remember, as I said before, under our constitution,

the Federal Government had other fields of taxation – indirect taxation which it can levy, sources of revenue which are not open to the Provincial Governments. There is no difference of opinion, I don't think, among most of the provincial governments of Canada. If we are going to occupy these fields jointly, then the provinces are entitled to probably 50 per cent of the revenue from these three taxation fields. Certainly they have, I think, an unanswerable claim to one-third of the revenues from these three taxes.

This, of course, is the whole reason why we think there ought to be a Federal-Provincial Conference, particularly in view of the fact that the present Government of Canada, prior to taking office, said it was their intention to call a Federal-Provincial Conference, that they intended to give very large sums of additional revenue from these three tax fields to the provinces and they see that the municipalities got additional fields of revenue. None of those things have been done.

It is true that a Conference was called in the fall of 1957, but it only lasted, I think, three days, and we were asked to go home and were told that we would be called together early in the New Year (which were the words used). We were not called together. We were notified, I think in the month of February or the last week in January, that the Federal Government was going to pay out an additional \$68 million to the provinces, and that Saskatchewan was going to get – I believe the figure was an additional \$4½ million. But, as the Provincial Treasurer pointed out, we did not get this additional \$3½ million. The Leader of the Opposition said this is because our population was going down and we were stagnating and nobody could possibly estimate what would happen in Saskatchewan. Even if that were true (which it isn't), this does not explain the fact that the \$68 million additional revenue which the provinces were supposed to get didn't materialize. The provinces, all together, got an additional \$40 million – not \$68 million; so it is not just Saskatchewan who are complaining that these estimates have not materialized and that these promises have not been fulfilled.

The Leader of the Opposition, today, said: "Well, you shouldn't be complaining, because the Federal Government is spending (and I think I am quoting him accurately) hundreds of millions of dollars in carrying out what, under our constitution, is a provincial responsibility."

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I don't like to interrupt, but I didn't say that you shouldn't be complaining. I said you had every right to complain, but I said don't try to add up provincial expenditures on municipalities and count them as unconditional grants, and not include the other expenditures. You have every right to complain and you have my sympathy.

Premier Douglas: — Well, what I want to deal with is my friend's statement that the Federal Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on things which are provincial responsibilities. Now, I am prepared to grant that they are spending some money, but my friend has not yet produced this hundreds of millions of dollars, or anything close to it. Let us just look over some of the items which he mentioned. First of all, he took the tax-sharing arrangement, some \$36 million. Mr. Speaker, this is not the Federal Government

giving us some money to discharge provincial responsibilities. This is a tax field which we have as much right to occupy as the Government of Canada, and although, by agreement, the Federal Government collects the taxes and pays out 20 cents on the dollar to the provinces, this surely is not the Federal Government assuming something which is a provincial responsibility. So we can take the \$36 million out.

The Health Grants – \$2½ million: that certainly is a provincial responsibility. This you can check up to a responsibility which the Government of Canada has assumed; although, (may I point out) that even in Section 91 there are certain aspects of health, particularly communicable diseases and so on, which the Federal Government has the responsibility for, and this is particularly true when you come to venereal disease and so on.

Old age Assistance – it is also true the Federal Government makes a contribution of \$1½ million under an agreement with the provinces, where we share 50-50 for paying old-age assistance. This could conceivably be said to be a provincial responsibility.

The same is true of blind pensions and disabled pensions. The same could be true of vocational training, although I want to point out that vocational training was undertaken by the Federal Government back in 1919, and it was undertaken despite the fact that education comes under the provinces, because the Federal Government recognized two things; one, that it had some responsibility at that time to train veterans coming back from the war; and secondly, that it was to its advantage in stimulating the economy to train people in technical work so that we could have a greater mobility of labour.

As to the Trans-Canada Highway, again this may be said to be a provincial responsibility, since roads and highways come under the provincial government; but, of course, it is of interest to the Government of Canada that we be able to have across Canada, even for defence purposes, a highway that stretches from sea to sea. The great tragedy is that we did not have it some 25 years ago. But I am prepared to concede those points, and they make, if you look them over, above \$7 million.

Let us look at the others. He says \$22 million of Old Age Pensions the Federal Government pays. Well, why do they pay it? Not because it is a provincial responsibility! The constitution of Canada makes old-age security pensions a Federal responsibility. The Federal Government . . .

Mr. McDonald: When did that become a Federal responsibility?

Premier Douglas: In 1951.

Mr. McDonald: Yes, in 1951, by an amendment to the constitution.

Premier Douglas: The fact remains that it is a Federal responsibility.

Mr. McDonald: After an amendment to the B.N.A. Act.

Premier Douglas: That's right, but we are not talking about before. We are living in 1959. I can't help it if my friends keep living in the past. I am trying to get them up-to-date. The trouble with the Liberal Party, of course, is that they are still living in the days of Laurier. He was a great man, and they have to live in the past in order to get any greatness at all.

In 1951, the Government of Canada asked the Provinces to agree to a constitutional amendment to do two things: one, to allow them to accept responsibility for all persons over 70 years of age; and to levy a tax of 2 per cent on corporation taxes, 2 per cent on income taxes and a 2 per cent sales tax, in order to finance this Old Age Security Pension. They are not assuming a provincial responsibility; it is not a provincial responsibility. This is a Federal responsibility under the constitution of Canada, which was amended to allow them to carry it out. They are not giving that to us for nothing.

The same thing is true of the Family Allowances. This is a matter which comes under Federal jurisdiction or the Federal Government could not be doing it. They are not doing it under an agreement with the provinces. They are not doing it at the request of the provinces. They are doing it as part of an anti-cyclical device to pump money into the low income groups so as to provide more purchasing power and in order to maintain full employment and a high level of national income. That was the reason given when it was introduced. Surely this cannot be talked of as something that is being given to the provinces!

When you come to P.F.A.A., this is a crop insurance plan for which people are paying one per cent on their grain sales.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): It can't be crop insurance.

Premier Douglas: It is a form of crop insurance. At least the Government that brought it in claimed it was a form of crop insurance.

Mr. McDonald: No, they didn't.

Premier Douglas: And as crop insurance it comes under Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. When this was brought into the House of Commons it was pointed out that the Federal Government had no authority to go into crop insurance, and that was the reason it was doing this.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: It certainly is a point of privilege.

Premier Douglas: That's the most juvenile statement –

Mr. McDonald: — Well, it's a fact.

Premier Douglas: This is a plan undertaken by the Government of Canada under their recognized responsibility, under which they

March 31, 1959

levy one per cent on all grain tickets, put the money in a pool and pay it out to people who have suffered crop failures. It so happens that in the year which my friend was quoting (1957-58), they paid out \$9.9 million and took in \$6.1 million; but there will be years also –

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Premier Douglas: This is not a point of order. If my hon. friend will sit down . . .

Mr. Loptson: I would like to put something straight.

Premier Douglas: He is not putting anything straight on a point of order. My friend can sit down. He has no point of order, and I don't propose to give up the floor to my hon. friend.

Mr. Loptson: Of course, it is. You are all wrong.

Premier Douglas: Well, if I am all wrong you take part in the debate and straighten it out. If you straighten it out it will be the first time, and I suggest you start with yourself if you are going to do any straightening out.

Here is the Federal Government collecting money on a one per cent levy and paying out for crop failures, and there will be years in which they collect more than they pay out.

Mr. McCarthy: That has never happened.

Premier Douglas: That is not so, of course. There have been years when they haven't paid out. In the aggregate there has not, but there have been years when they have taken in more than they have paid out. But this is not assuming any provincial responsibility. This is a plan for farmers, not unlike the provision for unemployment insurance for workers; and I will come to that next. My friend talks about unemployment insurance. The Federal Government is not relieving the provinces of anything; there is no question but that unemployment insurance is a Federal responsibility. If it were not, how could the Federal Government carry it on.

Mr. McDonald: They took your responsibility.

Premier Douglas: It is a Federal responsibility and it is recognized by the constitution, and, what is more of course, the Federal Government is collecting payments from the workers and from the employers to finance it. So how can this be accepting a provincial responsibility?

So here is the Leader of the Opposition, talking about his hundreds of millions of dollars which the Federal Government is spending, taking up provincial responsibility. Out of the hundred millions of dollars, there is

about \$7 million a year! \$7 million a year of what may be our actual provincial responsibilities, which the Federal Government is assuming.

Mr. McDonald: What about housing?

Premier Douglas: Housing? Housing is not solely a provincial responsibility. If my hon. friend would take the trouble to go back and read the Massey Report of 1947 and 1948, it made it very clear that housing was a national responsibility, and that it was accepted as a national responsibility in every Federal system of government in the western world.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a strange thing to me, that here are a group of men who have been constantly talking about wanting better conditions for the people of this country. They talk about the cost-price squeeze in which the farmer finds himself and of the difficult situation in western Canada because of adverse freight rates and because of protected markets. We buy in a protected market, and have to sell in an unprotected market. A resolution comes before this House, asking the Federal Government to convene a Federal-Provincial Conference, asking that we get a fairer share of the revenue from the three fields of taxation – income, corporation and inheritance tax – a share to which we are entitled. How do the gentlemen opposite support this? How do they help to create the public opinion that would call for some fairer allocation of these tax revenues? The Leader of the Opposition gets up in the House and says, “Why, the Federal Government is giving you hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out provincial responsibilities.” Sure, hundreds of millions of dollars we’re getting of Federal money to carry out provincial responsibilities! This is certainly designed, Mr. Speaker, to interest the Prime Minister of Canada in calling a Federal-Provincial Conference. This will certainly strengthen the hands of the provinces of Canada in going to Ottawa to suggest that we should get more than 20 per cent of these tax revenues, when the Leader of the Opposition in this province stands up and says, “Why, the Federal Government – we should be backing them, because already they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars . . .”

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, again, on a point of privilege. The Premier is once more putting words in my mouth. I never said what he has referred to at all.

Hon. Mr. Fines: That’s not true.

Mr. McDonald: And that’s just about enough out of you, too, my fine-feathered friend. One more remark like that from you, and I’m not going to ask you to withdraw it. I’ll meet you around the corner of the House and beat your head in!

To continue with my point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, if it is going to be a point of privilege, you will withdraw that remark about meeting somebody outside.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

March 31, 1959

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the hon. member withdraw that statement?

Mr. McDonald: Well, I might easily meet the member outside . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Will the hon. member withdraw it?

Mr. McDonald: Oh sure, I'll withdraw it. But I'm not going to take up the time of this House to ask my hon. friend to withdraw his statement because I don't think it is worth it, and I don't think . . .

Premier Douglas: Are we on a point of privilege or making a speech, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member proceed with his point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: Yes, I will. It is that the Premier has stated that the Opposition have taken a stand. Surely to goodness the Premier was awake during this debate . . .

Premier Douglas: That is not a point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: I put the position of the Opposition on the records, and I don't want that to be cluttered up by any statement by the Premier, or anybody else opposite. We are in complete agreement with the resolution as it was brought in.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the hon. member proceed with the point of privilege in the manner in which he intended.

Mr. McDonald: The words that were said were that the Opposition were complaining about the Provincial Government receiving all of this money, that they were getting too much now. The Opposition have not taken that stand. We have said that they were entitled to a greater share, and will continue to say so.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I simply drew the attention of this House and, I hope of the people of this province, to the fact that when a resolution was before this House asking the Government of Canada to convene a Federal-Provincial Conference, to give to this province and other provinces a fairer allocation of certain sources of revenue from certain tax fields which we occupy jointly with the Government of Canada, the contribution to this debate made by the Leader of the Opposition is to come in and make the statement that the Federal Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars for responsibilities which under our constitution, belong to the Province.

Mr. McDonald: And that is true.

Premier Douglas: My hon. friend says it is true.

Mr. McDonald: Sure it is.

Premier Douglas: I say that that statement is the greatest betrayal that the people of Saskatchewan have ever had; that the people of Saskatchewan have never been stabbed in the back as effectively as by this statement just made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Cameron: You're not on TV now!

Premier Douglas: I think that some of the Liberal Premiers in other parts of Canada will be very sad that this sort of statement has been made, because the former Liberal Premier of Manitoba is one of the men who have made a similar plea to the plea we are making. I did not go into what the Premier of Newfoundland is saying just now about the Federal Government's contribution! At this particular stage, when the provinces are, first of all, asking for something to which they are entitled – justice and a fair allocation of these tax revenues; when they are asking the Federal Government to keep some of its own commitments about putting additional revenues at the disposal of the provinces and municipalities, surely we might have expected from the Leader of the Opposition something else than this fantastic, arithmetical miasma, in which he stands up and says, "Hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal money going to discharge provincial responsibilities." Why, the Premier Minister of Canada, when he reads that, will say, "Why, the provinces say they are getting too much now; we are assuming too many provincial responsibilities. Maybe we're doing too much."

Mr. Danielson: I think we're doing the same as you're doing with the Premier Minister!

Premier Douglas: The people of this province, Mr. Speaker, have been ill served today by the Leader of the Opposition in the remarks which he has made.

Mr. Lopton: You are not talking on the amendment to the amendment. You're talking on the motion.

Premier Douglas: The Leader of the Opposition made the statement that he thought it unfortunate that the resolution which was presented to the House by the member for Souris-Estevan had been cluttered up by the amendment. I agree with that, but, of course, we didn't introduce the amendment. The member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) introduced it.

Mr. McDonald: You didn't complain about it, though.

Mr. McCarthy: I take full responsibility for it.

Premier Douglas: I do think it would be unfortunate if the motion which has been introduced were cluttered up by the amendment and the sub-amendment, and I think the House ought to think seriously about this matter of whether we ought to withdraw both the amendment and the sub-amendment. If

my friends want to deal with the question of the Provincial Government's treatment of local government, all they have to do is put a motion on the Order Paper. I am making a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that either the motion or the amendment and the sub-amendment be withdrawn, so that we can deal with the motion, and the hon. gentleman who wants to introduce his amendment can bring it in as a separate motion, or, if it is agreeable to the House, and to you, Mr. Speaker, we can vote on them as two separate motions. But I think it would be unfortunate if this House which, in common with Legislatures all across Canada will be dealing with this matter of the need for a Federal-Provincial Conference, we ought to do that by itself, so that our stand is clear and unmistakable, and is not cluttered up with differences of opinion in respect of provincial-municipal relations. I think that those two matters ought to be dealt with in separate resolutions. However, if the mover of the amendment insists that it stays on as part of the motion, then we shall have to vote with it as part of the main motion.

There has just been drawn to my attention a question regarding P.F.A.A. This is Hansard, 1957-58, page 4082. The question is, "How much money did the farmers contribute to P.F.A.A. by one per cent deduction from grain sales during the year ending March 31, 1957 (a) in Alberta (b) in Saskatchewan?"

The Saskatchewan figures is \$3,608,339.

(2) "How much money was paid to the farmers during the same year out of P.F.A.A. Funds in (a) Alberta (b) Saskatchewan?" The amount paid out in Saskatchewan was \$621,553. So, in that year, about \$3 million more was collected than was paid out, or there was paid out in that year about one-sixth of what was taken in. But in the aggregate there isn't any doubt that more has been paid out than has been taken in. Someone has denied the statement there has not been any year in which more has been collected than has been paid out.

All I want to say in closing is that, insofar as the sub-amendment is concerned, I think we on this side of the House have the support of the great bulk of people who are interested in local government, in our contention that we have treated the local governing bodies of this province just as generously as the finances of the province would permit. This Government is paying out 27 per cent of its total budget to local governments, has consistently increased it to the place where we have actually paid out in the last two years, and will be paying out in this coming year, much more than we are getting in increased grants from Ottawa. We, on this side can, therefore, support the sub-amendment conscientiously. But I would express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment and the sub-amendment (if they are to be dealt with), be dealt with separately from the main motion.

I think it is important, in the over-all picture in Canada, that the Legislatures of all political parties stand together on this question of the provinces getting a fair allocation of revenue. Even in the province of Ontario which has a Conservative Government, and the Manitoba Government, which has a Conservative Government up until yesterday, and technically still has – both of these governments in the matter of the last few weeks have made public statements that they do not think their provinces can discharge their constitutional responsibilities unless they get a larger share of these three fields of

revenue. It seems to me that we in this province, irrespective of our political views, and irrespective of our stand on the matter of provincial-local government relations, ought to present a united front in asking that a Federal-Provincial Conference be called, and that some fair allocation of these moneys be made. That is why I would like to express the hope that the motion would be separated from the amendment and the sub-amendment, and at least voted on separately.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Premier's comment on what the Leader of the Opposition said in regard to facilities of the Leader of the Opposition's office, I don't know the exact words, but he said that the Leader of the Opposition was casting a slur on the Government by those remarks.

Premier Douglas: I did not use the term 'slur', Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: No, but what was the exact word? In any event, we were 'discrediting the Government' by those remarks of the Liberal leader.

Premier Douglas: I said it was an unfortunate remark.

Mr. Cameron: I would point out that for years we have had to go away down to the Library – that long walk away down to the end of the corridor – to meet our secretary, and we found her tucked in between the books in the Library, and that is where we did our correspondence. We requested this year a little better accommodation. We did get a little better accommodation. We don't have to take the long walk away down the corridor to the books; they moved the steno closer, just across the hall from us; but they put her in the broom closet. That is the accommodation we have at the present time. Whether it's better or not, is somewhat questionable.

Then, too, the Leader of the Opposition, I thought, was showing how ridiculous the Provincial Treasurer had been in trying to build up a case for how much they had relieved the municipalities of the burden they formerly carried. He said, "If you want to be that ridiculous in the provincial field, let's take the responsibilities and the new relationships between Ottawa and the provinces, and total up the hundreds of millions there." Then the Premier gets up and he says, "Why, that is a betrayal of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the biggest betrayal that ever went on in this House, and the people of Saskatchewan will be interested to know that, through the Leader of the Opposition, he has said we are receiving probably more than we should be getting from Ottawa now, and, therefore, we have lessened our chances, or killed our chances, of getting a better deal."

I think in the spirit of the debate and everything, Mr. Speaker, the Premier forgot he was in the Legislature rather than before a TV audience, and that's why he carried on in that way.

Speaking of the amendment to the motion or first the

motion. I want to reiterate what the Leader of the Opposition said: "There is nothing in the original motion which we cannot support, nothing whatever."

Hon. Mr. Walker: Why did you amend it, then?

Mr. Cameron: Then an amendment was brought in, because in prior years we have had nothing, asking for Dominion-Provincial-Municipal Conferences. It is to follow through the suggestion that was made that it should come from Ottawa to the province, down to the municipalities, to the three levels of government, so they would have some ratio of sharing worked out that would be on somewhat an equitable basis, that the amendment was moved. The member brought in an amendment that urges the Government of Saskatchewan to give Ottawa in the form of unconditional grants to municipalities, a request that some of it be passed on to the municipalities in the form of unconditional grants. That is something which we haven't got. That amendment was ruled in order, regardless of what the Premier may say about it now. The amendment was accepted as being a proper amendment to the resolution. Then because the amendment was accepted in the House, the Provincial Treasurer, I am sure in haste – what do they say, "act in haste; regret in leisure"? – jumped to his feet with another amendment before the original amendment was even put. He jumped to his feet with an amendment to the amendment. This is what the amendment would read: That we use the original motion, asking for a better deal under the Provincial Tax Rental Agreement. Then along with that we go to Ottawa with this request, namely, "We commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving a reasonable share of money received from the Federal Government under the Tax Rental Agreement to the payment of unconditional grants to municipalities."

Premier Douglas: Read how it sounds without the sub-amendment.

Mr. Cameron: In order for us to support this original motion asking for a better sharing of the Dominion-Provincial Agreement, we would have to agree to this amendment and say we likewise commend the Government of Saskatchewan for doing something which they are not doing and have not done.

Mr. McDonald: And which they have no intentions of doing.

Mr. Cameron: And if you talk about a "betrayal" of the people of Saskatchewan, that would be the biggest betrayal of the municipalities that has ever occurred in the history of this province.

Opposition Member: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: It would be utterly void of common sense to say we recommend the Provincial Government for giving unconditional grants to municipalities. We would be proven to be untrue. We would be a party to perpetrating on the people of this province something which is not true. Never in our life can we bend our knee to submit to an amendment like that in order to secure this agreement for the province of Saskatchewan. If ever saw anything ridiculous in this House it is this. I have never seen it in my 11 years in the Legislature. I can understand their second thought now. I can understand why they want this removed, because I cannot conceive of anything so ridiculous going to Ottawa in a formal resolution asking for a better deal and to call a Conference.

If members of the Legislature vote in support of this, it will give substance to something which is untrue. I agree it should be removed, but I would suggest to the Provincial Treasurer, to the Premier and to the members on your right, Mr. Speaker, that they have it within their power to remove it. They can defeat this amendment to the amendment; then they can turn around and defeat the amendment as amended. Then you have the motion before you. If you proceed in that manner and get back to the original motion, then we are free to vote on it as the motion reads. You have it within your power to do it. Proceed and do it, and clear the decks from trash such as this! That is all I have to say.

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a very few minutes to clarify my stand with regard to this motion and the amendments which have been attached thereto. As I see it, the motion is something that we all could and should support. However, I think we have listened to an hour and 20 minutes of pure, real politics this afternoon, and to attach the amendment or the sub-amendment to this resolution, would be a shame, in reality. As the hon. member who just sat down has said, the Government has the power to defeat this side of the House, because of their numbers. If I were forced to vote for that resolution (and I would like to) with the sub-amendment attached, I couldn't possibly do it. I think every time I get up on my feet in this Legislature I am complaining about the inequality of taxation in this province. Therefore, I couldn't begin to do it, but I would definitely, if it is within the power of this Legislature, like to see the amendment and the sub-amendment taken from this motion so that we could honestly vote on the motion.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think I would just want to deal here with one subject. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the facilities which the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition has. Then that was mentioned again by the hon. member for Maple Creek: he complained about having to take a long walk from their office to the Library to where the secretary was.

I would like to point out to these hon. members (most of whom don't know anything about it) that when we were in Opposition, when I was Leader of the Opposition for four sessions, and the same was true when my predecessor was in that position, the Hon. G.H. Williams, the accommodation which we had was the one little office now occupied by the Leader of the Opposition, for the Leader of the Opposition and his secretary. We were only allowed to have a secretary and the office during the Session, and, within two or three days after the Session, were practically invited out on the street as far as accommodation was concerned. I never saw anybody acting so much like a cry-baby with regard to the accommodation. They have ten times the accommodation we had when we sat in Opposition. There were enough of us that we had good results in 1944 anyway – there was a sufficient number of us.

Now, the member for Maple Creek talks about the broom closet. I find that the broom closet (so-called) has 192 square feet, approximately, which is much larger than the average space allowed for government employees.

I just wanted to point out that, actually, the Opposition has not too much to complain about in this respect. What they need is to get the wheels in their heads going around and get to work, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: At least we have some wheels in our head, and that's more than you've got! I wanted to ask the Minister if he knew how many brooms there were in the cupboard that is under discussion. Did you count those too?

The amendment to the amendment (Hon. Mr. Fines) was agreed to on recorded division, by 28 votes against 19.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is now on the amendment as amended. Is the House ready for the question?

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could, on a point of order, raise this matter of whether or not we could separate these questions. We now have what are really two substantive motions; first, the motion which was originally moved, and now the amendment which has been amended. I imagine I could move a motion; but I thought the House would like to review the motion separately. I think we could deal with this matter in these two questions in the way that has been suggested, that we ought to express our opinion on these two questions in separate motions, rather than all on one motion. Would the House be agreeable to that?

Mr. McDonald: I would like to point out that, as I said in my remarks a while ago, this is what should have been done in the first place. I think the Government is responsible for finding itself in the position it is in now. They have no one to blame but themselves. The motion was moved from this side of the House, and you accepted it. There was no complaint; none whatever, now you find yourselves in this position, through no fault of this side of the House, but through fault of your own. You put it there . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that is not correct. The amendment was moved by the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), and the Provincial Treasurer rose and questioned whether or not it was in order. The Speaker gave the ruling, and that finished the matter. The only other way it could be made a substantive motion would be by a motion of the House.

Mr. McDonald: There was no debate whatever on the original motion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, the records are very clear. You will recall that when the amendment was moved, I asked you if you were accepting that as a proper amendment.

Mrs. Batten: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If this amendment was not in order he should have appealed your ruling to the House.

Hon. Mr. Fines: I am not in the habit of questioning the Speaker's rulings.

Premier Douglas: It was not a question of Speaker's ruling. It was simply suggesting that it might be better to have those two subjects dealt with as separate motions. If the hon. gentlemen are not prepared to do that, it's all right.

Mr. McDonald: I think that was the time to have done it.

Premier Douglas: Yes, I agree.

Mr. McDonald: Why withdraw it. Vote it out; you put it there; you have the power to remove it.

Mr. Weber: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Premier that this motion and the amendment thereto are irrelevant. In my opinion, the one is urging the Federal Government to do something, and the amendment to the motion urges the Provincial Government to do something. Therefore, I feel that we are dealing with two different subjects completely, and I feel they should be dealt with separately. It is very difficult for us to accept a clear-cut decision on those, because they are dealing with two different subjects completely. We feel they should be separated.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that all that is necessary to clean this matter up is to defeat this thing, and that can be done. I am sure that I will vote against it, and if enough members do, we will get rid of it then. Get rid of it; clean it up, pure and simple; just vote against it.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is a misunderstanding here about the original resolution which was moved. The original resolution is not a resolution to Ottawa. It is a resolution to the Government of Saskatchewan to do something, to request something of the Federal Government. It is not a resolution which has to be sent in its entirety to the Government of Canada. The original resolution reads thus:

“That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to again urge the Government of Canada to convene a Dominion-Provincial Conference at which special attention will be given to establishing a policy whereby the provinces receive a larger share and a more equitable distribution of funds from the Government of Canada within the framework of the Tax Rental Agreements.”

Then in the original amendment and all that was added to that. Now the original one was a request to the Government of this province, not to the Government of Canada. All it was stating was that the Government of this Province should write to the Government of Canada urging this stand. It isn't the resolution directed to the Government of Canada, at all. It is a resolution originally worded directed to the Government of this province to carry out an action on behalf of this Legislature.

Then we went on (and I believe it was quite within our rights) to urge that same Government that we were asking to do something in the original part of the resolution, that when they had received a satisfactory answer to that Conference with the Federal Government, they then turn around and give the municipalities much the same arrangement that we are asking them to request from Ottawa – not to send this resolution. It was not directed to the Government of Canada at all; it was directed to the Government of this province, and will never be sent to the Government of Canada for that reason. This Province has been asked to write and urge that this Conference be held.

Then we continued with the amendment to ask that, if they received this kind of consideration, then the municipalities of this province should be given the same consideration and be provided with a system of unconditional grants. Then we have the amendment to the amendment which is now before this House, and I say that, at the present time, if this House wants to move a motion to be sent to Ottawa, a new motion altogether should be moved, outside. This one is not being sent to Ottawa.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. May I point out the Legislature of Saskatchewan cannot send resolutions to the Parliament or to the Government of Canada. The proper form is that when the Saskatchewan Legislature wants to express an opinion to the Government of Canada, it moves this kind of resolution. The resolution itself is sent, but the resolution cannot say that we address the Parliament of Canada; the Legislature instructs their own Government to say what they in turn want to say, so this is the resolution which would be sent.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Premier's words, I still feel in my own mind that the wording of that resolution ought to be in such a way that the request of this Legislature was going to the Government to carry out this action, and therefore, in urging the Government to carry out the second action. There was nothing contrary to the first resolution at all; nothing contrary whatsoever to the original resolution, which was asking that the Government continue, after taking that action, and having a reasonable acceptance of the request from the Federal Government, that they then give to the municipalities of this province a form of unconditional grants from the moneys they would be receiving.

I can see nothing inconsistent in the original amendment to the main motion at all, and so I say here to my friends on the left, there is nothing inconsistent with the second part of this motion; it would well be left as one motion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I suggest that we have two distinct propositions here that are unrelated; there is no question of that. Now, under the Parliamentary rule, (I now refer to Beauchesne) Section 200, sub-section (4) – 1958 edition, 'a motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately.' May I suggest that the House rules apply here . . .

Mr. Cameron: Mr. Speaker, I would only point out that this amendment has been ruled on by the Speaker, and accepted as a proper amendment to this resolution. That is finished with. But if you don't want it on there, I suggest you vote with us to take it off. You put the amendment to the amendment on. You have the power to take it off, and clean the decks in the proper way.

Mr. McDonald: No, he can't.

Premier Douglas: The rules of the House say he can.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about something we have no right to talk about any more. All this discussion is entirely out of order. Let me remind you that this amendment to the amendment was ruled to be in order by the standing votes of this House. The standing votes of this House favoured the new ruling, Mr. Speaker, so we accepted it, but felt in the first place that it was out of order; but we accept that ruling. Now then, we have taken a vote on it, and you have the vote of the majority of this House now, to substitute an amendment to the amendment in place of the amendment itself, and there is where we are at now. This is not through any fault of the Speaker; it is the fault of the Government, and I sympathize with the Government for the position they are in, through their own extreme partisanship. All they have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to vote down the amendment, and they will have the original motion, and I will be glad to stand up and vote on the original motion, and I think so will everyone on this side of the House. That is the situation we are in, and it is as simple as A B C. No more discussion is necessary, because we have no right to do it.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, do you want to give a decision now as to whether or not we should split the motion or do you want to reserve that? If so, I will adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Taking the original motion by itself, I could vote for that, and I think every member on this side of the House could vote for it; but we have been given to understand already that some of the members opposite are going to vote against the amendment as it now stands, which indicates that we are going to have people making a decision here on one question because of their stand on another. The purpose of this power of the Speaker to divide a motion is to avoid that kind of situation. So, if the hon. members opposite can vote against the question contained in the amendment, and can, as the member for Arm River says, vote for the question contained in the original motion, then the only way that that choice can be obtained is by dividing the motion, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it deserves your very careful consideration.

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this is not the first time this has happened in the House. Time and time and time again, the Opposition has found itself in a similar position that the Government now finds itself in. We have asked that a motion be divided,

March 31, 1959

because we felt we would like to support part of it, and vote against part of it. That has been denied to us. Now, if we are going to follow this pattern as set down by yourself and by your predecessors, then I submit there is only one way to clean up this resolution, and that is for my hon. friends to repent their sins, and be honest with themselves and the people of this province, and vote against their own amendment.

Mr. Speaker: . . . I am of the opinion that I cannot now divide the question. Only by agreement of the House can the amendment be withdrawn. I feel that the only procedure to follow now is to vote on the amendment.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave then to move an adjournment of this debate.

Mrs. Batten: On a point of order, the hon. Premier has already spoken on the debate.

Premier Douglas: No, on the amendment to the amendment, not on the amendment. I spoke on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: Mr. Speaker, pardon me for rising to my feet, but I submit that we cannot adjourn this debate now. We have had a continuous debate on the resolution, and the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment, all the way through, and the hon. Premier does not now have the right to adjourn this debate.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Opposition Members: Yes, the Premier has spoken on all three.

Mr. Danielson: The Premier has already spoken on three occasions.

Premier Douglas: No. I have spoken once.

Mr. Lopton: You have spoken on the motion, the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly resumed, from Monday, March 30, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Sturdy:

“That this Assembly requests the Government to make representations to the Government of Canada urging the said Government to relieve the Provinces of the responsibility for carrying out the death sentence, provided such Provinces have, by resolution of their respective Legislative Assemblies, expressed their opposition to capital punishment.”

Mr. Cameron: Mr. Speaker, I just adjourned the debate on this motion because I had a question or two I wished to ask the mover for purposes of clarification. Since the mover is not in the House, I won't proceed to ask the questions now. That was the only reason why I moved adjournment of the debate, yesterday. Since he isn't in the House, I am prepared to allow the debate to proceed.

Premier Douglas: I'm not sure that the mover of the motion will be in the House for some time. He is under medical care. It might be just as well for my hon. friend to proceed.

Mr. Cameron: I don't know just how to proceed, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: Do you want to stand the motion?

Mr. Cameron: If you wish it to stand . . .

Premier Douglas: Just whatever you wish.

Mr. Cameron: I just merely wanted to ask a question. I felt that if he answered me, he would be closing the debate, so I adjourned it in order to put the question so that when he was closing the debate he could answer my question.

Premier Douglas: Why not put it to the seconder? I doubt that the mover will be here for a few days. He is under the doctor's care.

Mr. Cameron: I will withdraw it, then.

The question being put, the motion (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) was agreed to, without dissentient voice.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m., without question put.