

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**Thursday, March 3, 1960**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw the attention of the members to a group of high school students from the Melfort-Tisdale constituency. These students have come from Fairy Glen School District, of the Melfort School Unit, a distance of about 200 miles, and are under the direction of their principal, Mr. Paul Tomashewski.

On behalf of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and on behalf of the other members of the House, I wish to welcome them to Regina and say that I am sure this day will be one of the highlights of their school term.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — I too would like to welcome students from the Queen Elizabeth School in Saskatoon, and their teacher. You will see them located at the back of the Speaker's gallery. I am sure all members will join with me in saying how happy we are to have them with us and hope they have an enjoyable trip here to the capital city.

**PAMPHLET ON SQUAW RAPIDS DAY**

**Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would draw to the attention of the hon. members the pamphlet on your desk "Squaw Rapids Day". I was invited to, and did attend a very interesting affair yesterday with a cavalcade from Carrot River to the Squaw Rapids Dam. There were somewhere between 135 and 150 cars which made the trip. The co-operation was wonderful, and what I would like the

March 3, 1960

hon. members to do would be to check the inside of the pamphlet and see a design of the dam. The specifications are on the back. I think it is very important, because it is the first time the Saskatchewan Government has entered into a project of such magnitude.

### **MOTION RE SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AMENDMENTS AND DELEGATED POWERS**

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Fines, that the name of Mr. Meakes be substituted for that of the Hon. Mr. Fines on the list of Members composing the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT RE BONDS**

**Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, a week yesterday I had the pleasure of announcing that Saskatchewan had had received tenders for bonds to be issued. The bonds were later sold for \$99.50.

Manitoba has today received tenders for identical bonds. Their bonds will sell at \$97.75, or nearly 2 percent below those of Saskatchewan. This has meant a saving to us of almost \$150,000.

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate from Wednesday, March 10 on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Mr. A. Loftson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last night, I had said that the Provincial Treasurer had held office for 16 years, all of which had been the most prosperous in the history of Canada, and that he was leaving now because he could see trouble ahead; that he had piled up a debt of some \$388 million and he had

commitments totalling about \$140 million for the South Saskatchewan and Rapids Development, plus the many millions for ordinary expenditures for which this money will have to be borrowed in the future.

I had also proven by testimonials of high ranking authorities that, while we have a lot of respectably led labour unions in Canada, that the union leaders who are with the C.C.F. forming this new political party are affiliated with the worst gangster-led unions of America. They are men convicted of promoting every crime in the criminal code, in order to force their demands on the people they are dealing with, including murder. It seems horrifying to many supporters of the C.C.F. that a party led by preachers and teachers and with such high aims as to create a heaven on earth should now have to affiliate themselves with that type of organization in order to survive.

To cover up this disreputable union, they are endeavouring to get the farmers and the small business men of the country to join in with them, mainly to give the new party a respectable front. Of course, a labour union, whether respectable or gangster-led, has nothing in common with the farmer. A farmer is an industrialist producing goods in the form of food products, and has a capital investment. His income depends on favourable weather, pest and disease conditions, and the price he receives for his product, while labour, on the other hand, has only his labour to sell. This may be skilled or ordinary. He has no hazards to face, except to keep his employer solvent so he can pay him for his work. He naturally tries to get as much as he can for his labour, and this reacts upon the farmer who has to buy the goods that labour makes. During the last ten years the price of implements and other goods that farmers have had to buy, have almost doubled in price because of labour costs.

The C.C.F. leaders and the union leaders are telling the people that it is the profits of the manufacturers that has caused the increase in price. That is not true, as anyone interested can prove for himself by looking at the companies' financial statements, which they, as public companies, have to issue and publish every year. I doubt if the profits of the farm implements manufacturers has exceeded two and one-half per cent on the sales dollar on the average for the past 10 years, which if given back to the consumer would not amount to more than about 1 1/2 per cent discount on the retail price. And yet the C.C.F. leaders and some labour leaders, such as Mr. Stanley Knowles, who is regarded as a saint in the C.C.F. party, and who is the most active in the formation of the new political party, is quoted as saying at Sarnia, the other day, that labour costs have nothing to do with the cost of goods and services. If Mr. Knowles believes this statement to be true, then he must be considered ignorant. If he knows it to be untrue, then he has made it to mislead the people, and we must consider him dishonest. In either case, he is not a fit and proper person to hold a public position, especially that of such importance as directing labour, which is the most important segment of our economy.

March 3, 1960

No one wants to see low wages and salaries come back, but it is of national importance that productivity should be in line with the salary paid, or as Mr. Harold Winch, C.C.F. Federal member said, the other day, "We will have no wages or profit inside of two years." No, the farmers are not biting.

I suggest that the next provincial election in this province will likely be contested by four political parties — the C.C.F., the Liberals, Conservatives and the Social Credit. The C.C.F. socialist government, the only one of its kind in North America, will have to stand on its record which includes more fantastic political sins than have ever been known in Canadian political history. But they have been able to screen these off by holding up hospitalization plans, and other social services, which are in reality only an extension of the Liberal hospitalization services plan and services, all of which would have been done by the Liberal Government, when money became available, as it did after the last World War. So much so, that this Government has six times as much revenue coming in this year than the old Government had during the last year they were in power.

It is an insult, Mr. Speaker, to the intelligence of the people that the C.C.F. claim the Liberals should have done as much as they have done with less than one-quarter of the amount of money they have been receiving. Besides, when the Liberals came into office in 1934, over half the people in this province were on relief, and that continued on until about 1939 when the Second World War broke out. During that period of five years all the revenue resources of the country were tied up for war purposes. It is likely the Government this time will make much of their farm and village water-sewer scheme, which, however desirable, is not going to add to the farmers' earnings. It is going to add to his expenses by way of cost of installation in addition to any grants that the Government may make. It will add to his monthly power bill. I don't think they will make much of their medical scheme, because after all, there is small controversy between that and the Liberals'.

Now I come to the other party, and I would say the Liberal party in Saskatchewan is really on the march. Ross Thatcher, the new leader, is a man of the hour. This has given the hierarchy of the C.C.F. the jitters; so much so that everything possible is being done to discredit him. Even the Premier himself has gone so far as to brand him a 'renegade'. He has evidently forgotten that he himself, is a two-time renegade — first from the Conservative party, and then from the Social Credit party to the C.C.F.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege. I have never been a member of the Conservative party or the Social Credit party in my life, and have never been either a candidate or a member of any political party except the party with which I am now associated.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What do you think of the Social Credit . . . Would my hon. friend deny this? The Social Credit:

"Douglas says that he is going to make Social Credit work."

**Mr. Cameron:** — Read the whole thing.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I notice the hon. member for Moose Jaw is a renegade from the Communist Party, quite a prominent member of that party at one time.

**Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Saltcoats should say who he is referring to; there are two members from Moose Jaw.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I should say my hon. friend who was just on his feet. Will he deny that?

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I have been since the year 1944, a member of no other party than the C.C.F.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That's nothing. I didn't say that you were a member now.

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask your permission to speak without interruption?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member has the floor . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He's not going to take up my time by making a speech.

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker on a matter of privilege . . . I demand the right to speak.

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . I'll prove it right here. Here is the proof, right here.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Read it, Minty.

**Mr. Loptson:** — In 1939, when he was a prominent member of the Communist Party, whatever he did after that . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Will the hon. member . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — I want to deny, Mr. Speaker, that I have been a prominent member of the Communist Party, and to say this, that for 20 years I have been . . . no other supporter . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He can do that when he speaks. He can't make any explanation now, Mr. Speaker. He can do that when he speaks next time.

March 3, 1960

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member take his seat.

**Mr. Davies:** — I wish to ask the hon. member to withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Withdraw nothing! It's right here. Mr. Speaker, and it proves it right here. Do you want me to read it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Who wrote it?

**Mr. Loptson:** — 'The Leader-Post', February 20, 1939:

"W.G. Davies said the young Communist League desired to co-operate in every way in the work of the Congress, but had no wishes to dominate. The main business of the morning was to report on the work of the Canadian Youth Congress, and William G. Davies spoke of the Congress as a banding together of young people's organization in the interests of democracy, peace and progress."

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member for Moose Jaw be speedy with his point of privilege.

**Mr. Davies:** — I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that as a young man . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He can explain that in his speech. I'm not going to blame him — it's just the same as the Liberal Leader, a Ross Thatcher, explained how T.C. Douglas convinced him to join the C.C.F. party.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Davies:** — I want only to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have never been a renegade at any time to any party.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You're as much a renegade as anybody else in the C.C.F. And further . . . every C.C.F. supporter that was old enough to vote when the Party was formed, is a renegade from an old Party, and many notable public men have changed their party view down through the years and have not been classed as renegading, even though they did not resign their seat when they saw fit to change over.

But I suppose that you are a renegade only when you leave the party. Then why single out Ross Thatcher? Out of the ten thousands of votes that left the C.C. F. party, since it was at its height in 1945, including some prominent supporters, such as Clarence Stork, who was a member of this Legislature, as a C.C.F.er. Jake Benson, for instance, was

in this Legislature, a supporter of the C.C.F. from 1938-50, and later here we have Douglas Fisher, C.C.F. Federal member at Port Arthur, who says the C.C.F.s in the House of Commons are a bunch of phonies, and is going to leave them after this Session. Now, the latest of all is Harold Winch, the C.C.F. Federal Member for the House of Commons, a most ardent supporter of the C.C.F. party and its labour monopoly policy, has come out in support of Ross Thatcher's contention, that the course of the C.C.F. labour activities is leading the nation to destruction.

**Govt. Members:** — Oh, no. That's not true.

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, the fact that Ross Thatcher left the C.C.F. party is not the real reason he is being personally attacked. The real reason is that they know the people know that he sacrificed a sure job as a C.C.F. Federal member for as long as there was a remnant in the C.C.F. Party left, worth \$10,000 a year to him, and further that he demonstrated at the famous Mossbank debate that he was far more qualified to run the business of this province than our present Premier.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Loptson:** — As a result of his business training, which is all important as the province's business is the largest business in the province. Further another thing that worries them is that the Liberal platform is gauged to help the farmers, towns, and villages, in recognition of their importance in our economy. The return of the \$500 power line costs to the farmers will more than offset the C.C.F. proposed grant towards sewer and water installations. The permit to use purple gas in farm trucks is estimated by this Government to save the farmers \$2 million a year, and in addition the Liberal platform is more realistic than that of the C.C.F., and will save the municipalities many millions of dollars.

The Conservatives, this election will only be "also rans." The Federal record of a Conservative Government since before the turn of the century is that eggs were 5 cents a dozen every time they were in power and other farm products in proportion. In other words, the difference between the Liberal party and the Conservative party is that you have prosperity with the grits and depression with the Tories.

So much for the Liberals. Then we have the Social Credit Party — the mysterious party. I'm not going to say much about them, but I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that until they explain how they are going to give you and me money without earning it to buy the goods that we require, I don't think the people should be voting for them. Then in view of the fact that after they had taken Major Douglas, who had written the mysterious theory, to Alberta, after they were elected on the promise of \$25 a month for every man, woman and child, he came back and was approached by many reporters as to how he got along in Alberta. "Well," he said, "I didn't get along at all. As a matter of fact, I wrote the book just as a lark. I couldn't think of anybody being crazy enough to try to put it into operation." Until such time as somebody shows us how that theory can be operated, I would say the theory is just political hum-bug. Nobody should be voting for it.

March 3, 1960

In summing this up, I would submit that in view of the desire of the of the people to get rid of the Socialist Government in Saskatchewan, that the Liberals are the only other alternative, because they have trained members in the House. They have a trained business man as leader; they have nominated men of municipal and other practical public which qualifies them, above all other parties, to take over the Government of Saskatchewan after the next election.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, with reference to yourself, I appreciate your patience with me during your time in this House. I want to conclude by saying that as I leave this Legislative Assembly, not to return again, I do so with kindest thoughts and personal respect for my colleagues, including the members on the Government side . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Including the member for Moose Jaw?

**Mr. Lopton:** — . . . although I detest their political philosophy, and the method they use to promote it. I also want to convey my appreciation and thanks to my friends in the Saltcoats constituency who have seen fit to entrust me to represent them in this Legislature for 21 years. I have enjoyed every minute of it. I will not support the motion.

**Mr. Ross McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, in the short time at my disposal, I am going to dispense with the customary openings, and try to say what I want to say in this short space of time. I want to speak on the Budget, as to what was in it partly, and probably more particularly the things that weren't in the Budget. It is very noticeable, Mr. Speaker, that there was nothing in the Budget with regard to this new marriage between the C.C.F. and labour, despite the fact that the Provincial Treasurer said, in his Budget, the C.C.F. has maintained the Government should announce its program before an election, in order that the people might know what they are voting for and voting against.

I am sure the farmers of this province who have been voting C.C.F. would like to know more about this coming marriage. I don't think they are too happy with being hooked up with labour. That would be an unnatural unity. From what I read in the paper, I don't think that labour is too happy about it. I'm just going to read a very short quotation. Here is an article appearing in 'The Leader-Post' February 24th by a Mr. Macklin and Mr. Howard Palling. One was a Chairman of the Manitoba C.C.F., the other is presently Chairman. I'm not going to read all of this letter, but the sum total of the letter is that labour is confused as to what is going on. I'm just going to read the last paragraph, with your permission, Mr. Speaker. It said:

" . . . organization will be drained of funds through the election campaign, it will not be able to finance the maximum representation at their Convention. Under the proposed affiliation system, the affiliate members would not be contributing financially to the needs of the constituency organization."

There is a whole lot more in there. They are confused and opposed to it, and they are two prominent members of the C.C.F. party in Manitoba.

Then we have another one here from Mr. Douglas Fisher. I think you all know who he is. He is the gentleman who took Mr. Howe out, and I think a lot of people know now that that was a mistake. At any rate he is a C.C.F.er and his comments pertain to this union with labour:

"Douglas Fisher, C.C.F. member for Parliament for Port Arthur, has an apathy towards the new political party which hopes to draw strength from the C.C.F. supporters, labour and farm groups."

Mr. Fisher was quoted in 'The Canadian Democrat', a publication of the Winnipeg Woodsworth Society. He went on to say:

"The most prominent . . . is that unions have gone too far, and union bosses are dictatorial. Their attitude might be expected from some groups, but it is really sobering when it comes from the workers themselves. Labour is on the defensive. There is a Trojan horse within the framework, and the leaders cry of solidarity, political action, and damn the newspapers.

Union activities are carried on well by business agents and representatives regarding the wage increase benefits . . .

(but this is the important part as far as I am concerned,)

. . . these militant attitudes are rather poor assets for a political party. There had been no spontaneous enthusiasm for a new party from this labour union.

There will be small enthusiasm unless we see first some indication that the labour rank and file is in favour of the idea, and secondly, that the leadership does something to give them an honest part in discussing the problem."

That it is not Liberal propaganda. These both come from prominent C.C.F.ers,

March 3, 1960

and I think it is quite safe to say that labour is confused, and not enthusiastic, about this coming marriage.

It would seem that the C.C.F., in wooing this bride, labour, not for a bride, but for her money. The C.C.F. hope to get huge sums of money for political campaign purposes, out of this marriage. When marriages are conducted on that basis, Mr. Speaker, they are usually not satisfactory. I don't know anybody yet who got married for money that got along very well.

I want to read just a short article, when the Premier of this province was speaking in Winnipeg, January 4th, in the synagogue down there. I'm not going to read it all, just the last paragraph. He had this to say, (he criticized the name of his own party):

"He said the word 'Federation' in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation is outdated and obsolete. We are not a Federation any more; we are a political party.

Mr. Douglas said that the new labour political outlook does not indicate weakness in the C.C.F. Party."

It worries me that people in the C.C.F. feel this way. The fact is that it is definitely unfortunate that in the past 25 years, we have been taking in more growth."

Now, that is a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the C.C.F., say 15 years ago or less than that — since I came in the House. They weren't a political party; they wouldn't stoop to that. They were an organization; growth; they were going to show all Canada how to run a party — how things should be done. Humanity first! No politics. They even said one time (some of the more optimistic ones) that they would spread right over the world — right over to Asia, their system of government, and now the Premier has suddenly decided that it is a political party; it isn't that kind of a group; it is a political party, and all political parties need money, that is why they are trying to marry into some money. I don't think that is a very good idea. I don't think the farmers of this province are going to appreciate that very much.

I think under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, that the people in this province, the farmers who have been voting C.C.F., and others, are entitled to know before this election just who is going to run the C.C.F. party, and what its policies are. More so, in face of the fact that the Provincial Treasurer said they are now going to signify what their policies are, so that the people would know what they are voting for or against. Here is a beautiful opportunity for them to carry that out. Just announce what the policies are going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to have near the time I wanted to, to go into these things. I wanted to go into some of the municipal affairs, and want particularly to go into one part of the Provincial Treasurer's speech, where he said that municipal road assistance authorities would require \$7 million for the market roads and bridges, and then goes on to say that "15 years ago no such provincial assistance was available." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. The facts of the matter are that since this Government came into power, the bridges in our municipalities were the responsibility of the Government. I also wanted to say that until this Government came in, ferries were all under highways, and that is where they should be. The only reason that ferries put were put under Municipal Affairs was to boost up the amount that is being paid to municipalities so that their total would look greater for political propaganda.

There is another thing: if the Provincial Treasurer was really serious in his statement that the C.C.F. believe in announcing their policy so that the people will know what they are voting for and what they are voting against, then he should have mentioned reorganization of municipal boundaries. I couldn't see any mention made about the reorganization of municipal boundaries. I didn't see anything there, and yet that is a very important problem. The municipal men in this province feel it is a very important problem. I just want to say this, that that is an important topic with the municipal men, and I suggest to the Government over there that they go before the Municipal Convention, which is to be held in this city within the next week, and tell them without evasion or equivocation whether they are going to put them into larger units on a vote or not. That shouldn't be hard to do.

Our congenial Minister of Municipal Affairs is a lot more forthright than some the others. In speaking in Prince Albert, on April 21, to a group of teachers, he had this to say:

"Local governments are constantly asking for grants, and the responsibility is gradually moving to the central government. There are three types of government that can be used. They include coterminous boundaries, partial or semi-county system, and the full county system. The Continuing Committee, which is made up of representatives of school boards, rural hospital boards, rural and urban governments, and teachers . . ."

(and this is the part I want you to get):

"They will recommend the county system to the Provincial Government this fall."

Well, I think if we had a little more forthright talk like that, we would all know where we are going. Then he goes on down a little further and says:

March 3, 1960

"A group of people will be invited out of each community, and then the Provincial Government will decide upon which of the three types of county system they are going to use."

If we had a little more forthright talk like that from the other side, the people would know better just which way we are going.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, as I am encroaching on my colleague's time over there, I just want to say, in closing, that I shall not support the Budget, especially since this Government has neglected to announce the policies which I am quite sure they are going to put in. They are soft-peddling this labour marriage in the rural areas, and poking it up in the other areas. They are sidestepping the issue of these boundaries. In the last election they said they were going to have a Conference, and all they got out of that was a Continuing Committee. They are side-stepping it this year. Why can't they get up and tell us on these two particular items, just where they are going, and what their thinking is. They must know. The Minister of Municipal Affairs knew last April where they were going, but the rest of them seem very timid about telling us. I think they know, too — I think they do.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion.

**Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me if I dispense with the usual procedure at the beginning of a speech. I would like to say something about the needs of my constituency of Redberry. First of all, I would suggest that Highway No. 40 should be completed to Hafford, and blacktopped from North Battleford to Prince Albert. The blacktopping on No. 4 should be continued to Cochin and on towards Meadow Lake. No. 24 highway, which starts at No. 55, should continue to 40 and No. 5 should be continued to give the people of Rabbit Lake and all those other areas, a chance of approach to the city of Saskatoon. I would also suggest there should be more assistance given on the grid road system. In fact, I think the grid roads should be taken over by the Provincial Government and incorporated as a secondary highway system and their maintenance should be paid from the provincial treasury. I believe it is time, too, to think of constructing a gas pipeline through that part of the country so that urban centres, or at least the larger ones, should get the service of this cheaper fuel.

I would also mention the people in Edam, Vawn, and Meota areas are still waiting for the ferry across the North Saskatchewan River in that area. Perhaps one of the most urgent needs in the Redberry constituency and in perhaps all the constituencies, is the reduction of property taxes. Taxes are too high, and many people are at times unable to keep up with them.

Access roads should be built to some of the beautiful lakes that are found in our constituency. There are many beautiful lakes in that area, about which the country as a whole doesn't know very much because we are so far from many good roads. I have in mind some of the larger lakes, Redberry Lake, with a shoreline of 45 miles and an area of 27 square miles; Meeting Lake, with a shoreline of 11 miles and an area of four miles; Iroquois, 14 miles of shoreline, and an area of two and three-quarter miles, Mistawasis or Sandy, with a shoreline of miles and two square miles of water. There are others, such as Comoford, Polosa, Lost Lake, and others that are hidden away from the good roads. We should have roads so that some of the people from Saskatchewan and larger centres would have a chance to visit those lakes, and relax on their beaches.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the budget. In discussing the budget, it isn't so much a question of how much is spent, but how it is spent. I believe that large sums of money could be saved in each Department, if waste could be cut out. Over the past years, I carefully studied the spending by the various departments and especially I concentrated on the Department of Social Welfare. I find there was no effort made to save. I find the Minister is just as concerned at finding jobs for his friends, as he is in helping the needy. I studied the Public Accounts of . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — . . . several Canadian provinces, and I find that they do much the same kind of work for much less than the Department of Social Welfare spends. In 1958-59, the Department of Social Welfare . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The statement should be withdrawn!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just stated the Minister of Social Welfare was finding jobs for his friends. That is not so. If we were outside this House I would use a stronger word.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to express my opinion.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I want that withdrawn!

**Premier Douglas:** — You'll have to prove it, or withdraw it.

**Opposition Members:** — Sit down!

**Premier Douglas:** — No one can make me sit down, other than the Speaker.

March 3, 1960

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member will be required to withdraw that statement; it has been denied by the Minister.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member must withdraw it unless he can prove . . .

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, to save time I withdraw this. In 1958-59, the Department of Social Welfare spent \$12,933,000. I was curious to know how much of this was spent on administration and how much was for actual need. That is, the old age pensioners, child welfare, social aid and mothers' allowance, blind and disabled. I excluded from my consideration the institutional services, that is, for the aged, geriatric centres and gaols. Those cost \$2 1/2 million. If we subtract that from the \$12 million, it saves about \$10 million — \$10,400,000 for public assistance. That is the money to be spent on the needy and how was it spent? \$8,600,000 was passed on to the needy and it took \$1,700,000 for administration; simplifying these figures, that is what we get. Out of every \$100 spent, \$83 went to the needy, and \$17 for administration. It cost \$1 to process and issue cheques for \$6. The ratio is \$1 for the Government; \$6 for the needy. In the same year in Manitoba, \$8 million was spent on Social Welfare, \$500,000 was spent on administration, and the cost is \$1 to pay out \$16. In Newfoundland, \$13 million was spent on public aid, and of this \$709,000 on administration, or a ratio of \$1 to \$16.25. In Ontario \$42 million was spent on social welfare, and the administration cost \$2 1/2 million. In the past in Saskatchewan, in 1934, \$4,200,000 was spent, and the administration cost \$88,000 or one to 47. In 1935, two and one-half million was spent on the needy and the administration cost \$53,000. Again, the ratio is one to 47. After all, in the past the Liberals weren't such bad business men. The C.C.F. today charges eight times as much to do the same work.

Let us return to the Canadian scene today. Other provinces are doing it at a ratio of about one to 16; in Saskatchewan it is 1 to 6. It costs almost three times as much in Saskatchewan to help the needy as it does in other provinces throughout Canada. I have come to the conclusion that we could streamline our Department of Social Welfare, and do more efficient work as other provinces are doing today. We would save almost \$1 million. It would match the Canadian ratio of spending. If this amount so saved were passed to the old age security recipients, each one of them would get \$58 a year more or about \$4.95 a month more than they get now.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — If this amount saved was to be passed along to mothers' allowance cases, of which we have 2,222, each mother would get \$454 a year more, or almost \$37.80 a month to help take care of her children.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — We must streamline the administration of the Social Welfare Department and then pass on more money to the needy.

Checking this year's Budget, the estimates for 1960 under Social Welfare, we find this Department is budgeting for an increase of \$571,000 more over last year. But an estimate shows less to be expended on the needy. Mothers' allowances will get \$80,000 odd less; supplemental allowances, \$29,000 less than last year; old age assistance, will go down by \$142,000 from last year. Blind persons will get \$120,880 less than last year. In total, there will be less spent on the needy this year by \$185,990. Although their budget has increased by over half a million, there is a decrease to the needy by \$185,990. I suppose, then, that more workers will have to be hired for this extra amount.

From Public Service Commission reports, we find that on December 1, 1958, the fact that the Department of Social Welfare employed 790 people, and a year later, this figure went on up to 904, an increase of 110 workers.

**Mr. Bentley:** — Who wrote that for you?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — This was from the Department of Social Welfare — their report.

**Opposition Members:** — It was your own Department!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — And if it is true in the Department of Social Welfare, it may be equally true in other Departments, and so I believe the time has come when the people of Saskatchewan should take a very good look at the C.C.F. Government to see how they run their public affairs.

**Mr. Bentley:** — They've already done so.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — They're going to have a very good look again, and it is just too bad that we are unable to express our opinions really, because of this radio time in which we have to confine ourselves — to just so many minutes. You'll find the C.C.F. speakers are day after day speaking on, and we just get a few minutes to report, as if their truth was greater than ours. In fact, I believe they are trying to bury the truth in this province, and they are doing it over the air, over TV and in every possible way.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — You're certainly distorting it.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I believe the people are beginning to see through it, and I am sure the results of the coming election will be something that will surprise all the C.C.F.

March 3, 1960

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a statement which is not in accordance with the facts. The amount of radio time which each member has in this House is the same; if anything, Opposition members have slightly more per capita than government members.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, the people out in the country see it differently . . .

**Govt. Members:** — They sure do!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — We get half an hour, or 45 minutes in two days and the rest of the time is taken up by the C.C.F.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, on account of these shortcomings, in the Social Welfare Department and in the other Departments, I don't think I should support the budget because I don't think my people would suggest I support a budget in which there is so much waste. As I am speaking, I believe that the Social Welfare Minister will get up and accuse me of denying help to the needy. This is just the opposite. I would like to see that the needy get more, and his administration get less. I will not support the budget.

**Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, now that the storm has subsided to calm, I would first like to congratulate all those speakers who have taken part in this debate thus far. I would also thank on behalf of my desk mate, the member for Meadow Lake, the sincere concern shown regarding his health before he could attend, and certainly for the warm welcome that was expressed when he did come to take part in those discussions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the duty of the Opposition is to point out as we see them the weakness and the shortcomings in the program that is proposed by the government and, therefore, because the Members on your right expect us to do that, I shall use my time to criticize the budget as I see it. However, if we do criticize and then vote against the motion as a whole, it does not mean that we vote against all portions of the program individually. Certainly we are in favour of any possible measure that this modern age can give to people to enrich people's lives. Certainly we are interested in increased grants for health, for education, for the extension of the agricultural needs, and so on, and certainly programs of that nature have our wholehearted endorsement. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Social Credit has led the way in many of these programs as the records will bear out. I do, however, take exception to an attitude of the government, and the Provincial Treasurer even brought this out in his budget. I am referring to an attempt to get support during an election campaign on the strength of a proposed measure, namely, the prepaid medical health plan. This type of attitude is undemocratic. It is unfair to ask people to vote for an administration because people might want one part of their program. People should vote on the record of the Government, and that certainly is not the best in this case.

Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that this is the sixteenth consecutive surplus budget; it's true that this is the sixteenth of an

unbroken series of growing budgets; it is true that it is the last budget brought down by a capable and faithful Provincial Treasurer, yet, Mr. Speaker, this document is coloured with pride and jealousy; it is punctuated throughout with political appeal, so it sounds to me more like an obituary than a budget. The songs of praise and self-glorification fill thirteen pages of this budget because finally at page 14 at the top of the page, the Provincial Treasurer says: "And I come now to the presentation of the budget". And then when he did get started he somewhat contradicted himself. I would like to read from the budget at pages 14 and 15 . . . first at page 14 he says:

"As I prepared this budget, Mr. Speaker, I found myself comparing it not with last year's budget, but with that of 1945-46 — my first."

That was at page 14. Then on page 15:

"This whole program for economic growth is so vastly different from that of fifteen years ago that comparisons can scarcely be made."

**Mr. McCarthy:** — He admits that.

**Mr. Elias:** — The Liberal member for Maple Creek was somewhat conservative when estimating the number of trips the Provincial Treasurer made back to 1944. I found 39 comparisons made to 1944 and the great majority of these are on a straight dollar-wise basis. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer knows that such childish comparisons are almost meaningless. Certainly . . .

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — I got tired of counting.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — I don't like to interrupt the hon. Member's speech . . . just a minute . . . on a point of privilege . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Fines:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member has referred to a certain number . . . I believe he used the 39 — references to '44, 1944 . . . there is not a single comparison with 1944. Each one was with my first budget 1945-46 . . . not 1944. Let's keep the record straight.

**Mr. Elias:** — Well this just adds to the childishness of the whole affair. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, they are rendered most ineffective, when we take into consideration the inflationary trend of today. We also know that during these years — the first years of 1943 and 1944 we were just recovering from the depression years. This is what I mean. The fact that I wore \$7.00

March 3, 1960

shoes in 1944 and today wear a similar pair costing \$18.00 does in no way prove progress in my life. Similarly, all dollar-wise comparisons to 1944 have little or no meaning . . .

**Mr. Walker (Attorney General):** — Intelligent people take that into account.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Elias:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal so far in this debate about the problems of municipal reorganization, assistance to the grid road program, the right to burn purple gas in farm trucks, the formation of a new political party. We have heard beefs and bouquets about road programs, health programs, the farm credit plan, and so on. These are all important measures, that is true, but it seems to me that there are dangerous undercurrents and ominous hand-writings on the wall which forecast a stormy future. We should draw our attention to these, their causes and their cures, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the time would be well spent today to think of some of these real basic issues that are facing our fair province and our nation. There was certain remark in the budget that prompted me to speak on the topic that I was to discuss this afternoon. Much has been said in these debates about the debt of the province, and with these new descriptive terms added, such as 'net debt' and 'indirect debt' and so on they all simply add to the confusion, so I would suggest that we try to keep the confusion orderly. All debt, whether direct or indirect debt weight, or net debt come to borrowing, and all borrowed money must be covered with a debt charge which is very directly reflected in the tax load.

**Mr. Walker:** — What about debt free money?

**Mr. Elias:** — The Member for Maple Creek very severely criticized the government for going on a borrowing spree and rightly so. Yet he offered no solution to the problem, except that he suggested loans should be made within Canada. To me this criticism came as a real surprise, because when in office, the Liberals have always financed heavily through borrowing. This is true of their actions both provincially and federally.

I have here a table which goes back to 1940. This is the result of the Liberal administration . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — Now who's going back and forth (to forties)?

**Mr. Elias:** — The gross debt was over \$250 million dollars. The net debt was over \$190 million dollars and it goes on and on that way, so provincially they were financing through borrowing, yet, the Member was criticizing so I couldn't see the justice in it at all. Federally, the same way. Here is the record of the federal government. We all know that the national debt is growing to very great heights. These are figures that I wouldn't even attempt to read here, but those are the results of federal administration of financing through borrowing. The Conservatives are just as guilty of this practice, but throughout this whole budget the Provincial Treasurer not only condones borrowing but he boasts about it and calls it an accomplishment. To me the most

abominable execration contained in the whole budget is on page 10 where the Provincial Treasurer says . . . and I would like to read page 10 towards the bottom . . . he says:

"I expect, indeed I look forward to a continued rapid increase in the gross debt as we go on to expand these basic utilities to meet the demands of the future."

On page 11 at the top he calls it an "accomplishment."

Now, we as Social Creditors . . . we abhor debt. We look upon it as a cancerous growth in our whole economy. To us it means the mortgaging of the economic future of successive generations. It is, however, abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that the C.C.F. have completely resigned to orthodox financing and so, on this basis, there is no difference between the C.C.F. and the Liberals and the Conservatives, except in the degree and the speed with which they inflict punishment upon people.

Just the other day I ran across the definition of a coward which I think is very fitting at this time. It said, "A coward is someone who does everything that everybody else does." The government is very well aware of the evils of financing on borrowed capital. This was shown on Tuesday when the Minister of Public Works expressed the deep concern over the increased cost of public buildings due to interest charges. Much could be said to show how interest on public debt adds to our living costs, but at this time let us confine our remarks to those made by Mr. Cass-Beggs, general manager of the Power Corporation. I would like to quote from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, of Tuesday, January 12, 1960. The heading of that article was: "Money Cost Big Factor in Expense". I would like to quote:

"The interest rate on an investment was the critical item in electric power cost".

Mr. Cass-Beggs said on Monday, in addressing the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Agricultural Graduate Association. He illustrated the difference between the United States where the rural electrification administration had the benefit of government funding at 21 per cent interest, and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which had to borrow money around 5 per cent and now 6 per cent. Mr. Cass-Beggs said:

"The farmer would not get a significantly lower power cost even if the Power Corporation received its power free".

Mr. Cass-Beggs said:

"The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has moved into Hydro Electric generation as a cost-reducing measure, but the benefit to the farm population would be limited".

Now, before I go on and tell what our solution to the problem is, Mr. Speaker, I do feel I owe my friend from Saltcoats a reply. He

March 3, 1960

didn't understand social credit . . .

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — I certainly didn't . . .

**Mr. Elias:** — It is because the people of Alberta and British Columbia didn't understand Liberalism . . . that's why they didn't support that party. He challenges me to explain Social Credit. Well I will do that the minute he explains the present method of finance. I am sorry to see him leave his political career so uninformed.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, what is the solution to that? For the want of better names, let's classify all government expenditures. These are my own terms . . . I do not say they are official terms . . .

**Some Opposition Members:** — Are there any official terms?

**Mr. Elias:** — Under social expenditure we will put such items as public buildings, highways, roads, schools, hospitals, public utilities, these are all of a nature . . . they serve the people, they are never sold, they are never bought by individuals.

Under productive expenditures . . . moneys spent for industry, production processes, distribution, could be classified productive expenditures. We all agree that there is a distinction between home and foreign loans. We also all agree that foreign loans are a greater risk and result in financial penalties on our country. To overcome this, we, of the Social Credit, suggest that all capital for social expenditures, whether provincial or federal should be provided to the government directly through the Bank of Canada. The rate of interest on such advances should be just high enough to take care of the service of these loans. The Bank of Canada should be at the service of Canadians. The preamble of the law which established this bank in 1934 stated and I quote: To promote the economic and financial welfare of the Dominion".

The Hon. Mr. Fleming in 1957, when speaking to a conference of the eastern provinces said:

"The monetary policy of the nation and of the Bank of Canada was created to serve the people — all the people — wherever they may work and plan — wherever there may be dreams of a greater Canada."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we see that the federal and the provincial governments are involved in a long and losing battle with the financial complexities of their economic problems. Such procedure is not the characteristic of an institution of service, but of an institution of tyranny. This arrangement that I have proposed would have many advantages: and therefore an automatic reduction possible in taxation; No. 2, governments would not be competing with private industry and individuals for the available supply of money; No. 3, it would automatically help to keep interest rates down, thereby relieving the economy of the country of the adverse effects of a tight money policy.

Excessive debt charge inevitably result in increased taxation.

That taxation is becoming an ever increasing burden is an undeniable fact. The federal tax alone, paid by a family of five persons in 1868 was \$16.65; in 1939, it was \$192.55; in 1959 it was \$1,235.35. Taxes mean increased cost of living because they do ultimately find their way into the prices of groceries, clothing, homes and cars etc. I would like to read a little portion of the Reader's Digest. This was the last Issue. On page 183 appears an article called "Public Enemy No. 1". This deals with the United States . . . American figures, but comparable figures . . . could be had for Canada:

"Gasoline would sell for .02 cents a gallon, except for the taxes. Counting the indirect as well as the direct taxes there are more than 1,000 taxes on one quart of milk . . . "

And this is the part I wish you would all note very carefully.

"Historically whenever any nation has taxed its people more than 25 per cent, that nation has been headed for economic decay. Already the United States taxes are devouring more than a third of every income dollar."

Now, what is the picture like in Saskatchewan? The total per capita federal tax — and we must take the federal tax into consideration because we, as citizens, also have to pay the taxes of the federal government. Total per capita federal tax in 1958 were \$247.07. To this let us add the total per capita provincial and municipal tax . . . That is \$131.61 making a total per capita tax of \$378.68. The average personal income in Saskatchewan in 1958 was \$1,220, and therefore, 31 per cent of our income is absorbed in taxes and, therefore, we are already beyond the degree of taxation that they are in the States. Economists agree that when expenditures rise to meet income levels our path of freedom is blocked, still most people are too block-headed to admit it. Heavy tax burdens rob individuals of initiative and sap the vigour of a country. I would like to read two portions, one from Maclean's Magazine. This is Maclean's Magazine of January 30th, 1960:

"We do not base our personal budget on what our past extravagances have taught us to like but on the income we can fairly expect to receive. We do not in short plan to spend what we have not got. The same principle should be applied to public as it does to individual finance. The first question to consider is the ratio between the revenue and the gross national product. What proportion of the national income should the government demand?"

Now listen carefully:

"The power to tax creates the illusion of limitless income and nations blissfully spend themselves into bankruptcy. France's ancient regime bled its life away in red ink before

March 3, 1960

a single head fell under the guillotine. Like certain poisons, taxes can be taken only in small doses. When the peacetime national tax passes 10 per cent, people begin to take action. Add about 25 per cent, inflation debases the currency. Over 35 per cent taxes are alms for oblivion. The nation is carting itself to history's junk-pile."

Now Mr. Speaker, I think these are warnings and we should pay heed to them. I am deeply perturbed about the provincial pronouncement of continued rapid increase in the gross debt. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I owe the C.C.F. an apology for saying that they had no clear declaration of policy, but now we know. It's a policy not of humanity first but a policy of political expediency for the survival of the C.C.F. first. Taxes mean bondage, taxes mean enslavement, yes — and a loss of freedom. We maintain if we have 10 per cent taxes we have 10 per cent socialism; if our incomes are taxed 20 per cent then we have 20 per cent socialism; if our incomes are taxed 30 per cent then we have become 30 per cent vassals of the state, and should we continue it, if we have 100 per cent taxation we have communism. Mr. Speaker, I feel deeply about these matters and I feel we have a responsibility beyond ourselves. We have a responsibility to the generations to follow. The question is "What heritage will we pass on to the tomorrow?" The direction we are following in Saskatchewan can very easily be seen when we look at the capital provincial tax. In 1940, it was \$6.11; in 1945, \$14.09; 1950, \$20.49; 1955, \$36.66; 1960, \$54.14. The per capita municipal tax has the same pattern. In 1944 the per capita tax was \$31.00; 1958, it was \$78.00. There was an increase of 100.3 per cent. If you do not like the figures take the percentages then.

In towns . . . I am not comparing taxes, my friend, I am only showing how your administration has caused increased taxes and how they are coming to levels that are very dangerous. I am not comparing taxes at all, but I am showing the growth of taxes. In towns in 1944 it was \$23.70; in 1958 it was \$58.00, an increase of 145 per cent. In rural municipalities it was \$28.60 to \$102.00, and this is an increase of 256 per cent.

Now the Provincial Treasurer's announcement regarding the future financial policy of the C.C.F. is nothing short of bequeathing posterity with the loss of the very freedom our forefathers fought for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to a different topic. Revenues from the education tax, hospitalization tax, the gasoline tax, the liquor profits, are all expected to be higher than estimated, while petroleum and natural gas revenues are expected to fall below the estimates. In Alberta where they face the identical marketing problems, they are expecting an entirely different experience. In Alberta in 1959 they had roughly \$100 million dollar revenue from their natural resources development. Next year they expect to have \$35,019,000 more.

I have prepared a chart here — I wish they were bigger so you could all see, but to me these charts reveal the whole mystery. I

have a chart here with two lines on it. One is a red line, which is Saskatchewan, and the blue line is Alberta. The first one, the red line, shows what percentage of the total budgetary revenue in Saskatchewan came from taxes. In 1935 it was 37.65 per cent, and as you can see, the line remains consistently high, and in 1960 it is still 35 per cent, meaning that we had actually had no relief from taxes at all in Saskatchewan. Comparing it to Alberta, the blue line, you can see that taxes in Alberta contribute a far smaller percentage to their total budgetary revenue. It is consistently low compared to Saskatchewan. They started out in 1935 with 30.95 per cent and they ended up with 13 per cent. But where does the money that the Alberta government uses come from to give all the service they are enjoying in that province? This second chart gives you the answer. Again, we have two lines on this chart. The red line is Saskatchewan, and the blue line is Alberta. Comparing the same years, we see that the red line for Saskatchewan is low. This red line shows what percentage of our total budgetary revenue came from the development of natural resources. In 1935 it was 9 percent and it had remained very, very low — the highest was 18 per cent and now it is down to 15 percent, whereas, in Alberta we see that the line takes a decided jump upwards. Their highest was 54 percent. In 1955, 54 percent of their total budgetary revenue came from the development of natural resources.

Now, I found in The Leader-Post of February 27th a rather interesting column. It showed in one column in dealing with our province's provincial gross debt, the figure \$377,324,000, and the irony of the whole thing is that just opposite in the next column there is a figure almost the same — \$397,787,000. It is rather confusing. The first figure deals with our gross provincial debt and the other speaks of the provincial reserves which they have in Alberta. The cash reserves of Alberta are almost the same, in fact a little more, than our gross debt. So reading on in this column I'll quote from The Leader-Post:

"Mr, Hinman said that this consisted of so many million dollars invested in municipalities, school boards, roads, electrification association and Alberta Government Telephones, and \$84,000,000 in cash and investments in federal and provincial securities."

**Mr. Fines:** — May I ask one question here? If Alberta has all this cash why did they find it necessary to go to the Now York market in September to borrow \$30,000,000 for the telephone system?

**Mr. Elias:** — We're talking about reserves right now. I started checking and found that Alberta has in federal investments \$43,000,000 — \$43,216,000, which gave them an annual interest return on their investment of \$1,641,200, and then the provincial investments are \$40,140,000 which gives them an interest return of \$1,657,400, making a total return on their investment of over \$3,000,000. Incidentally, this return on their investment is approximately the same as the total spent by this government in the last three years on supplementary allowance.

March 3, 1960

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I thought they didn't believe in interest.

**Mr. Elias:** — Well, I was interested in these provincial investments and here I have "Within Our Border", of December 1959, wherein Mr. Hinman, the Provincial Treasurer, gave a breakdown of this and I find that the Province of Saskatchewan had borrowed \$2,000,000 from Alberta, so I am happy, and this is due in July of 1960.

**Mr. Fines:** — I might say we reciprocated. We did the same with them. We held some of their bonds.

**Mr. Elias:** — Because they have these huge reserves in Alberta, they are able to provide their people with services . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Elias:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe, I still have the floor, have I not? I would appreciate the courtesy of the whole House which I give to the House. Now, because Alberta has these huge reserves they are able to give their people service at far, far lower cost than we have in Saskatchewan. The town of Rosthern put in water and sewer. To do this they had to finance. The first debenture issued \$118,000 at 6 percent is costing them \$88,020 in interest. The balance of this \$232,000 at 6 1/2 per cent will cost them in interest charges \$278,889, making a total interest charge of \$366,909. More than the capital outlay of the whole system they have there. In Alberta that would not be so because they are providing these surpluses to their people at a very nominal rate varying from 2 percent to 3 1/2 and 4 percent.

Attempts are being made to measure progress. Some of these, as I have said before, are practically meaningless, so I would like to take time to make a few more comparisons which, to my mind, are much more realistic.

I found in the Trade and Commerce Magazine they had made a market survey, comparing the four western provinces. I have here the figures for Alberta and Saskatchewan. The Alberta story of the market survey was in the September issue, 1959, and the Saskatchewan in the May issue, 1959. I am quoting from those figures. Now, I have always said that dollar-wise comparisons have very little meaning. As I gave you an example before, though much has been said about population, I am just going to give these comparisons in the same order that they were given in this market survey. The first one happened to deal with population. The population of Saskatchewan has grown. Before I go on, this market survey compared the ten-year period from 1948 to 1958, and the population in Saskatchewan has grown from 1948 to 1958 — it has increased from 838,000 to 896,000. There is progress. Yes, our population has grown, but that doesn't mean too much. The population in Alberta grew from 885,000 to 1,234,000. This still doesn't mean much. But, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the population in those ten years increased by 6.9 per cent and the population in Alberta increased by 39.5 per cent, then it has meaning. That our population did not increase at the same rate as Alberta's is alarming, but the most alarming thing about it is if I take the vital statistics that were tabled here — Vital Statistics,

1958, at page 10, there is a table which shows the age distribution of our population in Saskatchewan. In 1938, the age group 15 to 44 represented 36.3 for population. That same group and the group I'm talking about now is the age group where people are in their best earning years. In 1948 it had dropped to 45.2 per cent; in 1958, it was only 39.8 per cent, so it shows that the age group that looks for employment is progressively representing a smaller and smaller percent of our total population. If you look at the last group given, 65 and over, in 1938 it represented 4.3 per cent; in 1948, 7.2 per cent; in 1958, 9 per cent. From these two comparisons it would seem as though our whole average age in Saskatchewan is increasing. It is no shame to live in an old folks' home but I would hate to see Saskatchewan become Canada's old folks' home. That's what I am somewhat concerned about. Let's go back to these comparisons. Bank clearings: bank clearings increased in Saskatchewan by 142 per cent, but in Alberta 331 per cent; construction increased in Saskatchewan 667 per cent, in Alberta 728 per cent; retail trade 90 per cent for Saskatchewan, 104 per cent for Alberta; manufacturing jumped 97 per cent in Saskatchewan, 127 per cent in Alberta; personal incomes increased by 34 per cent, in Alberta 108 per cent. For the per capita basis in 1958, ours was \$1,220; in Alberta it was \$1,469. Subtract and that gives you roughly \$250.00 difference per capita. Taking that on an average family of five, it works out to a difference of \$1,250.00, so we have to make a sacrifice of \$1,250.00 per year on a family of five for the privilege of living in Saskatchewan.

To go on with personal incomes, the Premier quoted the figure 49 percent — I didn't check it, but 49 percent of Saskatchewan's population did not earn enough money to pay income tax.

**Premier Douglas:** — I think it was 48.2.

**Mr. Elias:** — I checked and for Alberta it was 41.50 per cent.

**Premier Douglas:** — The national average is 44.5 per cent.

**Mr. Elias:** — I took this from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. It shows that personal incomes in Saskatchewan are not as high as those in Alberta.

One more comparison. Telephone service. The telephone service in Saskatchewan did grow. It increased in 10 years by 80 per cent, but in Alberta it increased by 190 per cent. So, all along, we see that we have made progress. I am not denying that fact at all. We have made progress, but I am of that type, I am only satisfied when we are making as much or more profits than the others. I have always had that attitude in life.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure this House that I am happy about the possibilities of greater services, because of greater expenditures forecast in the budget. I am also happy that the Departments of Education, Health, and Agriculture, will receive their fair share of those increases, but the question is, what are the sacrifices we are making in order to get these programs? I have tried to show the hon. members in

March 3, 1960

this House the urgency to turn back to fiscal and financial sanity in federal and provincial affairs before it is too late. This however, is not the policy applied in the Budget Speech, but rather it is one that will result in a financial nightmare to haunt future generations and future governments.

A predominant educationalist made this very thought-provoking statement:

"Most Canadians in the complacency and passiveness of the comforts and conveniences of modern living do not understand how close and how rapidly we are being drawn to that precipice of catastrophe."

Hon. members, I am appealing to you. Let's face the facts! Mr. Speaker, I will not support the Motion.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I am not going to go through all the formalities that we have heard over the last few days. I think your ears must be getting rather tired of it, but I will just say that I join with the others who have preceded me in extending congratulations to the various members who have taken part in this debate, and also to the ones who are, like myself, leaving the legislature after this term.

Today, as I listened to the member for Saltcoats (Mr. A. Lopton) when he made a comparison between the different parties in the province, I couldn't help but think of the decimation that is going to take place in the seats opposite after the next election. He was quite convinced the Tories would not make a showing and he was also convinced that the Social Credit would be washed out, and I know in his heart he knows perfectly well that the Liberal party is also washed up.

Last night when the member for Saltcoats was speaking, I noticed he bewailed the fact that this province had gone back, that this Government had driven all the oil rigs out of Saskatchewan and my mind went back and I hate to use this term 1944, because I must admit I am going to use it. The member for Rosthern (Mr. Isaak Elias) said that he also criticized us for using it, but I notice he referred to 1944 ten or twelve times in the short time he spoke today, but I'm going to use it, and as I recall it, I doubt if there was a single oil drilling rig in Saskatchewan in 1944. I am quite sure that the Member for Saltcoats is quite familiar with the oil situation in the province, and I think he is interested and admits to this, but to make sure that I am not wrong I have looked up the record and this is what the records show, Mr. Speaker. The records show that in 1944 there was not a single oil producing well in the province of Saskatchewan, and there were 26 capable of producing gas, but not a single one producing oil in 1944. Now what do we find today. Well, I find that the last report put out by the Department of Mineral Resources shows that we now have 4,135 producing wells in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Loptson:** — When did you start it — in 1944?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — No, we didn't start it in 1944, but I quite well remember in 1944 when we took office in this province. The people from Lloydminster came down to see us, and they would have been quite happy if we could even use some of their oil in the heating of our provincial buildings and in the construction of our roads. Well, any hon. Member knows that that is a very small amount of oil, but even with a little assistance here and there it was much better than they ever had from the Liberals. And when he talks about the Imperial Oil being in this province, and this Government chasing them out . . . well, if they were chased out I am afraid I'd have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that they were chased out because they were not drilling and not living up to their commitments, but I want to tell you this, that once this Government was able to get oil companies into this province drilling for oil, the Imperial Oil came back in and they're in here today, and they're in here to stay.

I'm getting kind of tired of these people across the way talking about industries leaving this province and telling us how industry is afraid of this Government. Well, the other day, I think it was the Provincial Treasurer, mentioned a statement made by Dr. I.M. LeBaron in the 'Financial Post' of February 20th (and you can't accuse that paper of being prejudiced to this Government) but in this article, and again quoting, Mr. LeBaron said:

"I want to dispel the idea that we are insecure in getting this project rolling . . . "

That's the one down east of here at Esterhazy —

"In my books this is the best deposit of potash I have ever seen, and I have seen them all. The world's supply of potash for tomorrow is in Saskatchewan. In the next twenty or thirty years there won't be any large world producer not mining in Saskatchewan."

And then again, what do we find? This province has jumped from very low down on the list to the fourth producer of minerals in all of Canada, and we are still holding that position. That is something that never could be said when you had a Liberal government in power in this province. I also notice that the member for Saltcoats stated that it was going to be impossible for this Government to carry out the program that was announced in the Speech from the Throne on the budget.

**Premier Douglas:** — That was in every budget for sixteen years.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That's right. Of course he's thinking of what would happen if there was a Liberal Government here, and he's right. If you had a Liberal Government in this province there wouldn't

be any chance, whatsoever, of them carrying out the program that has been set forth in this Legislature through the Speech from the Throne and in this budget. He's perfectly right. But under the C.C.F. Government we will continue to do as we have done over that sixteen years to fulfill these commitments to the limit.

**Mr. Loptson:** — On a point of order. I never said that this Government couldn't carry out the budget; I said that it might have been a hundred million dollars more if you had a different Government from 1944 on.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Well, I'm not going to argue that point with the hon. Member, we all know what he meant. There are a lot of 'ifs' there. I also noticed today when he went to speak that he took up the old theme of upholding the prices which the farm implement companies are charging for machinery. And I am sure that the farmers in this province will be happy to know that if the Member for Saltcoats is speaking to the Liberal party that they are supporting the farm machinery companies in the price which they are charging the farmers today for their farm implements.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Surely I can tell the honest facts: I didn't support the implement companies — I have no interest in them. I am buying implements at the fantastic price which you fellows have put on them.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — I know he said this: He said that the financial statements showed that they were not making any money, or very little money. Well, I want to remind this House that when the control of prices was done away with in this country, we immediately saw prices go up, not only on farm machinery, but on every thing else, and I also want to remind Members opposite that it was a Liberal Government which moved price controls, and I also want to remind our Social Credit friends across there that they supported the Liberal Government, in fact so did the Tories throughout the province. The only people in the House of Commons who opposed that move wore the C.C.F. members.

Then again they take up the question of purple gas. All the Opposition parties in this province are going to allow farmers to use purple gas in their trucks. Well, I can speak, at least for the people in my area, and I can assure them it will not be a very popular move, because the people in my area — and I am sure that goes for all the province — want to be fair in this matter, and if you allow farmers to use purple gas in their trucks then you can have one farmer who uses his light delivery truck in place of a car and he is allowed to use the highways without making any contribution to their upkeep. The other man who may be using a truck for farm purposes, using his car for general transportation requirements, is going to be called upon to use standard gas.

Now another thing, the people of this province know that every

dollar that is collected from gas tax and from car licenses has been used for the improvement of their highways and their road system. As a matter of fact this Government has been spending much more than they collect from these sources for highways and road purposes, and as that money is being spent to good advantage, which the people know is being done, I can assure you there is going to be no general demand from the public in this province that we reduce those licenses or those taxes, and that the farmers be allowed to use purple gas in their trucks. I also want to say while I am on that subject that I can assure the member for Redberry that there is no waste of money in the department under my administration and I am quite sure that that goes for other departments in the Government as well.

I notice that the member for Saltcoats also said that the Liberal party was on the march. It's the same sort of march that Napoleon was on when he left Moscow. I also note that he mentioned the attacks being made on the new Liberal leader. Well, if they are being made they are not being made on this side of the House. We left him alone. I think that's what's worrying them. They would like to have us persecute him. In fact we have done our very utmost, Mr. Speaker, to make it possible for him to come into this House and take his proper place in this province as the leader of the Liberal party. We have done everything in our power to help them, but apparently the Liberal party have other ideas in this respect and I don't blame them.

There is only one comment I want to make in regard to the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski). Did you notice, he started out by asking for more roads, more gas, more telephone lines, and I don't know what more he wanted. But at the same time he wanted taxes reduced, and no debt! Well, I think that sums about all he has to say in the few minutes he spoke today.

I noticed the other day one of the Opposition members had referred to the lower farm income as was also mentioned by our friend from the Social Credit side today. I wonder why farm income is lower. I mentioned one reason, Mr. Speaker, that farmers are paying more for their implements of production now. The farmers are paying more for their implements of production than was the case a few years ago and while they are paying more for the production, the price of the produce which they must sell has deteriorated. I want to remind this House of something I said in this Legislature two years ago. At that time I placed before this Legislature the farm policy of the C.C.F. We were told at that time it was an impractical policy, but I want to remind this House that since that time the United States Government has adopted that policy in the disposal of their wheat. And you know what has happened, we have dropped from the main exporter of wheat in the world to a very poor second and perhaps lower than that. It has happened because the United States Government has adopted the policies of marketing which we tried to get the Liberal Government of that day to follow. That is one of the reasons it has dropped.

March 3, 1960

I have a clipping here dated January 1, 1949. It's a bit old but I want to read it: It's headed 'Thatcher Critical':

"W. Ross Thatcher, Moose Jaw member of Parliament at a Sunday meeting of the People's Forum said that the billion dollar Anglo-Polish Trade Pact signed in Warsaw last February indicates that Canada's overseas markets for farm produce are rapidly disappearing. If British efforts to buy large quantities of Russian wheat is successful, western Canada farmers might be in difficulties before the year is finished.

"Thatcher was critical of the Federal Cabinet for trying to conduct British-Canadian trade on interdependent lines. He said the Federal Government policy has cost the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars. It has apparently given little assurance of future markets developing. Britain obviously plans to buy farm produce in the future, as in the past, at the cheapest price in a competitive market.

"The member blames the shrinking British market for some of the current unemployment in the Moose Jaw Swift Canadian plant and undesirable repercussions on both farmers and industry in this country."

I wonder if he has forgotten those statements, Mr. Speaker. I'm not surprised. I'm not a bit surprised. I hate to say it, but I think I was responsible for Ross Thatcher joining the C.C.F., and I'm ashamed of it. He attended a meeting of mine in Moose Jaw in 1942 and the next morning he called at my hotel room and enquired as to whether he might be acceptable in the C.C.F. organization. I remember my words to him. I told him we wanted young men, but we wanted to get men who would accept the policies and the principles of our movement. He told me at that time he was the Chairman of the Young Liberals Association In Moose Jaw. He came over to us and you can draw your own conclusions; he didn't stay very long and I'm happy that he has gone and you are welcome to him as far as I am concerned.

Now I want to say a word or two — oh, I see my hon. friend for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) has left the Legislature . . . I would have been disappointed if he hadn't made some reference to bridges in this province. He always does and, knowing that, I looked up some of the old records of the department at that time. He told us about the Liberal party being responsible for the cost and condition of all, the bridges in our province. I am not denying this, maybe he is right. But I want

to remind him that when the Liberal Government of the day, 1943, was preparing a brief to submit to the Federal Government, this information was sent to Mr. Cronkite, who was preparing the brief for them, dated November 13, 1943:

"On this system of main market roads there are approximately 2,600 untreated timber bridges. One thousand of these are over 20 years old and are consequently unsafe for heavy traffic."

That's the Liberal record.

And let me remind you of something else. Under a Liberal Government the province had the municipalities collect the public revenue tax which amounted to close to \$2 million a year, and it remained for this Government to do away with that tax.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald:** — We forced you to. You voted against it . . . Sure you did!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, compare that record again with that of the Liberal Government. Back in 1937 the farmers of this province were hard pressed, and the tax burden had piled up to such an extent that the municipalities were going to be forced to take control of the title of much of this land. Had that been done, the mortgage companies of this country were going to have a very severe blow or else be prepared to pay up these back taxes. So, in order to protect the insurance companies and the mortgage companies, they wiped out these back taxes. As far as the farmers were concerned, they were . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I'm not wrong. But the mortgage companies had their equities made secure in the mortgages they hold across this land. I want to say that the number of farms under mortgages at that time was very, very high.

That is the despicable thing that the people of this province can expect from the Liberal Government. Then the member for Saltcoats got up on his feet today, and talked about the plight of the machine companies, and gave us a good indication of what we could expect if the Liberal Government were returned to power in this province.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They will be.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Now, I want to say a word or two about some of the statements of my friends in the Social Credit Party. The hon. member, as I said a moment ago, deplored the fact that we had referred to 1944, but he did pretty well himself. Then he refers to debt, and he said all borrowed money must be considered debt. Well, I

March 3, 1960

have here the Public Accounts for the province of British Columbia and I also have a clipping (I think this is also from the Financial Post) regarding a statement on the last B.C. budget, and referring to this, he says:

"It was the first debt-free budget since 1874."

Well, how do they get a debt-free budget out in British Columbia?

**Mr. McDonald:** — The same way you do.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I haven't time to finish the whole story, Mr. Speaker, but I have here what is known as the British Columbia's poll on Highway and Bridge Authority, and this authority borrows considerable amounts of money, used for highway purposes. I find in Public Accounts, which is for the year March 31, 1959, the total amount that has been spent by this was \$71,172,098. During that time I find the province of B.C. out of general revenue had paid subsidies to a total of \$4,366,466. When we talk of debt-free moneys, and I heard the hon. member for Rosthern here saying that all borrowings should be considered as debt, I could not help but think of this little incident, and it is a great deal different to what the member for Maple Creek said the other day when he accused our Provincial Treasurer of taking a leaf out of the books of the Government. I want to say there is a great deal of difference between the borrowings for this road authority as between the borrowings for our Power Corporation. "It is nothing for them to provide over \$4 million in one year to meet the deficit of this authority. The thing is simply a hoax to give the idea of having a debt-free area in B.C." That, of course, is not correct. If our friend from Rosthern is correct, of course, the people from B.C., are entirely wrong.

I also note that he referred to expenditures, highway, power, etc., and I am just wondering how he would justify the statement I have just read with that statement of his. When he wants to use the yardstick of comparison he goes to the province of Alberta, and refers to the studies he has made there, but what he forgot to tell us was that Alberta has, over the last few years, been spending their heritage at an extravagant rate, and the wonderful surplus which he quoted must now be gone, because as was pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer a few moments ago, they have now gone to the markets of the United States to borrow \$30 million, for their telephones.

So far as the province of British Columbia is concerned, they have been doing more borrowing in late years than was the case even under the Liberal or Conservative Government, in British Columbia. Again I find that the province of Alberta has been loaning money to their municipalities on which they have been charging this awful thing of interest. These Social Credit friends of mine keep talking about interest-free money. I know when they are in office they forget all about it.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — How much has been charged percentage wise?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I haven't got the amount here; but it is a very considerable amount. As a matter of fact I think your desk mate there could give you those figures because he was quoting the amount of money which they had earned through interest charges. It is a very considerable sum.

Then the statement was made a few moments ago that the Province of Alberta to is giving their people better service than Saskatchewan, is one that will not hold water, when you come to scrutinize it. I haven't the time here, but I want to point out this, that a few years ago I was at the town of Macklin, and at that time the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was installing power to the farmers of that area for \$500 a farm, but right across the line in the province of Alberta it was costing the farmer \$1,300 to have power installed on their farms. That is what you get under private ownership. Here was another case: there was one farmyard in Saskatchewan where two homes were being serviced by power. The charge was the same, but in the province of Alberta where you have a similar situation, the cost for these two people was \$1,300 for each installation. Now, you can't tell me that the people of Alberta are getting better services than they are in Saskatchewan. I want to tell you that our scheme cannot be equalled in the province of Alberta, and the scheme which they have in operation there now, is not to be compared with what we have in the province of Saskatchewan.

He also talks of the population drop in the two provinces. Well it is understandable. In this province we have a much larger proportion of our population who are agriculturists, and anyone who knows anything about agriculture, knows that the process of mechanization our farmers have been going through of late years, has made it necessary that the population be decreased, because today you can have two men with modern machinery go out and handle 1,000 acres of land whereas a few years ago it would have taken many more men. The fact that we have a larger agricultural area than the province of Alberta is one of the reasons why our population increase has been slower, possibly, than the province across the way.

I want to say very definitely that as far as the province of Alberta is concerned, they have not given their people any greater services than the people of Saskatchewan have received.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Where are you going to live when you retire?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I am going to live in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

## SECOND READING

### Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend the Intestate Succession Act.

**Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt):** — The amendment to this Act has given me a good deal of concern and I hope that the House will see fit to have a debate on this question. I don't think it is so much a legal point, I realize that in the past the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Walker) and I have perhaps had too many technical arguments to keep the interest of the House, but this is something that very much almost concerns every person in the province of Saskatchewan. I think the suggested amendment is very important and I think that the hon. members ought to consider it from the point or view of the people who are going to be affected. It is not a matter of legal argument; it is a question of policy as to what is best for the people concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. members that this suggested amendment changes the law of Saskatchewan in the case of death without will, in the case of intestacies. At this time, if someone dies without a will the law of Saskatchewan states that the wife will get one half of the estate and if there is only one child, that child, will get the other half. If there is more than one child left the wife will get one-third of the estate and the other two-thirds will be divided among the surviving children. Now, the proposed change would give \$10,000 to the wife. If the estate consists of \$10,000 or less she would get the entire estate. If it consists of more than \$10,000 she would get the first \$10,000 and a lien on the third. The other two-thirds, after the \$10,000 has been deducted, would be divided among the surviving children. I think I am correct in summarizing these proposed changes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not limited to the case where the children have grown up, where the children are independent and over the age of 21. That might be a different situation. I think it's going to apply in hundreds and hundreds of cases where a young man in the prime of life dies, leaving a widow with young children. She is going to inherit the entire estate if it is \$10,000 or under. Those children will have nothing left from their father's estate, if he dies without a will. I realize and am very sensible of the fact that mothers, of course, are going to look after their children, and I don't think there is any question about that, but we do know, too, that very many young women, (perhaps the hon. Attorney General will say that nowadays women have had business experience) have not had too much business experience and have lost a great deal of money. We run into cases where children have been left with very little. They, or the official guardian or someone on their behalf, can apply to the courts to have the division changed, I presume. This amendment, however, creates an anomaly, a strange situation; we are changing the one Act to give more people the right to come in and attach the intestacy and the distribution under the Act, and on the other hand we are making the condition more static or narrow.

I can't understand the purpose of having these two bills amended at the same time. This is a case, and this happens very frequently, I have had actually dozens of cases even in the last year in my own office where a husband dies without leaving a will, leaving a widow and young children. The children's share is usually put aside, either handed over to the official guardian or held in trust, and, although the mother has the right to take a certain amount of that money for the maintenance of the children, this is done very, very seldom. Usually that money is held in trust for those children, and when they reach the age of 16, 18 or 21, they have some money set aside for their education or to set them up in business. In most cases, and I would say 90 cases out of 100, if this widow remarried, the second husband will usually support these children and the money is kept in a separate fund and it does give them something to start up in life with.

Now, take this case, with the proposed change the widow has complete control of the \$10,000 or the entire estate and she can do with it as she sees fit. She might invest it very wisely, and I presume that is the purpose of it, she's going to have to live off that \$10,000. If she remarried with children still under the age of 21, or very much younger than that, this money is here completely and will be hers and her new her husband's; those children have no lien and no right to that money whatsoever. They still have the right to be supported by the mother, of course, but you can see the situation that arises.

There's another thing that comes up here, and that's the matter of Mothers' Allowance. Regulations as to Mothers' Allowance change and this woman might be stopped from receiving Mothers' Allowance since she received the entire estate, even though there are young children, whereas in another case, if this Act is not amended, as it is presently proposed to be amended, she might be in receipt of Mothers' Allowance and there might be a little bit of money left for those children later on, or there might be a farm or something like that in which they would have an interest and which will probably grow and produce and give them a start in life later on. That's the one problem that bothers me, where there are young children.

As I said, it might be a different situation with other children, but let's look at that situation. We are living in a predominantly agricultural economy and quite often the people who die without wills, if they are elderly, leave sons and daughters who are perhaps living on the farm the deceased died on, and have contributed a great deal towards that financial position in which the deceased found himself. It seems fair enough, throughout the years, that the estate should be divided one-third to the widow and the other two-thirds to the children, and in thousands of cases, Mr. Speaker, the children, realizing that the mother needed more money and realizing that their father had dealt fairly with them and established them during his lifetime, will renounce their right to the estate and give the whole thing to their mother. But in other cases the mother herself might not want to take any more than a third and here again, Mr. Speaker, this provision might also stop her from getting

supplementary allowance or getting some assistance that she might otherwise get, at the same time taking away rights from the children, taking away an interest that they might have in the estate. If they are going to fight for those rights, of course they can come in under the other Act which we amended some time ago. That will simply increase litigation and increase the insecurity and the lack of assurance that the next of kin of the intestate has.

If someone has an estate that is too small to be divided, there is no reason whatsoever why he can't make a will leaving the entire thing to the widow. That proviso can be made now and if the widow, on the other hand, can prove to the satisfaction of the court that she can't live on one-third, the court will give an order giving her more of the estate. It means that this situation is looked after, where the estate is too small to look after everybody, it is looked after under the provisions of the other Act, providing you can come in and make out a case. But, Mr. Speaker, in this case if someone dies without a will, even if his wife happens to be worth \$50,000 or \$100,000, she would still get the first \$10,000 or the entire estate if it was under \$10,000, perhaps to the detriment of very young children or children who have contributed to the growth of that estate. I feel rather badly about having to vote against this as I do realize that there are many cases where an estate is too small to be divided and maybe the widow should have it all. At the same time, I think it is in her own interest that the present provisions stand and that she be allowed, as she is at present, to come into court and prove her case rather than have to submit to this type of amendment.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised some points which certainly deserve consideration. This is a matter where we will have to decide whether or not we will make a final and absolute rule which divests an estate from children or wife according to the determination of this Legislature, and if we do make a rule for vesting the estate, we have to decide whether or not to make the rule on the basis of the preponderance of good being in favour of the rule. Now, my hon. friend says that a young wife with children may use the money to live on and deprive the children of an educational fund when they grow up. This, of course, is true, but it should be borne in mind that when the estate is under \$10,000 it is practically inevitable that the estate will consist of a house or perhaps a house and a little bit of a refund on the contribution to a superannuation fund which the husband may have had. The problem is where the estate is under \$10,000 and it consists wholly of a house or an equity in a house. Now, under the present law, the widow is only entitled to one-third of the house and the children are entitled to two-thirds, and this means, if there is no will, that the widow must make an application for Letters of Administration, which means that the house must either be sold to get two-thirds of the money to hand over to the official guardian or the widow must continue to administer the estate on behalf of herself and her children until they become 21 or until she can pay them for their share. What nearly always happens is that if the widow

cannot afford to redeem the place, she goes to a lawyer and tells him about her predicament, and the lawyer then makes an application under the Dependents Relief Act for relief against this situation. Now, I say that this is what happens in a great majority of cases and this always runs into money. The number of cases where the widow will be left \$10,000 cash and has her own house and can support the children, is very rare.

**Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt):** — May I ask the hon. Attorney General how many cases have there been of applications under the Dependent's Relief Act?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am told by the judges that, for example, Saskatoon, there isn't a Chamber day goes by without one. I haven't checked the record . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — Twenty-four a year at best.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Yes. It would be at least 24 a year.

It costs the wives perhaps \$250 fee, as the Official Guardian has to go up there and represent the children, to appear on the application, and he goes every week some place to represent children on one of these applications to give consent to an Order. He gets his expenses and costs paid out of the estate, and it is a waste of money. Now, there may be the odd case, there likely will be, where a wife will benefit under this provision, where she has been living away from her husband, perhaps living with somebody else, and should not benefit — but the benefits will also accrue to the other 95 per cent. The widow, after all, made a real contribution to the accumulation of the estate, and should have the right to own the estate of the deceased husband. They have a moral right to inherit it, at least up to \$10,000.

I am not too worried. I have a great deal more confidence, perhaps, in the young married woman with young children in this province, than my hon. friend.

**Mrs. Batten:** — That's the usual smear. It's not . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . in their ability to look after their children and to use the first \$10,000 for the benefit of themselves and the children. I am not so worried about this frittering it away with a new husband or wasting the money in other ways. After all, she has a right to all this — to own this house — to rear the children in this house and, in my opinion, she shouldn't have to be a suppliant to a court to obtain what is her just and proper due.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Just for clarification, may I ask a question? Is there any reason why a wife can't continue to live in the house if that's a what the estate consists of, with her children?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Except she is subject to the administration of the estate and this involves the constant maintenance of relations with a legal office. It may be, if one of the children doesn't consent to dispensing with a bond, it may be that it will go on until the children reach the age of 21, they may have to have a surety bond which may amount to \$50 or \$60 a year. It is better that she just be freed of all these responsibilities, because after all she now carries the sole burden of rearing, feeding, educating, clothing, and taking care of these children who are left without a father. She shouldn't be burdened with any additional unnecessary formal legal responsibilities.

In the case of a farmer with grown up children where all he has is the farm, and it is worth \$10,000 the children have contributed to the building of this farm, and it is all he's got. He leaves a wife and children, and the wife has contributed a lot more to the building up of that farm than the children have. Whatever the children may have contributed, we have to take off from that the support and maintenance they have enjoyed during the first 15 or 16 years of life, and the wife has contributed toward the building of that farm before there were any children. She has to have a place to live. She is now widowed, with children. These children have other opportunities to find a place for themselves in society, and the wife, in my opinion, comes first in cases where the estate is only \$10,000. The chances are this will not be abused and will result in . . .

**Mrs. Cooper:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney General a question? What about this question of mothers' allowance. He didn't deal with that.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I have no idea what the regulations of the Department of Social Welfare are, but I am certain they will make whatever adjustments in the regulations are found necessary to accommodate this.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend the Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act.**

**Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act. At present the Act provides that no person shall be admitted to a sanatoria unless he has been a resident of the province of Saskatchewan. We have instances where people have come to this province who, before they have established residence, developed tuberculosis. It is obvious that we wouldn't refuse these people sanatoria

care and they have been admitted. What this amendment is designed to do is to enable such people to become patients of the sanatoria and, at the same time, enable a charge to be made since they are not residents, for the costs of their care.

I have also another amendment which is a House amendment to this Act. It is an amendment that provides for the spending of money, which I would refer to the consideration of the House, Mr. Speaker. There will be an increase in the amount of money that the Government will contribute towards the Anti-Tuberculosis League, raising the amount from \$2 to \$4 per patient day.

**Hon. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Has His Honour the Lieutenant Governor been informed of this?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Yes.

There is a change in the per diem grant; whereas hitherto we have been paying \$2 per day for every patient day for all people in the sanatoria, we now intend to pay \$4 for provincial patients only. This means that we are making a grant of \$100,000 additional to the Anti-Tuberculosis League.

I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, has been informed of the subject matter of the proposed House amendment and recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

**Mrs. M. Batten:** — Does this mean that people who come from out of the province, such as the displaced persons, the Provincial Government isn't going to pay for them? The \$4 per day?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — The entire cost will be paid.

**Mrs. Batten:** — The entire cost will be paid in combination with the Federal Government.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas (Premier):** — He is referring to persons coming from other provinces who haven't established residence and who need care. They are ready to pay for it but can't be admitted under the Act if you follow the straight legal interpretation.

**Mrs. M. Batten:** — But you are still going to pay the League \$4 a day for every patient in the hospital. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — For Saskatchewan residents. Yes. What you are referring to are the immigrants who have recently come in, the Saskatchewan Government is paying the entire cost.

March 3, 1960

**Mrs. Batten:** — What about the people who come in from other provinces and have found themselves stricken with tuberculosis?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Well, according to the Act, unless a person has established residence here, that is, has been here 6 months, he is ineligible for admittance to the hospital or sanatoria. We have been admitting such people because, obviously, they need treatment and the amendment I spoke of a moment ago would authorize them to be admitted before they have become residents and to pay the actual per diem rate for their care until they establish residence.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Do I understand the Minister right when he said a few moments ago that under the Act the Government will pay \$2 per patient day for all patients in the sanatoria?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — That's right.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — But now you're going to make a change in the Act by stating only those resident in the province of Saskatchewan, or who, are the responsibility of the province? In other words, these who are there under the responsibility of the Federal Government will not be covered under the new provision, by the \$4. You'll continue to pay the \$2 for those patients?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — The Federal Government pays on behalf of those people for whom it is responsible. The Indians, the D.V.A.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Didn't I understand you to say that up until now, though, you have also been paying for those people the \$2 as well. But now you are changing it, you are not paying anything for those people who are the responsibility of the Federal Government.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — That's right, and we are making up more than the difference by paying \$4 for all provincial cases.

I move second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, as printed.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill as printed, together with the Amendment, was referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 43 — An Act respecting Regional Parks**

**Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill, I would first like to review to some extent the pressures on park development increasing in the province and the need of such an Act, and the granting of financial

and technical assistance to the development of regional parks or local parks.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we in the department have been aware of the increasing pressure and need for more healthful outdoor recreational opportunities in the province. If we, for example, check the number of people who are taking part in, say, angling, which is one of the phases of recreation, or hunting, I could give you the following figures: for example, the number of angling licenses sold over a period of 10 years, 1947 to 1957, has jumped from approximately 20,000 to over 100,000, or multiplied five-fold; hunting licences, another form of recreation, has jumped from close than 30,000 to also over 100,000. I believe there have been a number of factors that has contributed to the people in our province taking more interest in recreational opportunities. I believe that one of them is the mechanization of agriculture and, therefore, more leisure time even for the farmers of our province. The other one, the cost-price squeeze which I believe has liquidated quite a number of farmers in Saskatchewan and all over Canada. They have moved into the urban areas, due to our increased industrialization in this province and through this increase of the population in the province, we are now having more workers with leisure time and therefore participating in outdoor recreation. Another very important factor is the fine expansion, Mr. Speaker, in the building up of the highway system in the province of Saskatchewan. The improvement in the transportation system and the increased incomes of the workers.

I want to say that we have been aware of this, Mr. Speaker, of the increased pressures for more recreational opportunity, that in the last two to three years we have carried on a study into the recreational land use, into the needs for more outdoor recreational opportunity and the potential in the building of recreational parks throughout the province of Saskatchewan. From our findings we have found out that there is a lack of natural areas capable of good provincial park development, particularly in the heavily populated areas of southern Saskatchewan. It is in the southern portion of Saskatchewan where exists the largest population and we find that there are only provincial park possibilities limited to, for example, the Qu'Appelle water system, Last Mountain Lake, the Saskatchewan River and the Jackfish Lake area north of North Battleford.

In our review we have also found out that the average recreationist is usually a Saturday or Sunday picnicker, a family that travels 50 miles to go to their recreational spot or park. We believe that there is a great need in the province of Saskatchewan for more parks whereby people would not have to drive much more than 50 miles in a weekend. I want to point out that in the province of Saskatchewan we have extreme difficulty, or an extreme problem in the development of provincial parks. I would like to scan over the three prairie provinces: for example, in Manitoba, approximately 8 per cent of the population is found in the prairie zone or grassland area. That is where it is very

difficult and very expensive to develop a park, The balance of Manitoba's population is located around two great lakes, the park land area in the Canadian shield to the east of Winnipeg. These areas have natural geographic features for easier and less costly development of provincial parks. Or go to the west in Alberta: approximately 40 per cent of the population is located on the prairies or grassland area, but they are considerably closer to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, and the balance of the 60 per cent population is in the park land and forest zone, there again loaded with many possibilities of park development. In the province of Saskatchewan 60 per cent of our population is on the prairies, grassland area, where development of provincial parks would be fairly costly.

Now I realize that some are going to argue that the Province should go all out in development and increasing the provincial park system throughout the province, and I want to say that over the past two or three years we have been doing exactly that. We have developed, or are developing, for example, the Rowan's Ravine Provincial Park on the south-east side of Last Mountain Lake; over the last year we have been developing a provincial park on Pike Lake, south of the City of Saskatoon near the Saskatchewan River; we are today negotiating for property and the possible development of a provincial park at Jackfish Lake; we now, too, have acquired some land and are developing another provincial park in the Pasqua, Echo Lake and in the Qu'Appelle system. At the present time we have some fourteen provincial parks in various stages of development and plan the possible development of two more, one at Buffalo Pound and the other somewhere around the Saskatchewan River Dam area. But even with these provincial parks fully developed we believe that it will not yet provide the recreational opportunities for thousands of weekend trippers who travel 50, 70 or 75 miles. We realize too that there are fairly many, fairly fine small recreational spots now under various stages of development by municipalities, by local recreational organizations, service clubs, co-operative organizations, Boards of Trade and by individuals . . . I know that I have within my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, maybe one of the finest, little resorts at Crystal Lake just off the No. 9 highway which is operated now by two individuals and a co-operative organization.

These are providing recreational opportunities to many thousands of people, but I want to say that they do lack funds which prevents them from improved development. Under the Regional Parks Act, we propose to offer technical and financial assistance in the organization and development of regional parks. The Act is going to provide the power for two or more municipalities to establish a regional park and apply to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for financial and technical assistance. The Act is going to provide for a regional park authority, which will be a body corporate to be constituted from the representatives appointed by each municipality to which assistance is granted. The Act provides for the Minister and the regional park authorities to enter into agreements as may be deemed necessary for the establishment and operation of the park.

We propose to assist the regional park authority with technical assistance in planning and orderly development of their proposed park over a 5-year period, and to assist the authority financially by contributing 60 per cent of the capital cost of the development that will be agreed to by agreement between the authority and the department. The cost of administering, operating and maintaining such a park will be the responsibility of the authority.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this plan will aid considerably in meeting the demand for outdoor recreation in Saskatchewan and will provide in time recreational opportunity within easier reach of every person in Saskatchewan and will bring about orderly and better planned local recreational parks in the province. This, too, Mr. Speaker, I believe, will add stability and assure continuity or permanency to local park development and administration.

With that. Mr. Speaker. I will move second reading.

**Mr. Korchinski (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear the very fine speech made by the Minister of Natural Resources. I think it will be a step in the right direction. I hope that perhaps more can be done in the matter of Redberry Lake. I don't think that the people of Saskatoon, for example, are aware of this lake. I notice that there is quite a bit of money being spent on Pike Lake, which is about 30 miles out of Saskatoon, in fact, they are building up or making an artificial lake, as far as I could get from the press, and this is about 30 miles from Saskatoon. Now, Redberry Lake is, I think, about 56 miles away. It is a very large lake and it's only 16 miles from pavement and there is a very good grid road that could be easily converted into a highway. I don't know whether the Minister of Natural Resources has seen that lake, but I would certainly like him to take a look at it when he is campaigning in that part of the country.

This lake has a great number of islands on it and many miles of very fine sand beaches, swimming places, but the trouble is that it is in a hilly country and it is very difficult to build roads to the beaches and I don't think we can expect very much local development in the future because of this particular terrain. It's a lake that covers 27 square miles of water surface and has some 45 miles of shoreline. There are fish in that lake, and I believe that the people of Saskatoon, if they knew about that lake, and if there were a road to it, would make full use of it, because it is just a matter of a couple of hours drive out of Saskatoon. I certainly hope that the department will try to do something about that lake more than waiting for the people to do it themselves.

You can reach the lake also from No. 40 highway. It's about 5 miles from that highway and there are beaches all around that lake.

March 3, 1960

There is quite a bit of Crown land in that area, so I hope that something will be done about this lake. There is boating and fishing, but there is just whitefish there because the water is quite salty, but I think it would be possible to plant other fish there.

I hope this will be taken into consideration.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolsely):** — Mr. Speaker, I thought possibly that this Bill would be brought in with a minimum of propaganda compared to some of the other bills brought in. However, the Minister, in introducing this Bill, made some statement that I think I ought not, especially on behalf of the people in my constituency and other constituencies, to let go without taking issue and pointing out what I feel should be done in regard to regional parks.

Now he mentioned the fact that farmers should have time off from the fierce stress and strain of the cost-price squeeze and one thing and another, to go to these recreational places, and I quite agree with him on that, but he said one of the reasons they were taking advantage of it nowadays was because of the improved system of roads. I want to point out the condition of one road that I am familiar with, one highway, and the conditions on that highway has been brought to the attention of this Government on different occasions, because of the fact that it leads to one of these provincial parks. The provincial park concerned is Katepwa. The condition of that road on weekends is such that the heavy traffic makes it a cause for much concern and as it has not been oiled or topped there is always the factor of accidents involved. That is one thing I would like to point out to the Minister, when he was introducing this Act and the condition of the roads at the present time. I would certainly like to point out the conditions of the roads leading to these parks where dust is concerned, especially on Saturday nights and Sundays. I would hope that when he is making improvements to these parks that he take into consideration that stretch of No. 56 highway from the TransCanada to Katepwa.

One factor that may injure the reputation of some of these parks is the statement that emanated last summer. These statements, I don't think could be tracked down by the authorities at Katepwa or in the Qu'Appelle Lakes but it was felt that in some government department, statements came out that were detrimental to the provincial park at Katepwa. The statement came out about a supposed degree of contamination by algae. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I must ask the hon. member to keep to the principle of this Bill as he is going pretty far afield.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I was trying to answer some of the statements that were made by the Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not in order.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I would just like to point out that statements like that can affect conditions in a provincial park.

I see once again the Government are giving themselves authority under Section 9 to impose fees, tolls, raise money by the levy of lease fees, concession fees, gate tolls or any other charges against any person or in respect of any private property. I had hoped that if any of these fees or tolls are registered that it would be a very small because I think if people have to pay a fee or toll, the natural thing to do would be to go on to another resort . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Does the hon. member say that the Government is giving itself the power?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — That is what is mentioned here.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Where?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Under Section B, here.

**Premier Douglas:** — You said the Government is giving itself the authority.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — If you have a provincial park . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — These aren't provincial parks. Why don't you read the Act?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I would hope that in the event that these fees and tolls are imposed that they would be small enough so that it wouldn't keep anybody from using these proposed parks.

Another thing that I would like to see is the parks in different areas of the province. I know that some projects, if they are successful and some group sees the Government on their behalf, may get a grant of say \$500. Other projects have been started where, if people in that area are successful, they may be able to get grants of \$750 and up. I would hope that there would be new regulations concerning these parks where more or less uniform grants would be obtainable to the people interested. In some cases, as in my own seat, a group of citizens went together and improved the beach and they were successful in getting a grant of some \$500, which I am sure they appreciated and it was a big help there, but I would hope that these grants will be on a uniform basis.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — The whole thing would be 60 per cent.

**Premier Douglas:** — If you were listening you would know that.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Well, I hope so.

March 3, 1960

**Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister presented this Bill so very ably that I thought I should get up and bring to the floor of the House the situation we have in the south-central part of the province. The Minister mentioned, in regard to these regional parks, the following areas, the South Saskatchewan River, the Qu'Appelle River, but he forgot the Wood River. God didn't grant us the natural habitat of our wonderful spot there, but the people of the community, in co-operation with P.F.R.A. developed a wonderful park and I am sure this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to make to an effort and see that the Minister gets a membership card for the Wood River Co-op. Beach and then I am sure he will take an active part in seeing that park is developed, on behalf of the people of south-central Saskatchewan, who have no park at all. There is one on the west side, Cypress and Kenosee in the east, but nothing in the south-central. There is an opportunity to put this Act to work.

The question being put, it was agreed, and the Bill was referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly then adjourned at 9:42 o'clock p.m.