

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature
19th Day

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the members to a group of children to the left of you, two groups from Saskatoon—one from the Churchill School, with their teacher, Mrs. Burwash, and a group of children from Haultain School, Mrs. H. Sallans in charge. I am sure all hon. members will join with me in hoping that their trip to this capital city will be worthwhile, and will be an enjoyable one.

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Monday, March 7, 1960, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair (The Assembly to go into the committee of Supply):

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, may I join with other hon. members who have extended to you their congratulations for a very fine job well done during the period you have occupied the position you now hold. I doubt very much if you have any regrets since the day you left your native land to take up your new home in Canada, and particularly in the province of Saskatchewan, notwithstanding the fact that you have lived sixteen years in "outright stagnation".

I would also like to take this opportunity of extending to my personal friend, 'Tommy' Bentley, congratulations for a very fine job which he has done during his residence in the province of Saskatchewan: first, his associations with the farm organization and later on, in the municipal and in the federal and in the provincial public fields. I think he has done an excellent job. I recall calling on our good friend 'Tommy' when he was buying grain in the little town of Preeceville, and discussing

March 8, 1960

with him his interest (if any) in joining the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool organization; and from that day on, he has made an outstanding contribution to the economic welfare of the province of Saskatchewan.

Last evening, in listening to the debate by the two members to your left, I was reminded that this is 'Education Week'. I was also reminded that those who sponsored Education Week were perfectly justified in doing so. I was also reminded that this is also 'Refugee Month' and there still might be some hope for those who have not as yet lived in the atmosphere and economy that we are living in today. You know the 'Leader-Post' does occasionally publish something that is of some interest, and I ran across this, a few days ago, entitled: "Today's Chuckle", and it says, "The reasons some of us don't hear opportunities knocking is that we make so much noise yacking about the bad deals we get."

The hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) mentioned, last evening, that the Government of the province of Saskatchewan had spent, I believe, some \$50,000,000 in excess of what was necessary to spend in acquiring public institutions. I would suggest to the hon. member that he look up the record. If he does, he will find that the total expenditure during the past sixteen years in public buildings may not exceed the amount of money suggested.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I must remind the gentleman that the figure I used was approximately \$15,000,00, and not \$50,000,000.

Mr. McIntosh: — Pardon me. I am almost sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the Liberals were sitting on this side of the House they would not only have saved \$15,000,000, but they would have saved the \$50,000,000 that has been spent on public buildings, if the record they demonstrated over the past thirty years of their administration continued down through the years that lie ahead. You know, after all, it is not too difficult when a ship of state lies in dry dock covered with barnacles and moss. All that is required, therefore, is a watchman, so that, when the ship of state takes to the sea it must be properly and adequately manned. So, in 1944, the present Government took the ship of state out of dry dock and launched it on the free seas, and the moment that you do that, hon. members opposite will appreciate that it does require proper manning and proper direction which the ship of state has received during the past fifteen years.

We have heard a great deal about reconstruction and rehabilitation, and we were taken back into the history of the province of Saskatchewan. In checking over the submission by the Province of Saskatchewan presented to the Sessional Committee of the House of Commons on Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, Wednesday, April 19, 1944, we find this under the heading of "Industry":

“Saskatchewan, from the point of view of industrial development is in a poor position – poorer than any other province in the Dominion of Canada with the possible exception of Prince Edward Island. Despite the fact that we had, in 1939, 8.39 per cent of the population, we had only 2.09 per cent of the Canadian industrial production. This places Saskatchewan citizens in the position of having an overwhelming dependency upon the primary industry of trying to gain their livelihood under many handicaps under which their more fortunate fellow citizens of the more industrial provinces do not labour.”

This was submitted to the Government of Canada by Premier W.J. Patterson. I quote from a Canadian Press report published in the ‘Prince Albert Herald’ in 1956:

“It was stated Thursday night, that the larger school unit and the grid road plan had been tried before the CCF administration came into power in Saskatchewan and had failed.”

This is a quotation as published in the ‘Prince Albert Herald’ from a meeting held at Dysart, and addressed by the Hon. James G. Gardiner. May I just repeat: “Thursday night, the larger School Unit and the grid road plan had been tried before the CCF administration came into power in Saskatchewan and had failed.”

There have been a lot of quotations here from editorials in the various daily papers, and there have been some lengthy quotations of articles which have appeared from time to time. this is from the ‘Star-Phoenix’ of December 17, 1959, and it says:

“The Leader of the present Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan may have been carried away by his zeal to raise campaign funds among the Ontario Liberals here. Whatever accounted for it, he went too far in his speech, Monday, to the Liberal Businessmen’s Club. His listeners, unless they knew better from personal experience, much have concluded from his remarks that Saskatchewan is teetering on the edge of economic ruin. ‘Economic stagnation’ are the words the Liberal Leader used in scoring the policies of the present C.C.F. Government. We don’t suggest for a moment that he should hold his fire, but let us be reasonably accurate, at least. The claim that Saskatchewan is in danger of becoming a chronic depressed area under the C.C.F. is to shoot very, very wide.”

March 8, 1960

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of wild shots made here in this House during the present Session of the Legislature. Might I say in connection therewith that while in Toronto, last fall, and in conversation with a group of businessmen, one of them said to me: "It is my information and understanding that the Government of your province is interested in public, co-operative and private industrial expansion"; and, he said, "it is my information that assistance, including financial assistance, is available to those three different groups of industrial development." He said: "You know, this is of extreme interest to me and of interest to my friends here, because we are living in a different kind of a world today than we lived in even ten years ago," and, he said, "we are fast coming to the conclusion that it is becoming increasingly more evident that the governments elected by the people must take a greater interest in the development of the natural resources of the country which those governments represent."

To me that was rather an interesting observation by a group of businessmen in the city of Toronto, and we have heard a great deal during the present day about agriculture, and there has been some criticism levied against this Government for what has been termed a lack of interest in the welfare of the primary producers of foodstuffs. In looking over the 'Western Producer' of a recent date (February 25) – and no doubt my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is a subscriber to the 'Western producer' – I noticed a very interesting picture of a group of the board of directors of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, representing 400,000 farmers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and when they have agricultural problems they go to the seat of the National Government where the problem lies. They don't come to the various provincial governments and say to the provincial governments: "We have an agricultural problem." They know where to go to look, probably in vain; but they do know where to go to look for the remedies for the problems with which agriculture is faced.

Agriculture is facing a very serious problem. In 1956, the gross farm income fell short of the actual cost by \$125.7 millions, figuring the cost out on a business basis; so that does indicate that agriculture is suffering very serious adversity. And what do my hon. friends opposite say is the answer? Return the \$500 that the farmer invested in power. You might have to spread it over a good number of years – that would be a great relief to agriculture.

They also mention that we probably should give serious consideration (and this is in their platform) to the use of purple gas in farm trucks, and I believe they argue that that would save the farmer approximately twenty to thirty dollars on an average per year; and some of our friends opposite point out what has taken place in the province of Alberta. I wonder if our friends opposite have taken a look at the farm truck licence and asked themselves what trucking can the farmer do with a farm truck licence in the province of Alberta, and asked themselves if they do any commercial trucking can they use purple gas

in those trucks. After all, here in the province of Saskatchewan our agricultural people respect their neighbours, and there is an exchange of assistance between one neighbour and the other, and it is a very common thing for Jack to call up Pete and say, "Pete, can you run around with that big truck of yours. I have a couple of cattle or some hogs ready for the market. I have some grain that I would like hauled to the elevator." If you did that sort of thing in the province of Alberta what would be the position of your farm truck licences, and could you use purple gas in your trucks for that purpose?

To me, the assistance rendered by the Government to the Co-operative movement of the province of Saskatchewan is very important. The Co-op, movement is very important in our economy. For example, the Wheat Pool dividends in the last year amounted to \$6,339,000, or 3 1/2 cents a bushel for every bushel delivered to the pool elevator. That was the surplus over and above the cost of operating those elevators. Take the Federated Co-operatives; in their last fiscal year their savings were \$4,200,000. Take the local Co-operative Associations, and their saving to the membership was \$4,260,000. Take the Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited, and their last financial year saved their members \$269,000. There is \$15 million there, through the patronizing of the Co-operative Movement in the province of Saskatchewan by the membership of that. It is the building of a Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. . .

Mr. Danielson: — Shame! Shame!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — It is the ability of the people to work together for the common good for each and all.

Mr. Gardiner: — Same sort of stuff.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — And through the working together for the common good of each and all, in the last financial year they saved for themselves some \$15 million; and the members opposite say that they should be permitted to use purple gas in the farm trucks because it should save on an average \$25 a farmer. That is their answer to the agriculture problems. . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — What's the connection. the Wheat Pool. . .

Mr. McIntosh: — And we hear a great deal, Mr. Speaker, about stagnation, and here's an editorial that appeared in the 'Prince Albert Herald' of March 2. May I just quote:

"Any one who doesn't think that Prince Albert has made progress in the past year need only look about them to see evidence of what amounts to a real boom in this city. Major projects are, of course, well known. They include our new station, our new

March 8, 1960

“addition to the Victoria Hospital; but smaller and less well-known projects are numerous. They include several new schools including the Riverside addition and the new composite District High School, which would surprise many people who saw it for the first time. The current work on the Sick Breweries, the tearing down of the old Central Hotel to make room for a new Co-operative store, and new Saskatchewan Power Corporation building, a new church on the flat, plans for the new Holy Family Hospital, and the presentation to the Sisters of Mary of a new building.”

And so on.

Let's take a look at the building permits which have been issued. If we take the city of Saskatoon in the year 1958, \$37,000,000 of building permits; in the city of Regina in the same year a little over \$29,000,000; in the city of Moose Jaw, in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000; and in the city of Prince Albert, \$4 ½ millions. If we take a look at the building permits issued by the nine cities in the three calendar years, they amount to over \$225,000,000.

And might I again return to my home city. . .

Mr. Gardiner: — You sure can, you will soon go back for good.

Mr. McIntosh: — . . . which has become famous in recent years. Take our population: the 1951 Census showed 17,000; the end of the last calendar year an estimated 24,500. The bank clearings moved from \$75,000,000 in 1950, to \$121,000,000 in 1959. Livestock marketing moved from 91,000 animals in 1950, to 269,000 in 1959. The city tax assessment from \$9 ½ millions in 1950, to \$17 million in 1959. The power consumption is usually a good yardstick as to the progress of any community, and in the city of Prince Albert, in 1950, they used 18,561,000 kilowatt hours, and in 1959 some 36,903,000 kilowatt hours. May I just quote again from a newspaper clipping which says:

“If the Minister, Mr. Howe, does not chose to do something for my province by way of defence industry, I am sure we are going to see its population go down as it did during the war. We are going to see many of our skilled young men drained out of the province to central Canada or to British Columbia.”

This is to be found in Hansard of June 4, 1951, and is a statement by the present Leader of the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan.

Then we also find a great deal of criticism about the Government of this province not setting up a revolving fund to assist municipalities in the financing of their undertakings, their public works. I think it has been stated that there is a fund available here up to the limit of the financial resources of the province of Saskatchewan, and that fund has been made extensive use of by local governments in the various fields of local government. Let us take a look at the national Association of Mayors and Municipalities, and when they have these problems (and they have them from one end of Canada to the other) what do they do? They go to the Government of Canada, and here is a submission to the Government of Canada on behalf of the municipal governments of Canada dealing with this very same subject, and suggesting to the Government of Canada that they give serious consideration to the problems associated with local governments from one end of Canada to the other.

Might I say a word or two in connection with the ability of rural municipalities to cope with their obligation, and might I just quote: Take the R.M. of Antler Park No. 322. It has an assessment of \$786,000., they have a 22 mill rate, and the amount of money that that municipality has for general municipal work is \$17,000. Then we take the R.M. of Browning No. 34 down close to where my good friend 'Ross' McCarthy lives. They have an assessment of \$5,350,000, a 23 mill rate, and they have \$123,000 to do the same kind of a job in the same size as the R.M. of Antler Park has with \$17,000. Take the R.M. of Spiritwood No. 496, and that's rather a large municipality, with 20 townships. They have \$2,704,000 of a taxable assessment, 25 mills, and they have \$67,000 in round figures to do their municipal work with. The R.M. of Snipe Lake No. 259, some 14 townships, they have \$6,573,000 of an assessment, 23 mills, and they have \$151,000. The R.M. of Lacadena, some 12 ½ townships, No. 228, they have an assessment of \$6,117,000, 25 mills, and they have \$170,000.

Now there is a very substantial variation of those municipalities to meet their needs. From \$17,000 for general municipal work to a high of \$170,000 or if we place it on a 9 township basis from 17,000 to \$123,000 in the R.M. of Browning, No. 34. Now this naturally makes a variation in the cost of administration. The general government administration expense, that is the administrative expenses of rural municipalities, a high of \$16,352 to a low of \$3,021 an average of \$9,418 is the average cost of municipal administration in the various rural municipalities of the province. That means, then, that the high takes 13.1 mills for general administration, 13.1 mill, while the low takes 1.7 mills, and the average is 4 mills for general administration costs of local rural governments throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

March 8, 1960

Another clipping:

“The Leader of the present Liberal party said that if the Liberals form the next government they will call a ‘summit’ meeting of the Saskatchewan municipal officials which will be aimed at modifying and reorganizing the whole field of municipal provincial fiscal relations.”

Mr. Gardiner: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Well, again, Mr. Speaker, too little and too late. This was done some two and a half or three years ago.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Here is all you’ve got.

Mr. McDonald: — On a point of order...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — The thing that surprises me, Mr. Speaker, is that those who sit to your left never seem to be tired of criticizing the personnel that constitutes the Local Government Continuing Committee, and for their information might I just...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — I don’t wish to interfere with the Minister’s address, but he has been off track so often, this afternoon, that I cannot allow him to go further. No member on this side of the House has criticized the personnel of the Continuing Committee. We criticize this Government for standing in the way of progress.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, the Continuing Committee has a free hand, and might I just give the personnel of the Continuing Committee...

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — That isn’t what you said in Prince Albert.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — There are four members of the Government among the fifteen. The Saskatchewan Association of rural Municipalities is represented by Messrs. Dawson, Carland and Irvine; Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities, represented by Messrs. Greenwood, Maher and McCaskill.

Mr. McDonald: — Who’s Mr. McCaskill?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Maher is the former member of the Legislature. He sat over in about where the two young lads are, and he is a Mayor of the city of North Battleford, and is a Liberal candidate at the present time.

Mr. John McCaskill, of Saskatchewan – they are the urban municipal representatives. The Saskatchewan School Trustees, represent by A.B. Douglas, of McTaggart; George J. Ingley, of Palo; J. Albert True of Lemsford, and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association by Mr. E. F Bourassa, of Regina; the Saskatchewan Association of Health Regions, by C.J. Fahlman of Kronau, and then there are, in addition to those 15, three associate members: The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation is represented by Mr. Trout, of Saskatoon; the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Secretary-Treasurers, by G.E. Cripps of Wolseley, and the Saskatchewan Association of School Unit Secretary-Treasurers, by P.M. McKinnon, of North Battleford.

That is the cross-section of the personnel of local government that is in complete control and complete charge of the work of the Continuing Committee, and I question very much if anyone is justified in criticizing the ability and the integrity of that Committee which is doing its utmost to come up with an answer that will solve some of the problems associated with local government.

Mr. McDonald: — What about the other members: Douglas, Fines?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Now, Mr. Speaker, something is said about tax collections, and it's rather interesting to note that, in 1945, there were 62 per cent of one year's tax levied in arrears, and in 1947, that was brought down to 30 per cent of one year's tax levies in arrears. 1956 tax collections were 101 per cent of one year's levy; 1957, the same – 101 per cent; 1958, 102 per cent; and from the returns of 158 rural municipalities in 1959, the tax collections were 94 per cent of one year's levy.

Some mention was made here sometime ago about the per capita municipal taxation debt. Take the nine cities that we had in 1957: the per capita debt of those nine cities in the province of Saskatchewan was \$73 per capita; and in that great province of Alberta, they were \$79 per capita; in the towns in Saskatchewan, \$58 per capita; Alberta \$60; in the villages, \$43 per capita in Saskatchewan, and in Alberta they were \$60 per capita.

In looking over the December, 1959 issue of the 'Municipal News' may I quote:

“The Minister of Municipal Affairs for the province of Alberta said that Edmonton's debt now totalled about \$154 millions, and suggested the city ought to look for more revenue to pay this debt, rather than seek increased responsibilities through amalgamation.”

March 8, 1960

May my hon. friends to your left, Mr. Speaker, make note. The debt of the city of Edmonton is \$154 millions.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I would like to point out that the Minister has now exceeded the time that has been allotted to him.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — If my hon. friend would keep his seat, it would be running on time. I have just one more statement to make.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Arrangements have been made with the Whips on the division of radio time, and I insist that it be maintained. The Minister is now a minute and a half over his time.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I have no knowledge of the time arrangement between the Whips.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, we have, Mr. Speaker, and either the Minister will take his seat or we will not obey any further rules on the division of time; one or the other.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Just one more statement. . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, again on the point of privilege. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. This time has been decided by the Whips. It has been allotted by a Committee of the House, and I suggest that it should be obeyed.

Mr. Speaker: — I have no knowledge of the arrangements between the Whips, nor have I any authority to stop anyone who has the floor.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is going to be your ruling. . .

Mr. Speaker: — It isn't a ruling, sir; it is a fact.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, that being the case, I can assure you that, as far as our side of the House is concerned, we will pay no attention to any agreement that has been arrived at by a Committee of this House, as far as radio time is concerned.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has taken two minutes. . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Closure! Sure.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I want to make this statement. The particulars of the gross debt in the province of Saskatchewan, rural, urban, schools, union, hospitals, and telephone, in 1958 was

\$110 million or \$44 million less than the city of Edmonton alone.

Mr. Speaker, I am awfully happy to support a very nice budget.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, again I wish to concur in the compliments and tributes paid to yourself by previous speakers in this debate, and to extend to you my very best wishes for many years of health and happiness in your retirement.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I wish also to extend to the previous speakers in this debate my sincere congratulations, but I must, however, disagree with much that has been said by my hon. friends opposite as to the adequacy of the budget. I thought I had heard practically everything in the way of excuses and alibis from those members across the House. When the Minister of Municipal Affairs, just a few minutes ago, on behalf of the C.C.F. Party and Government, attempted to take credit for the earnings of the members of the Co-operative organizations throughout the province, as a reason that the farm people are denied the use of tax-free fuel in their trucks, then I find that probably there are still many more such myths to come. This is just another C.C.F. smokescreen, and it is something I am sure that will not be appreciated by the co-operative organizations, and the co-operative-minded people of the province. It will certainly give little comfort to the farm population of this province, coming from the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

While we in the Opposition welcome many of the provisions of the budget, I fail to see much (if any) relief from the current high property taxation and other problems confronting, particularly, the farm people of this province. In my opinion this is strictly an election budget, designed to provide political propaganda for the Government in an endeavour to secure votes at the forthcoming provincial election, rather than to realistically cope with current problems and needs.

When I note there are decreases, rather than any increase, in the amounts provided for supplementary allowances to the needy people of this province, those people who are caught in the high cost of living and limited income squeeze, this section of the budget is, to me, a keen disappointment. There is no indication of any additional assistance of supplementary allowances so desperately needed by many, nor any indication of the relaxing of the stringent means test imposed. Members of the C.C.F. Party have always been very vociferous elsewhere, and in this province, in their criticism of a means test when it is applied by Federal authorities, or other provincial governments. However, in Saskatchewan, the means test of this Government is severe, and is rigidly applied. This is an example of C.C.F. inconsistency and disregard for their slogan, 'Humanity First'.

March 8, 1960

The current maximum supplemental allowance of \$10 for the old-age security pensioners and blind pensioners in many cases is not adequate. Subject to the means test, there are 16,767 recipients in the province. 43 per cent of these people receive only \$2.50 per month. In the case of a recipient whose spouse does not receive an allowance, the maximum supplementary allowance is, of course, \$20. These are cases where the couple have only the pension and the supplementary allowance, to provide for two people. Therefore, it is basically the same supplemental allowance of \$10 per person. The fact is that there are very few of these particular recipients in the province – only 50 out of 16,767. Due to this current maximum supplementary allowance, many of our aged people, without any resources except the \$55 a month old-age security pension, and \$10 a month supplementary allowance, which is a total of \$65 a month to maintain themselves, are living out their few remaining years in austere surroundings, loneliness and often on an inadequate diet. Due to the lack of a few extra dollars per month, they are denied the comfort of attractive housing, proper food and the companionship of those their own age, who have the same interests, as offered in the hostel sections of our splendid senior citizens' homes in this province.

We have another group, the old-age assistance group – those people between ages 65 and 69, who, subject to the means test, receive a pension of up to \$55 a month. Many of these people are in dire need of extra assistance. There are instances in this particular category where extra assistance is required as much as, if not more so, than those people in the old-age security class of 70 and over. We of the Liberal Party propose to rectify these hardships and difficulties now experienced by so many of our aged citizens. We would, on taking office in this province, relax substantially the provisions of the present means test. We would see there was a substantial increase in the current supplemental allowances; we would raise the maximum allowance at least \$15 per month for individual recipients, and to at least a maximum of \$30 per month for those who have a spouse not in receipt of an allowance.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — We would certainly arrange that those people in the 65-69 age group, who are in such dire need, would also receive a supplementary allowance. These added provisions will be of great assistance and benefit to many of our pioneer citizens during the twilight years remaining to them. We Liberals consider this extra assistance a 'must' and most worthy.

In the limited time I have this afternoon, I wish to briefly deal with the matter of the provincial debt. Due to the province's net debt figure of \$18 1/2 million being repeatedly quoted by the Provincial Treasurer and other government members, the public of this province, I am afraid, have a misconception of the real debt situation. At the end of 1959, according to the Treasury's own figures, our gross or total debenture and treasury bill debt amounted to an excess of \$377 million, both the direct and indirect debt. In addition to this large amount,

there is the matter of approximately \$11 million of contingent liabilities, which would make a total of close to \$400 million — \$388 million, I believe, would possibly be a little closer than saying \$400 million. Even with the wildest stretch of imagination, no one could consider Saskatchewan as being nearly debt-free. The future of this province is mortgaged, and the security of this province is pledged in full for this large indebtedness. It will have to be paid by the p of the province of Saskatchewan in the years that lie ahead. When discussing the public debt, to be fair and at least politically honest, I believe more publicity and mention should be made of this gross debt figure, which I have just mentioned, of \$377 million.

I readily agree that, for certain purposes, it has been necessary to borrow substantial amounts of money. However, I am also of the opinion that by more prudent fiscal policies applied during the years of prosperity and high revenues, this large debt load might have been less.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — By keeping administrative costs at a reasonable level, by keeping extravagance out of government spending, particularly on buildings and equipment, by eliminating waste and costly experimentation, and eliminating the many fancy frills this Government is noted for, the results would have been a smaller gross public debt, and consequently, a less amount would have to be paid in interest carrying charges.

Speaking of interest, in this year's estimates I find an item covering interest on the public debt. This is on page 50 of the 1960 estimates. It will require in excess of \$16 million to pay the interest charges on the gross public debt, during the fiscal year 1960-61. This is over \$1 million more than was required for this same item last year. This, Mr. Speaker, is quite an increase. The people of Saskatchewan will be required to pay this large sum, either from general revenue and partially by way of power and telephone costs. Irrespective of the source, these interest charges of over \$16 million will come out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — In the province of British Columbia, we have a similar situation wherein Premier Bennett claims that Program to be debt-free and interest-free. He even publicized this myth with dramatics on the Okanagan Lake at Kelowna, last summer. but B.C. has a very substantial debt, too. This debt in B.C. is made up of the so-called 'indirect or self-liquidating debt'. The Leader of the Opposition in the B.C. Legislature takes great exception to the claims of Premier Bennett and the members of the Social Credit Government, claiming a debt-free province. He is very emphatic and uses very strong language in his criticism of this contention and practice of the Social Crediters in B.C. He has

March 8, 1960

said, and I quote:

“Any Government that would attempt to deceive the people as this one is doing on the real debt of the province, is unworthy of our parliamentary tradition and cannot be trusted any longer to handle the affairs of the people.”

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, this particular quotation is taken from the “C.C.F. News”, of July 27 last, and the author of this quotation is no less a person than Mr. Robert Strachan, Leader of the C.C.F. Party in the province of British Columbia. The organ from which I took this quotation is comparable to “The Saskatchewan Commonwealth”.

Mr. McDonald: — It may have been worse!

Mr. Barrie: — If this strong criticism of the debt and interest treatment as carried on by the Social Credit Government is valid and proper as to B.C. by the C.C.F. Socialists, then it must be equally valid and proper in Saskatchewan in reference to the C.C.F. Government, despite anything that might be said to the contrary by any members of the Government, or their Party.

I wish to deal briefly with the plight of those people engaged in our basic industry, agriculture – the rural population. They are often the forgotten people. One of the serious problems they face is the high and steadily increasing tax burden, for municipal services and education, on real property. To provide local services, our municipal officials have only two major sources of revenue: real property taxation and provincial government assistance. If they are to hold the line on property taxation, which by many is considered at or about saturation level, the only way that this can be accomplished is by a greater sharing of provincial revenues with them. Lacking this assistance will mean further major increases in real property taxes, or a curtailment of current municipal services. Either of these alternatives spell additional hardship to our rural people and ultimate disaster.

We of the Liberal party recognize the present unfavourable position as one of the most, (if not the most) urgent problems demanding a solution. It cannot be solved by continuing piece-meal handouts. The approach of a Liberal Government would be to convene a Conference of government representatives and representatives of a local government bodies and organizations concerned. These representatives would sit down together as equal partners, and assess the sum total of revenues from all sources available to them, provincial, municipal and any other. They would determine the sum total of all the desired services required, and with this information before them, a complete discussion and reallocation of financial

and administrative responsibilities could, and would, be mutually agreed upon.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — The highest degree of quality and justice as to taxation, and providing of services, would result. The satisfaction derived by local governments and their members in being recognized and considered as full partners, would inspire confidence, develop initiative and provide a mutual understanding not otherwise obtainable. The proposed conference, Mr. Speaker, has no similarity to the one convened by this Government in 1956.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — This Conference, convened in 1956, was primarily one of Government domination, and the promotion of larger units of municipal administration. It has yet to provide any results after three years, except the Continuing Committee, and I am certain that some of the members on that Committee are as exasperated as many of the people in this province are. This Committee is still continuing, still studying, still fiddling while Rome burns!

At this time when our municipal men and women are assembled in convention in this city, I wish to pay tribute to those men and women who, over the years, have rendered excellent service as members of our own local government bodies. Often at great personal sacrifice to themselves and to their families, they have done, and are doing, a splendid job under most difficult and trying circumstances. In many instances, little in the way of appreciation and consideration has been extended to them for their untiring, public-spirited efforts. They cannot be complimented and commended, in my opinion, too highly.

There are a number of items of assistance that a Liberal Government would extend to our farm people, and I would like them left to the farm people to judge – not to the Minister of Municipal Affairs – because one of the items which I am going to mention is the permission to use tax-free gasoline in farm trucks.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Another is that we would provide substantial assistance towards the maintenance of grid roads, including snow-removal. A provincial Liberal Government will, as it did in the past, assume full responsibility for the construction and maintenances of all bridges of a 20-foot span or over. They would also take into consideration a problem of vital importance to our people of this province; they would share with the rural municipalities assistance to snowplough clubs operating on municipal roads other than those of the grid road system.

March 8, 1960

The last item I am going to mention is one of the things which could have been done, or might have been done, to assist these rural people, and that is that we will refund over a reasonable period, the share of capital cost of rural electrification which has to be paid by the farmers.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I expected some retort from my friends opposite who have made light of this particular item time and time again; but I just want to refresh their memory, and probably they will take into consideration that perhaps some of the members of their party in other parts of Canada have as much intelligence as they have, and they might possibly take a leaf out of their books. I want to read Plank No. 4 in the Alberta C.C.F. Party Platform. It deals with electric power. This is what it calls for, or proposes:

“The establishment of a provincial power authority which will, (a) acquire ownership of the privately-owned electric system of the province, and (b) assume the debt already contracted by farmers to build rural lines, and refund to farmers monies they have paid to build lines.”

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: —The last section of this, particular plank is that they will “rapidly extend rural lines without cost to the farmers to all areas where it is economically possible to do so.”

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I wonder how they reconcile the thinking of the C.C.F. Socialists in Alberta with their own particular program, with their own particular thinking, in connection with this matter or item.

These are some of the items a provincial government could have done to assist our farm people in their current difficult position, but which this Government has failed to consider, or act upon in any respect.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the condemnation and the maligning of the Liberal Party and former Liberal Governments by the C.C.F. Socialists generally, and their claims to the monopoly of intelligence and administrative ability of political honesty, with their holier-than-thou attitudes, I, as a Liberal, am proud of the record of Liberal Governments, both provincial and national.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — These accomplishments were in, many instances, established under the most difficult circumstances. Liberal Governments provided the leadership in this province and to our national during the most difficult period in our history, in a most creditable and commendable manner. Towards the end of, and during, the last war, the calamity howlers and prophets of doom predicted depression, large-scale unemployment, chaos and even collapse of our system in the post-war period. But what happened, Mr. Speaker? Due to the enterprise and resourcefulness of the Canadian people under free enterprise, assisted by sound, sane and efficient policies of the Liberal Government, we emerged from the war into an era of unprecedented prosperity and development in Canada.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Canada and Canadians were the envy of the world, and to a very large degree still are. However, we in the province of Saskatchewan with our socialist Government, did not share in the development and general prosperity to the degree other parts of Canada did. There may be, and possibly are, other minor factors partly responsible, but the main reason for this lack was, and is, the policies and attitudes of our Socialist government. Whether they like it or not, they must accept the fullest responsibility for it.

In making comparison of political parties, Liberals can well be proud of theirs, and offer apologies to no one. As there were Liberal parties and Liberal governments in Canada and in Saskatchewan long before the Socialists were even hear of, or know, let me assure them there will be Liberal governments in Saskatchewan and in Canada long after they are dead and buried in oblivion.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — In conclusion, I wish to say that, to ensure themselves of a greater share in the national progress, particularly in the fields of an industry and resource development, the people of this province have no alternative but to replace the present C.C.F. Government with a Liberal administration at the next election, which we anticipate will be within the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, it must be abundantly clear to all that I will not support the budget.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I will make it clear to start off that I will not support the budget, in case I get carried away and forget to do so at the end of my speech. Before I go on to analyse the budget and the faults that I see in it (and there are many faults) I would like to clarify one or two things that have been said in this House and elsewhere by the C.C.F. members on your right. I want to do this while we still have some air time.

March 8, 1960

When I refer to the members of the Government and the members of the C.C.F. Party in power, I want to make it abundantly clear to everyone that I am not including everybody who has ever voted C.C.F. Most of those people voted C.C.F., not because they were C.C.F., and certainly not because they were Socialists. Those people are not included in any slurs or any truths we might say about the C.C.F. Government, and they are only called in by the Government when they can't bear the truths by themselves. It happened just a few days ago, when somebody on the Government side was very insulted because they were called 'sanctimonious Pharisees', and they insisted on calling in all the C.C.F., and everybody who ever voted C.C.F., and calling them 'sanctimonious Pharisees', and that was never the intention.

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — How do you know?

Mrs. Batten: — Sanctimonious Pharisees, Mr. Speaker, sit in this House, and we were not talking of these people who merely voted for them for one reason or another. I want to make this clear, because, in spite of corrections and in spite of the fact that we have denied these allegations time and time again, the C.C.F. hierarchy has tried to instil allegations time and time again, the C.C.F. hierarchy has tried to instil fear into the minds of the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly certain portions of that population, based on untruths, and I want to clarify these points, I hope once and for all. I trust the C.C.F. people in the Government will be honest enough not to mention these untruths again.

The first thing that is said and that I want to clarify is that the Liberal Party does not believe that labourers and farmers can join in one particular party. That is a falsehood, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party has always believed that farmers and labourers can join in one particular party – in every political party. Our only objection has been, and will continue to be, to a party that is merely the C.C.F. Party, or any other party, plus organized unions to the exclusion of the right of the members of that union to belong to any other political party.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — And I say, and I think every Liberal in the country will agree with me, that it is against the best interests of labour itself to join with one party to the exclusion of all other political parties. We believe that such a union is against the best interests of all people and classes and occupations, whether within that party or within another party.

The second point that I wish to make is this. It has been said on numerous occasions by the C.C.F., that the C.C.F. must stay in power in order to protect the civil servants. It is amazing how the hon. Socialists are always running to the aid of someone who is not being attacked. It must be a little embarrassing to the civil servants. They who are protected are so obviously superior in intelligence and integrity to those who are doing the protecting. Civil servants have nothing to fear from a Liberal administration.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — You'll never get them to believe that one!

Mrs. Batten: — Thirdly, and these things are so blatantly false and dishonest I even hesitate to repeat them, but I have heard them so often, in this House, even, that I feel that in order to clear the record, I must do so. The C.C.F. members have said that the Liberals would sell out all Crown Corporations to private enterprise. They have said that the Liberals would eliminate prepaid hospitalisation; they have said the Liberals would decrease social welfare benefits. Those are falsehoods, Mr. Speaker. They are such glaring falsehoods that it should not be necessary to deny them. but for the record, let me state clearly that, if the Liberal Party is elected to office in the coming election, it will not sell out, but it will improve the services provided to the p of Saskatchewan by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation; by the Saskatchewan Government Telephones; by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company and by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. That, Mr. Speaker, should be clear enough even to the dullest people sitting across the way.

Government Members: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Your new Leader said the opposite. Go and listen to your Leader.

Mrs. Batten: — When the policy of the Liberal Party is dictated by the C.C.F. – Socialist Premier of this province, I will sit down and listen to him, but until then I will stand on my word.

Premier Douglas: — But you wouldn't listen to your own Leader!

Mrs. Batten: — A Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, will extend services under the present hospitalisation scheme, and it will allow interest charges to be charged as an expense – something that this Government has yet to see fit to do.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — A Liberal Government will increase the benefits presently paid to widows, old-age security and old-age assistance recipients. On this I pledge any political future I might have in the Liberal Party.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That's not very much, then.

Mrs. Batten: — I do want to offer my congratulations to those speakers who have preceded me. The Liberal members have given a most constructive analysis of the lacks shown by this budget, and have given a logical and a historically sound picture of the steps that must be taken by the Government of Saskatchewan to provide the type of prosperity and atmosphere that the people of Saskatchewan richly deserve. I am rather amazed that, when the last speaker who just sat down, the hon. member for

March 8, 1960

Pelly (Mr. Barrie), congratulated and thanked those people in local governments who have dedicated so much of their time and effort to the working of democracy in our province, not one hand was raised to clap on the other side of the House. Surely even the socialists realize the debt we owe to these people who have spent so much time and money in the service of Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — Actions speak louder than claps!

Mrs. Batten: — We have seen their actions, too, Mr. Speaker – the actions of this Government are very plain, and the treatment they have accorded local governments is quite plain.

Premier Douglas: — They are good.

Mrs. Batten: — The Social Credit members are too, to be congratulated on their able pointing out of Government inadequacies and administration, particularly in social welfare, and particularly in exposing the agile juggling of the hon. Provincial Treasurer's figures on the budget, insofar as debt is concerned. However, the only solution which the hon. social Credit members have proposed for the difficulties which face Saskatchewan, even if they were economically sound, are obviously beyond provincial jurisdiction. The solution – if you will remember, Mr. Speaker, was that all capital for social expenditure should be provided directly to the Government through the Bank of Canada at an interest rate just high enough to pay for the servicing of the loan. Obviously this cannot be done on a provincial basis.

I particularly want to congratulate the C.C.F. speakers who have spoken in this debate. Not only in this debate but throughout the years, they have demonstrated so ably and so consistently that they are truly worthy to sit in Opposition benches, because I don't think there is a party or a group of people that are quite so able in the criticism of the Government, whether they be other past governments, other governments from other provinces, or the Federal Government.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We'll do better than the Opposition sitting over there now.

Mrs. Batten: — Yes, you will, and I hope you'll have many years of it. I trust, like the hon. Attorney General, the people of Saskatchewan will recognize the C.C.F. ability to criticize and to do a little constructive work, and that the people of Saskatchewan will assure them a permanent place on the Opposition benches.

Even the hon. Provincial Treasurer, in giving a solution for Saskatchewan's problems, goes well beyond his jurisdiction. He says in his Budget Speech, page 3: "The fundamental problem is that the so-called free play of the market place has proved itself unable to allocate resources and income in a manner which will meet the tests of economic efficiency or social justice." I can't say it quite as unctuously as he did. In his last year's budget he made it even plainer. He said: "Those in Ottawa charged with piloting our ship" (I'm getting a little sea sick, this afternoon – everybody was piloting

a ship) “have a heavy responsibility.” In my own mind they could undoubtedly do the job better if they accepted the broad principles of economic and social planning consistently advocated by members on this side of the House.” I assume that the hon. Provincial Treasurer means by these “broad principles” the principles of Socialism, the principle of price control and, of course, by some quirk of Socialist thinking, without wage control.

Both these parties, in making this type of criticism, fail to recognize that the economic advancement and the high degree of national production and prosperity achieved in Canada during the most prosperous 20 years was achieved through freedom of credit, through supply of demand, and through private enterprise. Unlike the Social Credit and C.C.F. speakers, I am not going to say that the Liberal Government in Ottawa should take credit for this. I will credit the industry, the ability and the good intelligence and enterprise of our Canadian people, who worked out their own economic destinies for the good of the economy as a whole, within a framework of laws imposed by a Liberal Government who had faith in their wisdom and in freedom itself. This prosperity was achieved in spite of the prophecies of doom, poverty and unemployment with which the C.C.F. members in the House of Commons aided the Government.

It is a rather a sad state of affairs, this last budget of the C.C.F. Government. It reminds me of the gentleman who was introduced to somebody as Dr. Jones, and the person he was introduced to, said: “Oh, where do you practise Doctor?” He said, “Oh, I don’t practise; I preach.” This Government does a lot of preaching but very little practising; and in the preaching the economic principles so wisely and soundly, as the Provincial Treasurer does, there is very little effect of those principles seen in the budget itself, because where in this hodge-podge of ‘election bait’ are the guiding principles of social and economic planning that have been advocated by the C.C.F.? In fact, where is there anything but the most crass political expediency in this budget? Let me just take one example. This is what the hon. Provincial Treasurer says:

“I suppose the most significant change in the health budget is one of the smallest in dollar terms — \$42,310 for the Advisory Planning Committee on Health.”

He goes on to say:

“The reason our plans have been announced so far in advance is also clear. The C.C.F. has always maintained that a government should announce its program before an election, in order that the people might know what they are voting for or against. Nothing in this budget has caused more political stir than this one item.”

March 8, 1960

That is indeed, a strange statement. He said, and I repeat: “Nothing in this budget has caused more political stir than this one item.” Well, obviously, when he read this speech out to the House, nobody except the C.C.F. members even knew what was in the budget. How could there have been any political stir caused by that announcement at all? Not one speech had been made on this item in that House at that time, and yet he says “nothing in this budget has caused more political stir than this one item”. The only political stir that could have been caused was caused by the Socialists themselves. This is obviously a most despicable attempt to play politics, to distort and to make an election issue out of something that is too precious to all the people of Saskatchewan, and to the medical profession, particularly, who have dedicated their lives for this service, to be so exploited.

I want to quote this to you, Mr. Speaker:

“The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being, without distinction, of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition.”

This is not a principle of the C.C.F. Party. It is not even an announcement of the Liberal Party. This is the preamble to the constitution of the World Health Organization.

The desire to provide health services for everyone, irrespective of their wealth or their ability to pay, their colour or their creed, is the goal to which all humanity responds. This isn't an election plank for one party. I say this is not an election issue, because all other political parties have agreed to carry out such a scheme.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — You said you'd do it in 1945.

Mrs. Batten: — They haven't tried to make political capital out of it. I don't know what the hon. Minister of Health is saying about 1945, but I would like to remind him that they put out quite a pamphlet before the election in 1944, saying there would be a “black-out” of health if they weren't elected, and promising prepaid and complete medical coverage at that time. I don't know how many times they can use the same election plank, still waiting to be used again. I suppose it was good for being elected once, and it's good again.

Premier Douglas: — Now you're going back to 1919!

Mrs. Batten: — The hon. Premier once gave someone very good advice; it was rather rude, but quite effective. I think he said if they kept their ears open and their mouths shut, they might learn something. I hate to repeat it to any of the members opposite.

In 1951, a report was submitted to this Government by the Health Survey Committee under the terms of the Federal Health Survey Grant. That committee, in 1951, recognized that Saskatchewan had developed a municipal system to provide a basic medical service in rural areas, to the point where approximately one-quarter of the population of Saskatchewan had coverage.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — You're kidding!

Mrs. Batten: — Contracts were then in effect in 107 municipalities, 50 villages and 16 towns. In the fiscal year 1949-50, 170 municipalities received grants in aid of this type of care, totalling in value \$72,224.

I want to read out of the Report of this Committee (page 225), the following suggestions:

“Proposals for extending present programs in the province by providing complete health insurance benefits, have been endorsed by such lay groups as farmers, labourers, and municipal associations, all political parties in the province, and by associations of professional health workers, as well.

“In view of this experience, the recognized advantages and the expressed demand for health insurance, it is recommended:

“(1) that a comprehensive health insurance program should be undertaken in Saskatchewan at the earliest possible date. This health insurance program should be integrated with and built upon existing health programs, which should be extended, modified and co-ordinated as required, to the end that adequate health care of high quality should be available to all residents of the province on the basis of need, and without regard to individual ability to pay.

It is interesting to note that, in this same Report (page 228) the Committee said as follows:

“Only 22 per cent of the population lives in centres having modern water and sewage systems. Every effort should be made to have such systems installed in as many communities as possible. The development of such public utilities would be expedited if low-interest loans were established for this purpose by the senior government.”

This was in 1951, a brief presented to a Government that, before its election in 1944, had already promised prepaid medical coverage.

March 8, 1960

If these proposals had been followed, I would venture to say that all of our villages and towns would now be supplied with water and sewage facilities, and we would be well on our way to providing loans to those farmers in the rural areas who wanted to avail themselves of that aid for their own homes.

Moreover, if this Government had been truly interested in assisting rural people to obtain greater amenities of life, our rural people could have had access to loans for the improvement and the rebuilding of their homes, and the installations of those facilities which the Government now offers – we don't know what kind of strings are attached.

The people of the province of Saskatchewan have had good reason to doubt the sincerity and the altruism of this Government in putting forth the medical health program in the manner in which it has: First, because it is trying to make a controversial subject out of something on which there is basic agreement by everyone. It is trying to incite uneasiness and fear and distrust, where there should be none. Secondly, because it has not been consistent or as sincere in aiding health services programs which have already been in effect by local government and voluntary agencies in this province.

I want to quote a specific example of this, Mr. Speaker. Public Health Report, 1958-59, shows that the number of medical-care programs in operation have now been reduced from 1951 from 173 to 135, and only 100 of these are receiving any government grants from this Government at all. This grant amounts to a total of \$69,307 which is less than they were paying out in 1951.

When viewing the activities of a Government on matters like this, one is always faced with that very uneasy suspicion that this Government is more interested in perpetuating itself in power than it is in aiding local governments, voluntary agencies and individuals to help themselves achieve the goals that they desire.

Three medical services plans in this province provided insurance for most services, covered approximately 28 per cent of the provincial population; but I can find no attempt or study made by this Government of these plans, or for a possible modification of these plans. The Liberal Party believes that the Government is not the most effective body to provide medical services. The role of the Government is not to control and dole out these services. It is to assist the individual to obtain the best standard of health service possible, and, even more, to remove from each individual the fear of being unable to afford the necessary medical health services.

I want to spend just a few minutes of the time of this House in order to tell you about a scheme which I think satisfied these basic principles, a scheme which has been operating for three years, and a scheme which has been turned down in its appeal to this Government for any kind of grants whatsoever, even though the Minister has the discretion under

the rules and regulations of the Act, to make such a grant. This scheme was devised by the reeve and officials of the Rural Municipality of Humboldt, and I am very proud of it.

Many of the municipalities in my constituency have had very good coverage in the early days, covering both hospital and medical, and also giving almost complete medical coverage. When the time came in 1957 for this particular municipality to sign an agreement covering medical services with the doctors, they found that, due to the rising costs and changing schedules, instead of paying our \$16,000 a year, they would have to pay \$26,000. They did not feel they could afford this amount of money. Therefore, they made out another type of scheme. Under this scheme they say to their people: "There is no deterrent charge. You can go ahead to any doctor you want, as many times as you want. You can pay your own bills, and bring in the receipts to us, or you can bring in the statements if you cannot afford to pay the bills. We will put aside every year 7 mills of our assessment, which amounts to \$20,000 and out of this, at the end of the year we will pay whatever portion of the total of those bills we are in a financial position to pay."

This has resulted in a payment of 90 per cent of total medical coverage for that locality for the last two years. In addition to that, they have a fund for emergency. This scheme covers 2,200 people; it costs only about \$10 per head; it gives perfect freedom to the doctors and to the patients. It merely aids the patient to pay their bills. It keeps the municipality itself safe from any threat of a deficit, and it keeps the people in the community safe from bankruptcy, because of medical bills or the fear of inability to pay their medical bills.

Yet, this is the type of scheme that not only has been ignored; not only has this Government refused to study similar schemes in order to sincerely and truly learn from what already has gone on in this province and profit for the good of the people of the province, but they have refused even to pay the paltry grants that we do pay towards this type of coverage. Yet this is the Government that has the audacity to say, "You vote for us and you'll get medical coverage, and if you don't, you won't."

That brings us to another serious defect that is exhibited in this budget and by this Government, and this is the total lack of respect that this Government has for the advice and experience of the members of our local governing bodies or their executives. These are the people who have had the longest and most practical and the closest experience with medical coverage in this province or anywhere else, because Saskatchewan pioneered the municipal scheme of medical coverage. The very people who originated the scheme, who have lived with it, who have administered it, who have made a success of it, are ignored by this Government who, no doubt, will bring in an expert from foreign countries in order to teach us here what we already know, if we had but the wisdom and the humility to sit

March 8, 1960

down with the people who could tell us.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — This is the same old story of paying out the taxpayers' money for advice that could be obtained if this government but had the humility to do so. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the hospitalisation scheme in this province would never have worked if voluntary groups, charitable groups, local governing bodies and ordinary men and women in our society had not realized the need for hospitals, and had not, through taxation, voluntary donations, organizations and self-dedication, provided this province with the hospitals which we do have today. If we had depended on this Government to provide and plan and finance the hospitals of this province, we would be in a very sorry state today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — The Government has seriously offended these people, not only by its lack of wisdom, but by the very injustices with which it has tried to deal with the people who have built and maintained these hospitals. I want to point out just one example, and that is the crying need, the condition, that exists today in Saskatoon. I have here a clipping from the Saskatoon paper, dated March 2, and it says:

“St. Paul’s Hospital Closes Up 22-Bed Unit”.

“A 22-bed unit of St. Paul’s Hospital will be closed beginning at once, it was announced Tuesday, following an extraordinary joint meeting of the hospital’s lay advisory and medical advisory board, Monday night.

“In making the announcement, it was also disclosed that another unit of 30 beds will be closed gradually, if the hospital’s financial crisis is not resolved.”

It is quite all right to provide prepaid hospitalisation, but if people do not build and maintain the hospitals that patients can utilize, there is very little to having the right, if you don’t have the hospital bed. This Government certainly has not done its full share in assisting these hospitals, even in an emergency such as this.

It has from the very beginning, and in spite of all the briefs and all the advice it has had from the people who are vitally concerned, refused to consider interest on capital as being an expense, and allowable under the scheme. Now, of course, they can turn around and change their tune.

They used to say it was local responsibility. Now, I think, it is Federal responsibility they say it is; and yet they are the people who are trying to take credit for the hospital scheme, and for all the hospitals in this province, when they won't even do something that is merely justice.

Geriatric centres, nursing homes, mental hospitals which are built by this Government should be built after consultation with the people involved, as a matter of necessity; not as a matter of political plums to certain constituencies. I say that, with a more realistic approach to medical coverage, there must come something that was not even mentioned in the budget, and this is a resolution which was passed by the Liberal convention. It calls for "a thorough study of the problems of the mental ill and handicapped people, especially children, with a view to devising a comprehensive program of training and rehabilitation, with institutional care where desirable, the aim being to assist as many possible handicapped persons to become self-supporting and well-adjusted members of the human family."

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — May I ask the hon. member a question? Is the hon. member aware that this study is already going on in the province, and was, long before the Liberal resolution was passed?

Mrs. Batten: — No, I'm not aware, Mr. Speaker. I am truly amazed at the hon. Minister because, during estimates, this was suggested to him, and he gave no indication that anything would be done, but he said it would be taken under consideration. I am certainly very happy that it has been done, and I congratulate the Minister on taking this step.

The C.C.F. Government gave itself a lot of praise, self-adoration and publicity when it built the training school at Moose Jaw, but those wonderful facilities are of little comfort to the families of over 500 children who cannot be admitted, who are on a waiting list, and who have no assurance as to when, if ever they will be admitted. It is very heartbreaking to see a child lacking the care and attention it should have, because there is no room for it. There are children in rural areas who could profit from classes for retarded children. There is no provision in this budget to assist the parents in paying for their care and maintenance in cities, while attending such classes. Unless the parents are very affluent, they cannot possibly do so without sacrificing the other members of the family. This is a truly tragic situation for parents to see a child unable to help itself. Those children are loved, and are as important to society as anyone else, and yet there is absolutely nothing in this budget for them.

For three years I have been asking this Government, and particularly the Attorney General and the Minister of Social Welfare, to study and set up the machinery for a Family Court. That, too, was "taken into consideration", and I would be thrilled to pieces if one of them got up now and asked whether I knew that it was being established. This, I think, is vitally important. We could not only save thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money, but we could save something far more precious, and that is children and family lives. There are people who have absolutely no assistance in their marital difficulties,

March 8, 1960

and it is very easy to say you could send them to the priest, or send them to the Minister; but in most cases these are people who have lost all contact with the church. This is probably part of the reason they have these difficulties, but there it is. It is absolutely hopeless and useless to call on the department under the Attorney General, or the Minister of Social Welfare for any of these cases, whatsoever. The only recommendation that is made is to go and get social aid.

I was horrified to see a little booklet that was published and put out, a short time ago, under the Department of Social Welfare, giving advice to a mother who has been deserted by her husband, and the advice is to go to the police. The officer told her she didn't have to have a lawyer, and if she had one, she would probably have to pay. I don't know whether that advice came from the Attorney General or not. This is the type of place where the personnel of the Department of Social Welfare could render a real service, in re-establishing these people and letting them take a hold of life again.

The amount of advising that is done by the Department of Social Welfare certainly cannot be blamed for any of the administration costs, because I have been told (and I see no reason to doubt it) that child welfare inspectors, for instance, have been told that they have no business giving any marital advice whatsoever; they are not trained to do so. I have been told by the hon. Minister himself, in writing, that they have no facilities to take money, to collect money and to expend money, for deserted wives. They do not have the trained personnel; but the overworked town clerk has the training to do it, and they highly recommend him, or anybody else in the country who is willing to take on that burden.

I could go on indefinitely on this subject because it is one that I feel has been very badly neglected, and one that would not have cost much money, and would have saved a lot of families and a lot of children from becoming deserted and from becoming wards of the Government. This, Mr. Speaker, is a sorry record of the two pillars of a Socialist Government – public health and social welfare. These two pillars, in my opinion, are the only reasons for, the only justification of, their existence; and yet they cannot stand on their record, and that is why they have brought in their so-called election issue of a prepaid medical scheme.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Bunk!

Mrs. Batten: — That describes the Minister adequately – bunk!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — It describes what you are saying.

Mrs. Batten: — This attitude shows the arrogance of the members opposite, when they refer to farmers as “poor relations” in this House. The debt that has been accumulated by this Government, the lack of prosperity in this province, as contrasted with that of other provinces, the lack of leadership and direction, the lack of imagination and integrity on the part of this Government, is deplorable; and I will not support the budget, Mr. Speaker!

Hon. Woodrow S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all join with those many members who have sent you words of appreciation for your many years of fine service. Those of us who have known you now for a number of years in our present relationship, and perhaps even more particularly those of us who sat with you in the Cabinet, or, as I did, on the Board of the Power Corporation, know of your insight into the problems of the Saskatchewan community, and your very keen desire and great hope for the people of Saskatchewan. We thank you for all that you have done, and extend our best wishes to you.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I want also to associate myself with those who have complemented the Provincial Treasurer on this, his 16th, budget in this House. His competence in administration, his wisdom in influencing and directing financial policy, are well known and well recognized, not only in this House, but outside of it in this province, and beyond. I think these attributes are, after all, those of technical competence. Those of us who have known the Provincial Treasurer more intimately, while we will remember and admire him for that technical competence, will probably remember him and admire him for other characteristics. We will recall, for example, the fact that he was one of those people in Saskatchewan who, a number of years ago now, took a very leading part in bringing farm people and labour people together in one political party, a movement which was so successful, and which was accepted so well by the people of Saskatchewan, that ten years after it began, it formed the Government in this province and has remained as the Government since that time.

Some of us who have worked with him perhaps more intimately, will remember him, particularly I think, for his dedication in retaining and in strengthening some of the important aspects of parliamentary procedure. We will remember particularly, his zealously that the authority of the Legislature must be respected and observed. We will remember particularly, his fairness in adjudication with regard to financial problems, which must be settled as between departments of government.

Turning to the debate, Mr. Speaker, first of all, a few words with regard to the two speakers of the Opposition, this afternoon, who have just spoken to us. As I listened to them, I could not help but think of that old quotation, “Sweet are the uses of adversity”, because certainly the uses of adversity to the Liberal Party have produced a great reformation there. If the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) feels that sometimes the Liberal Party is misinterpreted by those on this side of the House, or those others like us throughout the province, she should not, it seems to me, feel too harshly about this, because after all, it is a little difficult to know just where the Liberal Party does stand, after her statement this afternoon. We, after all, have statements such as that which she made this afternoon – and which I am not disputing as having been made in good faith; the statements made by other members of the Liberal Party during this debate, which must be

March 8, 1960

considered; statements made by the present Leader of the Liberal Party outside of the House; statements made by Liberals during the last 15 years in this House, and actions of the Liberal Party in this province, while in government in Saskatchewan, and while in government in other parts of Canada. When you take all of these together, the picture becomes confusing.

It may very well be, for example, that civil servants today have nothing to fear from the election of a Liberal government, but everybody who knows the history of Saskatchewan, knows this was not true when a Liberal government was last elected, after having been out of office for some time. All of us will join in hoping that the reformation has been good, and has been complete.

It may very well be true that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has nothing to fear as a result of an election of a Liberal Party, or from a Liberal government. But it is not many years ago that a leading member of the Liberal Party stood up in this House, and referred to it as the greatest "political hoax every perpetrated on the people of this province". These things we must remember, too.

It may very well be true that they have a great respect for labour and the trade union movement, but we cannot forget statements made by such members as one of the elder citizens over there, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), a few nights ago in this House.

It may very well be true that they have a very great respect for public ownership as it applies to public utilities, but it is only a few nights ago, in the city of Saskatoon, that the present Leader of the Liberal Party was railing away against the "giant monopoly which the Power corporation has in the distribution of natural gas in this province". So I think, Mr. Speaker, there is some confusion with regard to this new Liberal Party that has risen like a phoenix from the ashes of the old one that is supposedly dead, and we may be excused from being somewhat confused.

Certainly this can be said about the speeches of the two members, this afternoon. They were the most "promising" speeches which have been made in this House for a long time. I suggest that never in so short a period have so many promises been made to the people of Saskatchewan, as were made in a relatively short time since we began this afternoon's sitting.

I want to say a few words, too, about some of the other members across the way who have spoken in this debate. The member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) spoke a few days ago, and performed for us a bit of mathematics to prove something or other about the Department of Social Welfare. Now, mathematics at best is a good tool; but there are ways in which it can be used, and used incorrectly. If I followed his logic, it was to take the salaries of those persons associated with certain aspects of the Department of Social Welfare, and divide this into the amount of money paid out in assistance, and say this represents the ratio between administration costs and money actually

paid out to be used by people.

The error in this thinking, of course, is that of saying that all of the expenses paid in connection with staff are administrative expenses. The hon. member is a teacher, and saying this would be comparable to saying that the sum \$30 million and more paid out in teachers' salaries in the province, is the cost of school administration in the province. These Social Welfare workers who are paid, are paid not just to pay over a certain amount of money to the recipients; they also have a very important and very far-reaching responsibility in connection with various programs. The money paid to trained welfare staff may well produce the best economic returns, and the greatest social benefits, to the people who are in need.

The member for Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) joined the forces of those who expressed concern as to the effect of a public health program in the province. He spent some time in reading a statement, which has now appeared in several newspapers, made by a doctor who is presently one of the medical staff in the Swift Current Health Region. The main impact of this statement seemed to be that the danger we faced was that of losing doctors. I think it only necessary to remind ourselves, as this House has been reminded before in this Session, that this was the same sort of prophecy which was made at the time the medical-care program in the Swift Current region was first organized; to remind ourselves further that, since it was organized, the number of doctors in that area has not decreased, but has increased from 19 to 41 at the present time. This increase represents, I suggest, a greater increase proportionately than has taken place in any other similar part of Saskatchewan.

Then he referred to the competence of the doctors who may presently be found at the University Hospital. This, of course, is a very accurate description of the character of person, and the ability of the persons who are at that hospital. We have been fortunate in attracting to Saskatchewan (I have said this in this Legislature before) a number of the ablest medical minds and hands to be found, not only in the Dominion of Canada but on the North American continent. But the point he missed, it seemed to me, is that those people who are to be found at the University Hospital, are engaged in a public health program. They are to be found there not only in administration, but in diagnosing, in treatment, in operation. Most of these people could, undoubtedly, make for themselves much more money were they to leave the University Hospital and go into private practice. But they choose to take part in this public program, because it gives them a better opportunity to do their best work, because it provides conditions which are interesting to them, because, I submit, it does improve their relationship with their patients, and improves also their relationship with society as a whole.

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) spoke, also, following the Minister of Natural Resources. You may recall that the member, in commenting on what the Minister of Natural Resources had said, commented that one could have learned a lot about fish that might be in the creek beside the door, but

March 8, 1960

not much more than that. He went on to say, of course, that there wasn't much in that speech that would be of interest to the voters. This is an interesting commentary in itself – that he should judge whether or not the worthwhileness of it would have some vote-getting appeal. Had he listened, he would have learned a great deal about the plans of that Department, for conservation in the fishing industry, for improving the efficiency in that industry. He would have learned a great deal about plans for conservation and adequate use of our timber resources. He would have learned that new areas of available timber had been discovered. He would have learned a great deal about a very vital program of park development. He would have learned much about a far-reaching and imaginative program which concerns most intimately the people living in the northern one-half of our province.

He did acknowledge, in the course of his remarks, that there had been considerable increase in school grants during recent years. Then he went on to say that, while this was true, there had been little by way of increase in previous years. This makes it necessary for me to review again, Mr. Speaker.

He mentioned the fact that there had been an increase in assessment since this Government took office, and that is true. So I thought I might try again to correct this statement, which is similar to that which the Leader of the Opposition made in a previous debate, that I might at this time measure in still another way to show the increase in school grants which they insist on saying has not taken place. I thought it would be worthwhile to show the school grants over a period of years in terms of their value, in mills, on the assessment available for taxation for educational purposes.

In the first budget which the Provincial Treasurer brought into this House (for 1945-46), the school grants were comparable to the amount of money which would be raised by four mills of taxation on the assessment of that date. Five years later, in 1950-51, school grants were eight mills on the taxation of that day, which was \$40 million more than it had been five years before. Five years later, in 1955-56, the school grants amounted to 12 mills on a still greater assessment. This year, the school grants will amount to approximately 24 to 25 mills of taxation on an assessment which is \$300 million more than the assessment in 1945-46. There you have it in blocks of five years, during which the value of the school grants have gone from four mills to eight mills, to 12 mills to 24 mills on an assessment which is \$300 million more than it was when school grants were worth four mills on the assessment of that particular time.

The facts speak for themselves, even though the Opposition refuse to look at them. Grants have been increasing steadily, and the greater amounts of increases have been, admittedly, during recent years.

They also had some things to say about tax arrears for school purposes. It is quite true that, for a period of years, the arrears of school taxes did mount up. It is interesting to note, however, that the arrears of school taxes were less in December, 1957, than they had been in December, 1956;

that they were again less in December, 1958 than they had been in December, 1957. As a matter of fact, over that period of two years, the arrears of taxation in our school units reduced by some \$1,300,000. It may also be interesting to note that they reached their highest level in 1956. If my mathematical friends would like to relate figures and facts, they might make something out of that, because it seems to me that 1956 was about the last year we had a Federal Liberal Government in office. This matter of arrears of taxes is, in considerable part, an indication of inadequate returns which our farmers were receiving for their produce at that time, and the inability of the farmers to market large amounts of their grain.

He had reference also what he termed to be a dangerously large capital debt for school purposes. Well again, there is a capital debt for school purposes. There are a number of reasons for it, which I mention only in very general terms. There has had to be, over recent years, a very considerable, a very expensive, school building program. This has been partly brought about because of the increase in our school population, particularly the increase in our high school population. In part, it has been brought about by the shifting of population from rural to urban areas, following the industrial development throughout the province. In part, it has been brought about because many of our buildings had reached the end of their natural life, and had to be replaced. In considerable part, of course, the size of this capital debt is directly attributable to the very considerable increase in the cost of building over the last 15 years or so. But even when you add all of these things up, we find that, in our school units, the total capital debt stands at about \$9 million. This, on an assessment of over \$750 million. This means that it could be paid off by a levy of 12 mills in any one year. By no means can it be called "staggering" or "dangerous". If hon. members want to take the trouble to look at Public Accounts or Estimates (as they do for some purposes) and compare this with the school debt in Manitoba or Alberta, they will find again the Saskatchewan figure compares very favourably to the situation in those two provinces.

I want to turn more directly now to the programs in the Department of Education for the year which will begin in a month's time. The hon. members will have noted that the Department of Education estimates show an increase of some \$6.8 million over last year's estimates. One and one-half million dollars of this increase is attributable to a construction grant to the University, showing in the Department of Education Estimates, money which was, last year and the previous years, paid through or spent by the Department of Public Works.

The main factors in the increase in Department of Education Estimates are the \$4 1/2 million additional for school grants, an additional \$500,000 for the grants for the University of Saskatchewan, and about \$100,000 under Federal-Provincial agreements, largely because of the extending program at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute. The increases in the school grants reflect a number of things. They reflect, first of all, more classrooms in operation in the province, particularly high-school classrooms. They reflect

March 8, 1960

secondly, an improvement in the level of service in the province, particularly as indicated by higher qualifications of teachers and the extension of the system of transportation of students. Thirdly, they reflect an increase in the proportion of costs carried by Government grants.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later I have to come to the point where I must say something about how the increases are going to be distributed, and whenever I talk about this to any group of people, I usually preface it by saying that it hurts me more than it does them. However, I will be as brief and as general as possible. To begin with, I will deal with the largest group of schools, namely those in communities, or in administrative jurisdictions having 20 or more classrooms. In this group we pay our operating grants on the basis of what we call the "general formula". This formula, the hon. members will recall from previous discussions, is based on assessment of the area; it is based on the number of classrooms operating in the area; it is based on the qualifications of the teachers employed, and it is based on the transportation costs and the costs of other assistance given to students. It provides basically that a percentage, which is determined by ability to pay, will be paid of certain assigned operating costs.

The main change for 1960 is a change in the amount of the assigned costs. The change is at January 1, 1960: the assigned costs will be increased by \$500 per classroom. This means that for an elementary classroom which has in charge a teacher with less than a standard certificate, the assigned costs will be \$4,100. If the teacher has a standard certificate or better, it will be \$4,500. For a high-school classroom, in charge of a teacher with less than a professional certificate, the assigned cost will be \$5,500; if the teacher in the high-school classroom has a professional certificate, the assigned cost will be \$6,100. The grants which will be paid range, in accordance with ability to pay, on a percentage scale running from 32 per cent to 81 per cent.

In addition to these assigned costs for classrooms for which a percentage is paid, the districts also receive the same percentage of the costs of conveyance, of board and room, and allowance and the fees which are paid up. May I put it this way. If we take an elementary classroom with a teacher with a certificate less than a standard certificate in charge in one of our highest assessed areas, the grant there will be 32 per cent of \$4,100 (the assigned cost), or \$1,312. In addition, the same percentage will be paid of transportation costs. If you take a low-assessed area and again the same circumstances – an elementary classroom, a teacher with less than a standard certificate – there the grant will be 81 per cent of the same assigned costs, \$4,100, or \$3,321. In addition to these grants, there are, of course, capital grants which are being increased in total somewhat, and the continuation of the grant of 25 per cent of the cost of buses purchased.

The second group of schools, which makes up the rest of the province, is a group of approximately 500 classrooms in communities or systems with 20 or less classrooms. The change here is in the equalization grants.

The present formula is that the equalization grant is obtained by taking 16 mills times the difference between the average assessment per classroom and \$140,000. the proposal for 1960 is that the equalization grants will be determined by taking 17 mills on the difference between the average assessment per classroom and \$145,000. In other words, we increased the ceiling by \$5,000. This will bring into equalization those districts with an assessment of between \$140,000 and \$145,000, and also it increases the equalization grants of all those presently receiving it. We increase the figure that we multiply by, from 16 to 17 mills.

May I say just a word or two about the relative values of the grant. In one of the units, over half a million dollars in school grants for operating purposes will be paid. At the other extreme, it means a smaller grant of about \$120,000. Look at it another way, and this grant in our lowest assessed unit is worth 77 mills on the assessment of that area, whereas, the high assessed area, it is worth only 7.2 mills on that assessment. In dollars per teacher employed, it ranges from \$4,600 in the low assessed unit, to \$1,600 in the high assessed unit. Again, this does not include capital grants.

I want to comment briefly on one remark made by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) when he was commenting in his reply to the Budget Address some days ago. He suggested the opinion that, when there were differences in cost, or differences in expenditure for pupil, this meant different standards of education. May I say that this again has not necessarily been a correct conclusion, and may I use some examples to demonstrate why differences per cost per pupil, or expenditure per pupil, do not necessarily mean differences in standards of education.

Let me then examine two units in the province in regard to their cost in 1958. The cost in one was \$230 per pupil; the cost for the other, \$340 per pupil. The one which cost \$230 per pupil is among the group which has the lowest cost in the province; the one which has \$340 per pupil is among the group which has the highest cost per pupil. This is the total operating cost per pupil. Part of it is carried by school grants, so, to get the net cost to the district itself, one has to subtract the amount of the school grants. If you do this, you find that the one with the lowest cost, spent about \$113 per pupil out of its own money; the other one with the highest cost, spent about twice as much, about \$223 per pupil. It so happens that the low cost one is in an area which is among our most heavily populated in the province; the higher cost one is in an area which is among our more sparsely populated. There you have two units, one paying out of its own taxes, \$113, and the other, \$223. It also happens that the second unit which is paying \$223 per pupil, has an assessment of more than two and one-half times per pupil as does the first one; so this difference in the amount they have to raise themselves is justified in that way.

We need, however, to look also at the services given. There are two units with considerable difference in cost, although, we submit, because of differences in assessment of relatively equal loads. They had about the same salary schedules for teachers. As a matter of fact, the area which has

March 8, 1960

the lower cost per pupil has a better level of certification for teachers, throughout. Both have approximately the same percentage in high schools: about 20 per cent of their total student population. the high cost area transports a little bit larger percentage of its total students and transports them further distances; but the low cost area transports a larger percentage of high school students. The low cost area has one, and probably two schools, which give a more complete service than any school in the other area.

I mention that only because I want to emphasize that you cannot compare the quality of education being received in an area by just looking at the expenditure per pupil. One has to analyse it to see the reason for the different expenditures, and one has to analyse to see what the load left on the local area is, and how able that area is to carry that load – and this shows that they compare pretty well. One has to finally analyse it as to quality of service, and this shows that the area which is actually expending less has probably a better qualify (if anything) program than the one which is spending somewhat more.

The second item of considerable increase in the budget of the Department of Education is the increase of \$500,000 as a grant to the University. This brings our total grant to the University, this year, for operating purposes to a sum of \$3.2 million. This again reflects the educational growth in the province. This reflects increasing students in attendance at University, and it also reflects extension of the program which the University is offering.

I think many of the members will already have heard about one of the new program proposals that the University is instituting, called the Institute of Northern Studies. This means that a number of scholars will be devoting their attention to considering the economic and social problems of the northern part of our province, and of the North-West Territories, as well. I think all of us are gratified with this still further indication as to the very great interest of the University in the very real problems of the province and of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

The capital grant, as I have mentioned, of \$1 1/2 million appears in the budget of the Department of Education for the first time. It appears there because of the change in policy. Prior to this year, the Department of Public Works actually undertook the construction, in conjunction with planning at the University; but the Department of Public Works actually undertook the construction of buildings on the University campus. This indicates that, in the future, we will be making to the University a grant, and it will be undertaking the construction of its own buildings.

I need only mention, because I discussed on a previous occasion in this House, Mr. Speaker, the developments at the Technical Institute. The building, it is anticipated, will be complete this summer, and this will make it possible for us to extend very considerably our program for courses and for students, and this makes necessary the expenditure of more money.

It is important, in a discussion in this Legislature, that we talk not just about money and not just about school buildings, but that we also spend some time in talking about the standards of education which are being achieved, and we indicate our concern for the quality of effort which comes as a result of this expenditure of money. I have, on previous occasions, given the Legislature facts to indicate a steady and good improvement in the level of certification of our teachers. I want to say again that, as a result of the incentives offered by school boards on salary schedules and the result of the willingness of teachers to take correspondence courses and to attend summer schools, there has been a very great improvement in the certification of our teachers in this province.

We need always to remember, however, that the preparation of teachers is something that is never finished. The good teacher is faced by the eternal questions of "What am I trying to do?" and "Am I doing it well enough?" all the days of his or her teaching life. As a result we have placed a very considerable amount of emphasis on what is called 'in-service' training of teachers. This indeed is one of the major functions of superintendents of schools. It is one of the major functions of principals of schools. Through regular institutes and workshops at which teachers get together with the superintendent of schools, or with resource people from the University or Teachers' College or Department of Education staff, there is much critical appraisal of the work which they are doing, and much planning as to how they can do a better job of their work. I want, this year, particularly to commend the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation for the very specific and direct interest which they showed this year in paying the salary and expenses of a very excellent teacher to go about the province and to hold institutes and discussions with teachers, on their own time, in regard to the teaching of English. I understand furthermore that they are planning to continue this in the following year.

Because this 'in-service' training is so important, I welcome very much the provision in the budget which will make possible the appointment of two additional high-school superintendents. Up until this time and at this time, we have had four high-school superintendents. They have all been working out of the city of Regina; they have not had special areas of the province as their particular responsibility. When we add the two additional ones in the fall of this year, we will station them in two, and possibly three, centres in the province. Each one will be given an area of the province, made up of nine or ten school units in the special area of his concern. They will continue to work together in order that they may bring to bear the specialized training which one has and the other one may not have; but it is important, I think, that they will have an area for which they are particularly and personally responsible. This, we feel, will be of more specific assistance to teachers and boards in that area.

We are concerned with equalization of opportunity in our schools, and this has led to experimentation with promotion by units of work rather than by grade, based on school years. Perhaps I can interpret this in this way, Mr. Speaker. Let us consider a group of children in grades 1 to 3.

March 8, 1960

Let us remember the wisdom of the man who said, "God made no sisterships." These youngsters are different in their ability. Some of them can complete the work of these three grades in two years; many of them, most of them, will take three years, and some of them will do it only in four years. Too frequently the provision for the one who can do it in two years is simply that he skips something. Too frequently the provision for the one who takes four years to do it is that he has to fail, and repeat practically the same work over again for a complete year. Obviously it is much better to try to design a program so that the achievement and programs of a youngster is at a rate based on the child's ability.

As I said, there has been a considerable amount of experimentation going on for many years in the Kindersley school unit, more recently in Meadow Lake School unit and Estevan school unit, adaptations of this kind have been under way and under observation. This year in the city of Regina, some schools have been organized on this basis, again, in order to try it out and that it may be observed. As a result of this we will be devoting the entire time of our own staff meeting of superintendents of schools and Teachers' College staff during our annual Easter week meeting, together with part of the time of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation Council at that time, to evaluate what has been done, in the hope of accelerating the adaptation of this method throughout the province.

I want to comment on several other programs in the Department. There is much concern (and I think proper concern) with regard to the physical fitness of not only our young people but our older people as well. For a number of years we have had reason, I suggest, to be rather pleased and proud of the work which a rather limited staff of trained people have been able to achieve in this regard. Undoubtedly one of the reasons why they have been able to make such an impression is that they have had the wholesale co-operation of so many organizations throughout the province: councils of municipalities and voluntary organizations, particularly those organizations which are concerned with promoting sports. I take this opportunity, as I have done on many occasions in speaking to them, to express our appreciation for all the assistance that they have given.

Actually, the work is in part carried out by the staff which acts by advising and encouraging and assisting a number of other organizations, and some of it is, of course, by way of giving grants to various communities and groups for specific activity. I thought it might be interesting just to indicate something of the extent of the participation of groups and individuals. For example, we work with various groups in arranging competitions in a number of sports. Last year some 8,700 students competed in provincial sports play downs under the direction of the Saskatchewan High-School Athletic Association, at the District and Provincial level. For a number of years now, hockey schools have been operated in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association. Last year people from some 123 communities took instruction at these hockey schools. An outstanding swimming coach was brought in to hold a clinic for coaches and people interested in swimming; some 55 people

received instruction from him. In connection with the Saskatchewan Men's Curling Association, three curling schools were operated throughout the province. Again, 123 people from 22 communities received instruction in this way. A grant to the Skiing Association made it possible for them to send five people away to get instruction in skiing, who in turn came back and gave instruction to groups of people who were interested in skiing in the province of Saskatchewan. The Amateur Athletic Union of Canada, Saskatchewan Branch, took a track and field training clinic which we had previously carried on, and about 100 persons came to that.

I could go on and on, and speak of the provincial meetings of those people who direct the activities of playgrounds throughout the provinces; to tell of the assistance of staff at the Camp Easter Seal, the Camp for Crippled Children at Watrous, the assistance given to the 4-H Provincial Camp held at Wakaw, and the Saskatchewan Training School Camp for the mentally retarded, and so on and so forth. I am pleased that we are getting at least one addition to staff here, to enable us to extend further the benefits of this very vigorous and very effective group of people.

I am pleased, also, to announce again that some of the Olympic trials will be held in Saskatchewan, and the budget provides money for putting the track at the University of Saskatchewan into first-class condition. I do hope that some of the members, during July might take advantage of an opportunity to go to Saskatoon and to watch the young competitors from all across Canada. There was a very excellent response on the part of the public when these were last held here, and some very thrilling events during the day.

May I say a word also about the work of the Adult Education Division, particularly with regard to a new activity introduced during the year which we are just finishing. My reference here is to the use of Saskatchewan House as a centre for continuous education. I suppose one of the more outstanding of the new programs was the Summer Festival which was held at Saskatchewan House. This was a festival of music, drama, dance, film, and even of food, Mr. Speaker. It involved a number of the ethnic groups of the province. Our native Indians, the French population, German, Hungarian, Ukrainian, Jewish, had an opportunity to allow the rest of us to enjoy their songs and costumes and dances – and food again. This will be carried on again, this summer, and again I would hope that some members of the Legislature will find it possible to test and taste the activities which are included in this summer Festival. I think it is an activity which can be developed to be a very considerable attraction in the city and in the province. I think it is an activity that can give a great deal of encouragement to the doings of our own people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Evening classes, throughout, continue to show a considerable amount of interest. Over 5,000 people are taking part in evening classes throughout the province of Saskatchewan. This doesn't count another 5,000 who are in

March 8, 1960

attendance at various classes in our city technical schools.

I want, too, to refer for a minute to the development in northern Saskatchewan, where we have had a very considerable growth in population and in the size of many of our communities, indicating the economic developments and the economic activity. Perhaps the facts of what have happened in education spell it out as well as anything. The number of teachers in that area has doubled during a period of six years. Go back 10 years ago now, there were in what we call our Northern Administrative Area, about 30 teachers. Last year, when I spoke to them at their convention before they went to their various schools in northern Saskatchewan, there were over 100 teachers. There are 1,000 more pupils in our schools in that area than there were six years ago. This again speaks of the growth of that part of the province.

I want also to say a word about some members of the staff of the Department of Education, who have received what seems to me to be rather special recognition during the year. The Deputy Minister, who is known to all the members of the Legislature, has been invited for the second time to represent Canadian education at an International Conference of Education to be held in Geneva during the summer. Our Director of Curricula is, at the present time, the sole Canadian representative, and one of two representatives of North America, at a U.N.E.S.C.O. Conference in New Zealand. Thirdly, Dr. Mahood of the Teachers' College, Saskatoon, is on leave of absence undertaking a special program of teacher education for the United Nations' Technical Assistance Program in Lebanon.

I want to say a few words about a few other agencies with which I enjoy some contact, and for which I have some responsibility. First of all, Libraries. It is rather interesting to note the fact that more people in Saskatchewan are reading more books. In our Public Information Library, in 1954 the circulation was 52,000; in 1959, that circulation had increased to 98,000 – a very marked increase during a five-year period. This is an indication of the growing interest, as I said, of the people of Saskatchewan in reading. I think, too, it is some indication of the effectiveness of the members of the staff of the Provincial Library, who have numerous invitations and opportunities to meet with groups of people in the province and discuss with them libraries and reading generally. This indicates that, indeed, there is a great interest in this. One can get it in another way, too. We have a service by means of which people can write to the Provincial Library and ask for information. The number of reference questions has tripled during the last five years; the number of people writing in to get specific information about questions with which they are concerned.

Of course, the most striking thing about the libraries' budget this year, is that it provides for a new Regional Library headquarters. This is a new program. While there is only one regional library in effect at the present time – and undoubtedly the new building will be built in the city of Prince Albert to accommodate that region – there are a number of other areas in the province that are extremely interested.

One of the factors which has stood in their way has been the difficulty of a number of municipalities co-operating in order to build a headquarters building; so this removes one of the most difficult problems which they had to face. Sometime during this year, a start will be made on the regional library headquarters to serve those municipalities extending generally from Canwood, Shellbrook, Leask, to the city of Prince Albert, down to Kinistino, St. Louis, and over to Melfort and Nipawin and Tisdale on the other side. I am extremely hopeful, and extremely confident, that this will make possible the development of other regional libraries in the near future.

The budget for the Research Council will show an increase of over \$100,000, bringing the total budget to half a million dollars. This, of course, is an investment basically in resource development. The Research Council is mainly concerned with finding out how, in Saskatchewan, we can better utilize our resources, both agricultural and non-agricultural. There have been, as many members may know, some rather hopeful developments in regard to one undertaken. There has been a great deal of favourable comment as to the possibilities of the use of this as an additive in lubricating oil, and you may have seen some of the reports in local papers and in the 'Financial Post', just within recent weeks. If this develops (as it seems it may well do), this would, of course, provide a very considerably increased market for one of our agricultural products.

A ground water survey, which was initiated some two years ago, will continue and extend. This provides a considerable amount of basic information, which is necessary information if industry is going to develop. It provides information which is going to be extremely useful in the farm and urban water and sewage programs.

The third aspect of the work of the Research Council is the advice given through its technical information service in industry generally in the province. I think it is right to say that the smaller industries are becoming more and more acquainted with the value of certain information which we either have at the Research Council, or can obtain for them from the National Research Council, or through other services. There is a great deal of personal contact through the two people we have employed in this part of the work and also by means of a bulletin which is distributed regularly to industries, manufacturing and commercial concerns in the province. One of the undertakings during the past year has been a productivity conference, hoping to draw more attention to the very important aspect of getting better productivity by bringing together all of the knowledge about all of the factors which concern productivity.

Mr. Speaker, the budget as I see it, demonstrates a very considerable amount of faith in the province of Saskatchewan on the part of this Government. It demonstrates also, a great deal of consideration for the welfare of the people of this province. Because the budget provides for further economic development, because it provides for continued distribution of the benefits of that development so as to advance the interests of all of the people of Saskatchewan. I have much pleasure in supporting it.

March 8, 1960

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — In rising to speak in the budget debate, I would first like to associate myself with all the other speakers in this debate, and I am sure with all the members of the Legislature, in wishing you, Mr. Speaker, all the best of luck in your retirement at the end of the present Session, and in the future.

I would also like to congratulate all previous members who have spoken in this debate, and in particular the financial critic of the Opposition (Mr. Cameron) for what I felt was a very discerning and a very masterful assessment of the budget.

In the few moments I have allotted to me before calling it 5:30 I would first like to say a word about education. I think it is fitting, during this week which has been set aside in the province as 'Education Week', that we should devote a moment or two to the cause of education generally throughout the province. Much could be said about the problems of education, but I believe that the theme of Education Week, "Education – Your Last Chance" has a certain significance for all of us. We have had other themes during Education Week, including "Education is Everyone's Business" and others; but those in charge of arrangements for Education Week are very concerned about the necessity of bringing home more and more to the public the importance of an education among the youth of this province.

I noticed that Jean Clyde, who is Chairman of the Saskatchewan Education Week Committee, commenting in the February edition of 'The Saskatchewan Trustee' has made some very important statements in her editorial, a few lines of which I would like to quote:

"One thing that may have been neglected in education is the responsibility of the individual to obtain the best education possible, according to his ability. It was with this in mind that your Education Week Committee chose for their theme in 1960, 'Education – Your Last Chance'.

Among other remarks that she made, Miss Clyde goes on to say:

"Education must have a broader purpose, if our culture is to survive. There is no doubt that our society is suffering from a deplorable waste of talent and brain-power, and how may we better harness it?"

On the subject of education, I would like to join with other hon. members in congratulating the members of the teaching profession and all educational officials who have strived in the past year in the best interests of education. I would like to mention the fact that the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Teachers'

Federation, Mr. 'Gib' Eamer, is at present on leave of absence in Europe and is over there to familiarize himself with some of the aspects of British education, and I am sure that we, as teachers, will in the future, benefit from Mr. Eamer's findings while on the continent. At this time I would, as a teacher, vitally interested in the welfare of education, like to commend the Teachers' Federation for the work and the strides they have made over the years in improving the lot of teachers and of education generally throughout the province.

I cannot but take the opportunity at this time, by virtue of the fact that our rural municipal officials from all over the province are meeting here, to also join and associate myself with other members of this Assembly who have paid tribute to the work and the effort of the municipal and local government officials throughout the province. I think of just a few weeks ago, when our rural municipal officials were called upon to assist in the acreage bonus plan in the province – to assist in screening applicants and in distributing assistance to our farmers. Through the medium of the reeves and the rural municipal secretaries, I feel at this time of crisis in the province, within the confines of provincial and federal legislation, that our municipal officials discharged their duties with efficiency, and certainly merit a great deal of credit. I am sure that the work of the rural municipalities in this time of crisis will be long remembered and greatly appreciated.

I listened with a good deal of interest to the speakers, this afternoon, particularly to the display on the part of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) with regard to the Liberal plan connected with the removal of the restrictions on the use of purple gas in farm trucks. I think there are two considerations with regard to this matter. The one consideration, of course, is the matter of economy; the fact that we could save the farmers of this province some \$4 million in actual revenue by removing this restriction. But I think the other one is a matter of convenience, and I can think of no single thing, sponsored by this Government, which has caused more inconvenience and been more of a nuisance to the rural people of this province than this same tax on purple gas in this province.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What tax on purple gas?

Mr. Foley: — I'll restate that, Mr. Speaker: than the restrictions which have been placed on the use of purple gas by this Government. That may be a more lucid way of putting it. Time and time again in this Assembly. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member be prepared to call it 5:30?

Mr. Foley: — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

March 8, 1960

The House resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at 5:30 this afternoon, I had associated myself with previous speakers in this Legislature and in this debate, in expressing my wish for many years of health and happiness to yourself and your wife in retirement. I had also extended my congratulations to all previous speakers in the debate, and I believe I made reference to the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) who was attempting to make light of the plank in the Liberal platform which would remove restrictions from the use of purple gas in farm trucks. I had suggested that not only was the removal of this restriction a considerable saving which, I am sure, all farmers would appreciate, but that these restrictions have created a nuisance for the farmers of this province and have, I suggest, created considerable difficulty for those charged with the enforcement of the restrictions on the use of purple gas in the province. Possibly the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) may be able to tell us the number of convictions that have resulted from this restriction by his Government, over the past number of years, in the administration of these purple gas regulations. I have no doubt that the convictions have been considerable, and, as one of the members of our party has suggested, certainly we will have the support of that element of the population, anyway, and will bring many more to our ranks before the next election rolls around.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs had some reference to education with relationship to the remarks, the very capable remarks, of the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) last evening. I listened to the remarks of both these hon. members, and I am confident that if it is possible to educate the members on your right, then the remarks of these gentlemen fell on very fertile ground indeed, particularly the remarks of the hon. member for Arm River with respect to the provincial debt and with respect to the refunds and seed grain cancellations which this Government proceeded to collect after the cancellations were in effect. The member made his point very stirringly, and I think it was interesting to note that he was not replied to by the speakers on the government side this evening.

We, here in the Liberal Opposition, feel that the time has come for a change in our provincial administration. The gentlemen to your right have had 16 years in office, and. . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Too bad you can't convince the voters.

Mr. Foley: — Well, who knows: We still have a few months left before we go to the polls, and I feel that a good many of the voters in this province are in the process of changing many of their preconceived notions about the aims and the ideals of the administration that has held sway in this province for the last 16 years.

Some reference was made, this afternoon, to the 'ship of state', and I think the hon. Minister was attempting to suggest that the Liberal party was not being adequately launched. Well, I want to say that, if we refer to the present administration as the 'ship of state', certainly the ranks of the crew have been sadly dilapidated, or sadly depleted. After the next election it may well be that the present C.C.F. ship of state may serve as merely a 'lifeboat' on the new Liberal 'liner'. Let us hope so, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — You'll need a lifeboat.

Mr. Foley: — I was rather interested, before we recessed, to hear many references by the hon. Minister to remarks in the 'Prince Albert Herald'. I noticed, however, that one reference was very conspicuous by its absence, and that was reference to the lack of industry in northern Saskatchewan. I want to give the 'Prince Albert Herald' credit, for they have been very discerning in their criticisms, and I am very pleased that the hon. Minister referred to this paper, because, I too want to make references to some of its remarks which have appeared from time to time. Of course, I refer to the lack of a pulp mill in Saskatchewan and the fact that reference has been made before each election to the possibilities of this taking place. Now, whether the Government to your right, Mr. Speaker, has suddenly become more modest in their point of view, or whether they simply lack the courage or the gall, to come out again, I notice they have not made too many references during this Session to the pulp mill. I have here an editorial, dated in the month of June, last year, stating this:

"Pulp Mill" — (here we go again) "The men from Regina are talking 'pulp'. The Premier of the province confirmed, just a few days ago, that it was not a thing of the past, and at least three firms were interested. The hon. Mr. Kuziak also suggested that the Saskatchewan Government Development office was ready to aid in the financing of a pulp mill. He mentioned such things as Saskatchewan's favourable tax gain."

These are supposed to be some of the reasons for getting a pulp mill, but I suggest that they may well be some of the reasons why we have never had one, and may never get one as long as the party to your right retains power in this province. Saskatchewan's favourable tax gain, reasonable ground rentals, fixed costs on fire suppression, a 25-year renewable lease on these area, and no municipal or school taxes on the land utilized; these were some of the reasons why a pulp mill might soon be coming in.

We know that there have been promises over the years, and it is interesting to note a little comment in the 1957 edition of the 'Prince Albert Herald' dated in May, stating as follows:

March 8, 1960

“Request for a little recognition and praise, when a pulp mill is established here, was made Monday night by Natural Resources Minister, A.G. Kuziak.”

“When a pulp mill is established, I wonder if the ‘Prince Albert Herald’ will give the C.C.F. Party a little recognition and a little praise. I heard the ‘Prince Albert Herald’ recently asked four Cabinet Ministers to resign if we don’t get a pulp mill in this province.” He goes on (that was Mr. Kuziak speaking) to conclude: “I suppose I am one of those Ministers”. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn’t want the hon. gentleman to be in doubt. I’ve been up in Prince Albert a few times, and I am confident that he is one of the Ministers who is being referred to here.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — How much longer are you going to go on?

Mr. McDonald: — Do you want to get going, ‘Bob’?

Mr. Foley: — Now, coming back to the C.C.F. ‘ship of state’, Mr. Speaker, which was launched in the House, this afternoon. As I stated a moment ago, according to press reports, ‘the crew is becoming severely depleted’. But what about the captain of the new ship of state? And his chief lieutenant? What is to be their status prior to the next election? I have no doubt about the result of the next election, but I think they should clarify their ranks before going to the polls, and that hasn’t been done.

Mr. McDonald: — What’s the name of the new ship?

Mr. Horsman: — ‘Walker’s wailing ship!’

Mr. Foley: — Another thing which the hon. lady for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) brought out very clearly, this afternoon, was a question in the minds of a great many people: just exactly under what flag will this ship of state be sailing by the time the election rolls around?

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs went on, this afternoon to relate our plank concerning purple gasoline with the Co-operative movement in this province, and with the Wheat Pool. I am not very clear at all why there should be any relationship between what we would hope to save the farmers of this province by removing the restrictions on purple gasoline and the very fine and excellent work which is being done by the Co-operative movement and the Wheat Pool movement in this province. I believe the hon. Minister should be called on to explain just what his motives were in bringing those two fine institutions into a discussion on the pros and cons of a plank in a political platform. I believe it is correct to say (if he wants to do that) that a Liberal government guaranteed a loan of \$20 million to the Wheat Pool in 1929, which was a considerable amount of money in those hard times.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That's not true.

Mr. McCarthy: — That is absolutely true, and they just finished paying it back the other day. It's absolutely true.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Some of us know that story, so don't start spreading that around.

Mr. McCarthy: — I know the story, too.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, with reference to the budget speech of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, made some days ago in this House, I would like to comment on some of the remarks he made and some of my reactions to them. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer expressed a certain vanity in bringing down this budget when he said that his budget reflects the unfailing good sense and sound judgment of the people of the province.

Mrs. Batten: — That wasn't vanity; that was imagination.

Mr. Foley: — Well, if 37 per cent of the electorate who supported this Government in the last election can be considered "the people of the province", then I suggest that many of us will differ with his remarks in that respect.

Another remark which the Provincial Treasurer made, which I think was of some significance in attempting to assess the political ideals and the basic philosophy of the gentlemen to your right, Mr. Speaker, was the remark that "the fundamental problem in our economy is that the so-called free play of the market place has proven itself unable to allocate resources and income in a manner which will meet the test of economic efficiency or social justice." And he goes on to suggest that this can be solved only by directing the economic affairs of the country and advancing the social well-being of the nation in a manner which suggests, to me at least, that again he feels the economic ills of this country cannot be solved without the regimentation and the planned economy which is one of the fundamentals of the Socialist movement.

That reminded me to go back and have a look at the document which, in my understanding, is the basis for the C.C.F. movement in Saskatchewan, and that, of course, is the 'Regina Manifesto', a copy of which I have here. Some of the remarks in the Manifesto are very interesting in the light of some of what has taken place here in the province over the past few years.

For example, they state that their purpose will be the regulation of production, distribution and the supplying of human needs, and not the making of profit. That is a rather interesting statement in view of what has taken place in some of the enterprises operated by this Government over the years, where certainly profits, in my opinion, seem to be the only justification

March 8, 1960

for their existence. I am referring, of course, to enterprises where the interests of the people could well have been served through free enterprise, much the same as has been stated by other speakers on this side of the House.

In view of some of the activities that I have noted with respect to the health plan advanced by the present Government and others, it is interesting to note another remark from this historic document, the Regina Manifesto:

“The new social order at which we aim is not one in which individuality will be crushed out by a system of regimentation.”

This statement also was supposed to be one of the basic precepts of the C.C.F. Government in this province, and yet I think we can point to ever-increasing regimentation over the years. We have heard many statements in this House regarding liberty and freedom, but certainly our interpretation of liberty and freedom in the Liberal Party differs with that we have heard from across the House. Obviously the socialist concept of freedom seems to be freedom by compulsion and freedom by coercion, and I suggest, that the people in this province have just about had enough of that type of Socialist freedom.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer, being very optimistic, of course, goes on to say:

“Regarding economic development in the province, it is clear that 1959 marked another year of steady growth.”

I suppose there are hundreds of yardsticks by which one can measure growth, whether we measure growth by the increase in the gross debt of the province, whether we measure growth by the exodus of oil personnel from the province, or whether we measure growth in terms of the amount of taxes collected from our ratepayers throughout the province. I want to suggest that, in some ways, this province could hardly be said to have experienced a year of steady growth and that the hon. Provincial Treasurer might have been more careful in his selection of words to describe the economic situation in the province over the past year or two. Certainly, in terms of population, in terms of industrial construction, and in terms of the gross agricultural product, we can be hardly said to have had a season of steady growth.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Let's have some facts.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Prove it.

Mr. Foley: — These are facts, Mr. Attorney General, which have been well substantiated and well documented by the Opposition in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Do you want to hear them all over again?

Mr. Foley: — If you like, I can give you the facts one by one. Would you like me to discuss the rather sorry state of population increase in this province this past year?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Tell us why you only got four people to support you...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Foley: — If the hon. Provincial Treasurer would like to start making personal references, I assure him that I can do likewise.

Opposition: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — I have attempted to read this momentous address, and I am attempting to give you some of my candid opinions on it.

Mr. Danielson: — Ask him why some of his businesses went 'bust'.

Mr. Foley: — Going on to page 9 of the Provincial Treasurer's address, he mentions the Province's investment in our power, gas, and telephone utilities, and suggests that he is surprised at the comment that this investment has aroused. He complains that there has been a concerted attempt to show that this investment, which necessarily involves a rapid increase in the gross debt, is somehow endangering the financial soundness of the Province and imposing heavy debts upon the taxpayers. The Provincial Treasurer implies, of course, that instead of the Opposition being concerned about the rapidly mounting gross debt, we should welcome it in some manner or other. Attempting to analyse the gross debt situation in this province is not an easy task, but the fact remains that the total gross debt, at the moment, is about \$383 million.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Where did you get that figure?

Mr. Gardiner: — Out of your own report.

Mr. Foley: — Out of your own report, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. If we examine each fiscal year until the time this Government took office, the Liberals, after 24 years in office, had a gross provincial debt of \$65,700,000. After five years of the Anderson regime this debt had increased by some \$95 million until it stood at about \$160 1/2 million in 1934. The gross debt had increased to about \$214 million when this Government took office in 1944, and this figure was reduced by 1948 to about \$142 million. This reduction between 1944 and 1948 was certainly not to the credit of this

March 8, 1960

Government, because it is my understanding that this reduction in the gross provincial debt in those four years was made by other agencies and contingent liabilities which came from the Federal Government and other sources.

Now, maybe the hon. Provincial Treasurer doesn't agree, and if he doesn't, of course, he will have every opportunity to clarify his record. The fact remains that the provincial debt was some \$147 million at the end of the fiscal year of 1950, and that it has increased by some \$240 million during the last 12 years that this Government has been in office. So for the hon. Provincial Treasurer to suggest that we should not be concerned about the increasing burden of gross debt, I feel, is being very, very naïve indeed.

Mr. McDonald: — That's putting it mildly.

Mr. Foley: — I believe that we should all be concerned about the financial state of our province and must assess very carefully the aims of this Government in bringing us to the present state of affairs. In other words, for what particular reason have they allowed the gross provincial debt to reach these figures? Have they succeeded in giving all the residents of this province a fair share of the provincial expenditures throughout the province.

What about rural telephones in the province? I believe (if I am correct) that there are some 50,000 rural telephones subscribers in Saskatchewan, and as of last year, there were 101,000 farm units. Therefore, one out of every two farmers in this province has not, as yet, the service of a rural telephone and very few of the farmers have the services of natural gas. Certainly there still are a number of farmers in this province who have not the services of power. So the fact remains, then, that, in view of the size of the gross provincial debt, many of our rural people can be very concerned indeed, because of the lack of essential services under this administration.

If concern wasn't enough, the Provincial Treasurer goes on to say this:

“I expect, indeed I look forward to, a continued rapid increase in the gross debt,” . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That's to bring gas and utilities to all these people.

Mr. Foley: — “As we go on to expand the basic utilities to meet the demands of the future.”

Well, where are we going to end up, Mr. Provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The farmers are going to get these utilities.

Mr. McFarlane: — How are they going to get it at \$500 a crack?

Mr. Foley: — Through how many generations are we going to extend the debt in this province?

Mr. Gardiner: — Brown will tell you, tomorrow.

Opposition Member: — I don't think they're going to let him on.

Mr. Foley: — So Mr. Speaker, in view of the Provincial Treasurer's remarks, I think the people of Saskatchewan may consider themselves fortunate that there is about to be a change on the bridge of the ship of state with regard to the finances of this province. I can assure you that I will do everything in my power, and I know my colleagues will do the same, to make sure that the next provincial treasurer will approach the matter of public expenditures from the Liberal point of view.

Much has been said about the various Government enterprises which failed and which were discontinued, but very little has been said about the tremendous investment in human resources which resulted, and the fact that these resources might well have been expended in other directions. When it comes to human resources, I am reminded of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Lloyd) before supper, when he was referring to the arithmetic of the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski).

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the arithmetic of the hon. member for Redberry was just a little too accurate for the comfort of most of the gentlemen to your right. Just a little too accurate! Let me just review, since their memory seems very short, some of the results which he arrived at. He suggested that it cost \$1 for every \$6 expended in Saskatchewan for social welfare as compared with \$1 for every \$16 1/2 dollars in Ontario. The hon. Minister of Education suggested that it wasn't correct to say that this \$1 was invested by the Province merely to distribute social welfare to the residents of the Province. And he went on to suggest that the personnel so engaged gave a number of other services in the province. Well, if his argument has some merit, then would it not be fair to say that the personnel engaged in distributing social welfare in the provinces which the hon. member for Redberry has mentioned, are likewise giving other services in their provinces? Therefore the comparison, I submit, is just as valid in any of these provinces.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — If the hon. member knew anything about the other provinces he would not make such a statement.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a debate. I understand that there will be an opportunity for members on your right to attempt to refute the statements of the member for Redberry. But is the Minister of Social Welfare suggesting that the personnel taken into this consideration are not giving the same public service in Ontario, Newfoundland and Manitoba as they are in Saskatchewan?"

March 8, 1960

Opposition Member: — Shame! Shame!

Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me if I knew if these services were provided in the other provinces. This does not appear on the public papers.

Mr. Foley: — Further, I understand that, under previous Liberal administrations, \$47 was distributed to the needy of this province for every \$1 spent on administration.

On page 15 of his budget address, the hon. Provincial Treasurer goes on to state the two constant goals of all his budgets, and says that it is his duty to “administer the financial affairs of this province to enable his colleagues and himself to plan a wide expansion in the fields of health, pensions and the like, and to tap the available investment resources for a planned full development of old and new industries in the province, and to work for the security and enhancement of personal welfare and dignity.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, if these have been the objectives of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, then I want to emphasize that, in my opinion (which I am sure is shared by many of my colleagues) he has certainly failed to provide the people of this province with the services they richly deserve. As far as I am concerned, in the matter of industry alone, when we compare the employment positions in manufacturing today with the positions available when this Government took office, the figure is substantially less. I realize, of course, this is only one yardstick for measuring industrial expansion, and yet I suggest that it is a very pertinent yardstick and one which is very difficult to refute, as the members of the Government have failed to do so often.

On the matter of the development of natural resources in this province, the Timber Board is one example where people have not had access to our forest resources to the fullest possible extent, within the confines of worthwhile conservation policy. Our members across the way have attempted, over the years, to suggest that we in the Liberal Party were not concerned with conservation of natural resources. This is another deliberate falsehood or untruth which the C.C.F. Party has attempted to spread throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly we, on this side of the House, are every bit as aware of the necessity of preserving our natural resources; but, at the same time, we are also aware of the necessity of these resources serving the people of the province and helping the rural people in the areas where the resources are located. I think it certainly would be possible, within the confines of good conservation policy, to make available to the rural people more permits for timber than is being done by this administration.

I want now to say a word about the proposals that were made, a year ago, to assist the young farmers in the province. We were told in a report, tabled just the other day in the House, that 488 applications had been received by the Co-operative Trust Company for farm loans. We were told that 125 had been approved, but that only 41 had been granted – less than 10 per cent

of those who had applied. I am sure it was not the understanding of any of the members of this Leg that the Provincial Government would be so niggardly in its farm loan scheme that less than one-tenth of the loans which were asked for would be granted.

We had a report tabled in the Legislature, this afternoon, concerning the Local Government Continuing Committee. I regret that I have not had more time to study its contents, but nevertheless, in the few minutes at my disposal, I looked in vain for the one clause which I had hoped would appear. I note some of the following comments: that the location of boundaries has virtually been completed by the Committee; that the study of rural roads strongly favours intermediate or large-sized units; that the ultimate objective could not be attained without getting an increase in the size of rural municipalities. Then I found in this statement too, in connection with this very important committee: that the public will require information on all aspects of reorganization. I trust that this is a commitment, Mr. Speaker, and that this Committee will, through the various government authorities, make available to the people information as to reorganization structure, administration, provincial-local relations, finances as well as boundaries and size, to adequately judge any one aspect; but look as I might, I fail to find any assurance that even the Committee or this Government have made a recommendation for a vote by the people of the province before any changes were made in local government boundaries. This reticence, to my way of thinking, is alarming, and I sincerely trust, before this Session terminates, that this Government will see fit to reassure the rural people of Saskatchewan that they will provide the opportunity for the people to signify their feelings regarding the recommendations of this Committee, by providing them with the opportunity of a vote. I think it is most important.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Are you suggesting that the Government should instruct the Committee on the type of report they should bring in?

Mr. Foley: — I am merely suggesting that this Government should make sure that the people of the province have an opportunity of expressing their opinion regarding the report of the Committee, by holding a vote before any change is made in local government boundaries. . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — That will depend on the recommendations.

Mr. Foley: — . . .and that this should be announced prior to any election.

The manner in which this Government has avoided going to the people for a vote on major issues is indeed strange. Much has been said in this debate about the pros and cons of prepaid medical health schemes, but one thing this Government has been very careful not to mention was a provincial plebiscite for the electors before putting into practice any such plan, were they re-elected. In fact, they have stated very definitely that the vote of the people at the next provincial election will determine whether or not they will put a compulsory prepaid medical scheme into practice.

March 8, 1960

In the last three provincial elections, this Government has been returned by a minority vote. In other words, less than 50 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan supported their return to office. If that is the case, let us suppose that, in the next provincial election, whoever is returned to power is returned with less than a 50 per cent majority; let us suppose that whichever party is elected in 1960, is returned with about 35 per cent of the vote of the people. Would it then be democratic, for that party to assume that it had a mandate to put a prepaid medical health scheme into effect because of that 35 per cent vote?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Just as much as sewer and water on the farms.

Mr. Gardiner: — Keep quiet and listen to Clarence!

Mr. Foley: — I am sure that many people in the province find it difficult to understand just what the present Government is actually recommending. The hon. Minister of Health in his remarks in this debate, suggested there would be no regimentation and that there would be no government control. Yet, at the same time, other speakers, including the hon. Premier, have stated that any prepaid health scheme to be successful would have to be both compulsory and also operated under government control. Certainly, it is extremely difficult to understand, as I say, just what the motives of the Government are. It has been suggested by some speakers that the advancing of the so-called state medicine by the C.C.F. Party is an attempt to gloss over some of their other inadequacies and some of their other weaknesses. Yet, on the other hand, it seems surprising to me that this Government, which has so often prided itself on 'humanity first', would bring forth a plan which has met with so much criticism on the part of professional people throughout the province.

I noticed a few remarks in the local press, this morning, to the effect that doctors are increasingly disturbed at the health plan which this Government has advanced. It says: "Despite assurance from the Government that doctors need not fear regimentation under a government-sponsored prepaid medical-care plan, Saskatchewan's medical fraternity is becoming increasingly disturbed for the future of the profession in the province." The doctors believe that the Advisory Planning Committee should investigate the whole field of health care and at that time recommend whether such a medical health plan is needed since the fact remains that we do have prepaid medical schemes in operation in this province at the moment.

I feel that the stand of the Liberal Party on this matter has met with a great deal of approval and could well tip the scales in our favour in the next provincial election, because the people of the province are becoming increasingly concerned with the tendency of the present C.C.F. administration to avoid a plebiscite on matters of provincial importance. They are concerned about the lack of a plebiscite policy regarding local government boundaries, and I am sure that they are equally disturbed by the fact that there has been no assurance of a plebiscite by this Government with regard to future prepaid medical plans in the province.

One other remark in this morning's 'Leader-Post', I think may be of some significance, and I would like to quote briefly:

“As an indication of the Government's wish to proceed as rapidly as possible with the medical care plan and of the great importance placed on this plan as a main plank in the C.C.F. election platform, political observers pointed out that Premier Douglas appeared to be handling most of the major chores in connection with the scheme. Political circles say this lends weight to the belief the Premier himself will take over the health portfolio if the Government is returned.”

Mr. Speaker, I certainly think this may be a matter of some concern to the hon. Minister of Public Health who has been smiling so broadly for the last few moments.

Going on with the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer, I note that the province of Saskatchewan in 1960-61 will spend about \$520,000 on the South Saskatchewan River Development project and about \$500,000 on the construction of the dam itself. In view of the fact that the Province's share of the South Saskatchewan River Dam development is about \$120 million, then an expenditure of this magnitude, about \$1,020,000 seems like a very small figure indeed, and suggests to me that future governments will have some difficulty in meeting this large commitment.

The building program of the Department of Public Works plans an expenditure of about \$5.3 millions this year. Mention was made, this afternoon, of the large number of retarded children in the province and the fact that the Training School at Moose Jaw has a waiting list of some 350 to 500 children, who have no other available facilities.

As I have said in Committee, while I certainly welcome new buildings in the province, I feel that building for human resources is certainly far more important than building for public utilities, and as long as we have retarded children in the province who lack suitable facilities for instruction and care, then I think that this Government, and future governments, must show more concern for their welfare. I know that, in my own particular area, we have about 10 children who certainly require the facilities of the training school, if they are to develop in the best possible way, and it seems strange to me that in a public works expenditure of over \$5 million, something more could not have been done for the retarded children.

We hear a lot about the 'humanity-first' slogan of this Government, and the Provincial Treasurer, again, said that this budget must not be only a monetary budget, but it must be a human budget. I say, Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Treasurer had seen fit to spend some of his budget for the retarded children, then it might well have been a much more human budget than it is.

March 8, 1960

Something has been said in the budget and by speakers on this side of the House with regard to sewage and water systems in our farm homes and in our smaller urban communities. Certainly, for many years, members on both sides of the House have felt this was a very worth objective for the future of this province. But, again, it seems difficult to assess the aim of the present administration or to understand how much progress can be developed with an expenditure of about \$500,000 for farmsteads and about \$400,000 for our towns and villages. As many speakers have suggested, this small amount will barely scratch the surface and, while these objectives are very noble, some thought and some consideration must be given by future governments not only to the utilities of the farm home, but to the farm homes themselves. Many of our rural residents have not been able to afford the construction of homes, and have not been able to improve facilities, over a great number of years. While the introduction of farm sewage and water is welcome, I feel that there are other objectives with regard to the welfare of our rural people which should not be overlooked by this and future governments. Again, I want to come back to the matter of rural telephones, which has been a matter of some concern to myself and to other hon. members on both sides of this Assembly.

For a great number of years it has been very difficult for a rural telephone company to operate, due to ever-increasing operating and construction costs. Even though some assistance has been given to rural telephone companies, 'phones are not being brought to our rural people in the manner which, I and many others, would like to see. Thus it is just a bit difficult to comprehend the thinking of this administration who have spent millions of dollars on modernized telephone facilities throughout, this province, and on new buildings. They have modernized telephones several times over in our urban centres, and have left nearly half the farm people of this province without so much as a telephone of any kind. While I realize, of course, that the matter of farm telephones is an extremely difficult one, it seems to me that more could have been done than has been done in this regard, and it is high time, in my opinion, that rural communications be looked at much more carefully than in the past.

On July 15 of 1959, the Hon. Mr. Williams, speaking to the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Telephone Companies, said: "Every farm in Saskatchewan was expected to have a telephone shortly." I quote from 'The Saskatoon Star-Phoenix' of that date. I don't know whether he was reported correctly or not, because the following day he hastened to say as follows: "Farm phones won't be in overnight; the Hon. C.C. Williams said today. Although the ultimate aim of the telephone service is to provide every farm home with a 'phone, this would obviously be a long-term project and expensive."

No doubt the hon. Minister is correct. This would have to be a long-term project, and certainly it would be expensive. But the fact remains that a start should soon be made, and I am going to suggest that other things must be done besides grants to existing telephone companies. I feel that some

assistance must be given to encourage groups of farmers to amalgamate together and form new rural telephone companies, something which most farm people are finding it very difficult to do. I believe, one thing that can surely be done is to increase the number of pay phones in our small rural communities, and while, of course, this problem may seem rather remote, I am sure that many of the hon. members in the northern part of the province will agree with me that there are still rural communities which have no rural phone service whatsoever. I have attempted in Committee and on the floor of this Legislature to bring to the attention of the Minister, and other responsible groups, the necessity of serving these small rural communities and local administration district with pay phones, and yet we seem to run into a surprising number of difficulties and delays. So again, while I note that the Government proposes to make available grants to assist in re-construction of rural lines and in the maintenance of these lines, I am disappointed that the budget down not contain some proposal to assist groups of farmers, who have not as yet found it possible to organize into rural telephone companies, to do so, and thus assist them in the construction of the new telephone lines. Certainly this is a matter which would go a long way to equalizing the expenditures of the provincial treasury throughout the province.

Another matter which I note has not been touched on, directly at least, in the budget address – a matter which is of considerable concern to my own constituency, and that is the matter of wildlife damage to crops. I have had occasion to mention this in the past, and I want to say something more about it tonight. I believe that, this year more than any other year in Saskatchewan, we have cause to be concerned with the fact that there is no provision being made to compensate farmers whose grain, both in the stock and in the swaths, lies under the snow in many parts of this province, and which has undergone considerable wildlife damage. I know fields of several hundred acres where the damage which has been done by mice and ducks last fall, by wild game during the winter has been considerable, and I doubt if very much grain can be retrieved next spring, when spring harvest operations are attempted. Thus it is absolutely vital that some provision be made for the compensation of these farmers as soon as possible. This crop damage, of course, has not been limited just to the snow-covered grain of the past year; but this crop damage has been something of concern to farmers now for several years, and I am sure that most of you have seen press comments, from all over the province, expressing the concern of farmers with regard to this serious problem. I have taken the trouble here to note sever farmers' comments in this regard. We have a letter here, taken from the 'Western Producer' from Mr. Howard Clark, of Flaxcombe, Saskatchewan, who states:

“As a farmer who has just lost over \$1,000 worth of income deducts, I don't take kindly to the remarks of another individual who signed himself 'Ducks Unlimited'. I wonder how many of our farm people realize the cost of ducks to farmers? I wonder how many of them would be willing to give us a thousand dollars of their income to promote better sporting conditions for hunters. The farmer is not willing either, but he

March 8, 1960

is expected to put up with it.”

And then he goes on to express some of the hardships which he has suffered. He goes on to say this:

“To add insult to injury the farmer is offered an insurance to cover the damage. This makes about as much sense as saying we are going to protect the rates in the city, even though we know they will cause a lot of damage, but we will sell you an insurance policy to cover it.”

I have here, too, the remarks of a farmer from the Spiritwood area of Saskatchewan, who writes concerning “thieves in the fields”, and I quote from a letter written by Hartley Clark, of Bapaume, who says:

“I, too, am a farmer who has lost a good many bushels of grain to ducks, and I am still losing. The government takes a strong stand on grasshopper campaigns and cutworm control measures. In this part of Saskatchewan these two do very little damage in comparison with ducks. The man or woman working for wages has police protection if anyone steals his pay check, but the farmer has no protection from duck damage that takes his pay check every day in the fall.”

And he goes on to say:

“If the Government and others think that ducks are such big business, then let the Government of Saskatchewan insure the crops gratis to farmers and collect the premiums on this insurance from all those who make a profit on ducks including the manufacturers of shotgun shells, insurance on hunters, fees, etc.”

Now, I am merely reading these letters, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of this Assembly some of the thoughts of farmers throughout the province who feel very strongly about this matter of wildlife damage and to state again that additional assistance is urgently needed. We now have a system of wildlife insurance under which policies must be taken out no later than the 10th day of August each year, and which does provide some coverage for those who so insure themselves. I note that the hon. Provincial Treasurer, recently in Committee, as reported in the press, denied Thursday the claims of some farmers that it does not pay to insurance against wildlife damage to crops. He goes on to mention that \$13,901 was written in premiums in the year under review, and that \$161,829 in losses was incurred under that type of insurance in 1959. Farmers received about \$12.50 per loss per dollar paid in premiums.

The fact remains that many of our farmers have found it very difficult indeed to pay for spraying costs, fertilization costs, and the rapidly increasing overhead of the agricultural industry today. Therefore, many of them are inclined to take a change on this matter of duck damage. After all, in the northern part of the province it is rather difficult to predict, on the 10th day of August, what type of wild-game damage you are going to suffer, because often the northern ducks don't come down until late in October or in the early part of November. As a result, the present wildlife insurance scheme, while it may be a step in the right direction, has not proven to be satisfactory as far as this problem is concerned. Again I suggest that this Government, and future governments, must attempt to find some more satisfactory solution to this problem of wildlife crop damage.

I want to say just a word tonight about the rights and the privileges of the members of this Legislature. As a newly elected member in his first Legislature, I had always believed that we were all of equal status and should be considered so. However, I would like to make reference, tonight, to a few of the actions of this Government, which, in my opinion, suggests that these equalities do not exist to the extent which they should.

I have here a little clipping from 'The Leader-Post' of last August, which reads as follows:

"We don't like the implications of an Ottawa report which states that the Progressive-Conservative MP.'s will officially share the responsibility in government publicity releases for federal public works projects. Announcement of new public works in a constituency will be issued jointly as coming from the constituency member, on the condition that he is a Conservative, and the Minister. If the project is for a Liberal or a C.C.F. constituency, the sitting member is out of luck. The announcement will then be made in the Minister's name only. The end result is that credit for new public works will be put strictly on a political basis."

I believe this situation exists here in Saskatchewan at the present time, because I know of Public Works projects in many constituencies, particularly where there are Liberal members, where expenditures have been announced by the Minister and by private M.L.A.'s of the Government without the member in the constituency concerned having the slightest knowledge of the proposed expenditure, and before, the proposed expenditures have been approved by the Legislature. All hon. members in this Legislature are trying to do the best they can to represent the people in their constituency, and certainly should be kept informed by this Government of Public Works projects which are taking place in this province. I want to give you a concrete example. Certainly, the hon. member for Redberry and myself were pleased to learn that a considerable expenditure for reconstruction and

March 8, 1960

gravelling on a No. 4 Highway, from Cochin to Glaslyn, was to be made this year. However, we were very surprised to first hear the announcement from the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). I submit if we are to be considered equal in this House, even though we may be in Opposition, that the Minister of Highways might have informed the member for Redberry and myself, who are the members in the constituencies concerned. After all, we are just as concerned as the members of the Government in matters of this nature, and thus I feel there is an important and basic principle at stake in the manner in which the Government expenditures are announced.

As a result of an exchange I had with the Provincial Treasurer just recently, the statement was made that private M.L.A.'s who are not occupying the treasury benches, are not members of the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a play on words. While the Executive Council of the party in power may be that portion of the Government which administers legislation, nevertheless I feel that all the M.L.A.'s on the Government side of the House certainly must accept some of the responsibility for many of the actions of this Government.

I made reference recently to a land transaction in my constituency and suggested that this transaction was announced as having been completed several weeks before the official announcement by the Government. I based my conclusion on a press release from the North Battleford 'News Optimist', dated January 27, 1960, which stated as follows:

“LAND BOUGHT FOR JACKFISH PARK”

“The Salteaux Indian Band of Cochin voted Monday, 52 to 8 in favour of selling a parcel of 251 acres of fine beach property to the Saskatchewan Government, Department of Natural Resources. The purchase price of the land was \$20,000 plus 5,000 acres of Crown land some 15 miles north of Glaslyn.

“The Government has sought the Jackfish land for the purpose of creating a provincial park. In making the announcement, Monday afternoon, Eiling Kramer, M.L.A. for the Battlefords, said that he was extremely happy with the result of the vote. He gave credit for the successful conclusion of the transaction to the Department of natural Resources officer Bob Alberts and Clarence Delsney of Aquadeo Beach.”

In view of this press announcement, I think I can be justified in considering that the transaction was complete, and I was greatly disturbed when, some five weeks later, the Minister of Natural Resources stood up and said that this transaction had not been completed and was still under consideration. So, Mr. Speaker, I contend that there should be more responsible relations between the members of the Executive Council and the private M.L.A.'s of this Government, with regard to government transactions. To my way of thinking, it is an alarming development when a member of the Executive Council

finds it necessary to repudiate press statements made by a private M.L.A. sitting on the Government side of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, does he know that an arrangement was made with the Whips whereby the time tonight was to be divided between himself and four members on this side, and he has now used an hour and a half, and left an hour for the four private members of this side?

Mr. Foley: — I would remind the hon. Provincial Treasurer that the same arrangement was made last Friday and also yesterday, and the men on this side. . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You and the member for Last Mountain used the whole of the time, last night. You did very well, thank you.

Mr. Foley: —I want to make this statement, Mr. Speaker. Until the Provincial Treasurer made the remark just now, neither myself or any other member on this side of the House, nor the Whip, had any knowledge that such an arrangement had been made, until I received a note, a few moments ago, informing me that the other side of the House would like the floor around 9:00 o'clock. Now that is the situation; and I think it is unfair of the Provincial Treasurer to accuse me of taking time which, I was given to understand, belonged to the Opposition. If other arrangements have been made, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to relinquish the floor in a moment or two.

In summing up, remarks have been made by C.C.F. speakers that no government should stand idly by and act as a referee, but that it should take active steps to guide, with compulsion if necessary, the future of the people of this province. If that is a principle of the Socialists, it is something which neither myself nor any of my colleagues can accept, because Liberalism has always emphasized the freedom of the individual to make his own decisions to the greatest possible degree, in a democracy. I am proud to be a member of the Liberal Party, and I am proud of the philosophy of Liberalism. I believe that all who subscribe to the true principles of Liberalism feel that no man is fit to exercise irresponsible power over others. We, in the Liberal Party believe in freedom because the resources of the human personality need unlimited scope in order that every individual may make his maximum contribution to society. I believe, in the dignity of the individual and the family and what the people must have supreme authority over their elected representatives.

In conclusion, because this budget does not satisfy the needs and the desires of many of the rural people of this province; because this Government has shown arrogance towards members of the Legislature, and has infringed on human freedoms; and because, I believe that the Saskatchewan people in their desire for a change of administration will reject this Government in the next provincial election, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the budget.

March 8, 1960

Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan): —Mr. Speaker, may I begin by joining with all those others who have extended to you their best wishes on your coming retirement, and express the appreciation which I am sure all of us feel for the wise and dignified way in which you have conducted the affairs of this Legislature. This has certainly brought credit not only to yourself, but to all of the members who have been associated with you here.

There are a number of reasons why I intend to support the budget, mainly because I expect it will do a good many of the things which the people of the constituency of Souris-Estevan would like to see done, not only in the fields of health and welfare and education, but also in the matter of assistance to local governments for various public work projects, and in other programs which local governments undertake.

However, I rise to make only one point, and I think the most important point, so far as reasons why we should support this budget. This is simply because, in this budget, education receives the highest priority. Twenty-five per cent of all the expenditures are planned in the field of education. One of every four dollars which this Government will be spending in the fiscal year 1960-61 will go for educational purposes. So far as I am aware, this is the first time in the history of the province in which the budget gave its single largest priority to education.

I think this indicates the kind of value judgments which are held by the members who have prepared and authorized the Provincial Treasurer to present this budget. I believe, also, that the people of Saskatchewan will judge this Government not so much by the words which are said in this Legislature, but mainly on the basis of the deeds performed by the members of this Legislature and by the Government. Certainly, they will judge according to the priority that is given for the expenditure of public funds.

The most important fact about the expenditures for education is that this money is not really spent: this money is invested. Money which is expended for educational purposes is not gone and gone forever. It is money that is put to work, and the benefits will keep coming back and coming back for generations to come. These benefits and the returns which we can expect are very great indeed. Most people agree that the people are more important than things, but this kind of priority has not been reflected in the public expenditures of governments through most of the history of our civilization. Yet, today, there is a growing realization that the greatest returns can be obtained for society by giving priority to the development of human skills, rather than to investment in land or in capital.

Traditionally in our recent history there has been a change in the relative merits of the three types of resources which are brought together for productive purposes. It was once felt by most wise men that land was the most important of the three – land, labour and capital. One hundred years ago, most people would argue that capital, man-made goods, were the most important so far as productive purposes were concerned. But today,

most people will agree that labour, the development of human skills and the returns we can expect from such development, is far more important than money which is expended or invested in the development of land or of capital.

The nature of this kind of development requires public rather than private expenditure and investment. If a private company could be sure that the development of various individuals could be used for its benefit alone, I have no doubt that private companies and private individuals would be more than willing to invest the necessary funds to train and develop skilled human beings for their employment. But the fact of the matter is that no one company, or no one agency, can be sure that the benefits forthcoming from the development of human skills will accrue to that company alone. Only society as a whole can be sure of returns from investment in the development of human beings.

Throughout the western world, and in fact throughout the whole world, the greatest challenges facing mankind are in the field of education. We live in a world in which there are more people who are poor and oppressed than there are living in abundance and in freedom. The fact that our world, and our society, is more complex today not only in the way we make our living, but in the decisions which face us, indicates clearly that the greatest needs and, therefore, the greatest challenges, are in the field of education. So also the greatest returns are to be found in the field of education. It is my conviction that money invested in the development of human beings guarantees not only the maintenance of a worthwhile democracy, but guarantees that this democracy shall be extended to all of the people of the world. This is why I want to make a special point of drawing the members' attention to the fact that the greatest single priority to the budget we are considering, is in the field of education.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thorson: — As I said, there are a number of reasons why this budget is worthy of support, but this, I think, is the most important reason, and you may be sure that the Budget will receive my wholehearted support.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — In rising to take part in this debate, first, I would like to congratulate those who have spoken before me, and I would like to congratulate you also, on your stewardship in this House as Speaker, and I wish you many happy years of retirement, and many years of enjoyment in your retirement after you leave this Legislature.

March 8, 1960

I would also like to congratulate other Ministers for the work they have done, and the pleasure it has been in working with them over these past number of years. I am sure that the province of Saskatchewan, as history is written, will realize that more and more they owe a debt of gratitude to the Ministers of this past number of years who have blazed the trail, helped to build a way for society, where humanity is considered rather than considering other things first.

I would like to say to the Minister of Highways that we wish him also many years of happy retirement. The House may be, or may not, be aware of the fact that the Minister of Highways today in Saskatchewan is the only Minister of Highways who is still in office of those who took part and signed the Trans-Canada agreement. Of all the Provincial and Federal Ministers who signed that agreement, the Minister of Highways here is the only one who is still in office, and this is the only province which has concluded its portion of the Trans-Canada Highway. I think a lot of credit comes to the Minister of Highways and his staff for the work they have done here. When that agreement was signed on behalf of Saskatchewan, it was signed in good faith; the work has been done, and the people of this province are now using that highway.

I would like, on behalf of myself and a number of others, to say “thanks” to the Government for the trip which was supplied the members, a year ago last fall, and again this fall, throughout the north. I think that trip was worth many times over the actual dollars and cents that it cost to take the members to the northern part of the province. I think that the members gained a great deal of knowledge about the other half of this province, knowledge that many of us might never have gained for many years to come, had we not been able to go on that trip, on a conducted tour, to be able to see what the north holds and judge some of its potentialities for ourselves. I realize that it is now over a year since I took that trip; but last year I did not have the opportunity to speak on either of the debates, so I didn’t mention that trip; but would at this time like to thank the Government on behalf of the members who went on it.

I would like to take a few moments, before dealing with some of the aspects of the budget, to briefly mention some of the things which have been said from across the way. The members from Redberry said in his general statements that taxes should be cut, and then he called for increased services. He did not tell us exactly what taxes would be cut, but he was ready to call for more services; nor did he tell us how much the increased services were going to cost. I was also surprised to hear the member for Redberry comment on the allocation of radio time. He said that, as far as he was concerned, the Opposition weren’t receiving their fair share of radio time. Well, I want to say, along with some of the others, I am on that time Committee. The recommendation which was brought back to this Legislature, and which was adopted, was carried unanimously by that Committee. He was the only member on the Opposition side, this year, that did not agree with the allocation of the time. The radio time was allocated. . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. What the hon. member has just said is not quite in accordance with the facts. We have, from year to year, agreed to disagree on the division of time because we have no alternative, and no member on this side of the House has been satisfied in this Session or in the past Sessions with the division of radio time.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — I say once again, Mr. Speaker, that in Committee there was no dissenting vote, and the member for Redberry was the only one who raised an objection to it on the floor of the House. The others may have objected – I am not saying they didn't; but he was the only one who raised the objection. After all, they are receiving 29 6/17ths minutes per member on that side of the House; we are receiving 28 4/7ths, so I think, broken up per member on this basis, the fraction of a minute falls in favour of the members who sit to your left, and not on this side of the House. Some of us have not had any radio time on this side of the House, and we have not been complaining. It is entirely up to this group, among ourselves, to allocate the time as we see fit among our own group, and other groups have the same privilege.

The Leader of the Opposition says that they disagree. He did not say so in Committee; but I would like to recall what happened in Committees a year or so ago. The House Leader of the Opposition felt the time should be divided evenly among Government and Opposition, so there are two sides to the story. I asked him, on that occasion, seeing that there were two opposition groups in this House, if we would agree to that division, would he in turn agree that the Social Credit group should have half of the Opposition's time. He said he would not agree, and they would work it out among themselves; so I think that the time has been allocated fairly.

Mr. McDonald: —Mr. Speaker, I don't want to keep on interfering with the hon. member's speech, but again on a point of privilege. The words he has used in endeavouring to portray my stand and the stand of the Opposition with regard to the division of radio time is entirely at variance with the facts. We have said, and continue to say, that there are other factors that ought to be taken into consideration when we are dividing the radio time, other than those of the representation by members in this Legislature. I am not going on to explain this, Mr. Speaker; only to say that he has only told part of the story.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I think members of the House have heard. . .

Mr. McDonald: — It's on the record. Go back and read it.

Mr. Dewhurst: — It's on the record, yes. As I say, the radio time, in my opinion, as a member of the Committee, is allocated fairly and squarely when all things are considered.

March 8, 1960

Mr. McDonald: — It's a Socialist division!

Mr. Dewhurst: — One of the main topics of the Social Credit group was about the power in Alberta, and they dealt with it in general terms. I won't quote their exact words, but they seem to think it was just as good, if not a better scheme that we have in Saskatchewan. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) said he thought it strange that the power cost \$1,400 in Alberta, and only \$500 here, when the same material was being used. He went on to proceed to show that it still costs as much, and that is correct; on the average it still costs as much. But I would like to show what happened to a friend of mine who was living northwest of Edmonton. He had power. It cost him \$1,600. A year or two after having his power he decided to sell his quarter section of land. He sold it to a neighbour. He still had \$1,300 owing on the power installation, so this was registered against his land. When he went to sell his land, he sold it to the neighbour for \$3,600, but the neighbour did not need the power, because he already had power. So, in order to lift the encumbrance from that land and give that neighbour a clear title, he had to pay the \$1,300; so in reality all this quarter section brought him was \$2,300 rather than \$3,600 by the time he paid for the power which he didn't need. So I think that Saskatchewan's power does have its advantage in this province, and I am sure the people of this province are appreciating it.

The statement was also made by the member for Nipawin that there was too much spent on social welfare, and the cost of administration is too high. Yet at the same time we heard that there was lots to be done for the needy. It doesn't make sense to me; you can't have it both ways. You are spending too much on the one hand, and then he says there isn't enough for the needy.

The member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) would give a greater grant to the old-age people — a supplementary allowance, and so on. Well, that is a laugh! When you hear any member who sits on the Opposition side say they would give supplementary allowances to old-age pensioners, etc., when the facts of the case are that there never was, and never has been a Liberal Government in any province of Canada at any time, which has ever given a supplementary allowance or health card to any old-age pensioner anywhere in Canada. There never has been a Tory Government, either; and the records show that the first government in Canada to give supplementary allowance was the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan. Those ideas were followed later by the two governments west of us; but there never was, and never has been, and there still isn't a Liberal Government or a Tory Government giving supplementary allowances to the old-age pensioners.

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) said he wondered why the sewer and water works wasn't under Public Health and not under Agriculture. He felt it should be under Health; and that in order to bolster the expenditures of Agriculture, we were putting the South Saskatchewan Dam under Agriculture. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Liberal Government talked about the South Saskatchewan Dam, it was discussed by the Federal Minister of

Agriculture, and they had it under Agriculture. It was discussed with the Agriculture Department here, and the P.F.A.A. are now, under the present Federal Government, doing the construction on the terms of agreement with the Provincial Government. So if it is wrong now to be under Agriculture, it was wrong for the former Federal Liberal Government to have it under Agriculture for the last 25 years that they made a political football of it.

The member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) said there was nothing in the budget as regarding the C.C.F. – Labour “marriage”. You know, I believe each speaker on that side of the House has referred to this so-called marriage; but I would like to say if there is going to be a marriage, at least there is a courtship first between the C.C.F. and Labour groups. At least each side has a change to know the other. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is not a “shot-gun wedding” like we saw take place in the city of Regina, last fall.

I have here ‘Maclean’s Magazine’, October 29, where Blair Fraser in his “Backstage at Ottawa”, points out that the Liberal Convention had to take the present Liberal Leader, and if they did they would get a fair amount of campaign funds, but if they didn’t, then those campaign funds would be withdrawn. There was no courtship there. That is what someone has referred to as a ‘shot-gun’ wedding. The House Leader of the Opposition was much opposed to that, and so was the financial critic, the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I don’t blame them. I don’t think any part of society is too happy to talk about shot-gun weddings, so I don’t blame them for being opposed to it. But, Mr. McDonald, as quoted in ‘Maclean’s Magazine’, said:

“I hope”, said Mr. McDonald, “that the new leader won’t have to put up with the kind of bickering that has gone on in our party for the last four years. Some Liberals look to their party as some of the fans look at the cellar-dwelling Regina Roughriders: If you lose a game, fire the quarterback and get a new coach. I think if some of these terrific organizers and planners would go out and get themselves elected to something, even as dog-catcher, it might do them a lot of good.”

I am sure this high-priced wedding has cost a lot of money to put on a celebration, and is not going to be so satisfactory, because the present House Leader realizes that they need organization. Not only does the present House Leader and the financial critic realize that they need organization, but our lady friend, the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) also realizes that they need some organization. Speaking, as reported in ‘The Leader-Post’ of March 3, at the recent Liberal nominating convention in Regina here, they report this:

March 8, 1960

“The Liberal Party didn’t have a grassroots movement, and she says the reason they do nothing is because they do not have a grass-root movement behind them”, said Mrs. Batten.

We have been saying for years that the Liberals didn’t have a grass-root movement, because they are organized from the top down instead of the bottom up. That is why they were desperate in trying to get a leader, because, after bickering for four years and not giving their present leader the support which he had a right to expect, and deserved, they made it so uncomfortable for him that, in my opinion, he felt it was time for him to get out due to health reasons – and other reasons.

The member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) realized there weren’t many grass-roots because, after tramping the grass all around the province, he found four that our stand up and be counted with him. So I am sure that the grass was very sparse. I think that he should have been after the Minister of Agriculture to put in more irrigation to grow more grass, so that he might have found a few more grass-roots, because they were very sparse where he was tramping. He must be of the opinion that we really have a desert in this province, because grass is so scarce.

The Liberal Party do not have to tell us that we should have a courtship between labour and the C.C.F. After all, who was the C.C.F. in this province? It was organized 25 years ago by labour, by the farmer and other interested groups, and it is growing stronger today by leaps and bounds, and it is growing for the mere fact that we have no efficient and constructive Opposition in this province.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The hon. member, and I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer, too, has made some reference to the four who would stand up and be counted. Will the hon. member either substantiate that statement, or withdraw it?

Mr. Dewhurst: — You’ve got no point of privilege.

Mr. Foley: — I most certainly have a point of privilege.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The Opposition has made numerous statements on the proposed health scheme. They say doctors will be made civil servants or just paid a straight salary. They are the only ones who seem to know that this is going to be the fact. The Premier, in speaking on the proposed health scheme, and the Minister of Health, have made statements quite to the contrary. The proposed Committee will discuss ways and means whether doctors should be paid on a fee-for-service basis, or part service and part salary; or agreements and discussions which will be mutually agreed between the doctors and the patient and the plan. Let us suppose the doctors were in a salary; there still would not be anything wrong. Some people will try to tell you that no self-respecting person will work for a salary for society that way. Well, in this province, we have, I believe, some 8,000 school teachers

in the province. Each teacher works for a salary, and their certificate, as it improves, their salary schedule goes up. We would not dream of suggesting that teachers be paid an amount per pupil they have in their classrooms, and the more you can get in the classroom, the more you will pay the teacher. While some of the teachers in this province leave a lot to be desired – such as the speaker to whom we listened to for an hour and a half this evening (Mr. Foley) – I do have a lot of respect for the teachers of this province. They are, by and large, a very good qualified group. The teachers of this province are doing a good job. From time to time you can pick up magazine articles and publications which turn to Saskatchewan more and more for leadership in educational fields, and, as the Minister of Education pointed out this afternoon, several of his staff from time to time, and some of them at the present time, are being recognized and honoured by the educational authorities throughout the whole of Canada and even boundaries outside of Canada.

The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), the other night, had quite a bit to say about the deficit of the Power Corporation. When he was asked just how much it was, he said he didn't know for sure; but he knew the figures were not correct. Well, I would like to say that in 1954, the deficit from the Power Commission of this province was \$263.8 million; in 1944, \$231.4 million.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I think I have a point of privilege here. He said \$263.8 million in 1944. There was only \$11 million or \$12 million invested in the Power Commission at that time.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member proceed.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I beg your pardon. . .

Mr. Danielson: — That shows clearly that you don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Dewhurst: — It was \$263.8 million. The Power Commission was organized in 1929, and for the first 10 years it never made one cent surplus; it had a loss every year for the first 10 years.

Mr. Danielson: — That's not true.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, it is true.

Mr. Dewhurst: — It is taken right from the Journals of the Legislature here. The first 10 years, from 1929 to 1938 inclusive, each year it had a loss until there was an accumulated loss of over \$300,000. 1946 was the first year it operated with the surplus being more than the accumulated deficit, and showed an accumulated surplus of \$339,000. So the Power Commission, which later became the Power Corporation, has progressed to where the people of this province today have got millions of dollars invested in the Power Corporation, and the Provincial Treasurer pointed out in his budget that, if we are

March 8, 1960

going to do the job that should be done in building the hydro and the service of this province for industry and other things, it is going to be necessary in the years which lie ahead to invest many more millions of dollars in the Power Corporation.

The Opposition have always been saying, "What is the Government doing for the farmers. Nothing is being done for them." They say this budget holds nothing for the farmers, and that this Government is continually working against the farmers. I would like to take the House back to the Votes and Proceedings of Wednesday, April 10, 1957. This side of the House asked for something for the farmers, but on that side of the House, every member who was present voted against trying to get fair play for the farmers. During that Session, the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) moved a resolution asking for \$.10 per bushel for wheat which was sold on the domestic market for human consumption, or for the first thousand bushels delivered by each farmer. The member for Rosthern, (Mr. Elias) moved an amendment asking that there be the multi-price for wheat, whereby it would be sufficient to satisfy domestic consumption and would be sold at a parity price, subsequent delivery units to be sold at the best export price obtainable through the International Wheat Agreement. Then the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) and myself moved an amendment to that motion, and I would like to read the motion the way it is when it is put together as amended. This is the way the motion read at that time, after the amendment was moved and seconded by the member for Bengough and myself:

"That this Assembly recommend to the Government of Canada that the said Government establish through the Canadian Wheat Board, a multiple-price system for wheat whereby initial units, sufficient to satisfy domestic consumption, would be sold at parity prices, with subsequent delivery units to be sold at the best export price obtainable through the International Wheat Agreement."

And this is where we added the amendment:

". . . and any other export marketing medium, or agency; and further, that the Government of Canada, through the medium of such means as the Agricultural Prices Support Act, undertake to establish a permanent marketing program which will assure to the producer for all wheat sold in commercial channels, a price that will bear a parity relationship to farm costs."

And because the member for Bengough and myself had moved the last sub-clause asking for parity for all wheat sold, the members to your left, Mr. Speaker, as recorded in the Votes and Proceedings for Wednesday, April 10, 1957, not only voted against the sub-amendment, they voted against the amendment and

the motion as amended. Then they say this Government wants to do nothing for agriculture; but when we bring in a resolution, trying to get a fair deal for agriculture, they are the ones who turn it down – not those on this side of the House.

Recently the Federal Government has turned down deficiency payments for the farmers of western Canada. They said it was too costly, and turned it down. In my thinking, never in the Canadian history have so many people been betrayed by so few as when they were turned down on deficiency payments for farmers of western Canada. It was just, fair and needed by them. We spent, as Canadians, more on one Avro Arrow which never took to the air than it would have cost to give a subsidy to agriculture. After all, if agriculture is going to play its fair share in the activities of this province and of this nation, then we should have a fair share of the national income.

This budget is a humanitarian budget; it is a budget which gives to the people of this province a fair share of the income of the budget available. Four-fifths of our budget brought down this year goes to education, health, social welfare or related groups, which serve the people and the humanity of this province, and only one-fifth goes to such departments as Attorney General, Natural Resources, Mineral Resources, etc. So this is a humanitarian budget; and I am sure that, if anybody is considering the welfare of society, the welfare of the children of this province, and the better living conditions of this province, they can do nothing but agree with us on this side of the House when we say that we are going to support the budget.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this budget debate, I should like to join my voice with those who have preceded me, in extending to your Honour my appreciation of the very able manner in which you have fulfilled the duties of your high office. Those of us who have had the privilege of working with you, both as Speaker and when you were a member of the Cabinet, and a private member of the House, we have, all of us, over the years come to have a high regard both for your ability and for your integrity. I am sure we all regret that you are leaving public life. On the other hand, if you look over this province and see power lines taking electricity into homes and communities that did not have these advantages before, and look at some of the great power plants that you helped to organize and plan, I am sure it must give you a great sense of satisfaction. Natural gas was one of the projects that was started under your direction, and this province, Mr. Speaker, will be long in your debt. I would like to express my own very deep personal appreciation of the fine way in which you have discharged your duties, and the great contribution which you have made to the public life of Saskatchewan.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

March 8, 1960

Premier Douglas: — I would like, too, to extend my congratulations to my desk-mate, the Provincial Treasurer, on his 16th budget. No one regrets more than I do that he says it is his last budget. The Provincial Treasurer and I have worked together for nearly 30 years, and for the past 16 years we have been desk-mates. People often work together in public life without necessarily being close personal friends. The Provincial Treasurer has been one of my closest personal friends, and I shall miss his absence from this House very deeply. (It is rather significant that the two ‘kids’ in the House – the ‘Dead-End Kids’ and the ‘Gold-Dust Twins’ – should be breaking up at about the same time).

I would like to say to the Provincial Treasurer, it has been a great privilege to work with him. I think that, when the history of this part of our era is written, it will record the job he had done in taking Saskatchewan out of the state of insolvency in which he found it in 1944, and bringing it to the place where it has a good credit rating. Not only has he reduced the deadweight debt of the province, but he has been able to borrow for self-liquidating utilities, which are a great asset to the people of this province as it serves thousands of our citizens. All of this has been done because of his business acumen and his very considerable ability. Plenty of people have ability, but with their ability they are little more than human adding machines. The thing that has endeared the Provincial Treasurer to me is that he has been, as well as able, a very human person, with a deep love of people, and with a deep sympathy for human suffering. He is a man who has given himself unstintingly in the service of those who are less fortunate than he. I would like to express to him, on behalf of my colleagues, and I am sure a very large number of people in this province, our very heartfelt appreciation for a life of service in the provincial field, and many years of service in the municipal field.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Whatever paths he may follow after he leaves public life, I can assure him that our good wishes will go with him. If he ever changes his mind and comes back into the Legislature, I think he will always find a warm welcome here.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — I will not take time to enumerate the various members who are not running again. These include the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley); The Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas); the Minister without Portfolio (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), the member for Morse (Mr. Gibson), the senior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming) and the member for Elrose (Mr. M.J. Willis). This is quite a number, and all I would like to say is that I will have other opportunities, I am sure, of expressing my own personal appreciation for their friendship and loyalty, and the appreciation of the C.C.F. Party, and of the Government, for their long period of devoted service.

There have been so many speeches of farewell that I have been wondering lately what it would be like if we didn't have an election until 1961, and if we all found ourselves back here next year, saying farewells all over again! This would be the best political joke that has been pulled. I doubt if all these speeches would be repeated; so it might be as well to discard that idea right now.

There is one thing I want to say before I adjourn the debate, and it is that I want to take very strong exception to the statements which have been made by two or three speakers opposite on the work of the Continuing Committee on Local Government. The statement has been made, two or three times, that the Government, in some manner and in some sinister way, has been able to prevent this Committee from reporting. It seems to me this is a very serious reflection on the members of this Committee. There are only one or two reasons why they have not reported: Either they are deliberately dilly-dallying, or avoiding the task which has been assigned to them not only by the Legislature, but by the respective organizations which they represent; or they are such weak-kneed individuals that the Government has, somehow or other, been able to bully them and over-awe them and persuade them that they must hold back any report for the present. Either of those assertions are a reflection on the integrity and the intelligence of the men who sit on this Committee.

This Committee was set up in the summer of 1957. There has been constant talk of it having been sitting for four years. It has not. It has been sitting for three years. They are studying probably the most complicated problem that could be put before any group of men. They are looking at a local government situation which has grown up over a period of more than 50 years; looking at problems of changing of boundaries, and all that that entails, including market areas, geographical features, transfer of assets and liabilities. They have looked deeply into the whole field of reallocation of finance, and reallocation of responsibility, not only as between the local governments and the Government, but as between local governments themselves. If you are going to have any significant changes in the local government structure of this province, it is not going to be done every five years. This will probably establish a pattern that will last for the next 50 or 100 years in the province. Therefore, it must first be done well; secondly, it must be done in such a way as to have the maximum support of the greatest possible number of people.

The Liberal Party have changed their story. A few years ago we were told, out in the country, that the Government had, somewhere hidden away, a "secret plan" of municipal reorganization, and that, when this Committee was set up, we would ram this down their throat, and presto!, the whole province would be into larger municipal units. We kept insisting there was no secret plans. This Committee, on which the local governing bodies have the majority, have sat down with ourselves and have tried to work out something that would be reasonably acceptable to all parties concerned. If all we had to satisfy was the Government, it would be comparatively simple. Or if all we had to satisfy was rural municipalities, or urban municipalities,

March 8, 1960

or school trustees, or health region representatives, it would be comparatively simple. But to work out reorganization, and reallocation of finances and responsibilities that will be acceptable to all groups, requires painstaking work. Again and again, plans that have been carefully gone over have to be scrapped, because it is found that they are not acceptable to some particular group. We don't propose to use a steam-roller to persuade one group that they must give way because certain other groups are in favour of a given proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I make no bones about saying that I would rather take several years to bring about a reorganization so that when it is accomplished, it will leave no scars and no ill feeling and that it will have the committee-operation and support of the great majority of the people of the province. Rather than to come up with some report or plan which has been quickly put together and which causes ill-feeling, and which does not get the endorsement of the great majority of the organizations concerned.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — I think it ill behooves people opposite to be talking about these people as though they were malefactors. The member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) this afternoon, was concerned because we didn't all clap our desks when the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) was giving a little bouquet to the municipal people. Well, we are quite capable of giving our own bouquets. No one appreciates more than I do the work which has been done by the municipal men and women of this province. But these people on this Committee are municipal people, and they are local government people. They are people who are deserving of the thanks of this Legislature for the hundreds of hours they have spent, and for the hundreds of miles they have travelled to attend meetings, and to carry on work which they hope, and which I believe, will some day be found an answer on which we can build a more smoothly-functioning local government structure in this province of Saskatchewan.

Instead, the Opposition snipes at these people who cannot be here to defend themselves. They infer that they are under the Government's thumb, and that they do not dare to bring in a report because the Government has told them they must not. This is to infer that these people are cowardly and inept. As a matter of fact, there is hardly a man on that Committee who, if we dared to suggest when they should put in a report, or that they should put in a report, or that they should put it in when they weren't ready to put it in, would not resign in protest. I certainly wouldn't blame them for doing so. I must, Mr. Speaker, take very strong exception to this constant attack upon a group of people who are not in the position to defend themselves.

I believe there is some desire to get some of these Second Readings and Private Bills through the House, so that they can go to the Committee. Therefore, with the consent of the House, I would like to adjourn the Debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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