

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Fourteenth Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday, March 1st, 1961.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

Continuing Committee

Mr. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the report of the Continuing Committee was presented today, I was wondering if the Premier could tell us when we'd have a copy of that report.

Premier Douglas: — I was just proposing to deal with that, Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day.

At 11 o'clock this morning the Continuing Committee on Local Government submitted its final report. I have here the letter of transmittal which, I think I have time to give to the House. It is addressed to myself and it says:

“Dear Sir: We have the honour to transmit herewith the report of the Local Government Continuing Committee, pursuant to the Order of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in Council, dated the 21st day of June 1957, Order in Council 1244/57.

The Members of your committee, drawn from the provincial government and the various rural and urban local government associations in Saskatchewan have framed this report with but one purpose: to strengthen local government as a vital and capable element in our democratic structure. It is our conviction that the changes which we recommend will enable our local government

March 1, 1961

institutions to maintain in the future the fine record they have established in the past.

The Committee benefitted from a number of Ministers of the Crown during its deliberations. We wish to acknowledge the participation of the Ministers, which at all times were helpful and free of any effort to impose policies. The Committee realizes that the Ministers cannot be signatories to this report. This would be inconsistent with the whole principle of Cabinet government and the Committee cannot insist on prejudicing Cabinet discretion. These Ministers together with their colleagues, must now assume responsibility for evaluating this report and arriving at a course of action. The fact that five Ministers participated in Committee work should provide Cabinet with a comprehensive understanding of our analysis and recommendations.

We wish to express our appreciation to the local government associations, the employees of local government, and the people of the province, who have given us such a large measure of encouragement and helpful criticism during the course of our study and consultations.

Respectfully submitted, signed by –

John McAskill.

E.F. Bourassa

G.H. Dawson

A.B. Douglas

C.J. Faulman

T.W. Garland

H. Greenwood

Geo. J. Hindley

W.J. Irvine

H.J. Maher, &

J.A. Trew.

An appendix – As Associate (non voting) Members we are happy to associate ourselves with the full members of the committee in this letter of transmittal.

G.E. Cripps, B.M. McKinnon, H.G. Trout.”

Mr. Speaker, as hon. Members know, this committee was appointed by Order in Council on the 21st day of June, 1957. They have carried on a prolonged and arduous survey of the needs of local government in our province, and the report is now in the hands of the Government.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Government, and I'm sure on behalf of the people of the province, to express our heartfelt thanks to this group of busy men who have taken time off from their other duties and responsibilities to spend so much effort and put forth so much thought in the compilation of this survey, and in the preparation of this report. Irrespective of whether or not Members agree with the recommendations, I think we cannot but commend the public service which has been given to the people of this province by this group of men. They are public-spirited citizens with a very complicated problem.

I would venture to suggest that in the history of the province this is probably the most complete and exhaustive survey which has ever been made into the problems of local government. I would venture to say that whatever may happen in the future the chances are that a quarter of a century from now we will look back to this report as an important milestone in considering the problems of local government, and in seeking to find their solutions.

At the time the committee was appointed the Government stated that it was our belief that local government is the bed-rock of democracy, and that local government needed to be strengthened and to be made as effective and as efficient as possible. This is the task to which the committee applied themselves. As hon. Members know, the committee was made up of three representatives from the Association of Rural Municipalities, three representatives from the Association of Urban Municipalities, and three from the School Trustees. There was also one representative from the hospital association and one from the health regions. These were the active and voting members. In addition there were representatives from the Teachers' Federation, the Municipal Secretaries, and the School Unit Secretaries Associations, who were members with the right to sit in, but with no right to vote. There were also four Cabinet Ministers,

March 1, 1961

who were available in order to provide the committee with such personnel, and such data as they might require.

We are happy to receive this report. Copies will be placed on the Members' desks today. As quickly as possible, this report will be printed. It will be made available to all local governing bodies and to the local government associations. It will be the intention of the Government to study this report and to evaluate the recommendations. We will carry out the commitment which we made to begin immediately consultation with local government organizations to see to what extent it would be possible to proceed with the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report.

That, Mr. Speaker, will be done. I would like once more to express the thanks of all of us to the Chairman of the Continuing Committee, and to all the members of the Continuing Committee for a piece of work well done. I believe the people of Saskatchewan, present and future, are deeply in debt to this public-spirited group of men who have laboured so valiantly in the interests of our province.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to associate myself and Members of the Liberal Party with the remarks of the Premier, when he thanked members of the Continuing Committee for their work. But at the same time I think in fairness I should say that we certainly of course can't agree with some of the recommendations which they have made, and the hon. Member for Moosomin will have something to say about that later in the day.

Premier Douglas: — Have you read the report?

Mr. Thatcher: — I did some time ago, Sir, and I certainly hope Sir, that the lesson of Turtleford will be taken by the Premier and that nothing will be done about the recommendations at this Session.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet — I'm finished with this report, but before the Orders of the Day are called, if I am permitted, I should like to

direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In view of the almost complete lack of interest shown by farmers in the crop insurance program up to the deadline yesterday, could he state whether the plan will now be discontinued or whether some other action will be taken to try and get farmers enthused about it?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It appears we may have three areas, two or three areas eligible, and we hope to go back where the number of applications received was closed to endeavour to get the full 25% as required by the federal legislation.

Saskatchewan Savings Bonds

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Members will be aware that this is the first day of sales of the first Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, and I'm sure that all will be gratified with the response which we have received up until noon today. Insofar as we know, and we undoubtedly do not know of all the sales made, but up until noon, sales to the extent of \$2,301,000.00 had already been made.

Budget Debate

The Assembly resumed from Monday, February 27, 1961, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

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

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before going into the main body of my remarks, this afternoon, I too would like to take this opportunity of extending my congratulations, and I'm sure the congratulations of all those Members who sit on this side of the House, to the members of the Continuing Committee. As the report is only being tabled, naturally I have not had the opportunity to peruse it. From the statements that have appeared in the press and elsewhere, it would appear that

March 1, 1961

there are some recommendations that I would not agree with. However, I will leave my main compliments or criticisms, as the case may be, of this report, until such time as we've had the opportunity to read it.

I found it most difficult over the last few hours to peruse a document that was tabled in the House on Monday last, which I'm expected to deal with this afternoon. I can only presume that the report that was tabled this afternoon will have far more meat in it than the one that was tabled on Monday. I would like to have more than one day to prepare any comments I might have on the report of the Continuing Committee. I do in all sincerity express our gratitude to the people who served on this committee, and I understand they are sitting in the Speaker's Gallery, and they, like people who have served on committees of this type since the beginning of time, render a tremendous service, not only to the people of our province today, but a service to people probably yet unborn. Undoubtedly the Member from Battleford is a little disturbed, but undoubtedly he too will read the report, and after I have completed my remarks this afternoon, he may not be so vocal.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer on two counts. First of all, in the manner in which he delivered his budget address here a few days ago. I thought the delivery was excellent, and that his grasp on the financial matters of the province showed the experience he has had, and I give him full marks for the effort he made, working on the material that he had to work with. I also want to express our thanks to the people of the province of Saskatchewan who have already taken part in this new Saskatchewan loan. Although I would have been happier, Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Treasurer, when he was designing this loan to be made available to the people of Saskatchewan, had paid the same interest rates to our own people that he has been prepared to pay to the coupon clippers of eastern Canada, and other parts of the North American continent. Surely, if we are prepared to pay 5 ½ % interest to outsiders, we ought to be prepared to pay the same thing to our own people. I am one of those who believe, that governments are wise to endeavour to do as much borrowing as they can within the immediate vicinity in which they reside. There are reasons for this: If people have sufficient savings to invest in loans of this type, it's obvious that times

have been fairly lucrative, for our people to have saved this money. But we have often found in the past that when the interest payments came due the money was not easy to come by, and it has often appeared to me that it would have been much better if interest payments could have been paid back to our own people in Saskatchewan rather than going to people in other parts of Canada or in the United States. I think the principle of borrowing in Saskatchewan is sound. I hope that the experience now will be worthwhile, and in the future we will be able to borrow more money from our own people, and less from people abroad – and to borrow at interest rates equal to those that we are prepared to pay to investors in other parts of Canada or the United States.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when I had an opportunity to say a few words earlier during this Session, I extended congratulations to you on the high position which you now occupy, and the fairness and the wisdom that you have exhibited so far in this Session. It appears obvious to me that you have taken your responsibilities to heart. It appears to me that you have read a lot of Beauchesne and Bourinot, which I must confess is not very interesting reading. Not only have you read these documents, but apparently you remember what you read. And that's the difficulty I've had in reading Bourinot or Beauchesne. I have difficulty in remembering when I'm on page 24, what I read on page 23, but apparently you haven't had that difficulty, and I want seriously to congratulate you for the work that you have put in in preparing yourself for the office which you now hold, and I hope that your decisions in the future will be as fair as I believe they have been to date.

At this time I would also like to congratulate new Members of the Legislature irrespective of whether they sit on the right of Mr. Speaker or the left. I've sat in the Legislature now for thirteen Sessions, and I've seen some people come and go, but I don't think I've ever seen a better crop of new Members than came into the Legislature after the elections of last June. Many of the new Members to date have made a worthwhile contribution to the discussions that have taken place. I hope that any plaudits that may be handed to them will not go to their heads, but that the reverse will be the case, and that they will work even harder, and attempt to make even better contributions in the future. We welcome you here,

March 1, 1961

and we hope that some of you will stay for a long time; we hope that some of you will stay only for another three Sessions.

Now before I adjourn the debate on Monday, Mr. Speaker, I had referred to certain announcements that appeared in the Budget. I have referred to increases in taxation and fees that had been levied by this administration between June last and the commencement of this present Session. I had said that I was not in agreement with governments increasing revenues, by any method, when the House is not in Session. I believe that when governments intend to increase revenues, whether it is by taxation or fees, that at least they should have the courtesy and the decency to do it while the House is in Session, in order to give the Members of the House, no matter which side they may sit on the opportunity to debate the wisdom of increasing these taxes or fees as the case may be.

I had referred to the hospitalization tax being increase, not a meagre amount, but some 37% between the election in June and the Session which opened on the 9th of February. There's quite a history to the hospitalization tax in Saskatchewan. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1959 before the general election the hospitalization tax was reduced, and the reason given at that time for the reduction was that the Provincial Government would be in the future in receipt of some \$13 million a year from Ottawa to help pay for hospitalization services in Saskatchewan. This was the reason for the reduction in 1959. I want to say here and now that that reduction ought to have been larger, and it ought to have been permanent. But what has happened? Once the election was safely over, an increase was brought into effect that was far greater than the decrease which preceded the election. I don't think this is good enough, Mr. Speaker. Surely to goodness the financial brains of the Government should have been good enough to have seen ahead of time that a decrease in taxation was not possible, and I'll give them the credit for having that ability, but I want to say here and now that they lowered the rates for political purposes only, and found themselves a few short months later in a position where the rates not only had to be brought up to what they were prior to the reduction, but even higher.

I had also referred to other increases, and I am sorry that the Premier is not in his seat, because

there seems to be some argument about this proposed increase for automobile insurance rates. Mr. Speaker, I want to end this argument for good and for all. I have in my hand a copy of the 'Yorkton Enterprise' of January 26th, 1961, and I want to read into the records of this House what the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance said on that day, in the town of Yorkton. This is the heading "Insurance Rates Boosts Confirmed – Details to come later."

"Confirmation that insurance rates will be raised slightly by Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office was given here by H.L. Hammond, S.G.I. general manager, during the annual 2 day agents' conference last week."

Well, now, the Premier denies it. Is he trying to tell us that Mr. Hammond, the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office doesn't know what he's talking about?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You didn't quote what he said, only what it says he said.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, the Attorney-General of course, is a lawyer, and there might be some difference in his mind as to what people said, and what somebody else said they said. Well, he can have his choice, he can either tell this House that the manager of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office doesn't know what he's talking about, or he can tell the editor of the 'Yorkton Enterprise', he doesn't know what he's talking about – I don't care which one – but you can't have it both ways.

I have also referred to some other tax increases. I had referred to the increase announced in the budget in the gasoline tax of 2 cents a gallon on gasoline and 5 cents a gallon on diesel fuel. Mr. Speaker, again the province of Saskatchewan is getting out of line with their neighbouring provinces. How on earth can we expect to attract industry to our province to compete with our neighbouring provinces, if we tax the people who do business in this province out of existence. What is the situation today? Manitoba has a gasoline tax of 11 cents a gallon; Alberta has a gasoline tax of 10 cents a gallon and 12 cents on diesel fuel; but in Saskatchewan it is 14 cents on gasoline and 17 cents on diesel fuel. What going to happen, Mr.

March 1, 1961

Speaker? Any trucks that are still running through the province, and there are few of them because of the weight restrictions on load limits in this province, will fill their tanks in Alberta, drive through Saskatchewan, and fill them again in Manitoba. Have these people no regard for the many, many people who have invested their life savings in building filling stations along our Trans-Canada highway? These people are going to be out of business, and they have nobody to blame but the socialist Government that sits opposite. In the seventeen years that they've been in power, they have continuously poked their tax-picking fingers deeper into the pockets of the people of this province.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Now I referred to some increases in court house fees, and maybe the Attorney-General will disagree here. Perhaps he will say that these appeared in the 'Gazette', but I didn't know anything about them. It's going to take some time to read into the record of this House the increases in fees that have brought into being over the last year or two. I apologize to the House, and to the general public who may be listening to their radios at the present time, for having to use the number of figures that I must use this afternoon, because of the task that has been given to me. Let me refresh the Attorney-General's mind as to the amount of money that he is picking out of the pockets of the people of this province. I have three typewritten pages of increased fees that the Attorney-General is responsible for, and every Minister of the Government is equally guilty of this increased taxation, increased revenues, and increased pick-pockets.

To issue a writ of summons, Mr. Speaker, in a Queen's Bench Court prior to February of 1961 would cost \$3.00; it now costs \$5.00. In the District Court it used to cost \$2.00; it now costs \$3.50. The levy for taxation of costs in Queen's Bench used to be \$2.50; it is now \$5.00. In the District Court it used to be \$1.75; it is now \$4.00. Civil action down for trial in the Queen's Bench Court it used to be \$2.00; now it's \$10.00. In the District Court it used to be \$1.50; it is now \$7.50. Examination for discovery (I hope you're following this in the 'Gazette', I wouldn't want to make any mistakes) up until February, 1961, used to cost \$2.00 in the Queen's Bench; now it costs \$5.00; in the District

Court it used to cost \$1.50; now it costs \$4.00. These are not meagre increases; in some instances, Mr. Speaker, they are an increase of 500%. Yes in some cases they couldn't find an old fee to increase so they brought in a new one.

Now what are some of the new ones? A hearing of a trial in Queen's Bench is now \$10.00 for the first day and \$5.00 each day thereafter. Of course, that's new. In the District Court it is \$5.00 the first day, and \$2.50 each day thereafter. These are new. This is because we have full employment and a buoyant Saskatchewan economy, I presume. We can now afford to pay new levies, along with the increase in the old ones.

Let us turn to another list. For receiving, entering and endorsing summonses, writs for probate in Queen's Bench, it used to be 75 cents it is now \$1.50. In District Courts it used to be 50 cents; now it's a dollar fee on every service. Queen's Bench used to be 50 cents, and now it's \$3.00. District Courts were also 50 cents, and it has been increased to \$3.00. Executing every writ – Queen's Bench used to be \$4.00, now it's \$10.00; District Courts used to be \$2.00, now it is \$5.00. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take the time of the House to read them all, but I'll go on and read some more. Where over \$5,000.00 it is \$10,000.00 plus ½ to 1% of an amount exceeding \$5,000.00. Attending in Queen's Bench used to be a dollar now it is three dollars; District Courts used to be 75 cents; it is now \$2.50. Notices of sale of land used to be dollar in both courts; now it's \$1.50.

Mr. Speaker, there are fifty various fees that appeared in the 'Gazette' of a few weeks ago, and only three or four of them have not been increase. Now, what does this mean? Supposing, and I'm referring now to the Surrogate Court costs and the increases in costs, the probate fees payable on a \$40,000.00 estate up to September 1, 1959 would cost \$40.00. On September 1st, 1959 it was increased from \$40.00 to \$80.00, but apparently that wasn't bad enough. On September 1st, 1960 it was increased again from \$80.00 to \$123.00. Now let us take an example of a \$20,000.00 estate. Again, on these same three dates, September 1st, 1959, the old fee \$30.00 on a \$20,000.00 estate was increased on that date to \$40.00, and again last September 1st to \$63.00.

March 1, 1961

In the past, Mr. Speaker, in this House, and elsewhere, one could rely on the Speech from the Throne outlining the Government's proposals for their activities in our province for the next twelve months, and that was followed by the Budget Address which showed this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan how these proposals were going to be fulfilled, how the Government was going to raise their money, and what they were going to spend it on. Well we have arrived at this sorry day in Saskatchewan where the Speech from the Throne and the Budget Speech mean nothing, absolutely nothing. Just because an announcement is made in the Speech from the Throne doesn't mean that this is going to be fulfilled or carried out. There are numerous examples where this Government have come in here and made announcements to the people of Saskatchewan that I don't think they had any intention of carrying out.

Even worse than that, Mr. Speaker, when they brought in their budget and even in some instances allocated, or supposedly allocated some money to fulfil these commitments, lo and behold they were even cancelled after that, and there are many good examples on record. One of the most recent ones, of course, is the proposed mental hospital for the City of Yorkton.

Now enough said about increases that have taken place between the Sessions of the Legislature, and especially those increases that take place immediately following provincial elections and the next Session of the House. I want to turn to a more general criticism of not only the budget that was read last Monday, but the handling of the financial affairs of this province, not for the last twelve months, but for the last seventeen years. We have had tremendous revenues available in Saskatchewan since the very day that these people walked into this Chamber as a Government, and I wonder even if some of my fuzzy-headed friends who sit opposite realize the revenues that have been available. There are five chief sources of revenue, Mr. Speaker. Of course, there have been tremendous increases from these sources of revenue. What are they? The subsidy which we receive from Ottawa and the payments under the tax agreements that have been discussed at an earlier date in this House.

The year before this Government came into

power, the amount of money raised from that particular source amounted to \$8 1/3 million. Some of you people want to make a note of that on your desk - \$8 1/3 million. By 1961-62, and this is the estimate for 61-62 because the actual figures are not available, the estimates from this same source is a little better than \$40 million. Over five times the amount of revenue coming into Saskatchewan today from federal sources than came in the last year the Liberal Government was in power.

What about this gasoline tax, Mr. Speaker? When this Government came to power gasoline tax yielded to the province of Saskatchewan about \$3 1/4 million annually. This year, with the increase that has been announced in the budget, gasoline tax will bring in about \$25 1/2 million.

Education and hospitalization tax prior to this Government coming into office yielded \$4 1/4 million, this year it will yield \$22 1/3 million. What about the motor vehicle license? 1943-44 brought in \$2 1/2 million; this year it will bring in almost \$8 million. What about liquor profits? They must have driven a lot of people to drinking, because liquor profits have gone up from \$3 1/3 million to \$14 million. What is the total being extracted from the people's pocket? The total from those five sources in 1943-44 was about \$22 3/4 million; this year it will amount to almost \$110 million.

Now there are other sources of revenue available to our province, and have been over the years, and the total revenue in 1943-44 amounted to about \$29 million in round figures. Twenty-nine million dollars compared to one hundred forty-seven and one-half million dollars in 1961-62. Where's this money coming from, Mr. Speaker? In 1943-44 we had a population in Saskatchewan of about 836,000, today we have a population of 912,000. On a per capita basis the last Liberal Government in this province took out of the people's pockets \$34.46 per person annually. Today's pickpockets are taking \$161.65 per person annually. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford this taxation. Would it were only that they've been taking more sums out of the people's pockets annually! But they've been spending a whole lot more money than their people were prepared to give them. Look at the debt today: in 1943-44 our per capita debt was \$241.00 per person; today it is \$446.00 per person. Not only have they extracted some \$130 more annually out of the people's pockets of this province, but in addition to that they have

March 1, 1961

gone and increased our debt by approximately 100%.

Now I want to refer to a little pamphlet that was published by the Party that my friends opposite adhere to. A few years ago, as a matter of fact it was published back in 1952, and that time they were boasting that they had reduced the public debt between 1944 and 1951, they said, "Why we have in this short period of time reduced the public debt of the province of Saskatchewan by 27%". Not one nickel of that reduction was of any credit to this Government or to any Member of it.

Who were the people who were paying off a part of the public debt in this period? Payments or contingent liabilities were being paid off by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and by the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries. Seed grain debts were being paid and being cared for by the Government of Canada. Those are the people that were responsible for this reduction of debt between 1944 and 1951. The figures are correct as far as I know, but there is certainly no credit coming to this Government for this decrease in debt in that period. If they want to compare another facet, and I challenge them to do so, then they can only show that from 1944 to 1961 they've increased the public debt of this province by over 100%. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, during this period of high revenues from many sources that I have referred to, we heard at the same time many speeches made by my friends opposite with regard to a planned economy, and with regard to handling Canada's resources in such a manner as to control inflation in times of buoyant revenues, and to control increasing Government expenditures during times of recession. One would have thought that this Government would have practiced what they preached. But what are the facts? After all these years of high revenues we find ourselves this year in a position where there has been some drop-off on revenues; we have considerable unemployment in our province; business in general is in a bit of a back-slide. The Government is going along and playing their baleful part creating more unemployment. After all these years of buoyant revenues one would have thought that there would be some provision made so that the Government today could step in and fill the gap, so as they could come up with programs, and put the unemployed back to work. They could have been expected to prime the pump with public money and to get our economy back onto the road we lost when the people

of this country were so foolish as to elect a Tory Government.

Mr. Speaker, how could provision be made to build up a reserve in the province of Saskatchewan? There have been many sources of revenue to the Government over this period that ought to have been used in a different manner to what they have been used. I'm only going to use one of them as an example, and I want to repeat there are many other sources of revenue that ought to have been treated likewise, but I will only take liquor profits as an example. Now during the period of time that this Government has been in charge of the financial affairs of our province, we have had about \$163 million liquor profits. It was always my opinion that revenue derived from this type of source ought to be used for paying off public debts. It could be used on capital expenditures, but I do not believe it should be used or taken into revenue accounts and used for day to day expenses. Out of the \$163 million that my friends opposite have collected in liquor profits, they have taken almost \$76 million into revenue accounts, and I'm going to have more to say about that later.

But, Mr. Speaker, had we been astute enough to have set even a portion of this \$76 million that was taken into revenue accounts aside for a rainy day, I don't think the unemployed would have had to come to this building yesterday, and beg this Government to do something about the plight in which they find themselves. The money would have been available to set the wheels in motion, to put these people to work. Surely we need a planned economy, but we need one that's planned by some people who know how to plan. I think their plan must have been given to them by this chap they sponsor on television – this what's his name – Phil Silvers, Sergeant Bilko – because their planning of the financial affairs of this province reminds me so much, of the activities of Sergeant Bilko.

I'm not going to blame the Provincial Treasurer who sits opposite for this unholy mess.

An Hon. Member: — Blame the Premier.

Mr. McDonald: — This was created chiefly by his predecessor, and his predecessor will be best remembered by the people of this province when they go to pay their taxes in the years to come for the many extravagances that he

March 1, 1961

practiced while he was the Provincial Treasurer of this province. There has been no provision for reserves. This Government has spent money like drunken sailors with no thought of a rainy day, no thought of their responsibility to the people of this province. When we find ourselves in this situation, not in the heart of a recession, Mr. Speaker, but when there has been some slight falling off of the general activities of our province, we must, ask what on earth would happen under a socialist government if we ever entered a period similar to the thirties? What would this outfit do? Why it takes more today to pay the interest on the public debt than were the total revenues of this province at one time. What are you going to do? There is no provision to take care of an emergency, even a minor emergency let alone a catastrophe such as has struck Saskatchewan in the past and could do so again.

The Provincial Treasurer's predecessor seemed to get a great deal of enjoyment through his association with the financial or the high financial men and women of this nation and other nations. He seemed to like to borrow money; it gave him a wonderful feeling. He seemed to like the association of big business so that after he borrowed the money he could come home and spend it in association with some of the high and mighty of our province and elsewhere.

All we need do, Mr. Speaker, is to examine for one moment what conditions were when this Government came into office, and the conditions that had existed prior to them coming into office, when this province and not only this province, but western Canada as a whole, Canada as a whole to a lesser extent, and the whole of the world, had gone through one of the most severe depressions that I think any part of the world had ever witnessed to that date. That period was followed by a period of war when it was impossible to get men or materials to provide services for Saskatchewan people or people anywhere else. But when this Government came into office, they found \$7 million in cold cash sitting in the top drawer, ready to take care of these emergencies, ready to provide potential needs for the people of Saskatchewan. But today we have no reserves, and I want to say that when this Government leave office is June of 1964, the Treasury will be as bare as Mother Hubbard's Cupboard.

Opposition Member: — Hear! Hear!

An Opposition Member: — If they last that long.

Mr. McDonald: — I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that having passed through these very lucrative years some reserve should be available today to take care of the pressing need of Saskatchewan at the moment. There is none. Now, because of this unfortunate experience that has faced us, I wonder if the Party opposite are not going to find themselves in a rather embarrassing position. Because of this proposed marriage, or proposal that they have made to a certain maiden, I wonder if this maiden is going to be very interested in a husband who's gone broke, a husband who's not able to take care of the responsibilities he has now, let alone those resulting from wedlock. I know, Mr. Speaker, there are generally new problems after wedlock, but we have no money to take care of the ones we have now. I wonder how willing their new sweetheart's going to be, because their new sweetheart, as you know, went to the Government of Canada only a few short weeks ago and asked the Government of Canada to enter into a tremendous expansion program. Why the Canadian Labour Congress wanted us to build from one end of Canada to the other. But, if it would be right for the Government of Canada to enter into a program like this, why wouldn't it be right for the Government of Saskatchewan? Surely, governments ought not to work at cross purposes?

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . Got to find the money in Saskatchewan.

Mr. McDonald: — Well I think they'd have to find the money in Canada too. As far as I know they have no more reserves at the moment, than this Government has. I want to wish them well in their courtship, but I doubt, in view of the performance of a planned economy in Saskatchewan, that if the bride talks to her father-in-law and to her own father, she'll go through with this wedding.

Now a few months ago, we were informed through the press, that the new Provincial Treasurer was entering upon a new economy drive. He was going to cut the frills, and waste in order to balance this budget. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there ever should have been any frills to cut off in the first place. I think it is the duty of the Provincial

March 1, 1961

Treasure and his Government to see that every dollar that is spent, both in good times and in hard, brings a maximum benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Liberals have been proposing this economy drive, both in this House, and on public platforms throughout Saskatchewan for years. With what results? You know full well, Mr. Speaker, what we were accused of. When the people opposite went out and said, “These Liberals, if you elect them, are going to fire all the civil servants.” No Liberal ever said they were going to fire the civil servants, and I want to put the Liberal Party on record again, on our attitude towards the civil service. Certainly we have said that there are some people on the payrolls of this Government that we think ought not to be there, but the great bulk of the civil servants of this province, like the civil servants of any other province over the Dominion of Canada are a dedicated people. The great bulk of people who have made of their own free mind a decision to serve their country by serving their government, provincially, federally, and municipally, have made a decision that I believe they ought to be given credit for. The great bulk of civil servants care not who the Government are, what political party they are; they are prepared to do their level best in handling the tasks that are assigned to them by different Governments. I want to give credit to the civil service of this province and civil servants in general for the attitude that they have adopted and I’m sure will maintain in the future.

If the Provincial Government and the Provincial Treasurer would like to cut expenditures further, I think they could do so without curtailing any worthwhile services. Only a few days ago one of my colleagues held up in this House a copy of the ‘Commonwealth’. Which is the propaganda paper of the CCF Party, and in that newspaper he pointed out scores of ads that had been placed by different departments of Government of Crown Corporations. I think the day is passed, Mr. Speaker, when the revenues of this province, ought to be used to bring in the campaign funds of any political party.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — We could go back to poor Sergeant Bilko. I think he could get another sponsor without the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan having to sponsor him.

When I was given the task of delivering this address this afternoon, I made it my business to go back and read the speeches that had been delivered by different people who had in the past occupied the position that I occupy now. Some of them were people who now sit over in the other side of the House, and while reading those speeches I ran across criticism several times of Cabinet Ministers' expenditures. Man-oh-man, the Cabinet Ministers of the past in this province were pikers compared to these people. The amount of money that these people are spending both in and outside the province of Saskatchewan — the trips to Europe — why I hope someday they'll let me know when one of them is going and I'll get in one of his empty luggage bags and go with him. It must be wonderful to have the country pay for a mice trip to Europe. The red carpet must have been out, because if it wasn't they were wrong in the amount of money they paid for it.

The number of the boards and commissions that have been set up by this Government, and I'll refer to a list as long as your arm a little later on, that have been paid for at Government expense is amazing. After the reports were given to the Government that sits opposite nothing ever happened. Maybe they read the report and promptly forgot everything that was in it. These are some places where money could be curtailed. Surely to goodness we're not going to curtail activities that will give employment to people who need it today. We can curtail this type of nonsense, and not affect anyone other than a few friends of the people who sit opposite.

I want to turn for a moment to my own Constituency. The reason I do that, Mr. Speaker, is because for the past several Sessions it has been my privilege and opportunity to be Leader of the Opposition, and during that time I never happened to mention any of the wants, the likes and dislikes of the people of my Constituency, and their reasons for them. I think that position demands one to deal with things concerning the whole province. I find that that's what some people on the other side of the House

March 1, 1961

have done, and I followed their example and I think it is a good one. But I do at this time want to say a few things about the Moosomin Constituency. Of course, the first thing I want to do is complain a little bit. That's logical, because again my friend the Attorney-General is kind of hard on me these days; he has closed our Land Titles Office. Now this is a sad blow to the Moosomin community, and unfortunately Moosomin is not the only community that this has happened to. It seems to be the desire of this Government to centralize services in larger centres, and this closing of provincial facilities is taking place not only in my Constituency, Mr. Speaker, but from year to year is taking place in all rural Constituencies in Saskatchewan. I cannot agree with it. Not only am I unhappy because the Land Titles Office is to be closed in my own town, but people in the smaller urban centres throughout Saskatchewan are bending every effort, many of them, to have their communities survive. Many of them are bending every effort to supply better services to their people, such as sewer and water, natural gas, hospital services, senior citizens homes, better schools. There is a genuine community spirit to build up better communities, and in many instances they are striving for survival. But at the same time, they have a Provincial Government working in the opposite direction, doing everything that is humanly possible to destroy our local communities, to hide the activities of Government in a few larger centres. Now, the Attorney-General used a figure of some \$17,000 that would be saved with the closing of the Land Titles Office in Moosomin and Arcola. (I think I'm right when I say that). Economies in Government are good, I will admit that, but when those economies mean the destruction of services in local areas, then I cannot agree with them. I want to suggest in all sincerity that if the Attorney-General feels that this must be done in the interests of all Saskatchewan, then I hope that he will give me his support in endeavouring to have some other Provincial Government service, or some industry locate in Moosomin to offset the death to the community that the removal of the Land Titles Office will cause.

There's quite a history to the Land Titles Office in the town of Moosomin, and as a matter of fact to our court house, and to the town as a whole. While I'm not going to take the time of this Legislature to read this into the record I would recommend it for the reading of any Members who are interested in one of the oldest settlements in the

province of Saskatchewan, and as a matter of fact as far as our judicial system is concerned, the oldest in the province of Saskatchewan. I recommend you go to the library and get this little booklet called 'Moosomin and its Pioneers', written by James N. McKinnon. It is well written, and I think for those people who live in much newer areas of the province of Saskatchewan it would be very worthwhile reading.

I would hope that immediate consideration can be given to providing the town of Moosomin with a Geriatric Hospital. (It doesn't appear in this budget speech; but perhaps it will be brought in next year.) We have one of the finest general hospitals anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan; we now have a new senior citizen's home; we have one of the finest medical staffs, including a famous surgeon, on the staff at the hospital, and we feel that if we could also have a Geriatric centre, we would then have complete medical services for the people in that area. Unless we can build a geriatric hospital in the town of Moosomin, it is going to be necessary in the very near future to build a new wing onto our general hospital. There is some feeling that a geriatric centre would provide equivalent service, and in some instances better service than building a new wing to our hospital. It is one thing that I hope the Government will keep in mind. Because that area of the province is one of the oldest settled areas, we have more elderly people per capita according to a government-conducted survey than any place else in Saskatchewan, and I suggest that would be a logical reason to build a geriatric centre in the town of Moosomin.

I sincerely hope that the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation will come down again this fall so that we can open gas in the town of Wapella and Whitewood. I know I always like him to come to my Constituency, if there's no election on, because generally he comes down to light the flare when gas services have been extended in that area. So I hope that he will see fit to supply the two remaining towns on the main line which I understand could be supplied without too great a public expenditure. I hope that the new Minister of Highways will . . .

(Brief recording failure)

I sincerely hope that the Minister of Highways can see fit this year to build No. 8 highway from Moosomin north. If he does that they we will have

March 1, 1961

good all-weather roads in and out of town of Moosomin in four different directions.

I hope that the Minister of Agriculture, and he's not here this afternoon, but I'm, sure someone will pass this on, will take into consideration a proposal that I have made to him on many occasions, and that is that we are in desperate need of community pastures in the area. We have the largest cattle population per quarter section of any area on the North American continent, but we have no community pasture. Now I hope that the Minister of Agriculture can see fit in the immediate future to meet this need for us.

There are other needs in the Constituency that I will be prepared to discuss during Estimates in the House. I want to turn now to the public debt of Saskatchewan. There seems to be some argument in some people's mind as to what is public debt. Some people use a figure of \$17 million when they're talking about public debt, and other people use a figure of something over \$400 million when they're talking about public debt. Now the first seven budget speeches of the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Fines, when he occupied that position, followed the same procedure that had been used by his predecessor, Mr. W.J. Patterson. In the period covered by those first seven budget speeches the net debt of the province was decreasing. I referred to this earlier, Mr. Speaker, but I want to repeat it was decreasing because certain agencies were paying off debts that the province of Saskatchewan had guaranteed, and consequently these became a contingent liability. These payments, I want to repeat were being paid by the Wheat Pool, Co-operative Creameries, and other agents. Following the first seven budgets of this Government, there was an increase in the debt created by the Government that sits opposite, but at that time the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Fines, changed the system of setting this up, and I want to give him credit that when he brought in this change told this House that he was doing it. But I want to indicate to this House, that if the Provincial Treasurer sitting opposite. Hon. Mr. Lloyd, were to set up the public debt in the same manner that was used by his predecessor in his first seven budget speeches, this is what he would have found. As at December 31, 1960, we had a bonded debt of \$405,615,000. We had \$26,521,000 of treasury bills; we had contingent liabilities of \$14,459,000, making a total of \$446,595,000.

Of course from that we must subtract the sinking funds, and on that date December 31, 1960 our sinking funds amounted to \$39,467,000 leaving a net debt, Mr. Speaker, of \$407,128,000.

Now, there seems to be some argument as to what constitutes net debt. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a little booklet entitled 'Financial Statements of the Provincial Governments 1959, Fund of debt, direct and indirect', and this was issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in 1959, which is for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1960, and I want to turn to page 8 of this document. On page 6 we will find this: (these figures differ from mine that I have given to you because they are only up to March 31st, 1960, where the figures that I gave you a moment ago are December 31st, 1960). On a table in page 6 of this document (and these are not my figures, they are supplied by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics) we find that the net funded debt of the province of Saskatchewan was \$354,310,000. Now this is the figure that Liberals have used to me and time again, and it has been disputed by my friends opposite. Mr. Speaker, from this table prepared, not by a bunch of politicians, but by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, we find that the province of Saskatchewan on March 31st, 1960 had the second largest net funded debt of any province in the Dominion of Canada. Only one province in the whole of the Dominion of Canada had a larger net funded debt than we did.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny the facts. This province is in debt up to its neck. Some people can say, "Oh well it's self-liquidating", some people can say, "Oh well, the taxpayers won't have to pay this by taxation." This principle and interest, Mr. Speaker, can only be paid in one of two ways: either by high power and telephone rates, which are paid in monthly bills, or by taxation of the people of this province. There's no other way.

Well my friend has got private utility on the brain. The future of generations yet unborn in this province has been mortgaged by you, and your colleague.

Now I want to go on a deal with this so-called balanced budget. The Provincial Treasurer, from time to time, not the present Provincial Treasurer, but his predecessor, took a great pride

March 1, 1961

in boasting about balanced budgets, but you know we've had the greatest juggling of figures to come up with balance budgets, or so-called balanced budgets, I've ever seen in my life. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that in the 17 years that they've been in office, there have been only two budgets brought down by my friends opposite that could rightfully be called balanced budgets. Don't beat around the bush. What are the facts? We'll go way back to 1945-46 and if the Treasury of that particular time had not taken \$4,250,000 out of business profits and taken them into revenue accounts, they would have had a deficit of \$3,759,167. With my hon. friends there is apparently little use of trying to talk sense into a sawdust-head.

I indicated earlier on that this Government or no other Government, in my opinion, should take liquor profits into revenue accounts. They should be used to retire the public debt, for capital expenditures and to provide a nest egg for a rainy day.

Premier Douglas: — . . . capital expenditures.

Mr. McDonald: — They were taken into revenue accounts, Mr. Premier. Again, I want to repeat, you took, them into revenue accounts in your own budget that was tabled in this House, and the public accounts show it. These are not my figures; they are yours.

Again from 1946-47 you would have had a deficit of \$4 million even, had you not taken \$5 million liquor profits into revenue. Again in 1947-48 there would have been a deficit of \$3,500,000 had they not taken \$5 million into revenue accounts. Again in 1948-49 a deficit of just under \$3 million had they not taken \$4 million of liquor profits into revenue accounts. And so it goes on . . . Then finally they arrive at the position where they could no longer balance their budget by taking all of the liquor profits into revenue accounts. What did they do? You know this man with the horn of plenty wasn't going to bring in a budget that wasn't balanced, so he went over to his colleagues and stole his money out of the telephone profits and put those into revenues. Then again, my friend with the horn of plenty, comes in and says, "Well I balanced the budget". Man oh man, how ridiculous can you get.

But you know, my friend who now sits opposite, the new Provincial Treasurer, if he's only gone over to the (yes we're coming to the tie) if he'd only gone over to the archives, and borrowed that tie, he could have balanced last Monday's budget. He must have had a tougher man to deal with than the Minister in charge of telephones. He ran into the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation, and he would give him his profit, so he couldn't balance the budget. Had he beaten him about the head and shoulders, and got his profit, he too could have had a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker. Balance! They don't even know the meaning of the word. This balance is only a figment of the imagination. Two years out of seventeen we have been presented with a balanced budget.

Now a few days ago we were discussing something in this House, and I can't refer to I, I'd be out of order, but it had to do, Mr. Speaker, with certain revenues that come to Saskatchewan from the Dominion of Canada, and I wouldn't want Members to leave this House thinking that we only receive money from Ottawa on account of the Dominion – Provincial taxation agreement. We receive additional revenue, but sometimes I think the people opposite lose sight of where they received this money, because I've never heard them going about the province, or in this Legislature, giving credit to anyone for have provided any service in our province other than themselves. But what are the facts? We received from the Federal Government a health grant last year of \$2,615,000 and a hospital grant of \$12,770,000 and when you add this to the subsidy in the tax rental payments, we received a total of \$57,411,000, from those terrible Tories at Ottawa. But these terrible Tories are only carrying out Liberal policies, that were put on the statutes by a Liberal Government. Every nickel that you received this year was the result of Liberal Government policy.

Premier Douglas: — How much did the Liberals pay for hospitalization?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Health grants and hospital grants, Mr. Speaker, are not included in budgetary revenues, but I think they ought to be mentioned when we are dealing with the financial patter of our province.

March 1, 1961

Now I want to turn to another matter dealing with the report that was tabled today. I want to repeat that I haven't had the opportunity of even reading that report. But according to the discussions that have taken place, one would think that the origin of the so-called county system, or larger units of administration of local government, stated back here a few years ago, when it was recommended by the Royal Commission on the Agriculture and Rural Life. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. My friends who sit opposite, and I think it was the Premier who said a few days ago that some Socialists had not only mellowed, some of them had gone rotten. Well, Mr. Speaker, the ones that have mellowed are over here, and the ones that have gone rotten are over there.

I want to refer to how these people have decayed in the short period of time. I want to refer to 1944 – December 5th – a newspaper clipping and it said “New municipal boundaries built.” I want to read you this:

“Legislation to provide for the establishment of larger units of administration for rural municipalities in Saskatchewan will likely be introduced at the next Session of the Legislature, Municipal Affairs, Minister J.H. Brockelbank said Tuesday.”

What is the date – December 5th, 1944. Now the then Minister of Municipal Affairs was prepared to bring in Legislation in the first Session of the first Legislature that they had after this Government took power. The Again on December 19th, 1944 another heading in the newspaper – “Larger Municipal Units Would Be Beneficial says Municipal Affairs Minister Brockelbank.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I didn't know I was right so long ago.

Mr. McDonald: — You still haven't convinced many people. Then again on February 9th, 1945 – “Enlarged Rural Municipalities draws convention opposition.” You know, the only person that you have convinced, that you were right, is you.

The people of Saskatchewan told you that you

were wrong in 1945, and they're still telling you. You voted for it. Then again on March 12th, 1945 "Larger Municipal Units postponed." Well then again, I've got clippings here all the way from 1945 to 1955, but again there is the report of a speech, and this is not in the 'Leader Post', you people don't need to worry about that, this is in that other paper 'The Commonwealth' reporting a radio address of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he made this address available to the members of the Continuing Committee. It would be very interesting to see if the Continuing Committee agree with that's in this.

Let's see what happens to the socialists who mellowed and the ones that went bad. During the Session of 1945, and I'm taking this out of the Journal, there was a resolution moved in this House, by the then member for Rosthern, Mr. Hooge. It appears on page 51 of the Journal, on page 81 we find that there was an amendment, and then on page 92 we find that the amendment was passed. What were they voting on? They were voting on extending the privilege to the people of Saskatchewan to vote before there would be any change in local government boundaries. Who voted for it? Douglas (Weyburn), Nollet, Brockelbank, McIntosh, Williams, and Stone. They are the only C.C.F. that sat in the House at that time and are still here. Sure, there are some socialists who have mellowed, and sure some have gone bad at the core.

These people were prepared to give our rural citizens a vote and some say as to what type of local government they wanted away back in 1945, but in 1960, no vote. This Session they voted against giving the rural people a vote. Well now, Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about devising a ballot, about whether a vote was possible or not. Mr. Speaker, when the Rural Municipal Act was set up in Saskatchewan in the year 1908-1909, legislation was placed on the statute books of this province making provision for a vote to be held under the exact circumstances that we now find ourselves in. that legislation, I want to repeat, was put on the statute books in 1908 and 1909, and it is still there. As a matter of fact in 1908-09 the legislation read that the Minister of the Commissioner may do certain things. Now the legislation says the Minister shall do certain things. The provision for a vote to be taken on municipal boundaries or

March 1, 1961

any other kind of boundaries (no, no, I'll read it out).

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But not on boundaries . . . or on constitution either.

Mr. McDonald: —

“Prior to the organization of any rural municipalities under the provision of this Act, the Commissioner shall prepare a map of the province on which shall be outlined from time to time the areas and boundaries of municipalities to be hereafter organized and such boundaries shall be fixed as provided in the next preceding section commencing at the south-eastern corner of the province”.

Next:

“The map thus prepared shall, at all reasonable hours, be open to inspection and the boundaries of every municipality petitioned for shall, subject to such variations that may be approved by the commissioner, correspond to those indicated on the said map.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They didn't vote on boundaries.

Mr. McDonald: — Brock, you know better than that; I'll give you the benefit of the doubt. You know better than that, but, Mr. Speaker, certainly they didn't vote on the boundaries, the boundaries have always been drawn as it is stated in the Act, by the Commissioner or some of his employees, but when the boundaries have been decided, then the people voted whether they wanted that area within a district. Now what's the difference?

“Whenever the residents of any portion of the province deem it advisable to take steps to organize a municipality in their neighbourhood, they shall apply to the Commissioner for a form of petition, and for a plan showing the boundaries of the proposed municipalities, as indicated on the map, referred to in Section 9 – ” (and so on).

Let's go on a little further.

“Upon receipt of such petition and the statement in due form the Commissioner may forthwith authorize the municipal committee to proceed with an election as hereinafter provided and shall notify them of the divisions into which the proposed municipality is divided and the boundaries thereof.”

This provision is here and you turn over the page, Mr. Speaker, and you will find on the next page, the parallel.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What section are you quoting?

Mr. McDonald: — What section am I quoting? This is the Bill of 1908-09 – Part I – Municipal Organization – Sections 9, 10, 12, 16 and I am now over on 21, they type of ballot for or against municipal government.

Government Members: — . . . For what?

Mr. McDonald: — For or against the municipal government. Now I ask you, and if you've got the courage of your convictions, you'll give the people the opportunity to say whether they are for or against this county system.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — You have been preaching this, Mr. Minister, you have been preaching this from 1944 to date. He still is not convinced he can persuade a majority of the people of Saskatchewan, that this would be good for our province, or he would be only too please to have a vote. A lot of money has been spent in endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, to persuade the people of Saskatchewan that this would be good for them. First of all we had a Commission set up in 1945, an enquiry, pardon me, not a commission. Professor Van Vliet headed it. That enquiry cost the people of this province \$32,400 but it never was allowed to report to anybody. Then there –

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It was wrecked by a Liberal.

March 1, 1961

Mr. McDonald: — I don't know how the Liberals wrecked it, you were the Government. Then following that we had the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, headed by Professor W.P. Baker, that cost \$460,000. Then we had the Local Government Continuing Committee, that reported today, and as far as I know, that to date has cost the people of this province about \$300,000, so since the announcement of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the then Minister away back in 1944, that legislation would be introduced during that Session to bring in larger units of administration, we spent \$100,000, and if the facts were known, if we could get all of the expenditures, I would venture to say it would be closer to a million. They are still not prepared to give the people the opportunity to vote, not a vote on whether they want a county or a modified county, as someone mentioned earlier on, nobody wants to vote on whether they're going to hang you or shoot you. What people want to vote on is whether you're going to get hung at all or not. I challenge them to give the people that opportunity. They voted in the south a few days ago not to do it.

Now one could go on at great lengths of the misgivings of this Government. As a matter of fact, I wanted to deal with this so-called summary of results of Crown Corporations. Someday I will do that. There's a claim of some \$10,776,000 profit. This is not an honest statement, Mr. Speaker. If the legitimate costs were subtracted that ought to be subtracted from this \$10,700,000. There's no profit at all from the socialist Crown Corporations that have been set up by this Government. Someday I will deal with that, but I've talked long enough.

Before I conclude I want to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move this amendment seconded by my desk-mate, Mr. Thatcher:

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substitute therefore:

"This Assembly deplores the heavy and rapidly increasing public debt, the failure of the Government adequately to reduce excessive administration costs, and regrets the proposal to increase heavily taxes and exactions."

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by Mr. A.H. McDonald, seconded by Mr. Ross Thatcher:

That all the words after “that” be deleted and the following substitute therefore:

“This Assembly deplores the heavy and rapidly increasing public debt, the failure of the Government adequately to reduce excessive administration costs, and regrets the proposal to increase heavily taxes and exactions.”

We have before us this afternoon an amendment to the Motion “that the Speaker do now leave the Chair.” This type of amendment is one that calls for considerable consideration, and I do not feel quite able at this time to bring in a definite ruling on the admissibility of this amendment. I would like, however, to have any advice that I may be able to receive from the House at this time. I would appreciate any advice that can be given.

Otherwise, with the consent of the House, I will allow the debate to continue on the amendment and on the main motion, and reserve my ruling in regard to this amendment until a later date.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate you, Sir on your elevation to the high position as Speaker. You have shown already that you are a worthy successor to the previous Speaker, whom every Member in this House respected and honoured, and we are very pleased with what you are doing.

I would like also to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on his elevation to this high and very difficult and responsible position. I would like to congratulate him for his very able way in which he is carrying out his difficult task. He has shown a very tremendous capacity for work and in introducing the present budget, he has demonstrated that he has a very broad and comprehensive grasp on the whole field of finance, not only in the province of Saskatchewan, but the whole field of finance in the Dominion of Canada. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the province is very fortunate to have a man of the ability of the present Minister

March 1, 1961

as our Minister of Finance.

I would like also to congratulate the Member from Moosomin, and I am sorry that he left the Chamber. I always enjoy listening to the Member from Moosomin. He is very vigorous and he is very interesting. I cannot always agree with him, but I always enjoy listening to him.

When I try to analyze in a few minutes what he had to say here, I found that it was the usual cry: less taxation and more services. Mr. Speaker, that makes a good speech, but it is completely unrealistic as the Member well knows. If you were to add all the services he would like to add and reduce all the taxes he would like to reduce, I would like to see him balance a budget. Mr. Speaker, we would need a new Crown Corporation that would be a printing press to print several millions of dollars, or else resort to Social Credit scrip.

However, I don't think the Member was worrying too much about balancing the budget and so he can be as irresponsible as he wishes. I think this sort of criticism makes more interesting political propaganda than it does as an appraisal of a budget.

Now as to the fact that he wasn't interested in balancing the budget, I have a little clipping here that I found extremely interesting. It comes from the 'Star Phoenix', of November 22, 1960, and it has to do with the Liberal Convention there, the heading is, "Grits defeat resolution on platform," and I would like to read it to this House:

"A resolution that the Provincial Government refund to the farmers the amount they had paid for power line construction, was tabled by the agriculture panel at the Saskatchewan Liberal Association Convention here Monday. Though it was a plank in the Grits' program at recent provincial elections, the resolution was listed as originating from the Yorkton Constituency, by Bernard Gallagher said the Liberals had lost two provincial elections while having this refund as part of the platform, he thought they should drop it, and just tell the

farmers that this was the price they had to pay for a C.C.F. Government.”

Now this is the part; listen to this:

“The main objection seemed to be a conviction that the Liberals would form the next Provincial Government, and the Members by passing this resolution would get them into additional difficulties by saddling them with a refund of over \$25 million.”

Mr. Gallagher: — All that was printed in that report.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Do you have a point of privilege or a point of order?

Mrs. Cooper: — Well there you have it, Mr. Speaker, the cat's out of the bag, they never intended to do it, and this is the way that they balance the budget.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, they came to the usual criticism of waste and extravagance on the part of this Provincial Government. Now I am quite sure that the Cabinet Ministers who went through such a vigorous process in trying to cut out expenditures wouldn't agree with this, but of course, as I say, waste and extravagance is not only a favourite topic of the Member from Moosomin, but it is a very favourite topic of the Leader of the Opposition. It has been for a long time, Mr. Speaker. I very well remember the first time that I listened to the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre, and he was speaking in a little hall in North Regina, and this was his special theme, a variation of his speech, on that time, Mr. Speaker, he was talking about things like horses on the payroll, Mr. Speaker, about the awful, terrible, inexcusable, unprecedented, extravagance of the Liberal Government at Ottawa.

Now then, just to refer to one or two things that were said this afternoon when the Member for Moosomin was criticizing the rise in hospital tax. He didn't point out that rise was to enable the Government to give more capital grants to the hospitals of this province. When he spoke of the increase in the gas tax, he said that we were getting out of line, and he forgot to mention that British

March 1, 1961

Columbia has raised its gas tax 3%, and in a short time we may see somewhat the same in the other provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought he was a little bit inconsistent when he was talking about the tremendous amount of money we have in this province, the money that has come from Ottawa and the money that has come from other sources. How can he relate that to the story that there is stagnation in this province. Everything is stagnant; no industries; no business. Where does he get all this money from, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Thatcher: — The farmers.

Mrs. Cooper: — I was very much intrigued by this little statement, about \$7 million left in the top drawer when the Liberal Government left office. Now this may be debatable, but if it was there I know the Provincial Treasurer would be glad to know where they hid it. If it was there, Mr. Speaker, why is it that when the Liberal Government left office, there were no roads in this province?

Mr. Thatcher: — There was a war on.

Mrs. Cooper: — Why was there no power? Why were there no supplementary allowances and so on?

Now then, he came to the question of local government, Mr. Speaker, and he said that he wasn't going to discuss this report until he had read it, but then he proceeded to discuss it. I think perhaps he might better hold his fire regarding votes in municipal boundaries until he knows what the Government is going to do about it. I don't think that the Government has made any announcement at all.

Mr. Thatcher: — I don't think so either.

Mrs. Cooper: — Now then, Mr. Speaker, there were some other things that I expected the Member for Moosomin to say that I was prepared to contradict, but he didn't say them, so I cannot contradict them.

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

The debate was, on motion of Mrs. Cooper, adjourned.

Second Readings

Bill No. 22 – An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1957

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to amend The Vehicles Act, and I think that a great deal of it can best be discussed in the Committee. But there are one or two changes in principle which should be identified at this time.

The major change that is recommended in this Bill, will result in the initiation of what is known as the demerit point system for grading drivers' licenses. This of course is not a new topic of discussion in the province of Saskatchewan. It is a possibility which has been under discussion for a considerable number of years and one which has been particularly urged on the Government by The Highway Safety Council.

It is also a procedure of which one finds a somewhat similar type at least in the province of Manitoba and in the province of Ontario. The purpose behind it is, of course, to improve the safety on the highways for the motoring public, because of the additional control, if you will, that it gives our drivers who may have violated some of the traffic rules. I know that the Members of the committee, when we go into Committee on the Whole, will spend some considerable time in discussing details.

Just briefly, we will in the initial stages start everybody out with a clean slate, except those who may be the holders of a blue license or a red license. Those who, at the time that the Bill comes into effect, are in possession of a blue license, will receive a bonus four points to begin with and those who have a red license, will receive six points, in a similar fashion. As drivers are convicted, subsequently, when the legislation comes into effect, they will receive a certain number of demerit points, the values of which are set out in an Act. The Act also gives to the magistrate, when he convicts a person for violation of the Act, the right to vary a number of points which the driver

March 1, 1961

will receive. The magistrate may vary by 50% either up or down the number of points which are signed in the Act.

That is in brief, then, how one obtains the demerit points by conviction in a court as a result of having violated those Acts. The points are removed by virtue of a person going without violation over a period of time.

The only other change in principle, I think, in the proposed amendments are that it provides for the use of a uniform traffic ticket. The same tickets will be used in all jurisdictions, provincial and municipal, in the province in order that there may be standardization. I think that I am correct in saying that the police officers are particularly interested in this and that it will have effect in saving them some time.

When the Bill goes into the Committee, I will hope to provide for the Members some description of the various offenses and the demerit points which will be allowed, and at that point we can discuss those in detail. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 23 – An Act to amend The Town Act.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill consists of a number of detailed amendments; no provision to do away with any counties; no provision with regard to boundaries of towns, and I would move, that the Bill be now read the second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 24 – An Act to amend The Village Act, 1960.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: —

Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in this Bill are similar to those in The Town Act, and are more or less of detail that can be better discussed in Committee. I would therefore move that the Bill will now be read the second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 25 – An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the Department of Education Act and the chief change in it is to provide in a legislative way for the operation of a technical institute and more particularly to provide for the operation or advance accounts at the Technical Institute. I think that the details of it can be best taken up in Committee and I would accordingly move second reading of the Bill.

Mrs. Batten: — Can I ask the hon. Minister a question? Why was it thought that it had this under the Department of Education rather than the Department of Labour or was that considered at all?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think there have been in the past a number of considerations with respect to where this would best fit. I think that the thought was that the function was more akin to fundamental educational activity which would be carried on there. Among the things that are carried on are programs beyond the grade XII level, sub-university courses. The type of person to look for is the person who, at least to some extent, has been taught in a technical school.

Mrs. Batten: — Are there academic requirements? Formal academic requirements?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, there are formal academic requirements. By and large there are three levels of programs, one requiring a grade VIII level of academic requirement or equivalent; a second one requiring a grade X academic level or equivalent; (this is

March 1, 1961

for one year trade courses); and the third one, the sub-university courses, requiring a grad XII level – I don't know whether the institute would take an equivalent to grade XII for that unless it was heavily oriented science and mathematics-wise. Then you go on and take a two year course in advanced technology.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 26 – An Act to Amend the University Act.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill to amend The University Act and it contains three principle provisions, three principle principles, if I may put it that way. It provides for the appointment of a Vice-President of the University and describes in some respect his duties – deals with his duties.

It adds to the University's authority to discipline students.

Thirdly, it provides for the establishment of an Advisory Council to the College of Engineering, and provides for certain minor changes in the regulations governing the Advisory Councils of other colleges. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 32 – An Act respecting a Certain Election in the Constituency of Turtleford.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I imagine, all the hon. Members are familiar with the purpose of this Bill. As the hon. Members know, in a by-election, we have to follow the same procedure as is set out in the Election Act for a general election. This means that following the actual election date, a Member cannot officially be declared elected until time has passed for the final counts and for the right of appeal for a recount and so on. This takes about thirty-one days.

As all the hon. Members know, as a result of the judgment that was handed down under the Controverted Elections Act, the seat of Turtleford was declared vacant and even though the Government called the by-election as quickly as possible after receiving that judgment, it was not possible for the successful candidate to take his seat in the House, until after thirty-one days had elapsed.

This means that a Member has been elected as far as the count is concerned, but that under the Act, he is not yet entitled to take his seat.

I think all the hon. Members will feel that we ought to expedite the matter, so that the elected Member can take his seat in the House, and so that the Constituency can be represented in this Session of the Legislature.

Of course, it has to be understood, that all the protection which the other candidate had under the Elections Act, shall be preserved. This includes recounts or if a final count brings something to light or if any action is necessary under the Controverted Elections Act. This of course is provided in this Bill. I think that explains the situation and I would therefore move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, Members on this side of the House welcome this Bill. I want the Premier to know that we appreciate the fact that he has brought it in this afternoon, as he is doing. Otherwise as it has been pointed out, the people of Turtleford would be deprived of representation, probably for the balance of this Session.

It seems to me, that there is one thing that the House should give consideration to, if not while this Bill is before us, certainly at some time before the next election. I think the Turtleford election result, which came up in front of the court, would indicate that there are some weaknesses in our Election Act. I don't say deliberate weaknesses, not at all. But apparently there are places where people in some cases are prevented from voting, who should be able to vote. And there are other cases where people are voting who perhaps should not be voting.

March 1, 1961

I think the Attorney-General should look over the judgment of Mr. Justice Hall and see if something can't be done to rectify the difficulties that appeared at that time. However, I say again, Mr. Speaker, that Members on this side of the House welcome this Bill.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, to make my stand known, I have some strong feelings on this, I appreciate what the Premier has said, and what the Leader of the Opposition has said in reference to representation in this House.

But I do not believe that we should give privileges to Members-elect unless they are declared elected in accordance with the law and therefore I am not going to support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask a question of clarification of the Premier, if he can give me the answer, and it is this: because we have here a situation that has not arisen before, and because there is nothing to indicate that we will have the same kind of future, I wonder if any consideration has been given to the indemnity of a Member elected in a situation such as this. Would you give him an indemnity automatically since the June election or for the time that he sat in the House? Would you taken into consideration that the Member who takes his seat on Friday had say in the House the full term of the Session? I just wonder if in principle something is being taken care of.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, two matters have been raised. The first has reference to the matter raised by the Member of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. The whole question of the indemnity for the Member is dealt with under the Legislative Assembly Act and can be dealt with later in the Session, if the Members choose to do so.

As I understand it, and I am speaking now without any consultation with the law officers, a Member, who is seated as a result of the passing of this Bill, and takes his place in the House, will be entitled to his indemnity less the usual amount which is deducted for any Member who misses certain days. I think we are all allowed to miss five days. After

that we lose ten dollars a day (or something like that). In this case the Member would lose the days above the five days allowed. Unless special action is taken he would not be entitled to his indemnity. If this Bill was not passed, and a thirty-one day period had to be observed he would come into the House, (assuming the House lasts till the tenth of April) for about five or six or seven days. In this case he would one get his \$25.00 a day for the days he actually sat. He would not be considered as having sat in the House for a major part of the time. This is why the Bill is being passed. He will get his indemnity less a very small amount to be deducted for not attending the days that he has missed.

Secondly, in reference to the question that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I quite agree that there is a need for, in the light of the judgment handed down by the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench Court, a review of the Election Act. I think most of us have taken the position, that once a person stated that he or she is eligible to vote and was placed on the list, that the voters list was final insofar as the returning officer was concerned. If voters perjured themselves, action could be taken against them. This would not be a cause for a controverted election. It is almost impossible for anyone to get a birth certificate and to get all the other particulars, which would have to be presented in order to prove that: you are 21; that you are a British subject; that you lived in the province a certain length of time and in the Constituency a certain length of time. You could not get documentary proof for this. What you have to do is to take a person's word for it, and if necessary they can be challenged. They can be made to take an affidavit. If the voters' list is not to be the determining factor, then it seems to me, that the Election Act ought to be looked at. Otherwise there could be many problems.

The other thing we should look at in the Election Act is the matter of by-elections. We should look at whether the same time lag should apply in by-elections that applies in general elections. The reason for the time lag, as everyone knows, between the day of voting and the day of the final count, is to allow ballots from all over the province to find their way to the Constituency in which they have to be counted for the final count. That does not obtain in a by-election. The only ballots in envelopes are the ballots which were

March 1, 1961

cast within the Constituency. These will be from people who were out of their poll or from a person who is voting in an advanced poll, or they will contain a sworn ballot. The length of time does not have to be as long in a by-election as it is in a general election. Probably this is something we ought to look at. I have no doubt that sometime the Members will want to take a look at the Election Act and see whether or not any changes should be made in it. I would certainly suggest that when that review is being made, we ought to keep in mind the experiences that have arisen out of the judgment handed down by Chief Justice Hall.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I understood that this motion could not be passed at the second reading, unless unanimous consent was given.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that you are quite right in regard to its being done today. I don't think it has anything to do with second readings as far as unanimous consent is concerned. But it is possible I made a mistake this afternoon in not putting the question, in regard to this being given a second reading later today, but you will have a chance to voice your disapproval in regard to having it considered in Committee later today and in that regard I think you are possibly right.

The Clerk has just pointed out to me that, by Standing Order 58, "Every Bill shall receive three readings on different days, previously to being passed but on urgent or extraordinary occasions, the Bill be read twice or thrice or advanced two or more stages in one day." It is his opinion, that the use of the word "may" in this regard, does open a door and the matter is not actually an order. But I believe we have, at this time, carried the second reading in regard to this thing.

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