

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Fourteenth Legislature
19th Day

Tuesday, March 7, 1961.

The House met at 2:30 o'clock.

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming a group of Grade VIII students from Argyle school, along with their teacher Mr. Keys. I am especially interested because I see my eldest granddaughter sitting up there. I am sure we all wish they have an interesting and an educational afternoon.

Mrs. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome a group of students from the Martin Collegiate in Regina, and also a very large group of students from Sacred Heart Academy. I'm sure we are all delighted to see these people here, and we hope they will enjoy their afternoon, and find it very profitable.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): — I want to join with the lady Member from Regina, particularly in welcoming the girls from the Sacred Heart Academy. I have the very great honour of being an alumnae of the Academy, and therefore, I am more than pleased to see them here. I will do my best, Mr. Speaker, when I speak this afternoon, and I'm sure the other Members will do their best, so that the girls don't have to strain their charity in order to listen to us.

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Monday, March 6th, 1961, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the

March 7, 1961

Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

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

Mr. C.B. Peterson (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of responsibility and also humble resolve that I rise to take part in this debate this afternoon. I follow the new Members in making my maiden speech, with this thought, that I would like to thank them for forfeiting their radio time so that I might get on the air.

May I join with those who have already spoken in extending to you, Mr. Speaker, congratulations on being chosen to your very important position.

I would like also to congratulate the Premier for his unending struggle for the betterment of the people of this province. His wisdom and his foresight has been displayed in leadership, unsurpassed in any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

I would also like to congratulate the Premier on his choice of Cabinet Ministers. These are men who have displayed quality and ability, who have shown enthusiasm in their work, and who have really measured up to the requirements of Ministers in our Government. As for the Private Members, much credit has also been given to them, and rightly so. Let us remember that they are picked men and women chosen from their respective communities.

As the new Member from Kelvington, I am naturally concerned with the conditions that affect the people there. So far they are dependent entirely upon agriculture. While some of the land has been farmed for over fifty years, the process of clearing and breaking land is far from complete. There are many good and well equipped farms there, and we have two fairly good-sized towns, Kelvington in the north, noted for its high quality seed grain, and Foam Lake in the south, which is equally noted for its purebred cattle.

My Constituency lies between the park belt and the timber area to the north east. From this it can be understood that farm operating costs are much higher than in the plains area, sometimes running as much as two or three times as high. Moisture and climatic conditions also lend to much weed growth, and as a result it is not an uncommon practice to see as many as ten cultivations completed on a field of summerfallow in one season.

The cost of clearing and breaking brush land is also very high. Mr. Speaker, I think these factors should be considered when formulating crop insurance for that area. (I trust that Mr. Brown is listening.) Clearing and breaking land even with modern equipment costs as much as \$40.00 an acre. Although a lot of land has been cleared in this way and accomplished with not too much hard labour, yet much of it was done by hand. Instead of costing \$40.00 by machinery, it cost a lifetime of hard work. However, people grow old no matter where they live, but as the oldtimers of the Kelvington Constituency look back and see the whole pattern of rural life changed: — They see changes in the convenience of electric power, in the conveniences that the school units have brought to education, in what our good roads have done, such as the grid road system. They also see a number of other changes.

Now, a few years ago, perhaps ten years ago, when this oldtimer went into a farm yard, and saw the farmer happy there, with his machinery and his family, farm life carried on in a very home-like way, — he owned his machinery — he owned his land — and he felt secure. Now the same farmer finds himself in a position of insecurity; — he is bewildered, and he is afraid. He has tried to follow the pattern of big business by increasing production at the same time reducing the amount of hired help as much as possible. To do this he was forced to go into debt to buy newer and bigger machinery costing in the tens of thousands of dollars. Then to keep down the overhead on this expensive machinery, he had to mortgage his farm to buy more land in a last desperate attempt to keep from losing his life's work, his home, the family farm that we hear so much of today, to keep

March 7, 1961

from losing the security he had hoped would be his for his declining years. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later, and this is very serious, unless something is done to help this man, and there are many of them, he will go down – another victim of the cost-price squeeze.

Many have already gone down, and have left their farm homes only to find themselves among the ranks of the unemployed in the cities. The farm house that was once his home, his hope, and his pride, is now standing empty and silent. It stands as a mute testimony to the failure not of the farmer who once lived there, but to the failure of the national fiscal policy on trade and commerce, to provide a reasonable balance of economy between industry and agriculture.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Peterson: — I want to make this point clear, Mr. Speaker, that under the British North America Act, regulations governing trade and commerce and currency, were and still are the responsibility of the Federal Government. Now as farm products must pass through the channels of trade and commerce it can be seen, that they are beyond the control of the Provincial Government. I'm pointing this out, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the need for federal action in stimulating foreign trade and other required measures that in the process, agriculture will again be restored to the place it once held in our national economy 10 to 15 years ago.

I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that our Provincial Government is doing all within its constitutional power to assist the farmers of this province. I have on my desk here a copy of the 1960 report on agriculture. This copy contains over 175 pages dealing with Provincial Government assistance to farmers. The 1960 Public Accounts show that over \$7,800,000 was used last year in assistance to agriculture in this province. Besides these things, Mr. Speaker, I would like to show what is being done by way of direct assistance to rural municipalities which in turn reduces taxes on farm land to less than half of what it would be otherwise. In other words, what steps are being taken to reduce taxes for the farmer?

Let us use the Rural Municipality of Kelvington for an example. In the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1960, I have set up a list here in three parts. The cost of municipal administration or assistance or public works, whatever you might call it, done by the municipality; then we have public health; and finally education. Now

I don't think I'll go to the trouble to list the various items and expenditures that were carried out by the municipality, but I could name them. They are public works, social welfare, and administration and some other items that I won't go into, but it totals anyway \$99,000 in round figures. The municipal health plan is \$21,000. With education and all we have a total expenditure by that municipality for one year — \$248,000.

The Provincial Government grants for the same year were \$128,000, which meant that the taxpayer only had to pay \$120,000. In other words, for every dollar that the farmer paid out, they got back about \$1.40 from our Provincial Government. Then when we had the disaster of snowed-under crops, we got for that municipality over \$59,000, in addition to the regular grant I just mentioned. Besides this, all the other departments of Agriculture that I just mentioned are mentioned in this book, all these are added to what I have just mentioned. I didn't go to the trouble to break down the figures, but thousands of dollars have gone to the Kelvington municipality in the one year mentioned in this report. So I think it's time that we realized, though we hear that little story that the Government has never done anything for the farmers, that we proved here today that it has been done, and it is being done.

Now I want to bring out one more point, and that is this. Knowing that both the Liberals and the Conservatives have indicated that they believe the farmer has never been so well off, and knowing that they have no intention of implementing a national program that will protect the farmers, it has occurred to me, that the rural population, may continue to decline at an ever-increasing rate, and that as long as we have a Liberal or a Conservative Government in Ottawa, it will be useless to waste any time or money to build more roads or schools or hospitals in any of the rural areas, because the services we already have, will now be more than enough to meet the requirements. It's a sad thought, but I believe it is a fact. But, Mr. Speaker, in anticipation that there will be a New Party Government in Ottawa after the next federal election, and believing that the farmer will then get a better deal, I have hopes that the farm exodus will cease, and that the farmers who are now facing the unhappy situation that I have previously mentioned will not have to leave the farms. In that case Mr. Speaker, the very opposite will apply. But before I close, Mr. Speaker, I want to just make some mention of the former Members in this House, one in

March 7, 1961

particular who has served in this House for 22 consecutive years, one who I respect very much, and that is the former Member for Kelvington, Peter Howe. I am sure that all who know him, will join with me in wishing Peter and Mrs. Howe many happy years of retired life.

I would like also at this time to thank the people back home for the support they gave me in the June election. I am sure I am going to try and do the best I can to fulfill the task that has been given me.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is hoped that our Provincial Government will continue the assistance toward rural Saskatchewan, and that we can look forward to a continued improvement in highways and to municipal roads and the assistance we have been receiving in the Kelvington Constituency. I hope that we can see better and more schools, that we might see more of our homes equipped with running water, and that we might see more community pastures. I am proud of the fact that we have a Government that is concerned about, not only labour, as we hear some of them talk, but about the farmer, and one that is concerned about the conditions which exist to keep the family farm intact. I hope too, that it will see fit to plan something for the care of our geriatric patients. We have a number of people who are elderly and need continuous care, not regular hospital care, but geriatric care. It is hoped that perhaps, some arrangements can be made, between the small hospitals in that area. I think particularly of the hospital at Invermay, Kelvington, and Foam Lake, and then also Wadena, because Wadena is so close to our community it is used considerably by people from our area.

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence in our Provincial Government, and the budget that has been presented. I shall oppose the amendment, but I will support the motion.

Mr. Dick W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this budget debate, may I also add my congratulations to you on your elevation to the high office of this Assembly. In so doing, I am confident, as all hon. Members of this House are, that in the discharging of your responsibility, justice and impartiality will be accorded to all Members regardless of whether they sit to your right or to your left.

Before proceeding Mr. Speaker, permit me to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the manner and competence with which he brought down his first budget. I am aware, as all hon. Members are, that his forthright knowledge of the provincial financial situation more than justifies his appointment to this very important position. This Government, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan, are conscious of the fact that this is the first budget since 1945 wherein a modest deficit is anticipated. However, this trend, due to the slowing of the economy, is evident both in the federal field, and in some of our neighboring provinces, particularly the Province of Alberta.

May I at this time, Mr. Speaker, take this opportunity to thank the people of my Constituency, for the honour and confidence they conferred upon me, in June of last year, when I was elected to speak on their behalf in this Legislature. I also wish to assure the electors of the provincial Constituency of Redberry that I will do everything to merit their confidence and trust, and that I will endeavour to serve them all to the best of my ability.

As a new Member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen interest to the debate, in which hon. Members who are sitting in this

March 7, 1961

House for the first time have participated. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, these hon. Members will in the future add valuable contributions to the proceedings of this House, to the people of their respective Constituencies, and to the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member from Pelly, gave to this House on Friday of last week what he considered the duties of the official Opposition. As a matter of fact, he quoted to this House, the Hon. Sir Winston Churchill's definition. He further qualified the stand of the hon. Members opposite, by concurring in the belief that the sole duty of the Opposition was to oppose. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the hon. Member from Pelly. We on this side of the House know that this is precisely the stand that the hon. Members to your left have taken for the past seventeen years. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in opposing, they opposed the Farm Security Act, the contributory automobile insurance, the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, the establishment of our Crown Corporations, the capital borrowings for expansion of rural and urban electrification, the borrowing for the extension of gas to urban centres. It seems odd to me that the hon. Member for Moosomin mellowed when he spoke the other day, and made a specific plea, that two remaining urban centres in his Constituency, next to the Manitoba boundary, be serviced with gas in the near future. He did not seem to worry where the money was going to come from.

During the sitting of this House, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Members opposite have opposed the construction of the new Saskatchewan Power Corporation building, the members of the Local Government Continuing Committee, certain personnel of the public civil service, and no doubt they will all oppose the budget. All this, Mr. Speaker, leaves no doubt in my mind, that the hon. Member for Pelly was sincere in his concept as to the duties of the hon. Members opposite. But I would remind the hon. Members that in spite of all their opposition to this Government, to what this Government has done over the years in terms of security and service to the people of Saskatchewan, these things have been accepted by the people of this province as was so indicated on June 8th of last year. My suggestions to the hon. Members opposite is that they change their attitude and become more constructive and less destructive.

The hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, complained last Friday that there was not as yet transmission of gas in any of the urban centres, or highways in his Constituency. Mr. Speaker, if I heard him correctly, he gave me the impression that his Constituency had nothing. The election results of June 8th of last year clearly indicated that some 2,328 people in his Constituency did not share his views. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, as did the hon. Minister of Natural Resources only yesterday, that the hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, do some homework, and procure the necessary information as to what assistance was given to the school units, to the municipalities, to the hospitals, to social aid, to mothers' allowances, for grid road construction, and for the extension of power in his Constituency. I am certain that this information will convince him that his Constituency shared in the various departmental expenditures on the basis of need in accordance with the same formula as did any other Constituency in the province.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — May I, Mr. Speaker, give to this House some information, as to what assistance was received by the municipalities in my Constituency, and I wish to mention only a few. The R.M. No. 434 of Blaine Lake received in the last five years some \$125,760 for grid road construction, \$4,942 for municipal bridges, \$6,476 in equalization grants, making a grand total of over \$137,000. The R.M. No. 435 of Redberry received a total of \$173,073 for this same purpose. The R.M. No. 466 of Meeting Lake received \$455,900 over the same period. I could name other municipalities that received similar substantial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, operational, conveyance, and equalization and capital grants received by the larger school units from the Department of Education surpassed the million dollar mark in each of the units of my Constituency for the last five years. Mr. Speaker, I wish to name but three. The Blaine Lake School Unit No. 57 received \$1,207,965 over this period. The 1960 grants to this unit amount of 43.2 mills on a total assessment: The Medstead School Unit No. 64 received \$1,398,184 during this same period. This then is equivalent to a 55.3 mill rate on the total assessment, and the Turtleford School Unit, Mr. Speaker, which is situated on the west side of my Constituency received \$1,500,789 amounting to some 66.5 mills on the total unit assessment.

March 7, 1961

Mr. Speaker, almost 3,000 rural and urban homes in my Constituency received connections from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Some \$25,826 was received in hospital grants in the last four years, and I could go on and on.

I would like to commend the Minister of Agriculture for the establishment of the 14,400 acre Hatherleigh Community Pasture in the Hatherleigh and Sandwith areas. Farmers of the surrounding community can accommodate, some 850 head of cattle. This Mr. Speaker, provides an opportunity for the farmers of this area to diversify by raising cattle to supplement declining farm income.

I would like to say a few words in the short time at my disposal, Mr. Speaker, about my Constituency which is predominantly agricultural. The farmers are affected to the same extent as are the farmers anywhere in Saskatchewan, by rising costs of production and declining farm income. The location of my Constituency is somewhat unique, Mr. Speaker. It is located between Highways No. 55, which is in the Turtleford Constituency, and Highway No. 40, which runs through the extreme south-western portion for about 28 miles, and then enters into the Battlefords Constituency. Highways No's. 4 and 26 run parallel from a point about 13 miles north of North Battleford. Mr. Speaker, this leaves about two-thirds of my Constituency without any highways or any connections between Highway No. 40 in the south and Highway No. 55 in the north. Since 1957, the municipalities of this area have commenced grid road construction, but due to the topography of the land, road construction is very costly. However, Mr. Speaker, when these inter-municipal grid roads are completed, the people of the area will be within easy reach of all weather roads, and the two main highways.

May I remind the Minister of Highways, that my Constituents have not as yet abandoned the hope that a connection linking Highways No's. 40 and 55 will be built sometime in the near future.

I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, that some consideration be given to the request from the Prince and the Meota areas for dust-proofing that section of Highway No. 26, from the junction of Highway No. 4 into the village of Meota. As this section of highway is heavily travelled during the summer months due to the fact that Meota is a summer resort, I feel certain that the

moving of this section will alleviate the problems and hazards, that must be overcome on gravelled roads.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs the necessity for the construction of the proposed grid road through the Moosomin Indian Reservation. Although this road is in the Rural Municipality of Meota, and is a joint responsibility of the two senior governments, when built I feel certain that this road will serve all the people in the surrounding municipalities. The necessity of having this road constructed has been brought to my attention on several occasions, and I am satisfied that if this were done, it would give the people in the Medstead, Park Bluff, Marron and the whole area immediately east and north of Murray Lake an outlet to Highway No. 4 in the Cochin area.

Mr. Speaker, on June 5th of last year, I had the pleasure of attending the official opening of the Battlefords Provincial Park, located on the east side of Jackfish Lake. I would like, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people in my Constituency, and all the people in north-western Saskatchewan, to commend this Government, for making this recreational facility available to this area. I would also like to thank the junior and senior Chambers of Commerce and the North Battleford Fish and Game League, for their effort and contribution in bringing to the attention of this Government the necessity of this park.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have left, I would like to mention one of the Crown Corporations, and what it has meant in savings to the people in insurance rates. This Crown Corporation commenced operations in 1945 on an initial investment of some \$12,000. To date, it has returned almost \$4 million to the people of Saskatchewan, and the return for 1960 shows almost half a million dollars. This Corporation, on various occasions, has been ear-marked to go out the window. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to look into the thinking and reasoning of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and his attitude towards the Crown Corporations, and government in business. Here is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said about Crown Corporations and government in business in the House of Commons, as reported in Hansard on page 6,495, and I quote in part:

“I hope sales of this nature will happen time and time again, in the near future. I should like to see other Crown

March 7, 1961

Corporations sold also, because I think the business of Government is to govern, and not to be in business. From what I have seen of Crown Corporations in business, they simply do not operate as efficiently as private enterprise.”

The hon. Member’s stand taken in the House of Commons, towards Crown Corporations was made abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker. On August 27, 1959, before the Liberal Provincial Leadership Convention as reported in the Saskatoon “Star Phoenix” on that date under the title “Retarding Development” and I quote:

“Mr. Thatcher said that he would favour the sale of most minor Crown Corporations in the province, if a Liberal Government was elected next year, but if employees contributing to the Corporation were not put out of work, and only if private concerns assured continuation of the Corporation.”

Referring particularly to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is reported to have said, and I quote:

“He said he would favour the sale of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to private enterprise, if he was assured that it would continue to operate in Saskatchewan.”

On the other hand he added,

“If the Corporation was not sold, he would take out the compulsory categories from the insurance scheme.”

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear statement made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in 1959. Mr. Speaker, I have sold insurance for some 8 years, and I have had the occasion to discuss insurance with many people. I do know, that one of the few commodities that has declined in price in this province since the removal of price controls by the federal government in 1946 is the cost of insurance. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has given to the people of Saskatchewan the cheapest

insurance to be found anywhere in the North American continent. Mr. Speaker, as far as the Members opposite are concerned, they dare not put their free enterprise picking fingers to meddle with an enterprise belonging to the people of Saskatchewan, that has given annual surpluses, while at the same time has forced private companies that do business here to give the people the benefit of competitive rates.

Mr. Speaker, I have three policies from the people of my Constituency to show what actually has happened to the rates and the savings in premiums since the inception of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. In 1948 insurance premium for a coverage of an \$11,000 store and stock amounted to some \$359 a year. The same coverage with the same general insurance agents for 1959 amounted to only \$180.40 or a saving of some \$178.60 in one year. A similar establishment Mr. Speaker, was insured by the Mutual Company in 1946-47 for \$15,000. The annual premium less dividends refunded amounted to \$327.16. This same coverage with the Government Insurance Office was obtained for \$208, or an annual saving of \$119.16. I have one other example, Mr. Speaker, but I have agreed to share radio time with my colleague on this side of the House, and I think with this I am going to conclude.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, because this budget makes provisions for further increases to education, for public health and welfare, and for necessary services to the people of this province, I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Mr. Arthur Kluzak (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I've had to congratulate you on your election to the high office of Speaker of this House. I'm sure that our selection has proved to be a good one.

I feel highly honoured that the people of the Shaunavon Constituency have elected me as their representative in this Legislative Assembly, and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking all the people who supported me at the polls in the June 8th election. I will assure them that I will endeavour to do my best to serve all the people of the Shaunavon Constituency to the best of my ability.

March 7, 1961

I would like at this time to pay tribute to my predecessor, Tom Bentley, who has represented this Constituency so faithfully for the past eleven years. Mr. Bentley, working with the CCF Government, has done a fine job in promoting the needs of the people of the Shaunavon Constituency, and not only of the Shaunavon Constituency, but in the Province of Saskatchewan, as Minister of Public Health, and Minister of Social Welfare. He has made a great contribution to this province, and I know the people of my Constituency would want me to wish Mr. and Mrs. Bentley everything of the best in their retirement.

The people of the Shaunavon Constituency are among the most progressive in Saskatchewan. The reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that since 1934, except for one break, either all or the major part of the area within the boundaries of this Constituency have been represented in this House by a CCF Member. This means that for twenty-one years, at the expiration of my term, it will be twenty-five years, that is twenty-five out of thirty-one years that we have been on the side of progress. I know that we could have elected a CCF Member in 1938 too, had not the Liberals eliminated the Shaunavon Constituency for their own political gain.

I have lived in this area for over forty years, and I realize and appreciate, along with my people, the fine progress we have made under this Government. I believe one of the most outstanding accomplishments, has been the distribution of power throughout my Constituency. At least 95% of the farmers and ranchers in this area are now being served with power from Saskatchewan Power Corporation. This is a remarkable achievement when you consider that much of this area is sparsely populated. These people can now enjoy the many conveniences which make life in rural areas more pleasant. Not only the rural areas, but it has been a great help to the many towns and the villages and hamlets within this area, some of which had no power at all, and others had a part-time service which was costly and of little or no value, certainly of no value insofar as operating electrical appliances was concerned.

We also appreciate the fine all-weather highways that have been built in my Constituency, replacing the old, unimproved, dirt roads we had prior to 1944. Being situated in an extreme corner of the province, highways are so essential to our economy. J.T. Douglas, the former Minister of Highways, will go down in history in this province as the man who took the Saskatchewan travelling people out of the mud. I know that his successor the new Minister of Highways, has equal ability to administer this

Department, and we can look forward with confidence to continued highway improvement. The grid road program, and road assistance to municipalities have completely eliminated the hundreds of miles of prairie trails, we had in my Constituency, and feared at one time that we would be left with for the rest of our lives.

While we some years experience a shortage of rainfall in our Constituency, I maintain that the farmers of my Constituency produce more pounds of food per capita than any other area of similar size. To substantiate this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote you a few figures on grain handling at different points in my Constituency. The grain handling at the shipping point of Shaunavon on a ten year average has been 1,350,000 bushels a year, on a five year average 1,606,000 bushels a year. The shipping point of Frontier has a ten year average of 696,000 bushels; Climax, which is only eight miles from Frontier, has a ten year average of 547,000 bushels. Last year at Climax there were over 4,000 head of cattle shipped to the co-op shipping facilities, plus the hundreds of head that were picked up by drivers.

This production has been made possible by automation – the use of large power machinery and proper utilization of submarginal Crown Land by the Department of Agriculture. By reclaiming and regrassing this waste land, and leasing it to farmers, it has enabled the farmers to raise cattle, and thereby supplement their income. Also the forming of co-op and provincial pastures has been a great assistance to the farmers in these areas, and thereby, makes their units more economical. While grain yields are some years lower than other areas of the province, we do produce some of the highest quality grain on the Canadian market. Farmers in my Constituency are looking forward to the day, when they will have a Government in Ottawa that will see that they are compensated for the high protein content of their wheat, so essential in the milling of high quality flour.

As in all other grain growing areas of the west, the farmers are being caught in the cost-price squeeze; they must sell their grain far below the cost of production, while paying highly inflated prices for their machinery and other commodities which they must buy. Agriculture being the basic industry, the cost-price squeeze is having its effect, not only on the farmer, but the merchant and the labourer as well. Surely, many of the people who followed Mr. Diefenbaker in his crusade for parity prices, must now be very disappointed, and I know that Mr. Hamilton's

March 7, 1961

tree-planting program will not meet with any approval in my area. The farmers are also experiencing a difficulty in obtaining farm help, due to the Federal Government's policy of not covering this group under the unemployment insurance Act. In spite of pressure that has been brought on the Federal Government, both Liberal and Tories, they have turned a deaf ear to this request, and this is having a very serious effect on farmers and labourers as well.

While agriculture is our basic industry, it is by no means the only industry we have in the Shaunavon Constituency. As you know, after the CCF Government took office, we developed an oil exploration program, which has proved very beneficial to the Province of Saskatchewan. I have in my Constituency, seventy oil wells, either producing or capable of producing oil. This adds not only to the economy of the province, but to the economy of the people in the area as well.

I would like at this time to commend the Minister of Natural Resources and his Department for his program of stocking many of our streams and dams with fish. This is providing excellent recreation for our many sportsmen, and I would like to assure him it is greatly appreciated. It is certainly something new in southwest Saskatchewan.

One of the brightest chapters that has been written in the story of the CCF Government in Saskatchewan is that dealing with health services, for which the people of this province owe a great tribute to Premier Douglas and the CCF Government. Not only the people of Saskatchewan, but people all across Canada. When I think of health services, I think of such programs as free cancer treatment, without which thousands of people would never have availed themselves of any treatment. Thousands of people would have been financially ruined had they had to pay for this costly and prolonged treatment. Free mental health is another program that falls into exactly this same category. Hundreds of people would never have been rehabilitated but for this, and it is available to everyone. We have the Air Ambulance, which is a unique service on the North American continent. It has saved hundreds of lives of critically ill people by fast transportation to major health centres, such as Regina and Saskatoon. It is available to every resident in this province at the astonishingly low fee of \$25.00. I am sure we have all seen this plane pick up mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters, that would never have been reunited with their families, had it not been for the service of this plane. In 1947 the hospital services plan came. It has spoken for itself, to the extent that all other political parties have had to adopt it as part of their program.

Yes, even the Liberals had to do this. Without this plan today, people would be as badly off as they were in the twenties, the hungry thirties, or the early forties. I can recall the days, when families and neighbours spent twenty-four hours a day sitting at the bedside of one who was critically ill and never had any medical or hospital care. Some of these never recovered; others were left chronically ill or disabled. Now we are looking forward to the medical care program. We in the Shaunavon Constituency have removed nearly all the price tags on health care, by being part of the Swift Current Health Region. We didn't do this by any magic process. We did this by electing a Government in 1944 that pledged itself to support a comprehensive medical care program, available to all, regardless of age, physical condition, ability to pay. We know its value by the many grim experiences of the past, the experience of standing at the graveside of a loved one, or a friend, who we knew was there because of the price tag on health services that he or she could not afford to pay. I recall standing at the graveside of a father, who had three sons in the armed services, and was there because he didn't have the price tag for the proper medical care.

We know the experience of going to the municipality and getting an order for medical care, and being told by the doctor that he already had his briefcase full of them, and that they were of no value. The grave experience of not having the price tag for an operation and a special nurse, for a critically ill son, without which he was given but two or three weeks to live. And the joyful experience of a friend winning a sweepstake, and loaning the father money so that he could get these medical services for his son and save his life. What a hope for survival if someone has to draw a horse on an Irish Sweepstake.

I have nothing but praise for the health care we have received under the Swift Current health region since July 1st, 1946. It has made excellent health care available to all of its residents, regardless of age, physical condition, or ability to pay. There are no exclusions, and the patients have the full freedom to choose any one of the forty six doctors within the region. Surely, a much better program than many of the privately sponsored programs, where you are restricted to certain doctors, or have to submit to a medical examination, and be told because of your age, or your physical condition, that you are not eligible. It is true that this region pays for only 50% of the medical bills that are incurred outside of the region. Most of these are for major surgery,

March 7, 1961

which has to be performed in specialized medical centres. We are now looking forward to the medical care program, which will remove this piece of the price tag.

I was pleased to see the brief presented to the Thompson committee by the Swift Current and District Medical Society, indicating that they were satisfied with the operation of the Swift Current Health Region. Certainly, these doctors are held in the highest esteem by the people whom they serve. The fact that there were only nineteen doctors in this region in 1946, and a year and a half later there were thirty-four, and now there are forty-six, would clearly indicate that the plan is acceptable.

The only way that people can be assured of complete health care is under a prepaid, co-operative, socialized plan, whereby the healthy help pay for the sick, and you never know in which group you will fall. It is also the only way the doctors and hospitals can be assured of being paid for their services.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment, but I will support the motion.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to extend my very sincere thanks to the people of Humboldt for electing me and sending me here to represent them. I think those of us who are on the Opposition side often feel on winning an election and finding out that we're sitting in the Opposition, as the man who was tarred and feathered and taken out of town on a rail, when he said, "If it wasn't for the honour, I'd just as soon walk." It's not too pleasant a thing to sit in the Opposition, but I am grateful to the people who had the confidence in me to re-elect me to represent them, not because I made any promises, but because they felt that I thought the way they think, that my principles were their principles, and that they could rely on me to give them the type of representation that they want. I feel very humble and all I can say to these good people, Mr. Speaker, is that I will, to the very best of my ability and with all the strength and intelligence which I may have, try to live up to their act of faith in me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish also to thank the Government and particularly the Minister of Highways for the road work that they have done in my Constituency. I appreciate this sincerely, as do my people. I hope that they will continue to do this type of work and I

hope that we will have paved roads throughout the Constituency before the next election, and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government doesn't see fit to leave it until just before the election, because we need those roads for the next four years. I hope too, that in putting these roads through the Constituency, not only in my case, but in the case of all the other Members, consideration is given to the damage that is done to farmers where roads cut across their farm land. I think this is something that the engineers should well take into consideration, and that where possible, roads be left where they are, straightened out, if necessary, but without causing any more damage than has already been caused to farm land, and to villages and other business places along the way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like very much, and I take great pleasure in thanking you for the marvelous way in which you have discharged your responsibilities. I feel that you have represented this House with great dignity, with graciousness and with fairness, and we are deeply appreciative of this. I would like too, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate all the Members who have spoken, particularly those who have spoken for the first time in this House. I realize what a difficult thing it is to speak in this House, even after you've been on your feet as many times as I have, and certainly the first time is quite a trying situation. They certainly are to be commended for the fine way in which they have discharged their obligation. I am sure their constituents are all proud of them.

Now, a few months ago, my young son came home and he told us that the teacher had told him that he had to go into an execution contest. My husband and I were quite shocked at this and we said, "Are you sure?" He said, "Oh, yes, she said I have to go into the execution contest." It turned out that he meant elocution contest, but you know, I think his teacher had been listening to the Legislature and she had the right word. I have never heard quite so many executions as I have in the last few days. Some of them have been amusing, some of them have been rather depressing, but Mr. Speaker, my radio time is limited and I'm not going to waste any of it on trying to refute some of the foolish statements, some of the maybe sincere statements, but wrongfully made, that have come from your right. I'm going to save that until after radio time.

I want to say this, before I go on to the budget, that I'm very disappointed, Mr. Speaker in not seeing the hon. lady from Regina as one of the

March 7, 1961

Cabinet. Now, I find it difficult to understand why she's not, because certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we have all realized and given her credit for a great deal of ability; certainly she laboured long and well in the vineyards of the C.C.F. Party. Surely, the appointments that have been made are in no way superior. I'm very sorry, I had hoped that if unfortunately this Government was formed by the CCF that at least they would have this good feature about it. However, it is the Cabinet's and the Government's loss and I'm very sorry for it.

I'm rather amused by the change in the seating arrangement, Mr. Speaker. I'm very glad to see the hon. Minister of Agriculture sitting beside the Attorney General because maybe finally he will get a repeal of that terrible law of supply and demand that he's been beefing about for so many years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not joking! I wouldn't put it past the hon. Attorney General to amend that law, or at least to try to. I'm very glad also to see another lady Member in the House; I am glad in the sense that she is a woman. I'm not a feminist; I think men are just fine, but women are just a little better. Now, she has exhibited a great knowledge and wide interest and certainly I have been very impressed with her desire to do something for the world, as she has said on several occasions, out of the House and in the House, that she seeks to represent the women of the world, and I think this is a very wonderful ideal. I have something rather homely though to say to her, and this is something that my husband said to me when I first went into politics; I said to him very happily that we were going to sweep the country; he suggested to me that I start by sweeping the kitchen. Now, that's good advice, not only for ladies, Mr. Speaker, but for all people. It is just a bit of homely advice, I would like the hon. lady Member from Saskatoon, before she changes the world entirely, before she gives us peace, and I'd like that too; but before we do all these great and noble things maybe we should just look in our own backyards and attend to a few things there.

One simple thing would be the terrible condition of the bus depot in Saskatoon, but maybe the hon. lady has been there recently, and I'm going to tell the hon. Minister in charge of that bus depot right now, that if that place isn't cleaned up, and if you don't hire a few people to keep it clean, I will buy a broom and mop and I'll go and clean it up myself. I have

no union card but I have, in spending a few minutes in the place (and that was all I could bear to stand in the place) seen women with little children just dreadfully inconvenienced by the fact that the place is filthy. I don't think this is a good thing for the Province of Saskatchewan, or the City of Saskatoon. Surely, when our Crown Corporation set up a bus depot it should be the best, as the CCF boasted that everything that is socialist, is the best. Let it also be the cleanest. Let people who travel from other provinces not have to step gingerly around, turn up their noses and go and sit in a hotel lobby, until their bus comes in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the budget that was presented to us is, in my opinion, a rather damning indictment of the philosophy of this Government, not because it is a deficit budget, Mr. Speaker. A deficit budget under certain conditions might be necessary, might even be desirable. But the budget that was presented by our socialist Government, in the first place doesn't even aim or attempt to cure the economic ills that are before the people of Saskatchewan today. Second, and this is even worse, that budget reveals to the people of Saskatchewan that the people on your right, Mr. Speaker, and especially the Government Members, hid facts before the election, which are now revealed by this budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't for one moment believe that a Government who had planned, and who has as many economic advisers and planners and experts as this Government, could have been blind to the fact that we were walking into a depression, and into unemployment, and into increased taxation, before the last provincial election. They were either stupid or they had those facts, and I don't think they were stupid.

To take one example of this, Mr. Speaker, let us take that plank on which the hon. Premier, who won this province for the CCF Party, stood – his health scheme. Now you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that this health scheme is not a new thing; it was promised by the CCF Party way back in 1944. It was far more comprehensive than it is now. But, before this last election, the Speech from the Throne, which in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is a document not to be treated lightly – it purports to come from Her Majesty the Queen, from Her Majesty's Government – it purports to honestly set out the plans and aspirations of Her Majesty's Government. This Speech from the Throne last year told us that we were going to have legislation for a comprehensive health scheme. This was greeted with joy by a great

March 7, 1961

number of people. They had a right to rely on that assertion, yet the Government did not bring in that legislation, and to the best of my knowledge, made no apology for it. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, before the election, on TV and on radio, on some platforms, and I don't know where else, the hon. Premier went around saying very definitely, without any visible or noticeable hesitation, that there would be a compulsory health scheme for 1961.

Premier Douglas: — 1962.

Mrs. Batten: — 1961. This was before the election, Mr. Premier, and it is definitely 1961. I have never seen a contradiction of these statements. It was in black and white in every newspaper in the land. "State medicine predicted for 1961"; — "The CCF will implement state medicine in 1961" — "A health scheme for Saskatchewan in 1961". People, Mr. Speaker, obviously believed these assertions; people elected the CCF Government. What do we hear now? Well, it will be sometime in 1962. The last few days we heard it is going to be sometime towards the end of 1962. It will be here, I suppose, sometime before the election, so that another election can be won on this plank.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't think for one moment that this Government can honestly say that they thought they had the resources with which to implement such a health scheme in 1961. How could they? Look at the budget, Mr. Speaker. Where is the money going to come from? There's no answer in that budget for that. Instead, they say that they have an advisory planning committee, and when we asked and finally had tabled the reference which was given, the terms of reference given to this committee, we find, (and the Premier knew this before the election) that the committee was going to decide on the extent of public needs; the committee was going to decide on the people who should be eligible for benefits; the committee was going to decide on the scope and extent of benefits, and the implication of various methods of financing programs of health. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the CCF Party asked the people to vote for them on the basis that they were prepared immediately to implement a health scheme. There was no explanation of the terms of reference; no suggestion that we will wait until the committee comes back, and then we will tell you what kind of a health scheme we're going to have. Oh, no, the way they

spoke, Mr. Speaker, it was cut and dried; it was quite simple; they knew exactly what the people were going to get, and the people believed them. Now, what happened? The election was over and the budget was down. Now the hospitals got orders from these people, saying that they have to cut down their expenses.

Premier Douglas: — No.

Mrs. Batten: — Well, let me read to you from the ‘Leader-Post’ of March 2nd, 1961, where the General Hospital Board was meeting in Regina, and Dr. Brown stated:

“That the directive said that the Government was not prepared to increase its rate of payment by more than 3% over the approved 1960 budget, and would not pick up deficits incurred by increased volume of service or extension of service. The General Hospital had a deficit of \$123,000 last year. It is unrealistic, Dr. Brown said, salaries are going up, other hospital costs are going up, cost of living, everything is going up. If the Government feels this way, we will have to go back to the old system in which accounts are handled through patients; Hospital Services Plan will cover part of the costs but patients will have to pay the rest.”

Mr. Speaker, let me draw your attention to the fact that this budget is not a budget of just an ordinary party or an ordinary Government that sort of goes along and tries to do its best, tries only to give its people security and justice. This is a budget of a socialist Government, a Government that produces paradise on earth. This is the budget of socialist planners; this is the budget that’s going to cure all the ills of the world. Now, Mr. Speaker, how does the harsh reality of this budget compare with those glowing words and those gushing sentiments that we hear across the way? How does it sound when we hear that we have decreased revenues, that we have increased unemployment, and that we have increased taxation? How does the CCF Party measure up against its own socialist ideals? What would an old Fabian socialist say if he came back to visit and saw this socialist paradise? For the socialists have had complete control for sixteen

March 7, 1961

years; they've been able to plan to their hearts' content; they've been able to hire all the experts they want in Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't have socialism, in spite of the Government of Saskatchewan, but neither, Mr. Speaker, do we have good government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I think we need, is not as the hon. Member from Regina says – more planning – what we need Mr. Speaker, is better planning, —

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — . . . not only by governments in their proper spheres, but by business in its proper sphere, by farmers and consumers in their proper sphere, and by individuals, so that they could lessen their own economic burden and provide for social goods for others. Mr. Speaker, that we do not have good government in Saskatchewan, is proven by a number of things. First of all, if we had had a capable Government, a realistic Government, in times of depression such as we are now experiencing, the Government would be in a position not to increase taxes, but to lessen taxes. This is only good economics and certainly we've heard this often enough from these self-styled economists on the other side. Surely increased taxation merely tightens the economy, merely produces more unemployment. Surely, the thing to do in time of depression is to make the economy more buoyant, to lessen taxes. Secondly, if we had a good Government in an underdeveloped province such as ours, where industrially we have not been fully developed, but where we do have rich natural resources, even a national recession should be lessened and lightened here, because we are still in the process of development, because we do have those natural resources, that are needed by other parts of the country and the world. This should take up the slack and the pain of recession. This has not been provided for by our Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan cannot very well boast, as this Government has been doing, that we have less unemployment in Saskatchewan than we have any place else in any other province in Canada. This may be true, Mr. Speaker, but let the hon. Members also admit that we have less employment in Saskatchewan than anywhere else in Canada. Read the statistics, and let us also realize the fact that a lot of the people left this province – (and make no mistake, there are

people still leaving this province; we are still not retaining our natural increase, and during the years of the socialist rule, many people left this province) and these statistics that the people on your right, Mr. Speaker, toss around so gaily about unemployed in other provinces, include our own Saskatchewan boys and girls who left this province and are now away from home, and unemployed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fourth reason that I give to substantiate my assertion that we do not have a good Government is that the Government wants to spend money that we do not think is necessary. Now the money we object to them spending is not, Mr. Speaker, money for schools or hospitals – we urge them to spend more money for these socially desirable ends. We have spoken a number of times and pointed out a number of places where they could use money to good effect for such purposes. Mr. Speaker, the money we object to them spending is not money for productive things, such as Squaw Rapids and other developments. I wish they only had more other developments. What we do object to is the waste of money on frills, on unnecessary propaganda machines, on their self-idolizing tendencies, both as a Government and as individuals. Where, Mr. Speaker, in this socialist paradise are those Crown Corporations that were going to pick up the tab for all our social welfare and hospital services? Do you remember them way back in 1944? My, they were going to pay for everything. We didn't need any taxes at all. Why aren't they picking up the tabs? Why are we today again taxing the poor? Why have you not developed a rich corporation that would look after these social services? This, Mr. Speaker, is why I will support the amendment, and why I will vote against the motion.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Premier can convince me (and he is the Minister in charge of liquor) that he needs a million dollar warehouse in Regina more than the people of Yorkton need a mental hospital in Yorkton, I might change my mind and support this budget. After all, he managed to convince a lot of people that socialism is a sweet lamb and not a materialistic lion that would swallow up and destroy the best in self interest, the best the people have in initiative, the best that they have in self-respect, in dignity and democracy. He convinced a lot of people a few months ago that doctors were an unscrupulous lot of profiteers and capitalists, seeking to keep good health

March 7, 1961

from people. He might convince me; I'd like to see him try!

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in this Session, quite an attempt to make the word socialism respectable. That's quite a job, but you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that last Session, we tried to get these people across the way even to admit that they were socialists, but they just wouldn't admit it and they'd have no part of this debate or discussion. They sat back and waited for the formation of a new party. They didn't want to commit themselves. But, this year, things are a little different. After all, they can sit safely for four years. They're not worried about the people of Saskatchewan. They're trying to attract a lot of socialists throughout the country, therefore, they want socialism to be the badge that they are now going to wear, and I must say that they picked a good sponsor for this. After all, the hon. lady from Regina is certainly very respectable and beyond reproach in her sincerity. I do doubt her objectivity and her analysis.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said on a number of occasions that some socialists mellow, and some just go rotten. I don't think he meant this as a confession. But, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say that any individual went rotten; I would say that socialism is rotting. I say this because it is unreal, an incorrect assessment of human reality. It is a denial of the natural law that every human being feels instinctively, if not through his intelligence. Therefore, I think it is corrupt. This is the type of rottenness that we, as Liberals, oppose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard an awful lot from the Members of the Government, telling the Liberals that we are going right and that we are going left and they seem to be very perturbed about this. This subject of right and left can be fascinating. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time that politicians stopped worrying about going right or going left. I think it is about time that politicians and people in general started worrying about right and wrong – and never mind the right and left.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — I don't know what those words mean, but they mean different things to different people. This was very aptly illustrated the other day – the fact that certain words mean one thing to one person, and another thing to someone else. One of the hon. Members mentioned a red light that Saskatchewan was showing to industry. Now to me, that meant that Saskatchewan said stop. The hon. lady from Regina took that to mean that they were being accused of being Communists. Now, less moral people might have taken still another version of that. Words are funny things; they can be terribly misused, but norms are here to stay. The norm that politicians should adhere to is that of right and wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about a subject that I think is rather important – a personal type of thing. I hate to bring it up, but I have listened ever since I came into this House this Session to attacks on the Leader of the Opposition. This is exactly, of course, what the Premier meant when he said that some socialists went rotten. I don't take kindly to that. One, I think it ill-behooves a man in the Premier's position to make a personal reflection on anyone, because of his position, if nothing else. Secondly, I think it ill-behooves him personally since at least the hon. Leader of the Opposition represented two different parties, on two different occasions, the Premier managed to represent two parties on one occasion, before one election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not the most enthusiastic supporter that the hon. Leader of the Opposition had when he sought leadership in the Liberal Party. In fact, I say this in all humility, that I was a little bitter towards the Liberal majority that elected him leader at our convention. I felt that this man had been exalted by our people over those who had worked long in the Liberal Party in humble positions for the good of the Liberal Party. I was bitter, but one day I heard a sermon. I cannot reproduce it here; it is sufficient to say, that I examined my conscience and I wiped out that bitterness, and because the hon. Members on your right so frequently try to identify their socialism with their Christianity, maybe they will accept at least this authority, maybe it will wipe out the bitterness in their hearts and maybe we won't have to listen to those vicious remarks any longer.

I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker to the parable that was described in this sermon, and it's a parable that I'm sure you will know – that of the prodigal

March 7, 1961

son. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that one son of a father took his inheritance and he wasted it, and finally he got to the point where he had nothing left and he felt forced to sleep with the swine, while the other laboured in his father's vineyards. But when the prodigal son returned, his father was happy and rejoiced, and he honoured him as he had never honoured his other son. The other son of course complained to his father and he said, that although he had served his father well, he had never received this type of recognition. And, I just want to quote – this son said to the father – “but as soon as this thy son has come who hath devoured his substance with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf,” but he said to him, “Son, thou art always with me and all I have is thine, but it was fit that we should make merry and be glad, for this thy brother was dead, and has come to life again; he was lost and is found”.

(Mr. Speaker, I don't know my Scriptures off by heart the way some few people pretend to – I have had to read that part.)

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but be amused at that brash young man from Regina. I'm sorry he isn't in his seat, because I've got a number of things to say about him and to him. Also, brash young Co-operative Minister, who is absent, and I am sorry that he is. I hope they are both at the meeting of the delegates to the trustees convention, and I am sure they will learn more there than they could from me. I hope they're not wasting their time.

But, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it was rather shocking to hear someone who had just been elected tell the Opposition exactly how they should mind their affairs, and what obligations and duties they owe. Now, it is not amazing that the Opposition should tell the Government, because after all, that's what we're here for. The Government is the one that rules and governs; you're the people who make the policies, and carry them out. After all, what strength have we? Why should we be opposed? But this young man spent half an hour of his radio time talking about education and half an hour talking about the Opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that young man's speech was a product of our educational system, and I understand he is highly educated, the time has come for us to take a good hard look at our educational system.

In my five years, Mr. Speaker, I have worked an average of fourteen hours a day during every Session,

and I won't tell you about the work that I've done politically in between Sessions, but we've had either an election or a by-election every single year since I came into politics and I am now running my third automobile motor. I have examined probably over five hundred Bills that came before this House; I have studied them clause by clause; I have read thousands of pages of reports of Government Departments every year; I have studied the expenditures that this Government makes; I have spoken on many of these subjects; I have given all the devotion of which I am capable, to my job, and this is only my fifth year, Mr. Speaker. How does a man like the hon. gentleman who represents Arm River feel, to be told by a young upstart that he doesn't know how to be a Member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition? How does a man feel who has given twenty-seven years of his life to this province and its people, who has worked to protect their interests and to safeguard their freedom? It's rather a bitter thing to have to take. I can only hope that the young man was simply carried away with his own brilliance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's another item that I would like to bring up. I don't like to have my loyalty doubted; I don't like to have an insinuation made that the Opposition Members are disloyal either to Saskatchewan, or the people of Saskatchewan, because we oppose or criticize some of the things that this Government is doing.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — We don't like it either.

Mrs. Batten: — We are doing our duty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we who labour in the Opposition, poverty-stricken as we may be in ideas according to the Members on your right, are every bit as loyal as Members of the Government, who can make their fortune and escape to sunny California.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — It is only because we have respect for the people of Saskatchewan and a real affection for this province, that we continue to work here and continue to work for these people, even though we have to do it in the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking of my own conscience, I am speaking for all the people who sit on this side of the House.

March 7, 1961

Mr. Speaker, to get back to “conscience”, that brings me to a topic on which I had a few remarks to make. I felt generous and I was going to avoid making them.

Premier Douglas: — Please, do . . .

Mrs. Batten: — I think I’ll come back to it, because it is a subject that annoys me extremely. It is nice to talk about how wonderful socialism is, especially the type of voluntary socialism of which the people on your right, I think, know very little, although I did hear a rumor to the effect that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is going to join the Trappist Monastery. Certainly, I don’t know what attitude the Superiors of the Order will take to this.

There is a socialism that is voluntary, and that was practiced by many people. That socialism comes from a feeling of responsibility and real love for one’s fellow beings. That is socialism, where people voluntarily give up their property. They live in a community and labour for the common good, but this, Mr. Speaker, has no relation to the materialistic philosophy of Marx and the people who followed him, the type of socialism that these people on your right would impose on every single person in Saskatchewan, yes, every single person in Canada, if they had the power.

Now, in spite of this fine boasting of morals, that I have heard exhibited, I think that this Government has done and said things that I think are absolutely immoral, and should be pointed out as immoral and should be found disgraceful to everyone as they can possibly be to an individual.

I have heard some of the remarks that the hon. Members have been making. The first one, I have a number of them here, the first one I guess, is just a little funny. This is by the Premier. I was a little shocked, when driving the car one day to hear a newscast which reported that the Premier was so thrilled that the New Party now had a candidate. According to this quotation, I hope it was wrong, but according to this newscast the Premier said that this proves the virility of this New Party; there is an offspring even before the marriage.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this may be virility, but it is doubtful morality.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — I was further shocked to pick up a newspaper and find a report of a meeting that the hon. Premier has had with our Indian citizens. He is reported to have said at this meeting and I find this hard to believe and I hope, that if this is not true the Premier will deny it. I would like to hear his denial, but the report, and I read it in two different places, reports of this meeting with our Indian citizens, the very newest citizens which we have in Saskatchewan. The Premier told them that if they were offered bribes that they should take those bribes, and that they should vote as they wish. Is this morality, socialist or otherwise for a Premier of a province to preach the breaking of the law of this land, and in addition to that to preach breaking the sanctity of a contract? I hear no denial. Maybe this is considered funny, maybe this is the way you people think this is how you should discharge your responsibility to our native brothers. But I still say they are better off, living without our civilization, if this is the type of civilization that we are going to give them, if we are going to teach them to break laws, to accept bribes, to pay no attention to contracts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in addition to this, there are many other things that are too distasteful to go into. Let me refer to one other thing, that not only the Premier, the entire CCF Party is a party to, and this is the attempt by them, as a party and united with the unions, to deal with votes, not on the basis of buying one, but on the basis of buying them wholesale. This might be the co-operative structure, the hon. Minister of Co-operatives was talking about. According to him, you should do everything big now. It is not enough to threaten people, scare people, and tell people that if you are electing an Opposition Member you will not get the roads you want. That is petty stuff for them now, they are in the big league. They are going to buy votes on a wholesale scale, they are going to make their deal with the union boss and get the whole flock at once. It is much simpler that way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, not because I am afraid of this New Party, but I hope that in our British democratic system we never come to the point where we are going to deal with the wholesale sales of votes, to the point where one man or one executive can decide for hundreds of people how they are going to vote, where their political loyalty is going to lie.

March 7, 1961

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I should say a few words about my hon. friend the Attorney General.

Mr. Thatcher: — Smile, Bob!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Please do!

Mrs. Batten: — I know this was a sort of a half deal at the suggestion of one of the Members on your right, Mr. Speaker, that if I keep quiet, the hon. Attorney General would keep quiet, and I said "Yes, I thought I would". But he spoke so I am going to do so too.

The hon. Attorney General, I hate to take after him, although his Department has to be cleaned up a little bit. I am sure he is sort of a helpless individual and I can't help liking him; I don't like to be too hard on him.

The hon. Attorney General, in discussing the law, reminds me of the man, of whom it was said, that he knew the price of everything, but the value of nothing. The hon. Attorney General is so busy running around building monuments to himself, one in Saskatoon and one in Regina, trying to save a dollar here and a dollar there, firing a few people in the court house here, closing down another court house, and putting it in a grocery store, or garage or wherever it's handy, so that you can issue a writ along with a pound of sugar, that he has lost sight of the value of justice and the obligation he has as that Member of the Government, in charge of that Department and I say this advisedly.

When I hear the hon. Attorney General boasting about how many cases the magistrate can put through, I wonder if he realizes that the things being put through are human beings. The hon. Attorney General, I am sure, if anybody could convince him that there was a machine for processing people as to whether they were guilty or not guilty, would go for it in a big way, because he pays so much on magistrates' salaries.

This is a very serious thing, Mr. Speaker and I am not joking when I say that one of the main purposes of the state, of the Government, is to see that the administration of justice is carried out, that people have

security, that the individuals are protected. The English Common Law did not grow out of a desire to be reported or to make history. It grew out of the very best that was in the hearts of men when they thought to protect their fellow citizens. I don't think that this system of justice is to be played with lightly.

I could go through a number of things and try to point out to the Attorney General where he could make improvements, but I don't think I'd get anywhere. The amazing thing is that no matter what happens, the Attorney General is sure that history will always prove him right and I remember another man saying that. He died after a terrible world war. You will remember him when I go through his words and I am not suggesting for one moment, and I want to make this clear, that the hon. Attorney General has anything like that in mind. But it is a dangerous thing to say that history is going to prove you right. I think the best most of us can do, is blunder along and let history worry about itself. But when one sets out deliberately to make history, sometimes one makes for tragedy and confusion.

I have a few suggestions that I have asked the Attorney General to consider before; I'm still going to ask him to consider these. One of these is the question of family courts. The Attorney General announced that he had established such a court. Of course he established a farce, certainly not what I had intended or what anyone else intended when they spoke of family courts. We did not mean just another magistrate operating under the same rules and regulations as everybody else operates under today.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important subject. I have no doubt that our social aid bills, that our mental health bills and our hospital bills could be drastically reduced if we could give families the type of help that they need. When families run into difficulties, and more and more every day in the tension-filled society in which we live are running into difficulties, those families need some outside help. Were these people firm adherents of the Church, that help is perhaps available. A great percentage of those who run into difficulties have no such adherence and have no such faith and those are the families, those are the people and families, who need what I call a family court. Courts, where no one sits in judgment on them, but where somebody is available to assist them with their problems, to explain to them what their difficulties are and show them a way to live together in harmony. This has not been done. There is no provision made for the type of person who is going to carry out these

March 7, 1961

duties and this, Mr. Speaker, is not a loss just in money to the Government and to the Treasury. It is a loss in human value, a loss in suffering, resulting in delinquency and tragedy and illness.

Another thing that I think the hon. Attorney General should consider doing, rather than worrying about mimeographing land title material, would be to set up some type of board that could study the sentences that are being passed out so quickly today. I am not blaming the magistrates personally for this; they are rushed; they have wide territories to cover; they have no personnel to assist them in committing or in deciding not to commit people to prison. This is something that could well be studied and implemented by the Attorney General, if he wants to be justified by history.

Now, another thing, and I could go into detail on this, and this would be a good study for the Attorney General, is a new Election Act. I think we should start talking about that soon. I don't think it is good enough to wait until a few months before an election and then try to implement all these things. I suggest very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that in view of what is happening in our province, in view of the disturbed way that people feel about swearing and putting a ballot into an envelope, that we should try to have some new methods of election, some methods whereby people would feel safe and secure to take such a vote.

I sat for many long hours, Mr. Speaker on the final day, counting the field ballots and I was asked, "Why do your bother, your majority is far better and you don't have to worry about those", and then I felt, Mr. Speaker, and I think a lot of the people here felt, that it is our responsibility as candidates to make sure that every one of those sworn ballots are opened, and without being looked at, put away in the ballot box. This is quite a responsibility, because a ballot should be a secret ballot. Although there was no other Member representing any other political party, I sat there for a long time. I had my two little girls with me, Mr. Speaker, and they were quite pleased with the ballots, they thought an election was a great thing. The returning officer was very kindly allowing them to read the ballots. They did not know how to read those things, but they knew that when the X was in the second line, it was for Mommy and they were quite thrilled, although I was quite shocked, when I got home and they ran up to my husband and they said, "Do you know, Daddy, more people sent Mommy kisses, but they did not sign their names."

I appreciate the confidence of those people, because it is confidence when you take a declaration, sign your name on an envelope and then put your secret ballot inside. There were many people who refused to do this, because they were afraid. I think that is quite an indictment.

What a terrible thing to have people who have lived in a district for sixty years, respected people, people of value to that community, come in and find that they are not on the voters' list and they refuse to take a declaration, because they don't believe that that ballot is really secret, and they're afraid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this should not be. No one should have to be afraid and I think this is something we can start thinking about now. Would it not be advisable if we made the work of the D.R.O. and returning officers a compulsory duty, as we do jury-duty? If we could take the very best people, people who have a conscience, assign those duties without any political consideration whatsoever, and have election machinery set up similar to a civil service such as the civil service in Great Britain, which does not change with the political party, and have these people perform their duties with good information, with efficiency and with the assurance so that people will be protected.

I think this is something we should start considering and I think this would be a good hobby for the Attorney General.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a subject, which I have chosen with some hesitation. I want to say . . . I am sorry, if you are going to make remarks, I wish you would say them louder so that I could hear them . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Then don't . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mrs. Batten: — The faults in this budget, Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out, are mostly faults of omission, rather than faults of commission, and one fault, Mr. Speaker, one glaring omission, is on a subject of what I and many others consider to be wholesale robbery. This is the robbing in Saskatchewan of people who have lost their money through no fault of their own, but because they were anxious to invest their savings and contribute to the development and expansion of industries in Saskatchewan.

March 7, 1961

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the sale of security bonds in Saskatchewan. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I chose this subject with a great deal of anxiety. On the one hand, I don't want to say anything or do anything that will hurt in any way the desire of our people to invest in the future of our province and our country, or hurt the expansion and the sale of reputable securities.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if in the time of danger to the life savings of our people, the Opposition is silent, are we not failing in our duty? I think we would be. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think I can say, without hesitation, that if a Liberal Government had come into power, if the Liberal Party had formed a Government, we would have set up a judicial inquiry or an investigation into the sale of securities, their licensing, and their methods of operation in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we did not form the Government; we cannot do this. Therefore, I am calling upon the people on your right to do their duty and to institute such a judicial inquiry immediately.

I think I can say without being unjust, Mr. Speaker, that frauds have been perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan. They had said, all of them, that no people would lose thousands of dollars to unscrupulous promoters. I think many millions of dollars have been lost to the industrial development of this province, to the security of our citizens, by unscrupulous promoters, and the frauds they have perpetrated. This, Mr. Speaker, was done during the existence of the present Securities Commission which was created to prevent just the kind of thing that happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I read just a few days ago, in the 'Leader-Post', that someone in Saskatchewan was sentenced to two weeks in jail for the theft of groceries valued at a dollar and forty some cents, from a chain store. If this Government can protect chain stores from theft of groceries in that sum, surely this Government is capable of protecting the citizens of Saskatchewan from the theft of their hard earned savings by unscrupulous so-called investment syndicates.

While I don't have to and I don't want to list the names of companies and the people who operated in this province, and may still be operating, I certainly would not want to throw in the innocent with the guilty. I wouldn't want to hurt the name of any reputable group

of people who are working for the good of Saskatchewan or proceeding in a socially desirable fashion. But, Mr. Speaker, let us go into the history of this for just a few minutes. You will remember, that away back in 1956 the Opposition expressed some fear about a business that appeared to be a conspiracy for the taking of money from innocents for investing their money in securities that were being perpetrated only to be a fraud. At that time, and I read here from a clipping in the 'Leader-Post', dated September 26, 1956, the Provincial Secretary, Russ Brown, said in a prepared statement as follows:

“Recently the Commission has engaged the services of a chartered accountant for the purpose of making interim audits with spot checks on the operation of the brokers. Many other safeguards are provided by our legislation.”

He says that it was unfortunate that the term “fraudulent selling” was used in the story stated by the press, because the tone of the report implied that operators in the east walked into Saskatchewan because there was more lenient conditions under which to operate and the Government was not taking adequate steps to safeguard the public interest.

You will remember that every time the subject of trying to protect the public came up, we were accused of putting fear in the hearts of people, we were accused of preventing investments from being kept by Saskatchewan. This was a serious action; this was one we didn't want to be guilty of; we let the matter drop.

In 1957, Mr. Brown, the Provincial Secretary, again said that an investigator and an acting registrar would be added to the Saskatchewan Securities Commission because the appointments were necessitated by greater activities in the sale of securities in the province in line with the increased tempo of mineral resources.

Well, I don't know what was going on in the Securities Commission. I do know, that during those years, people were losing money, or had since lost money that during those years they invested in securities in Saskatchewan. I do know that on February 6, 1960, in the 'Saturday Night' publication, there was a report on investments, syndicates, and securities and things of that nature and it said, speaking of a thing that had been going on in Ontario, that it did not just grow there, it had to be planned carefully by men who knew the business.

March 7, 1961

This is the sort of pattern that might be expected in a security jurisdiction such as Ottawa which had a major stock exchange, stock market and a highly organized industry. But it went on to say this:

“One is thoroughly chilled, however, to discover the same characteristics in a relatively under-developed security jurisdiction such as Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan has no stock exchange, and the security industry might, to a casual observer, seem only loosely organized and irregularly developed.”

Well now, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there was no such loose organization and that the schemes that were being perpetrated were well developed. The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and the Opposition, want to know what has happened, why our people are not being protected, and what is going to happen in the future. I am not interested in personalities, Mr. Speaker, I don't care about crimes of solitary individuals. I am interested in the people of Saskatchewan and the money they might invest in the future, money that could be used profitably to develop this country, or money that can go into the pockets of racketeers. I think the Government has the choice if it wishes and has the courage to take the action.

Mr. Speaker, this matter might have been left standing, with great hesitation, and only with the work the Opposition can do, and you know, Mr. Speaker, how limited we are. Any information we ask may or may not be given to us. I would like to know, for instance, how much money the people of Saskatchewan have put into the pockets of some of these so-called racketeers, through Government Agencies. But when we asked a question on the Orders of the Day as to what firms and persons received loans through the Industrial Development Fund, the answer of the Government is this, “To reveal the identity of the borrower and to make public aspects of their financial position, could prejudice the competitive position of the Industry”, and therefore we are not given the information. We have not even dared to ask about the investments that Saskatchewan Government Insurance might be making with their funds, because we are certain the answer will be refused us.

But the Government is in a position to reveal the facts. In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, we asked (and this is the way the question was worded) the Government to tell us, “the dates the hon. Minister of Education

was chairman of the Securities Commission.” This was a question that was turned into an Order for Return and the answer has not yet been given to this House. I cannot understand that, Mr. Speaker. Surely, if the Government records are so unclear that they don’t know when they had him as an employee, the hon. Minister himself should remember it.

Why are we being denied this information? I would suggest, that with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, this Government and particularly the Premier of the Province, who, it is rumored, might be leaving this province to other fields of endeavour, do so only after an impartial judicial investigation has shown conclusively that no Member of the Government, no employee of the Government, was in any way involved or connected or even guilty of any faults of omission insofar as the sale of the securities and these frauds were concerned.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — This would be good not only for them, and I must admit this consideration is secondary in my mind, but it would be good for the people of Saskatchewan and we would then know that people have some safeguard under the laws and the administration of those laws in Saskatchewan when they come to deal in securities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a distasteful subject and certainly not one that I or any other Member would bring up, if we could do this type of investigation on our own. We have neither the information nor the right to call witnesses, nor the ability to ferret out the facts, not only of one dereliction but of the whole picture as it existed in Saskatchewan and as it is going to exist in the future.

This condition, Mr. Speaker, is aggravated by the fact that the only Chairman we have had in the Securities Commission who appeared to engage actively in his duties has now resigned. Surely, the record would indicate that there are as many people registered as brokers and salesmen, corporations, with the Securities Commission today as there were in the past. Surely, the good sense of the Government should indicate that to protect the people of Saskatchewan we need a Chairman who can take this post seriously and has the knowledge and the information and the ability and the training to discharge his duties properly.

March 7, 1961

Yet, the hon. Attorney General says that no successor has been named. He says that Mr. Cameron is leaving for sunny Vancouver and that is an odd expression . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Victoria.

Mrs. Batten: — Victoria, he says. According to the press release, (now let me make this exactly right) Mr. Walker says, “That Mr. Cameron had first said he wanted to leave his post about one year ago, but he had talked him out of it.” Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a year in which to find a successor to Mr. Cameron, but we do not appear to have such a successor. The people of Saskatchewan are uneasy. I think that the only way this uneasiness can be stilled, the only way our investments can be secured, the only way people who are operating properly can be protected, is to have an additional inquiry of the type that I have suggested and only the Government can initiate such an inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Until this is done, until this Government has shown that their planning has resulted in some good for the people of Saskatchewan, I cannot support the budget, I can support the amendment.

Premier Douglas: — Before the hon. lady Member sits down, may I ask her a question? I am sure she did not want to mislead the House when she spoke on a question asking when the present Minister of Education was Chairman of the Securities Commission. I think she will find that the question was of necessity converted to an Order for Return, because it asked since July 1944: “Who were the persons who have occupied this position and since July 1944 who were the persons who have been legal counsel”. Surely the hon. lady Member will admit that that is not the question that she has indicated at the question asked.

Mrs. Batten: — Is that the only question, Mr. Premier? I understood there was a question asked more directly.

Premier Douglas: — This was the only one I could find. You may be right.

Mrs. Batten: — I think there was perhaps another one, I am not sure, but I think there was.

Premier Douglas: — You should be, before you make a statement.

Mr. Ian H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, before I get involved in this budget debate, I should like to congratulate the Member from Nipawin on his maiden speech. I notice he is not here at the present moment, but I would like to congratulate him anyway. He was so humble and sincere in his observations that I don't really think that he is a socialist. I wondered after he had finished his talk if he really knows what kind of an outfit he has gotten himself into.

I might make a short comment, Mr. Speaker, on the speech of the new Minister of Education, it was, as far as I could see, like sending a boy on a man's job. I hope for the future of the Department of Education, that the Minister will learn more about education than he learned about the health plan, or the so-called health plan.

He made reference to the Power Corporation being eventually owned by the people of Saskatchewan. In the great distant future this may be so, but I wonder how the S.P.C. would fare, or how many farmers would be able to pay, if they had a couple of dry or hard years in this province? As far as rural electrification in Alberta is concerned, and this is done by a private enterprise, by the Calgary Power Corporation, recent reports indicate that three out of four farms in that province are served with power. There are approximately 53,000 farms electrified at present, in Alberta, as against some 55,000 in Saskatchewan. Not bad for private enterprise. The power costs are approximately 30% higher here in Saskatchewan, and the reason can't be that hydro power is always cheaper than thermal power. I quote from the Calgary Herald, of March 18, 1919, and it says:

“Here by far the cheapest power in Alberta today is that which we get from the Waplum Gas Fire Steel Plant. In 1962, that plant will switch over to using coal as fuel, and then produce power even more cheaply than it does now.”

Could it be that the Government operations are more costly, and that some parts of the operation are inefficient? I hope the Minister can answer these questions when he takes his turn to bat.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to discuss the minerals in this province once again. In the February 9th issue of the “Leader-Post,” there appeared on page 21 a headline. “Proposed Change in Mining Regulations said Ridiculous”,

March 7, 1961

and in smaller block letters “Mining circles condemn Saskatchewan change.” Having driven out the oil and gas exploration in this province, these masterminds now want to drive out the mining operations as well. One would think by this time that the Government would use a little common sense with the mining industry, but no, apparently not, and I quote further; according to the “Northern Miner,” a newspaper published in Toronto for the mining industry:

“That’s an example of bureaucracy at work, a backward step, utterly ridiculous, down right silly,”

and these were some of the comments which that publication made. Now further quotes in that issue of the “Leader-Post,” which I referred to a few moments ago were that:

“From an exploration standpoint the most harshly criticized feature of the proposed legislation is the issuance of permits to tie up areas from 36 to 500 square miles. Such permits would be issued for a fee of \$25.00, an annual rental of 2¢ an acre, and a \$25,000 cash deposit undertaking to carry out a minimum of \$30,000 work during the first year. To retain the claim \$45,000 of work would be needed in the second year, and \$60,000 the third year.”

Now, as I said before, this Government should be doing their utmost to attract industry to the province, and yet they come with regulations or propose regulations that will tend to drive these miners away in no uncertain terms.

Another feature of the proposed changes, was the high royalties that they would be required to pay and more, but I don’t want to take the time of the House to read all this stuff, but it is quite easy to find it if you just get that copy of the paper. We talk about this mad-man Castro from time to time, but he has nothing on this Government when it comes to doing crazy things, Mr. Speaker.

I have gotten a real revelation since coming to this House, in the way that some of the Government Departments were set up. I was particularly interested in the health regions – once again I see that the Minister has left us and he is not going to be here to hear this. I find that in the set up of these health regions they seem to revolve around Weyburn, down in our corner. Now, Weyburn is not situated anywhere near the centre of our health region, it’s situated in the far northwest edge

of it, and yet the regional offices were set up there. This was not anywhere near the geographical centre, and it certainly wasn't logically picked out when they chose Weyburn for their office. I hope that former Members from Souris-Estevan kicked up a fuss when they were set up, and I also hope that the people who were paying the shot kicked up a fuss. When I think of the number of cars that are involved and used by these people who have to travel the length and breadth of that health region, I can't help but criticize the Government for all the waste that takes place, the waste of time, the waste of gasoline and the waste of money. I can guarantee that if this was private business trying to operate in this way, the shareholders or the owner would soon fire the manager. The same thing goes for the regional hospitals. I can only say that Estevan was once again robbed. This Government treats us like a foreign country.

When one looks at the area, Mr. Speaker, served by the regional hospital, and then looks at where it is located, I say that it stands out as a monument of political stupidity. Again I am wondering why the former Member did not put in a strong bid to locate the regional hospital in Estevan, where it should have gone. They are the geographic centre of the entire area. Weyburn is not the centre of the universe, it's not the centre of Canada, it's not the centre of Saskatchewan and it's not the centre of our health unit. Right now I am going to point out that Estevan needs between twenty and thirty hospital beds. Where are we going to get the help to get this addition to our hospital? I can say right now that we can consider ourselves very lucky to have St. Joseph Hospital located there. If it were a union hospital our taxes would be five or six mills higher at the present time. In the budget brought down recently, there is no provision for money for the real needs of the people, and I think that hospitals are one of these real needs. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that this is not, to my way of thinking, humanity first.

When I think of the social welfare offices the same thing applies. The offices are located, again, in Weyburn. Now when employees have to travel all over a health unit, such as we have, you can see that there is nothing productive taking place when these people are driving around the country in cars, and once again I say that these things should have been located in Estevan which is the centre geographically. No, I'm afraid that this Government (and posterity will even wonder of the sanity of this body) should hang its head in shame. You know, Mr. Speaker, Weyburn would have dried up long ago if it hadn't been the Premier's Constituency, and that

March 7, 1961

I am sure of.

There is more taking place in this southeast corner, and I think that the rest of the province should know about it and compare notes. For example, the Land Titles Offices have been moved from Moosomin and Arcola. I know that the Attorney General is not a very practical man, he can't be, because if he was he wouldn't take these services from the people in the rural areas. A farmer who once could travel thirty, forty, or fifty miles to get to the Land Titles Office, will now have to travel one hundred, two hundred and two hundred and fifty miles to get to Regina to get to the Land Titles Office, and I think that these services, once they are removed, can never be taken back. Centralizing everything in Regina and Saskatoon is drying up the small towns in the country.

Now, I am going to ask – and if he is not here he is not going to hear this so I hope that somebody tells him – I was going to ask him what he is going to do about these employees who have to move? The employees at the Land Titles Office at Arcola, for example, (I know more about that one) when they have to move who is going to buy their houses from them – on a depressed market? (There will be four or five of them.) It won't be easy for these people to pick up and relocate in Regina, and so I think that the Government should take this into consideration and try and alleviate these people's needs when they have to move. The town of Arcola itself will certainly miss the payroll that was coming in there, with the five or six employees that they had, and the whole southeast corner of Saskatchewan will miss the Land Titles Office. It is absolutely ridiculous to say the least. I think that the Attorney General's Department has gone sort of power hungry, and maybe worse, maybe a little mad.

Mr. Speaker, these small towns in the rural areas and everywhere don't like the way that they are treated and this Government will find out in three years time. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell the Government to enjoy the fun because it's not going to last very long.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk on one more thing here, and that's the hospital tax collections. At the present time these taxes are taken up by the municipal and the city staffs, and I can speak for my own Constituency because I know what I am talking about. At the present time we get approximately 3% of the hospitalization tax collected. Now this was fine when the hospital tax was taken up on a yearly basis, but now it's gone to four times a year, and 3% is not going to

cover the costs of our taking this collection up. It should be 6%, and the time and the work required now has certainly gone up four times. Next year the tax can be taken up on a monthly basis, and the cost will go up twelve times. I don't know what the Government plans are in these regards, but if they are not prepared to pay the municipalities and the cities 6% for these collections, then I say set up the collection agencies yourselves.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we have in Estevan a big Court House, a big empty Court House. The Government has a license bureau there where they sell licenses for cards, and I suggest that it won't be too much more trouble for them to set up the hospitalization tax collection agency at the same time. Better still, since there isn't much activity around our Court House these days, I would suggest to the Government to let the City of Estevan have it for a dollar a year, which is what they have done in Shaunavon. We can put the building to good use. I was informed by the Government the other day that we get no taxes for this building and no grants, so since we have supplied fire and police protection for all these years I don't think that a dollar a year would be too much for it.

Now, there is one section of the budget that is really going to hurt in Saskatchewan, and that is the increase in the diesel fuel tax, and this is particularly going to affect our local service stations. It's bad enough to have the load limits on our trucks 10,000 lbs. below the sister provinces, but when you raise the fuel tax it makes us wonder about the sanity of this Government once again. We have lost millions of dollars to the United States already, because the trucks choose to go around Saskatchewan, and they go down through Manitoba, through Montana and North Dakota, and the Trans-Canada truckers will naturally by-pass Saskatchewan because they know now they will have not only lower load limits, but also an increase in gasoline. Any diesel fuel distributor would do well to set up on either boundary of Saskatchewan, so that they can sell gasoline and diesel fuel to the truckers as they drive right through, if they do come through. That's not all, the trucker who does business entirely in Saskatchewan is the one that is really going to take it in the neck, if he stays in Saskatchewan. The increased cost of the tax on diesel fuel will be put directly onto the goods that he hauls, and once again the working man will be paying the shot.

Mr. Speaker, this is another blow to Saskatchewan. I don't know how the Government can talk about attracting industry on the one hand, and then pulling stunts like this on the other.

March 7, 1961

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are frequently asking for suggestions from this side of the House, and I am going to come up with a suggestion which they might consider, and possibly follow, and that is, I would like to bring before this House the subject of Sunday sport. I am speaking personally and not particularly for the Party which I represent, but I believe that the time has come, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan should legalize Sunday sports. After all, people curl on Sunday, they golf, they swim, play tennis, skate and so on, and as I see it that once a person has fulfilled his Sunday obligations, we should make it possible for him to relax and enjoy Sunday sports as well. I think that Saskatchewan should step out and modernize their thinking. In a city such as Estevan, or any other city for that matter, it would certainly give a boost to hockey or baseball on Sunday, if the people could go out and see these games. At the present time it can't be done, and because it costs a lot to operate these teams, if they had Sunday sports where they could charge people for getting in, it would certainly make a difference. Mr. Speaker, this is something that should be looked into soon, so we can keep in step with the rest of Canada, and I see that many other provinces are now looking at this, and I think that we can show progressive thinking if we step out and take a look at Sunday sports.

I support the amendment, but I can't support the motion.

Mr. Allan L. Stevens (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time in this House, may I add my sincere congratulations to the many that you have already received, on your appointment to this Assembly. Yours is a most difficult task, and already you have had to demonstrate your ability and impartiality. I know you will continue to do so. Even this early in the Session, because of your difficulty at times in keeping the Members in order, I felt sometimes that an expression of sympathy might also have been tendered.

First, I want to take this opportunity to express the gratitude of all the people in the Rosetown Constituency in appreciation for the services rendered to that Constituency and to the province in general, by the Member who preceded me in this seat, and who served for sixteen years as the Minister of Highways in this province, the Hon. J.T. Douglas. Mr. Douglas was the first Cabinet Minister ever to represent the Constituency of Rosetown in all the years since it was formed in 1912. I can very well remember how proud we were in 1944, not only to have a new Government, but to have as our representative in that Assembly, a man in a cabinet position for the first time as the Minister of Highways in Saskatchewan.

Of course, we were very expectant of that new Government at that time, as it was the first socialist victory in Government on the North American

continent. The events of the succeeding 16 years have lived up to our highest expectations and have gone far beyond. I don't think that anyone at that time would have had the optimism to predict that electric power, natural gas, paved highways, cheaper insurance, grid roads, or prepaid hospitalization, in addition to many other advances, would be made available to the farming community by that Government in such a short space of time.

Mr. Douglas, on his part was able to direct the construction of more miles of highways, as well as their proper maintenance, and the construction of bridges that go with such a program than had been done in the previous 40 years of old party rule.

Speaking of it on a dollar basis, there had been only \$97 million spent on roads in all the years prior to 1944 since the province was formed in 1905. Thirty-two and one-half million dollars of this was still on the cuff and still had to be paid for. During his term of office, the Highways Department spent over \$240 million on roads, and also paid off part of that old debt. In other words, in 16 years over three times the amount was spent as the old parties meted out in forty years. This is an amazing record and one that J.T., as he has been affectionately known in our community in order to distinguish him from the Premier, must cherish with a great sense of pride in his retirement. And because of his efficiency, honesty, and organizational ability, no highways department in Canada ever produced more roads for the taxpayers dollar than he did. This however, was not in my opinion the most important service that he rendered to this province during his term of office. He was able to do something even more revolutionary than supervising the actual construction of good highways in Saskatchewan.

In 1944, the highways system of this province consisted of bits and pieces of dilapidated roadways that began here and there and ended anywhere, as previous governments had only proceeded with construction in those areas where it was thought it might produce some political advantage. Contracts for road construction were handed out on a constituency basis according to the way that area had voted in the last election. Consequently, it was seldom possible to travel from one city to another on the same class of road, and you were always afraid that the road might peter out entirely in some rival constituency.

March 7, 1961

Mr. Douglas began his first organized network of highways that were to link every city in the province with one another by a dust free road. Roads were built according to traffic need and necessity for the first time in Saskatchewan's history. A plan was made for highway construction to serve the needs of the motorists and the people of the province, rather than the political aspirations of a party. This was a revolutionary change indeed, for the people of Saskatchewan and one that will be appreciated for many years to come.

At a banquet held in his honour in Rosetown, last July, he was asked at what time during his life he first realized that in order to correct the corrupt conditions that were preventing the farmers and workers from receiving adequate services for the money they were paying, he would have to organize and support a political party that would be democratic and faithful to their trust when elected. He replied that it had been in 1919 that he first took action in that direction by working in a political way in the Municipality of Harris. That is the one in which I now reside, and I have since told him that it would have been impossible for me to give him any assistance in that year for a very good reason, because that is the year in which I was born and I didn't arrive until late in the year.

I think this does illustrate rather forcibly that his work has been over a period of years, equal to the age of the average voter now residing in this province, and for their entire lifetime he has been trying to improve the conditions that would make life more enjoyable and abundant for all the people in Saskatchewan. He was able to assist this Government to come a long way in this direction by having a hand in the many humanitarian programs that were introduced and enacted in his term of office. He has also indicated that it will be a proud day for him as well when the Medical Care Plan is in force, thereby completing another program for which he worked so hard to lay the foundation. Mr. Douglas is still in Regina a great deal of his time and still takes an active interest in the affairs of this province. I am sure that I have the support of this House when I wish for him and Mrs. Douglas, who has shared with him his joys and troubles during all the years, much happiness and enjoyment in their retirement from public life.

The Town of Rosetown in my Constituency will

celebrate its Fiftieth Anniversary this summer on June 25th to 27th, and I want to take this opportunity to invite the Premier, the Cabinet and the Private Members on this side of the House, and more especially the Members from the other side of the House to this celebration. The reason I want to extend a special invitation to those on the far side of the House is that last July I attended the Fiftieth Anniversary celebration of the Town of Outlook, which is the other large town in my Constituency, and the Conservative M.P., Mr. Cooper was there, but there was no representative from the Members on the Opposition side of the House in attendance. As this was a Jubilee celebration, great tribute was paid to the pioneers of that area, and machinery and relics of the old times were on display and in action everywhere. I think it would be very fitting if all the relics of the pre-1944 days were there, to show the younger generation just what their forefathers had to put up with in those trying times. It is certainly within the realm of possibility that in spite of the odd injection of different blood, there might not even be a trace of these relics of the past for the 75th Anniversary in 1985 of these two towns.

I would also like at this time, to extend my congratulations to the new Minister of Highways, the Member for Melfort-Tisdale, on his appointment to this office. While the Highways Department is now a very efficient and well organized branch of the Government, the challenge to them and to the new Minister will still be those twin plagues of the prairies, long distances and sparse population, which, combined with a period of recession and therefore shrinking funds available for this purpose, will provide an opportunity to exercise their best abilities in the operation of this department. The Hon. Minister, I am sure, will rise to this challenge and provide excellent service in this position, as he has in the Department of Public Works.

I do hope, however, that I have not created in his mind the impression that all the roads in my area are up to the standards they should be, and all that is now needed is proper maintenance. I would like to join with the Member from Meadow Lake, who spoke recently, in his request for a dust free surface on the No. 4 Highway that extends from Swift Current to Meadow Lake through Rosetown and Biggar. This is a very important north and south highway, and while it is in a reasonable condition from Swift Current to Rosetown, from that point north I think it should have an oiled surface as soon as the funds of this

March 7, 1961

province will permit. Traffic from the south west corner to the north west corner of the province, or vice versa is always high on this road, and together with the traffic from southern Alberta and the tourists from United States in the summer months, make this a much used road. When to this is added the ordinary traffic of the area it traverses, a gravelled surface is just not adequate to meet the present days needs. The people of my Constituency look forward to a dust free surface on this road in the future as part of an improving highway system.

In this new budget, the increase provided for grants to education of some \$3 million will be welcome news in my Constituency. Having been a school unit trustee for three years, I have had the opportunity to view at first hand the large budgets that are necessary, in order to provide for the educational needs, and the increased services that are now considered essential in this field. This increase in grants will provide some relief from the rising mill rate that has been of some concern to the municipal taxpayers. While \$3 million higher will not be high enough to satisfy all the education officials, nevertheless, it is interesting to note that this amount, that is the increase in school grants this year alone, is larger than the entire amount of grants paid out in 1944. Only two and three-quarter million dollars were paid out in total in the last years the Liberals were in office. This comparison gives a good idea, how fast and how far, grants to education have been increased in this province since the C.C.F. came to power. As the Minister has already mentioned, they now total over \$31 million. However, in spite of these large increases in school grants, mill rates have gone up. The reasons for this are numerous. First, there is the extra cost due to inflation; everything has gone up in price tremendously in the last ten years, and school costs are not immune to this rise. Removal of price controls by the Liberal party in 1946, contributed a great deal to this rise. Secondly, school standards have gone up and extra services included. School costs now include the cost of transportation to the school by bus in many cases instead of the parent providing this out of his own pocket as he had in former years. Composite schools with auditoriums are, of course, more expensive. Thirdly, school populations have gone up in many units, because there are more children in the same area, and because they stay in school longer. This has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in assessment, because the

assessment on land is the major portion in a rural unit, and this has changed very little in recent years. Fourthly, new construction costs have increased enormously, because of the present day inflated construction costs, and because of higher standards of construction now. More classrooms are needed to accommodate the increased enrolments, and more are needed because of the relocation of classrooms from one-roomed country schools, to multiple-roomed schools and towns and villages.

All these costs have been beyond the control of school officials, and also beyond the control of the Provincial Government. All that can be done from a provincial level is to increase the grants to the school authorities as quickly as possible, and this it has been doing.

This Government is to be commended for bringing down a budget that provides for 10% increase in school grants, in a year when budget revenues have been in a decline.

The Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch made a tactical error, I thought, when he brought up the subject of municipal grants. I notice all the old Members leave this subject strictly alone, if possible. The Member from Canora has covered the huge discrepancy between past Liberal grants to municipalities in comparison to the present day grants extremely well, as have some other Members, and I do not wish to add very much more to that. There is another more sinister aspect to this comparison between the difference in the treatment of municipalities by political parties that has not yet been mentioned. In answering a similar wild charge about a municipality in my Constituency, records were traced back to 1930, and while we knew that there was a great difference between C.C.F. and Liberal grants, in this case \$1,139 in nine years of Liberal rule, against \$19,884 under nine years of the C.C.F. rule. It was found that even in 1931 and 1932, in the depth of the depression, the Anderson Government had supplied \$3,600 to this municipality in grants. What could be more damning than to find that the Liberal Government had not even been half as generous as the Conservatives in the middle of the dirty thirties.

It has also been a source of satisfaction to me to see that funds have been made available for the continuation of programs such as the extension of natural gas to as many towns and villages as funds will

March 7, 1961

permit. Perhaps one of the main reasons why I make a plea that the natural gas program should be extended as quickly as possible is because in my Constituency some of the small villages and the town of Rosetown have been blessed with this improvement. I say blessed because it is only those who have received this convenience that can really appreciate its many merits and advantages, and can realize how beneficial this program has been to them.

Any student of economics, or anyone who has studied the actions of private gas companies in other provinces, would quickly realize that this convenience would never under a private enterprise, be made available to the small villages that are slightly off the direct route of the pipeline from the gas fields to the major cities, as are many of the villages that do now have gas in my area. They would never have received natural gas because the margin of profit in these small operations, considering the pressure-reducing stations that are necessary in each case, would not be large enough for them to invest and satisfy their money-hungry stockholders and they, of course, are not concerned about the needs and wishes of the people in those places as the Power Corporation of a government must be.

These villages, and the Town of Rosetown, all have natural gas because the Government of this province instituted a program of service at cost to as many of the people as it was economically possible to serve, bearing in mind the financial position of the province's treasury. The only disadvantage has been that the other villages and the town of Outlook have been able to see at first hand the many advantages and the large savings that can be made by the use of this commodity. They are, of course, quite anxious to have this commodity extended to their area as quickly as it can be made available, and they have so indicated on many occasions.

This gas program, along with those in connection with electricity, insurance, and hospitals, are the type that a Provincial Government can best co-operate with the farmers to the advantage of the whole province. These are the types of programs that have meant so much to the farmers, and they would not have been implemented under any other than a C.C.F. Government. Unfortunately for the farmer, however, these programs only provide the most efficient services at the smallest cost for the money they have

to spend, and their greatest difficulty has been that their income has not kept pace with the rising costs in the country as a whole

Unfortunately too, their income is almost completely dependent upon export markets and trade conditions, and these are under the jurisdiction of a Federal Government who have not yet exhibited any desire to change the trend established by past governments for still more and more tariffs and trade restrictions.

Unfortunately too, no matter how small a percentage of a farmer's total production is exported, the price received for this small portion controls the price for his entire production even in the domestic trade as well. The domestic price of grain has always been determined in this way, and now we find that the price of livestock as well is almost entirely dependent upon the prices received for similar products in the United States. What the farmer receives for his products, is beyond the jurisdiction of a Provincial Government, and the farmers now are very much aware of it. In the provincial field therefore they must look for savings in costs rather than increases in income, and these programs I have mentioned are doing just that.

This is only half of the problem, however, in the cost-price squeeze that has such a disastrous effect upon the farms, and to correct anything in the other half, in the income part, they must look farther afield.

If the farmers of this province had only to look to the recommendations made by the party of the Members opposite to help solve this problem, the outlook would be extremely grim indeed. An examination of their record and past performance while in office would provide even more pessimistic reading. Most farmers have realized that something more must be done to assist them in this difficulty, and have they been thinking in terms of joining with labor in the hope that something could be done in this manner to solve their many problems. The statement has often been made that the farmers' interests would not be well served by such an alliance, and that labor is working in the other direction. This is not in accordance with the facts or with the direction which they are even now proceeding. Tariffs have always been our greatest problem in the west, and labor has come

March 7, 1961

to realize this too.

The 'Leader Post', in an editorial of February 7th, 1961, has this to say in this regard:

“In its submission last week to the Senate Special Committee on Manpower and Employment, the Canadian Labor Congress ranges organized labor on the side of forces which recognize that import restrictions, tariffs and quotas, have lost what potency they may have possessed in the last century to encourage the growth of secondary industry. As national policy in today's world, the C.L.C. in effect claims protectionism inevitably will work against Canada finding the broader world markets it needs for its industrial growth.”

Now I'm sure, that the hon. Members in the Opposition will agree that no one can quote a more reputable source than an editorial of the 'Leader Post', and when they claim that organized labor is on the side of the farmers, in asking for lower tariffs on imports, it certainly must be true. We have heard a great deal of supposition on what an alliance between farmers and organized labor will do for this country, with disastrous results for the farmer predicted, but I don't think there is any need for supposition, Mr. Speaker. Why not look to other countries who are now doing that very same thing, and see how they have fared there?

The 'Financial Post', a very reputable paper, each week carried a section of its edition devoted entirely to a report about what is happening in other parts of the world. In its edition of October 8th, 1960, it carried a feature story on Sweden by a reporter who studied the country at first hand, Mr. Dalton Robertson, Associate Editor of the 'Financial Post'.

Sweden is a country with a climate similar to ours, seven and one-half million people, 15% of which are farmers which compares to the percentage of farmers in Canada, and this is what he writes about the country;

“Sweden is caught up in a boom that will push all sectors of its economy to a new record this year. In this prosperity which is already swelling the value of Swedish Canadian trade, lie opportunities for

Canadian businessmen. But the Swedes' way of arranging their economic life also deserves the thoughtful attention of Canadians. Sweden appears to have accomplished the impossible. Full employment in a welfare state, stable living costs, the highest standard of living in Europe, exports that are competitively priced, peace on the labor front. What accounts for these achievements? The Special report provides some answers.

And a little further on, this paper quotes:

“Labor organizations and the Social Democratic Government, which has held power over the last three decades, are linked very closely together. Labor organizations and its members contribute heavily towards its election expenses. Union members constitute the bulk of the Social Democrats' registered membership. Both labor organizations and the S.A.F. place responsibility for controlling inflation squarely on the shoulders of the Government, which alone has the power to tax, budget, control money, stimulate and deflate the economy. The price is perhaps an economy more closely managed than any other that mixes free enterprise and a form of welfare state.”

Now let me read a little further to see how this has panned out.

“Booming Sweden producing to capacity, production up 7%, exports ahead 17%, unemployment less than 1% of work force. The current pace of business in Sweden and Swedish confidence about the future throws into sharp relief today's lag-along rate of economic growth in North America, and the concern in Canada and the U.S. about short term prospects. At the moment, Sweden's economy is operating at capacity levels. Further expansion of Swedish business is hobbled by a shortage of labor, and until new capacity under construction is ready to roll, the heady pace of recent output gains may have to slow down somewhat.”

This is the type of situation. Sweden has, with this type of Government, a Social Democratic party

March 7, 1961

in control, heavily financed by labor, an economy that mixes free enterprise with a welfare state, and now how have the farmers fared in this situation? I would like to read on a little further and read what it says about the condition of the farmers, from this paper.

“Government and agricultural organizations hammered out a new deal for Sweden’s farmers in 1959 that has until 1965 to run. Its aims: To bring average farm income up closer to the average pay that is received by the industrial workers in the lower wage groups, but it is being done by turning Sweden’s agricultural industry into a high price level industry, which, in effect, levies the equivalent of a 4% sales tax on Swedish consumers. Part of the cost of Sweden’s current farm policy has been to create a price level for Swedish farm foodstuffs, well above world prices, and about 10% higher than British prices alone. Swedish economists decide what farm prices must be, give an expected output to give the farmer a fair return vis-à-vis his industrial counterpart. Whatever the outcome Sweden’s agricultural policy over recent years has achieved some results that other countries with other policies might well envy. Some success in farm rationalization as an example, bigger and more economic farms, increased self-efficiency in the production of farm products, increased farm cash income, and a smaller gap between industrial workers and farmers, few surpluses and control over those that exist and fewer marginal farms and more low quality land turned over to pasture or reforestation. As well as using these price supports to achieve higher farming income, the Swedes are also pursuing an active farm rationalization program. The main features: subsidies for the small farmers in the far north, to encourage local self-sufficiency in potatoes, milk, and fresh produce, special grants to smaller farms in the south – not enough to discourage the farmers from giving up uneconomic farm units, but enough to help them eke out a living if they have no alternative, and encouragement to farms to merge small holdings into larger units, and to improve all land and stock. This is done through various grants.”

This is the way that a Social Democratic Party, supported by Labor, has used the farmer minority in that country. It certainly doesn't sound like abuse to me. Wouldn't the farmers in this province prosper if it were possible to receive even world prices on a free trade basis for all their products, let alone well above them as they have done in Sweden.

The farmers of this province have subsidized Canada's economy by high tariffs and quotas on imports for years and years, and now by new regulations of the Wheat Board, feed mills are asking farmers to take even less than the world prices for grain. The obvious conclusions therefore must be that the farmers in order to beat the cost-price squeeze, must support a budget such as has been brought down here, to avail themselves of the opportunity to receive the services they need, at the lowest possible cost, through government-planned programs, such as has been provided for. This they must do to hold down their costs.

In order to combat the other half of their problem, the cost-price squeeze, they must work with labor in order to attain that fair share of the national income that is their right.

Therefore, I will support the main motion, and vote against the amendment.

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all, to thank the people of Saskatoon for re-electing me for the fifth time in this Legislature. This is indeed a great honour, and I do appreciate the confidence that the people of the City of Saskatoon placed in me. I particularly would like to thank the women-folk of the City of Saskatoon, especially the young mothers. I think they appreciate the medical needs, and they really worked hard to re-elect this Government and have a comprehensive medical program, which they know that this Government will bring in.

It was a very good campaign Mr. Speaker, and the Liberal candidates made a very formidable showing as I stated before, the best they have made for some years, and I prophesy it will be the best that they will make for a good many years to come, in Saskatoon.

March 7, 1961

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because in talking to most people, I think the Liberal Party reached its ultimate low following the pipeline scandal. I think they could have maybe lived out the pipeline scandal – the people's memories are pretty short – but I think most decent people are not prepared to forget or to forgive this Party's despicable disregard for the rights and privileges of a democratic Government, and I find that most decent people, knowing that the Leader of the Opposition was a member of that Government, and did not protest its conduct at that time, the people are not prepared to trust the leadership of this province to his hands.

Mr. Speaker, before I continue . . .

Mr. Speaker: — It now being 5:30, I will leave the Chair until 7:30.

The Assembly resumed at 7:30.

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer. He has brought down a budget which contains many features which I am sure the people of my Constituency would want me to support. The city of Saskatoon for the past years has enjoyed a boom in construction and the Government has played a large part in bringing this about. For instance there was the extensive additions to the Cole Power Plant, the \$40 million new Queen Elizabeth Power Plant, the Telephone Building, new Court House, Power and Government Insurance office, and of course, there has been the tremendous construction program on the university campus. There will be a considerable extension to the university before it is finally completed. All this has meant jobs, and jobs mean pay rolls which are spent with the business men of Saskatoon. Besides this many other industries have been kept busy by this immense construction program.

There is still a great deal to be done in the university grounds, and we will look forward, of course, to this construction going on in the university grounds. We are also getting grants in lieu of taxes for many of these government buildings, something that was never done by any other previous Government, before. We've been getting assistance for our highway through the city. That is a new program brought in by this Government. We've had assistance to the repairs to our bridges,

and I should mention, of course, this Government removed the public revenue tax, which has been a great saving to the taxpayers of our city. I can remember many occasions when the Member from Arm River got up in his place, saying to the Government, "If you'd only take this tax off the municipalities, they'd never come back for another set." How wrong can they be on that side, Mr. Speaker? But then, they know very little of what is going on in this province anyway.

Saskatoon was the first city to enjoy natural gas from the Power Corporation. It is hard to estimate the savings that have been made by the fuel users in the city of Saskatoon. It is estimated that at least a third of the fuel costs are saved to the fuel users, by the use of the clean and uniform heating process. I could mention what hospitalization has meant, because I can remember being a taxpayer in Saskatoon for forty years, we were always faced with a huge deficit from our city hospital. We had no Government to turn to to meet that deficit, and we as taxpayers had to pay it. True, we have deficits now, Mr. Speaker, but a great part of that deficit is usually picked up by the hospital services plan.

There are many things, Mr. Speaker, that you can't measure in dollars and cents which have benefitted our people. I mention one or two: the security to our aged groups, and also the related groups, in having free complete medical hospitalization and nursing care. Much of this cost, of course, was borne by the municipality before these groups were given this security by this Government. I can mention the thousands of people who had free treatment for the care of cancer. This has meant a big saving to many of our people. Our social aid program has meant a great deal to our Constituency. I was rather amused during the last election, when the Liberal candidate from Redberry, had as one of his main planks the cost of social aid – what it cost in the days of the Liberal Government, and what it cost today. I wish I had the clippings here. There was quite a big difference.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we could carry on a program like the Liberal Government did with much the same cost as they had. If we only just wanted to keep body and soul together, that's about all they wanted to do, then our cost of course, could be kept down. But these are people, Mr. Speaker, and they do have problems. We have our child welfare program, which I imagine the Minister will say a little about when he speaks after me. We have our juvenile delinquency program, and of course, we have the case of broken homes.

March 7, 1961

It takes a great deal of counselling, and a great deal of time, and I suggest that if we can save just one of these broken homes out of ten, it is well worth the time and effort that it takes to keep that home together just for the sake of the children.

Labour legislation, of course, has meant a great thing to people of an urban Constituency. The Trade Union Act has meant, of course, that thousands of our workers have had the opportunity of an association, of an organization of their own choice, just the same as the employer has, to belong to an employer's union, association, or what have you. Minimum wage has meant a great deal to thousands of our workers. I could dwell a great deal on this, because Mr. Speaker, I remember back in the thirties, when I used to come down with labour delegations, with our caps in our hands, asking the dear kind sirs down here just to brush a few crumbs off for these particular people, who were earning at that time, anywhere from \$6.00 a week up to about \$9.00. The Hours of Work Act, of course, has reduced hours, and given our workers a good deal more leisure time than they've had in the past. I can remember, I think, the Minister of Labour said that he worked from seven at night till seven in the morning, seven days a week, three hundred and sixty-five days a year – well I did that too, Mr. Speaker, when I first started to work in the labour force here. I think the Holidays with Pay Act is very much appreciated by our workers. Hundreds of our workers for the first time, are able to enjoy holidays.

Our Workmen's Compensation Act, of course, has given our injured workers a great deal more security than they ever had in the past. I would have liked to mention what the Insurance Office has meant to my people in the way of savings, because if we lived in Manitoba, or Alberta, we would be paying 20% more than we are paying at the present time for our insurance. At the same time, we are keeping the money in the province, providing jobs for our own people.

Well I would like just to speak a little while on a little matter, seeing that it was brought up in this House. I appreciate the support that I'm getting from the Member from Humboldt, and the Member from Pelly, neither of whom is in his seat at the present time. I would appreciate their support for a new geriatric centre if I thought there wasn't some ulterior motive behind it. I'm a little suspicious of the Member for Humboldt – she usually holds a bouquet in one hand, to attract your attention, and has a knife in the other

hand. Maybe my suspicions are a little unwarranted, and I hope so. I'm sure that the Government is aware of the condition of the geriatric centre, and they are aware of the worthwhile job that that centre has done. Surely they have assessed the work that has been done there, and would not want to have it closed down, as those Members would no doubt want it to be closed down.

I think if we go back, the Government saw a need for this particular kind of work. We had buildings in Saskatoon and Regina available, and we put them to use. There has been a great deal of worthwhile work done in both of these centres. Regina, of course, now has a new building, and I would say Mr. Speaker, that for every one complaint that we might hear, we have at least a dozen letters, yes, letters, people actually write letters of praise for the work of the staff and the care that is taken for those old people in that centre. I have been present on a couple of occasions when one chap from the States and his wife were burying his dad, who had passed away. He was overwhelmed with the praise and the comfort that his dad had received in that centre, and asked me to pass on his compliments to the Government. I was there on another occasion when an old couple were having their 75th wedding anniversary, and their son was also a prominent person from the city of Calgary. He spoke very strongly of the geriatric centre, only wishing they had a few like it in the Province of Alberta at that time.

I'm sorry that the Members are not here; we've had trouble since the previous Minister of Social Welfare was on the job. One particular person has been the centre of this complaint, managed to get a few more around her, and investigations and meetings have been held. I have been dragged into them on two or three occasions. I am satisfied that if we have a new building, and get rid of one member of the staff, which she apparently cannot get along with, I am still satisfied that this person would not be satisfied. This particular person, of course, has already been asked to get her mother out of two private nursing homes in Saskatoon, and although I think she means well, I think that in her own mind she thinks she's doing a good job. I don't think she really understands the problem that is involved, because we hear many suggestions as to how to look after the old people. Some suggest we should have a wing on the hospital. Possibly it is a good idea to give old people better medical care, but I think rather, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest problem that faces old people, is one of loneliness – one of being wanted. I can remember going in the

March 7, 1961

geriatric centre a few days before Christmas, visiting the old chaps there, and I was a little imbued with the Christmas spirit. I came across this old chap, who had a very bad heart condition, and had very few days to live, and he knew it. I happened to bring up the subject of Christmas, and made a very bad mistake. The old boy had been very active in his life, and I think he ran a little newspaper around the Weyburn district, around that way. Nobody cared apparently, nobody came near him – Christmas was the last subject that I should have spoken about. I excused myself and left, feeling badly about it. I think that is the biggest problem, and the study is being made into the problems of old aged people. We may come up with some answers, I hope we do.

I think conditions have changed. The day wasn't long ago when as many as three generations could live in one big house. Grandparents were still the head of the household. They were looked up to and respected, but times are changing and the young people want to live on their own. The ties between the families are being broken down, and this is something that we have to realize. We have had surveys of our aged people and the conditions which were found, are very deplorable. There is public indignation about the conditions in which our old people are living. I don't think it's altogether the fault of the municipality or the Government. I have met and visited many of these old people, in such conditions, and I have done my best in a diplomatic way to suggest that they would be better off in a home, or a nursing home of some kind, but this seems to be their last piece of independence, and they don't want to give it up. An institution is the last place apparently that they want to go to, even though they have long passed the day when they can care for themselves. I do believe that our geriatric centres, and especially our senior citizens homes are helping gradually to break this kind of condition down – this problem of not being wanted, and of loneliness amongst our senior citizens.

I appreciate the support that I am getting for a new geriatric centre in Saskatoon. I am sure that we will get one, I don't think the Government can delay too long, but I feel that I'm not only representing the city of Saskatoon, I feel too, that I am here to try and help all the people of the province. I feel something like the Member from Moosomin, that possibly some of these places can be put where the relatives and friends are, so that they can be visited once in a while.

Mr. McDonald: — Thank you.

Mr. Stone: — While I'm on this particular subject, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention, I see the Minister of Health is not here, but I would like just to bring a matter up in reference to our restoration centre, that we have in Saskatoon. I feel strongly about this. It is very inadequate; if anything it is more vulnerable than our geriatric centre. We hear, of course, so much about the wonderful restoration centre we have here in Regina, the wonderful work they're doing here, but I say that with the work being done in Saskatoon under inadequate, cramped conditions the staff need not take second place to any centre, anywhere. We have a wonderful staff, we have people who come from all parts of the world. It is unfortunate that they don't have a better plant to do all that they possibly can, and they are doing a very good job.

I want to say that in my opinion, the Provincial Treasurer did a very good job with the budget, and I am particularly pleased to know that school grants, of course, are being increased considerably again this year, and I hope the Minister of Education has something good for the cities. We have, of course, a problem in the cities. I think the city people have been very patient, realizing that there are parts of the province that do have problems, as far as education is concerned, but our problem, of course, has been the migration of people from rural parts into the city. We've had a particularly heavy construction program in elementary schools, and now we're getting the bulge in the high schools, where the costs are even higher than in the elementary schools. We are very happy, I think all of us, to know that more of our children are going to high school, and more of them are staying there longer. We hope the percentage will continue to increase.

I am very happy too, to see that we have a little money for our little resort at Pike Lake. I want to congratulate the Minister of Natural Resources, and his staff. I have been going to that little waterhole since about 1913, and I couldn't believe that you could have transformed that place into what it is today in such a short space of time. I don't need to speak for my people, the fact that it's so crowded there on Sundays and holidays, there isn't enough parking space, in spite of the spacious parking lot you have, and I think that speaks for the wonderful job you have done down there. I am sure that when you finally get it finished, it will be a wonderful relief to be able to go down there from the humdrum of a very busy city, and get away to a pleasant spot.

March 7, 1961

I was also hoping that when the Minister of Highways announces his highway program, that he would have something in there for No. 5 between Watson and the junction of No. 2. We are very anxious to get work started on this particular piece of road. The Boards of Trade from Saskatoon and Watson have all been down to see the previous Minister. The northeastern part of the province has always done its business in Saskatoon, and we are very anxious to keep that. We are concerned that No. 6 has been improved and this particular piece of road has been left. I always want to draw his attention to the fact that we would also like a good road down to the dam, and we believe that we're in line for a great deal of business from the South Saskatchewan Dam, and the road suggested by the Board of Trade would cut our cost down considerably. I would also like him to press and keep pressing the Federal Government for a second Trans-Canada Highway. This is very important to the city of Saskatoon to have a straight-away highway to the east. We, of course, suffer in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, with a very unfair tax rate structure. I don't know what we can do to relieve that situation, and I think the best thing we can do is to have a good highway and get some kind of competition and possibly then we might be able to talk turkey to the railway company.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I will oppose the amendment, and support the budget.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in this debate just briefly, for two reasons. The first one is that I would like to compliment the Provincial Treasurer on the splendid job he did, not only in presenting and delivering his budget address, but the splendid job he did in preparing the estimates, and the charter for Saskatchewan's future in 1961-62. I can remember very well last year the tears that were being shed by Members of the Opposition, crocodile tears, I think they were, about the claim which they made that the Government would be hopelessly weakened by the loss of the then Provincial Treasurer. I hope that every change that is made in this Government, in the years that lie ahead, will result in the comparable strengthening of the Government, a comparable reinvigoration of the Government, and a comparable new lease on life, which this Government has enjoyed since the installation of the new Provincial Treasurer.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — This Government is not only not weakened by the change, Mr. Speaker, but I submit that time will prove that this Government is strengthened by the promotion of the new Provincial Treasurer to his present portfolio.

The other thing that impelled me to take part in this debate, this evening, was certain remarks made by the hon. Member for Humboldt, who I regret is not in her chair. I would have preferred to say what I have to say with her in her place. On the other hand, some of the things which she said, were of such a serious nature, and I believe reflected so much discredit on this House, that they can't be allowed to go even for a day without being answered.

I want to deal with several of the things which she said, Mr. Speaker. I regret very much that I have to enter into this debate; I had hoped not to have to enter this debate, and I'm sure I'm not the only one who regrets it; I'm sure that several Members around the House regret that I have to take part tonight. If you knew, Mr. Speaker, how much resistance I had to overcome on the part of some of my friends on this side, when I said that I was going to take part in the debate, you'll have some sympathy for me.

First of all the hon. lady had something to say about the ability and the capacity of the new Minister of Education. I know the new Minister of Education well enough to know that he requires no defence from me in this matter. I know that he is quite capable of taking care of himself. In the thirteen Sessions now that I have sat in this House, I have noticed that those new Members who succeed in riling the other side in their first fifteen minutes in debate, who succeed in drawing blood in their first encounter in this Assembly, are usually the Members who distinguish themselves. I am confident that the Opposition have, just as we have on this side, recognized the ability and capacity of the new Minister of Education.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Now, I was a little shocked when they saw fit to criticize him for saying that the Opposition had failed to put forward any constructive alternative to the policies of this Government. I was surprised when they deplored that

March 7, 1961

statement on his part, because a Member doesn't have to be in this House very long to become aware of that deficiency on the part of the Opposition in this Legislature. As a matter of fact, the Minister, before he became a Member of this House, has been a citizen of the province of Saskatchewan for many years. And most of the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan are well aware of the fact that the Opposition have no constructive alternatives to offer to this Government. Any citizen knows this. He should not have to be in this House for twenty-four years or thirty years, as suggested by the lady from Humboldt.

The very fact of the election results in 1960, 1956, 1952, 1948, 1944 just show that the people of Saskatchewan, or at least most of them know that the Opposition are not able to produce any effective alternative policies to those put forward by Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. Speaker, I read in the paper last fall, that the hon. lady from Humboldt was designated by the Opposition to be responsible for the criticism of the Department of the Attorney General. I must say that I was a little disappointed that there wasn't anything more substantial to her criticism than appeared today. The criticism instead consisted of a lot of wild charges, and serious innuendos, in support of which not a single shred of substantiation was offered.

First of all the hon. lady said that she was disappointed that Saskatchewan hadn't provided family courts, for the people of this province. She scorns the experimental family court that we have established about two years ago in the city of Saskatoon, by saying that it's just another magistrate's court. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure she knows that there's nothing small or restricted about the jurisdiction of a magistrate, the fact of the matter is that magistrates in Canada have wider jurisdiction over the person of the citizen than has even a District Court Judge. Magistrates have very wide powers, so that this isn't any trifling jurisdiction that has been conferred on the family court magistrate in Saskatoon. It is very wide. She says that it is following the ordinary rules of evidence, that it's dealing with trials and punishments. Well, the Magistrate of the Family Court in Saskatoon, reports, as published in the newspaper, that she spends the greater part of her time counselling and advising people in trouble, people with family problems, and very little of her time in the ordinary traditional role of a judge. I have in my hand

a clipping from the Saskatoon "Star-Phoenix" of last December 3rd, which reports an interview in which she said that:

"The juveniles who appear before her are always investigated carefully by the welfare department before a decision is reached. Following this the parents are interviewed in court, in the absence of their child. Then the child is brought back into the courtroom, and asked to give his opinion."

Now is this the standard and routine practice of our courts, as alleged by the hon. lady? Of course not! The Magistrate is quoted as saying,

"It may not be strict court procedure, but then I think we are expected to do something more than simply follow the letter of the law."

If my hon. friend would just check into her facts, before making wild and sweeping allegations and assertions in this House, we would have more patience to listen to her.

The "Star-Phoenix" of January 4th contained a report headed, "New Family Court System Works Well for Juveniles," and this is a photo copy of the clipping but I think I can read it.

"The idea of having one magistrate to handle all juvenile cases has been described as a successful experiment, by a Social Welfare official. Roy Wilson, Assistant Regional Administrator, of the Provincial Welfare Department here, at the same time, gave much credit to city police and to family court magistrate Mary Carter, for their part in making the new method of handling juvenile delinquency cases as successful as it is."

So, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Member permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh, I'd just love it.

March 7, 1961

Mrs. Batten: — Is the Minister not aware that long before his advent into the political arena we used to have a juvenile court judge, who held informal sittings? This is not new. This is . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am well aware of that, Mr. Speaker. There was no Dependent Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act at that time. The present jurisdiction of the family court magistrate is much wider than was given to the juvenile court judge under the old Welfare Act. Many people in those days were taken, who had committed offences, who were juvenile delinquents, in fact all were taken to the ordinary magistrates for trial and conviction. This is now being handled in Saskatoon and Regina before a special magistrate who follows these special procedures for the protection of these people.

Now the hon. lady also complained about the Attorney General skipping about the province, dropping monuments to his own memory in places like Saskatoon and Regina. Well, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for the fact that the Government of Saskatchewan has seen fit to build two new Court Houses, one in Regina, and one in Saskatoon. On the day on which I advised one of the judges of the fact that a new court house was going to be built in Regina, some three years ago, he told me that he'd heard that story before — that he heard it as far back as 1917, and he wouldn't believe it until he saw it. Well I had the pleasure of addressing that particular Judge at a dinner a week ago, in which I said it was the intention of the Government to call on him to take some official role in the opening of the new Court House in Regina when it is opened in June.

While I'm on the subject, I hope that all hon. Members will make that an occasion for a visit to the city, and an opportunity to be shown through that new building. I should say that I'm basking in glory which I do not deserve when I get the credit for the new Court House in Regina and Saskatoon. I want to pay tribute to the Ministers who are really responsible for these two fine buildings — the present Minister of Highways, who was at that time Minister of Public Works, was the Minister in charge of the Department which created, erected, and designed the Court House in Saskatoon, and the present Minister of Public Works has seen to the execution of the building here in Regina. I think they are both to be congratulated; I think they have both left

monuments to the work of their Department which are a credit not only to them but to the people of Saskatchewan.

My hon. friend says that we forget that court cases are people and not just statistics. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it's because we felt that the hundreds of people who go through our courts every day are people and not statistics that we provided them with adequate facilities.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — This I suggest, was overdue in this province thirty years ago in the city of Regina, and in the city of Saskatoon, as attested to by one of the judges, when I told him we were intending to build such a building. The hon. lady, I must remind you, Mr. Speaker, is criticizing the Attorney General in reference to this. If she has any criticism about these court houses, I suggest she direct it to the Minister of Public Works. It might be a good thing, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition got out a little handbook, indicating to the various Members which functions of Government come under which Ministers. I know that one after another they referred to my hon. friend, the Minister of Industry and Information, as the Provincial Secretary — this did this for three whole years after I was appointed to the post, without apparently knowing that there had been a change.

An Opposition Member: — You're not very noticeable.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It is really not uncommon for them to direct their criticisms to the wrong place. The hon. lady, who is a lawyer and should know better about these things, then turned to The Saskatchewan Election Act and thought that I should give some attention to that. Well I take as much responsibility as any Member on this side of the House for the Election Act. But, legally, strictly speaking, it comes under the administration of the Premier, not under the Attorney General, something which the hon. lady could have found out if she had looked up her law before making her speech.

Now she also had something to say about the provision of legal assistance for people, particularly in the family courts, and that the Attorney General should busy himself, and try and find some way of providing, not just trial courts for these unfortunate people who have

March 7, 1961

family troubles and who get before the courts, but providing them with some tangible legal assistance. Well, there again, if the hon. lady had been following proceedings of the House, she would know that this comes under the Department of Social Welfare, and that the Department of Social Welfare actually had voted money last year for this purpose, and in a modest way is providing legal assistance to dependent wives and children, who have this kind of problem. It would be duplication if the Attorney General were doing the same thing.

Well I'm afraid that I decided to limit my remarks to the things that the hon. lady from Humboldt dealt with, and therefore, I can't select things to talk about which are really important, and still stay within the frame of reference which I set for myself.

The hon. lady said, and I quote:

“I think I can say, without being unjust, that frauds have been perpetrated on the public of Saskatchewan by stock promoters.”

Well, I think that is something which no one will gainsay, — that there have been stock frauds perpetrated in Saskatchewan, as well as all other kinds of crimes. Saskatchewan has a very robust people, and they do get involved in crimes of all different kinds. We take second place to nobody. Crimes of all kinds will continue to be committed in this province, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the very best efforts of the Attorney General, of the Department, and of the police to bring offenders to justice. The fact that we provide magistrates, the fact that the Federal Government provides judges for our courts, is proof that we have faith in the fact that there will be crime in this province in the future. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, it is a cheap kind of political chicanery, to try to pretend that any one person should take the blame for the fact that crime occurs in this province. The causes of crime, the source of criminal instinct is something which baffles the mind of jurists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and spiritual leaders. This is something that doesn't lend to diagnosis readily; it is something that no one has yet found a means of preventing. Our judicial system is aimed rather at punishing criminals and putting them in places where they can be reformed. This presupposes all the time that they will be brought before the judicial system, to be punished and to be committed to reform institutions. This method of criminology seeks to prevent crime by

punishment, by example, and by reform, but there must be a crime committed before the person gets before these institutions for that kind of treatment.

No one to my knowledge has ever said that it is the fault of the Attorney General, or the fault of the R.C.M. Police, or the fault of the judge, because he has not prevented a person from committing a crime. We use all these agencies to try to prevent and deter the commission of crime, but no one has ever yet had the audacity to suggest that these methods would absolutely prevent crime from being committed.

I think that the hon. lady made a statement there which no one can dispute. She said, "I think I can say without being unjust that fraud has been perpetrated in the province of Saskatchewan." Undoubtedly, that is true. As a matter of fact, I was looking at the annual reports of the Securities Commission for the last two calendar years, 1959, and 1960, and I notice that in 1959 there were twenty-six people who were charged and tried under The Securities Act or the Criminal Code for securities or stock fraud. Of these twenty-six people who were tried, every single one of them was convicted, so he got the benefit of the reform machinery that we have. In 1960, with just as vigorous a program of enforcement, five people were tried and all of them convicted. There are still a couple of matters that are before the Courts, to which we do not know the answer.

I suggest that it cannot be said that the Department of the Attorney General has been negligent or remiss in prosecuting suspected offenders. If my hon. friend knows of evidence of stock frauds, violations of the criminal code and securities act, it is her duty, I feel, as a public-spirited citizen, either to go to the police and advance the knowledge which she has, or even come to the Attorney General's Department and lay those facts plainly before it – disclose those facts clearly to the proper authorities. I suggest that since she hasn't done that, she is engaging in a cheap kind of political skullduggery, to come into this House, and to allege that all isn't being done that should be done.

I should say that in some fields we even go further than prosecuting offenders after they have committed an offense. There are fields, for example, in the Hawkers and Peddlers Act, The Real Estate Agents Licensing Act, Securities Act, where it is provided that certain additional measures for law enforcement agencies

March 7, 1961

are taken, to try to prevent crime before it occurs. These agencies, in some cases, are designed and set up to exercise absolute power without appeal to anyone else, and without any resort to the rule of law. Such agencies are intended to substitute for the Rule of Law, the judgment, the hunch, the intuition of the administrator.

This perhaps can be justified in some fields of licensing. We haven't attempted to use that method in the licensing of the securities industry. The Securities Act of this province, in common with the Securities Acts of other provinces, provides that every decision made by the Chairman of the Securities Commission with regard to the licensing of particular applicants, or with regard to the approving of a particular prospectuses, is appealable to the full Commission. It doesn't stop there, it is appealable from there to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal, or to the Court of Appeal of the various provinces. This means that the Legislature had decided that this branch of enforcement will be according to the rule of law. Now what does that mean? Well, that means that people can't be denied the right to a license without some evidence, and if their license is to be suspended it must be after a proper hearing, it must be after giving them notice of the complaint, it must be after giving the accused or the licensee a chance to be heard, giving him a chance to hear the charges levied against him by his accusers. All these things are inherent in applying the rule of law to the administration of securities licensing. This is the method that is followed in this province as in most of the other provinces in Canada. We even made it a little surer in Saskatchewan: we said that if the Securities Commission in this province denies a salesman or a broker his license, the Commission must give the reasons in writing so that the suspended broker or salesman can know what is being held against him, not just any vague assertion that it is in the public interest to suspend this license, but the reasons, and those reasons must be capable of being submitted to the Court of Appeal and approved by the Court of Appeal.

Now this has resulted in some forty or forty-five decisions by the Saskatchewan Securities Commission in recent years, and I may say that not in a single one of these cases did the aggrieved individuals see fit to appeal to the Court of Appeal, for a reversal.

Now, it is true that some securities frauds can be prevented by refusing licenses to people who have been convicted of security offences in other provinces or in this province. It is true that some securities frauds can be prevented by scrutinizing the prospectus that is put before the Commission, to make sure that there is nothing inherently fraudulent in the prospectus. When my hon. friend says that the Securities Commission was set up to give absolute security against this kind of thing happening, she is not properly stating the case. The Securities Commission cannot absolutely prevent fraud from taking place.

People with the very best of reputation, the best of references, can go into the security business, satisfying the Commission that they are conversant with the Securities Act, and quite unexpectedly, without any advanced notice, turn out to be incapable or incompetent of carrying on that kind of business. It is then, when evidence comes to the Commission of that incapacity, that incompetence, or that unwillingness to abide by the law, that the Commission can take action to suspend.

We think that the Commission ought not merely to suspend people because we don't like the kind of name they have got, because we don't like the color of their skin, or because we don't like their politics. We think these things are all irrelevant as to the question of whether or not one is a competent person to be engaged in the securities business.

So, in this province at least, we enforce the Securities Act in accordance with the rule of law, the rule of law as laid down by the courts. It is true that if my hon. friend has any complaint about any of these people who are licensed in Saskatchewan, it is her duty in the interests of protecting the public to bring such complaints to the attention either of the Attorney General's Department, or the Securities Commission. It is commonly thought, Mr. Speaker, that because I invest money in the shares of Moose Pasture Incorporated that I'm entitled to make money, that I'm entitled to make a profit. That of course, is completely foreign to any realistic concept of securities law enforcement.

I'm entitled, Mr. Speaker, to invest my money in a concern that goes broke, if I want to; but I am also entitled to have those stocks honestly represented to me when I buy them. But if because of economic circumstances the enterprise does not pay off, that does not mean that there is some neglect in the enforcement of the Securities Act. Not at all, — the Securities

March 7, 1961

Commission and the Attorney General's Department, in no way, at no time, guarantee the success of any commercial undertaking that is launched in this province. All we do, all we have to do or purport to do, is to see to it that the people who sell that promotion, who issue those stocks, honestly represent it, and see to it that the prospectus that they put out honestly discloses all the material facts in relation to that promotion. That's the job of the Securities Commission, and if I want to buy an interest in a business to sell refrigerators to the Eskimos, that's my business, just as long as I am told that it's refrigerators and that the customers are Eskimos, and that they are going to be selling them in Aklavik. As long as I am told honestly what the promotion is, or what the proposition is, that's all I am entitled to ask for. I'm not entitled to ask the Securities Commission to underwrite or guarantee or warrant in any way, the soundness of the prospective enterprise.

I realize that it is sometimes assumed by people who don't know what the law is in these matters, it is sometimes assumed that the minute you lose money on a speculative promotion, somebody has defrauded you. Well that doesn't necessarily follow.

So far as I know, the Attorney General's Department and the police have diligently and vigorously pursued every complaint of fraud or dishonesty in the promotion of stocks in this province, and have prosecuted the offenders no matter who or where they were.

Mr. Coderre: — That's not so.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — If my hon. friend says it is not so, let him come forward with the facts. It is not good enough to stand up in this House . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, I can certainly do so.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that two years ago my hon. friend got up in this House and made a similar statement. I am also well aware that I invited him then to go to the Securities Commission and to lay his facts before the Commission, and he did not do so, Mr. Speaker. He did not do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Member for Humboldt, desperately seeking some kind of stratagem which would get her complaint into the paper when she stood in her place in this Legislature and demanded a royal commission or a judicial inquiry, when she said that if the Liberal Party had formed a Government they would have set up a judicial inquiry into the sale of securities, their licensing, and the method of operation in Saskatchewan etc. Mr. Speaker, it's one thing to ask for a judicial inquiry, but I think if we were to appoint a commission to investigate or inquire into anything we would have to set some terms of reference. We would have to give them something to examine into. If my hon. friend wishes to be taken seriously as a responsible public official and a Member of this Legislature, and if she has any information which would justify a royal commission, she should lay it on the Table so that the Government can decide whether or not there is any merit in this demand for a royal commission, and so that the people of Saskatchewan can decide whether or not there is any merit in this phony demand for a royal commission.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that what was really sought by my hon. friend was a chance, an opportunity to charge, indict, and convict this Government without a trial, — with a trial by newspaper. That is what she is really seeking. If she really wants to try the merits of those facts, which she should have, then I challenge her now to put those facts forward, and I promise that they will be laid before the court, and they will be tried in the fashion that we are accustomed to in the British Commonwealth. They will be tried in the courts of the land, Mr. Speaker, and that's the place where they ought to be tried. If she has facts which allege wrongdoing, which allege crime, which allege violation of the law, then let those facts be tested in the tribunals of justice that we have established in this country — the in the courts of Saskatchewan. I will undertake that if she has any facts which warrant the laying of charges, charges will be laid. It isn't necessary for my hon. friend to stand up here piously and demand a royal commission.

I suggest that this is an underhanded kind of attack on the Government. Unless she has some facts, this making assertions, insinuations, and innuendoes, I must say, Mr. Speaker, is unbecoming a responsible Member of this House, who has sat here now for five years.

Then in closing she made an innuendo that there was something suspicious about the retirement or resignation

March 7, 1961

of the Chairman of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently she and some of the people who report to her what is said about these things are so suspicious that they can't take an honest answer. I told the House two weeks ago, on another occasion, that the Chairman of the Securities Commission wished to live in a more pleasant climate at the west coast, and I will say that that is the reason he advanced to me. I know that's the reason his family are using to put pressure on him to move. I will say too, I'll add to what I said then, he did give as a reason for his wishing to resign, that he felt that there was no immediate prospect of there being any serious enforcement problems in the Province of Saskatchewan in the near future. He said he was a man who liked to be busy and earning his salary. The enforcement problems of this province, he felt were in hand, and I want to say on behalf of the Government that there was no attempt or no desire on the part of the Government, that he should leave his post and go to British Columbia or go anywhere else. As a matter of fact the Government tried, unsuccessfully, to persuade him to stay. But if there was any chance of Mr. Cameron being persuaded to stay and to continue in his post on the same terms as at present, I am sure the Government would welcome any such decision on his part.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is only one kind of word to describe this crummy kind of phony attack and insinuation that we have had to listen to here this afternoon. I don't make any pretense, Mr. Speaker, to be any paragon of virtue, heaven forbid, but I deplore hearing Members in this House talking about conscience, about other people following their conscience, — exhibiting brotherly love, — always analyzing the motives of other people, — citing the Holy Writ, — to try to justify the wanderings to and fro of my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thatcher: — You're the boys who are usually doing it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that I regret very much that I had to take part in this debate, but I want to make it perfectly clear that as the chief law officer of the Crown, and the person who is primarily responsible for the carrying out of proper law enforcement in this province, I am confident that we are doing everything that is possible to insure obedience to the laws, the security laws as well as other laws in this province. I don't take kindly

to these insinuations and allegations, that I am doing less than my duty under my oath of office. I would welcome any Member of this House, coming forward in a public-spirited way, with a sense of public spirit, with any information of a factual nature which will in any way help to make the enforcement of law easier. It's a difficult business enforcing the law. It's a heart-breaking business sometimes, Mr. Speaker. It isn't easy, and I resent very much the insinuation that is cast upon the Government that it is not doing its duty in regard to law enforcement. If my hon. friend wants to make serious charges of this kind, I suggest that before she does so, or before any Member of this House does so, they do their own duties as a citizen by bringing forward the facts on which law enforcement proceedings can be taken, before complaining and criticizing those who are doing their best to enforce the law and protect the interests of the people of this province.

I will support the motion.

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation): — Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time that I have risen since being elected to this Legislature, I would like to join my other colleagues in congratulating you on being appointed to this very important post. It is very rarely that Mr. Speaker enjoys the complete confidence of both sides of the House to the extent that you do.

I also appreciate very much being one of the three Members for the City of Saskatoon. I had been living in Saskatoon for a very short period when I was nominated and there were exceptionally strong candidates representing all the political Parties. I am aware of the fact that my election is due to the outstanding work done by the senior Member for Saskatoon, Mr. Sturdy, formerly the Minister of this Department, who has been a Member for many years, and the lady Member for Saskatoon, but especially the work of the Government.

The lady Member from Saskatoon and I were both quite new in Saskatoon and I feel sure that the large majority that we had was made possible because of the confidence that the people in Saskatoon had in the Government.

March 7, 1961

I appreciate very much the remarks made by the member for Pelly, the other day. He referred to the campaign that we were involved in when we were both much younger. As a matter of fact, twenty-one years ago now we were campaigning in MacKenzie and he thanked me for the good turn that was done. I had some experience in winning and losing elections, and losing an election is a little bit harder than winning. The Member for Pelly was a very good loser, and we have been very good friends throughout the years.

I have heard him speaking on quite a number of occasions. Occasionally we shared the platform together and he can really make a much better speech than he made the other day. I think it is a pity that he relied on Mr. Staines to such a large extent. I feel sure, that if the Member for Pelly was making his own speech he would have adopted a different attitude. I too was at Kamsack when the power was brought there last Fall and the Member for Pelly was very gracious in saying what it meant to the Pelly Constituency to have this wonderful resource way up in the northeast corner of Saskatchewan.

I was with the Member for Pelly when Premier Douglas went way up to Norquay to open a Memorial Rink and again on that occasion, as was expected, the Member for Pelly was a very gracious host. I think, if he was making his own speech the other day, he would have given this Government credit for the fact that in his Constituency, in Kamsack, they have one of the first and one of the finest junior high schools in the whole province. He would have mentioned some of the changes at Madge Lake, that have taken place in the last sixteen years.

Mrs. Batten: — He did . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — No, he didn't say a word about Madge Lake the other day. But it is one of the finest resorts in the province and I am sure that the Member for Pelly, if he was on his own, would give this Government credit for the new road and the new facilities in that wonderful park.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I am sure that if the Member for Pelly was making his own speech, he would have made a case for bringing gas to Norquay, Pelly, Arran, and the village of Verigin. But here

he is supporting an amendment with the view to blocking the bringing of this great resource into the rural communities in the province. I am sure the Member for Pelly does not want to block the bringing of gas to the Pelly Constituency. I thought he would have said something about two of the most interesting historic sites in the province, at Fort Pelly and at Fort Livingstone. The Federal Government needs the support of the Member for Pelly because they have been thinking about rebuilding Fort Pelly and I think that the Member for Pelly should be pressing the Government to co-operate with the Federal Government in restoring Fort Livingstone and Fort Pelly.

I appreciate very much his interest in my Department and I will have something to say about that to-morrow.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Why don't you talk about it to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — But I would like to say to the Member for Pelly that the Member for Humboldt, the Attorney General, and the Minister of Education belong to a very powerful union, it is not the largest one in Canada, but it is a very powerful one.

Mrs. Batten: — You are not talking about the New Party, are you?

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — No, it does seem that they are able to get judicial centres on quite a generous scale.

The Member for Humboldt, after visiting the geriatric centre, and again I want to thank her for this visit, drew my attention to the fact that there was quite a contrast between the court house in Saskatoon and the geriatric centre, and this Chamber and the geriatric centre. That is quite right, but the CCF Government did not build this building. I think that every citizen in Saskatchewan has reason to be proud of this building. I think that the pioneers deserve some credit for deciding that the people of Saskatchewan should have a fine Legislative Building and a good set of university buildings. I think it is not quite fair to use the sort of language the Member for Humboldt did in describing the only home

March 7, 1961

that some of our finest citizens have, and a little later on I am going to say something about some of the homes in northern Saskatchewan that resulted in my being involved in this sort of work. People are very sensitive, when you use that sort of language about the home where the patients are receiving very loving care and receiving as good care as is available anywhere in Canada.

One word to the Member for Saltcoats. To him too I suggest that he make his own speeches rather than reading one of Mr. Staines' speeches.

Mr. Snedker: — I did . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The Member for Yorkton, I am sure will receive support from all the Members, in urging them to make their own speeches.

Mr. McDonald: — How cheap you are.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The references to my predecessor, Hon. T.J. Bentley and to Mr. Probe, a member of my staff, are quite uncalled for. I want to appeal to the Members on both sides of the House to give some consideration to the position of the politician in society. I know that it is a pretty popular sport to brand us all as very selfish potential crooks, but I think that the people in public life, in all political parties, have to have some qualifications before they can get elected and certainly . . .

Mr. McDonald: — That I wonder . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Bentley, who has a distinguished record in World War I, Mr. Probe, who has a distinguished record in World War II, certainly do not deserve the remarks that were made when they are not here to defend themselves.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

An Opposition Member: — What about you?

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I am sure that if the Member for Saltcoats was making his own speech he would have said that this Government had provided a job for Mr. Egnatoff, who had been a Liberal Member here for some time and he stood for the nomination of the Liberal Party in Saskatoon. He was not nominated, but if he had been nominated, he no doubt would have felt quite free to make any criticism he wanted, but Mr. Egnatoff is still on the Government's payroll as far as I know and I think that the Member for Saltcoats in mentioning the names . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — He would not . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I beg your pardon?

Mr. Thatcher: — He would not have been hired for his political viewpoint.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — . . . he would have been fired for his political activities, if the Members on that side of the House were sitting over here.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — You don't know.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition has not had anything to say so far regarding social welfare. He did have a good deal to say about this topic when he was in the House of Commons. I happen to have a copy of Hansard for April 24, 1952. They were discussing the budget that year too. Mr. Thatcher was then a Member of the Federal Parliament and had something to say about the old age pension.

“We have had this scheme now for four months and I cannot help feeling the worse about paying old age pensions to Canadians who are wealthy and have no need for it.”

And further on in the same speech:

“The point I am trying to make is, that there are thousands and thousands of Canadians receiving this old age pension who obviously do not need it.”

An Hon. Member: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Who said that? Well, we have two Liberals in the Liberal Party who want to do away with . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I said anybody over \$5,000.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Returning to Mr. Thatcher in the House of Commons:

March 7, 1961

“The point I am trying to make is that there are thousands and thousands of Canadians receiving this old age pension who obviously do not need it. The same might be said of the baby bonuses.” Sorry, the Member for Humboldt has left. “The taxpayers are going to spend \$332 million this year on family allowances. I say that most of this money will be well spent, but I can’t help wondering how badly my good friend the hon. Member from Comox-Alberni needs the Family Allowance cash. There must be many other people in Canada in the same category . . .” Mr. Garson asked: “Would the hon. Member permit a question? Would he apply the means test of Family Allowance too?” Mr. Knowles: “Over my dead body!” Mr. Thatcher: “I thank the Minister for his question, I should like to answer it. I wonder whether it is sensible to pay old age pensions or family allowances to those with an income of say \$5,000 a year or more?”

Mr. Thatcher: — I stand by that.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Well, I am very glad to know that the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan wants to have a means test for the Family Allowances, for the Old Age Pensions and he has one supporter on the Opposition side of the House who is prepared to say “Hear, Hear.” Only one though, nobody else is prepared to support the leader.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Member permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I’ll be delighted.

Mr. McDonald: — Do you now oppose the means test for the supplementary allowance that you pay? Do you? Yes or no.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Only yes or no.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The answer is yes . . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The answer is yes, but I want . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . hundred dollars.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — . . . I want to say to the hon. Member that there is no Liberal Government anywhere in Canada that is providing a supplementary allowance . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The Liberal Government in Newfoundland . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — There was in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — There was no Liberal Government . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Ottawa . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — . . . in any province in Canada that provides any supplementary allowance and our supplementary allowance is applied on a means test basis, so that the wealthy people that are mentioned, are not eligible for the supplementary allowance, and the medical and hospital services.

I would like to say a word about the Mother's Allowance. Again I go back a few years, when we had a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. I have here a report of the Social Security Committee of Canada. The Liberal Government in Ottawa was making plans for the post-war period. They were stressing the need to have uniform registration across the country. On page 97 of the March report we have the average Mother's Allowance paid in Canada. That was back in 1943 that this was published. British Columbia then was high, \$39.19; Manitoba was second \$35.75; Ontario third, \$28.91; Nova Scotia fourth, \$28.55, Quebec next \$26.64; Alberta \$22.96; Saskatchewan at the bottom of the list with \$13.77.

Government Member: — Good, old Liberal . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — And so, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that those who are sitting across the way should at least try to be fair and to make public their record when they were in office. I mentioned earlier that I have to get back a few years, and I want to have some time tomorrow, in discussing the social welfare program and again I would like to thank the Member from Melville for his helpful remarks when we were in Public Accounts. The Member from Rosthern made some reckless charges regarding, no, it is quite in order . . .

March 7, 1961

Mr. Cameron: — What debate is he on?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't think we can have references to other committees . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I am sorry, I make reference to his remarks yesterday. The Member for Rosthern, yesterday, made some remarks regarding the people who are receiving social aid in Saskatchewan. I am sure that his colleague, the Member for Melville, will ask him to reconsider what he has said, because I am sure the Member for Melville, who is handling these problems on a day to day basis, when he takes part in the debate will say that Saskatchewan people aren't crooks and chisellers. They are good, honest citizens. They do not want to get social aid if they can get work, if they can buy their groceries and keep their families together.

I happen to have, Mr. Speaker, a Return that was brought down in the House of Commons a few years ago when I was there. I was then describing the conditions which prevailed in Saskatchewan, that resulted in the organization of this political Party.

One of the Conservative Members said, he couldn't believe what I said was true and so I asked for a Return and these were brought down. Dominion-Saskatchewan Lease Settlement Agreement, dated June 2, 1932. There was a Conservative Government in office this time in Canada, and also in Saskatchewan. There was a land settlement scheme that encouraged people who were on relief to move to the north from the cities. Large settlements all across northern Saskatchewan were settled at that time. The scheme started out as a \$600 program, but they did some budget cutting and they reduced it to \$300. They decided that \$300 would be spent: \$50.00 for a house; \$10.00 a month for food, and then you had to provide a cow and either a horse or an ox, and you were supposed to be self-supporting at the end of the year. Of course, they extended this relief. Here are some of the typical cases: This family had a team of horses costing \$50.00; \$10.00 for the groceries for that month; a set of harness \$15.00; a cow \$35.00; a wagon and plow \$10.00; railway fares \$30.00; groceries \$10.00; and building materials \$31.60, (the logs were available for the cutting and later two rolls of tar paper were supplied.) So here was a house which cost \$36.10. These people were expected to live for a year on \$10.00 a month. Well, I will come to the Liberal program a little later; it was a bit more generous.

The next one spent \$70.00 for cows; \$20.89 for hardware; and \$11.20 for lumber. Their house cost \$32.09; but during their first year they were in the north they spent \$288.40. They moved in from the city, they had no garden, no resources, they had to be on relief to qualify. The second family, during the first year spent \$283.30; the next one spent \$309.00 and the last one was \$302.90.

I happened to run across one of these families out in Victoria twelve years later. The eighteen year old son had been prevented from joining the army because of malnutrition during that period. The mother was a trained nurse; the father was a carpenter. One whole year on less than \$300 for a trained nurse and a carpenter, forty miles from the nearest hospital. When I saw them in Victoria, father and son were both working in the shipyard at \$1.50 an hour and an eight hour day; the mother was nursing and they said, "We hope our children will never have to go through those long, lean years in the north country."

An Opposition Member: — Were they C.C.F.?

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — No, these were Conservative people. The Liberals took over in due course, chiefly as a protest. We were unsuccessful in our first and second attempts to form a Government but these were the conditions that enabled the Liberals to form a Government in 1934. The Liberals said: "\$50 for a house – that is ridiculous. No one can build a decent house for \$50. They raised the maximum to \$200. Well, you can build a much better house for \$200 than you can for \$50 but the Member for Pelly has been in some of these \$200 houses; he knows where they are. The relief allowances also were increased from a maximum of \$10.00 in 1932. The Liberals said a big family should have more than \$10.00. One person should have \$7.89; two people \$12.60; three people \$15.20; four people, \$17.75: Ten in the family should have \$32.45 a month. Oh, that was much more generous . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — The total revenue was . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Clothing \$14.00 a year for one person; in a large family of ten people \$86.50.

Government Member: — Did they get deductions?

March 7, 1961

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Yes, there were deductions. I am glad you mentioned that. If you had your dairy products, you knocked off 10%; if you had vegetables, you knocked off 10%; if there was wild game in the areas, you knocked off 15%.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the conditions that prevailed in Saskatchewan in the early thirties and all through the thirties. Whatever criticism Members opposite have to offer regarding the policies and procedures of this Government, I think they would be well advised to leave alone the programs regarding care for the young, care for the old, and social aid.

Mr. Gardiner: — Family allowances . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Family allowances, as your leader has gone out now, he wants to do away with . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — You voted against them.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, that is another falsehood . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — You voted against family allowances . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I must ask you to have the hon. Member withdraw that remark, because I never voted against family allowances; no Member in the Canadian Parliament voted against family allowance or spoke against it, and the next time I have an opportunity I will have the Hansard here, giving my speech to support my claim that I spoke for and voted for family allowances.

Mr. Speaker: — I am afraid that this is an allegation of fact, it is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that if a Member makes a false statement regarding . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Premier has the floor.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, under the rules of the House you must accept a Member's word and if the Member gave his word that he did not vote against the family allowance, the hon. Member must accept this.

Mr. Speaker: — That is true.

Opposition Member: — That is a matter of opinion.

Premier Douglas: — It is not a matter of opinion. You must accept a Member's word. If you want to enter into the debate to bring in contrary evidence, you can do so, but in the course of the debate, under the rules of the House, you must accept it.

Mr. Gardiner: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the present speaker and other speakers before him have told what the Liberals are going to . . .

Premier Douglas: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Gardiner: — He voted against . . . the control, he voted against . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — You are shouting . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member has qualified my statement and at some convenient time I will have available Hansard to show that I made what I consider to be quite a forceful speech in support of family allowance, and when the legislation was brought in, every Member of every party voted for it. I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition was in the House at that time.

Premier Douglas: — He wanted the means test. The Liberal Party wanted a means test, and don't you forget it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to adjourn the debate.

The debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Nicholson, adjourned.

March 7, 1961

MOTION RE ABOLITION OF MINERAL TAX ON FARMER'S LAND

(Mr. MacDougall)

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on the resolution, I had made a few notes when the Minister of Mineral Resources was speaking. What I have done with them, I don't know, this is one difficulty one runs into when one adjourns a debate and it is not called again for several days.

However, I think I can recall some of the remarks of the Minister of Mineral Resources at that time. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my intention to prolong the debate on this particular resolution, but I do believe that it would be of assistance to a good many farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, irrespective of what the Minister of Mineral Resources may think.

In that part of the province where I happen to represent, a goodly number of farmers own their mineral rights, and when the Minister of Mineral Resources says that it has no bearing on farm costs, I don't think he is very conversant with the facts.

I happen to own some land in that part of the province myself on which I own the minerals, and undoubtedly when once a year I am called upon to pay the mineral tax it is a burden to the already expensive operation of carrying on farming. I believe that the Minister compared this to an individual who might own a home in the city, but have no tenant in his home. Well, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that owning a home and owning your mineral rights are two different things, because when you own a home, you know what you own, but when you own mineral rights, you have no idea what you own.

It is not very difficult to get someone to assess the value of most assets, including a home. But I would like to have someone immediately assess the value of the mineral rights on my farm, because I don't know whether they're worth this year's taxes or not. If I care to protect those mineral rights, then I must pay the tax.

The Minister also referred to the fact that many people had incomes from the fact that they owned their mineral rights. Well I would like to point out now that the vast majority of people in the southeast corner of

this province, who had an income from mineral rights a few years ago have dropped them because the great bulk of the freehold land in that area of the province has been dropped by the oil companies, and there's no revenue from it today. I don't believe that necessarily means that those mineral rights have no value. I think it means that the oil companies are not prepared, at the moment, to carry on the terrific expenditure they did for a few years in leasing all potential oil lands in the province.

I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, and the opinion of the people on this side of the House, the Government that sits opposite, and the province of Saskatchewan, have some responsibility when it comes to farm costs – this cost-price squeeze in which the farmer finds himself. We have a resolution on this Order Paper now, condemning Ottawa for this. That, and the other thing, asking Ottawa to relieve the farmer of his plight. Well I want to say tonight, and I've said it before, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government have neither the resources, nor the constitutional power to solve the farmers problems of today. But, Mr. Speaker, they have some constitutional power, and they have some resources. Why don't they use them? I think that our case, in asking the senior governments to help us rectify this cost-price squeeze, would be much enhanced if we as a Provincial Legislature in the greatest agricultural province of Canada, were prepared to go to the full limits of our resources and our constitutional power to solve this problem. But this Government is prepared to sit on their hands and do nothing, and this is a typical example of their answer.

They have responsibilities, Mr. Speaker; they have the constitutional power, but they're not prepared to do anything about it. Now, no one is suggesting that 3¢ an acre is either going to break a farmer, or that he would be wealthy if he didn't have to pay it or that his financial problems would be solved. No one is that foolish, but every nickel of expenditure that is added to farm costs is a burden. I do not believe that this cost-price squeeze can be solved by any one move, either by Provincial or Federal Governments. It will only be solved by a multiplicity of actions on behalf of all governments. For goodness sakes, let us, as the seat of an agriculture economy, and an agriculture province, do our little bit, and show our good faith to the rest of the people of Canada.

March 7, 1961

Can you wonder at the people of Canada not being prepared to implement those programs and those policies that are necessary to solve this cost-price squeeze, if we, the people in Saskatchewan, are not prepared to do anything about our own province, and that is exactly the attitude of this Government on this resolution, and on all matters, where they have the constitutional power to move.

I would like to see every Member in this House, lend his or her support to this resolution, and I'm sure I will be very pleased to lend mine.

Mr. James E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, in connection with the resolution, which was moved by the hon. Member for Souris-Estevan with whose remarks I concur, and I also agree with the remarks just made by the Member for Moosomin, I would like to add some observations of my own in connection with this tax which was instituted in the province in 1944, at the time of the inception of The Mineral Taxation Act.

I think it might be just as well to study the history of the province, and ascertain just how farmers in Saskatchewan came into possession of the mineral rights which they now own. We discover when we search the records that the first Order in Council of the Federal Government, dated October 31st, 1887, reserved all minerals to the Crown, but that Order was never promulgated and therefore had no force. Subsequently another Order in Council was issued, dated September 17th, 1889, reserving all minerals to the Crown. Court judgments have held that the first Order in Council was invalid. Possibly there are some people who might be entitled to minerals, who are not enjoying the benefit of the same due to the fact that the minerals were not included in the titles, which were issued between the period of October 31st, 1887, and September 17th, 1889. However, those settlers who came to the province and homesteaded the land prior to 1889 were entitled to, and generally did

receive the mineral rights, if they didn't receive them they were entitled to receive the mineral rights with the titles to their land.

The next Order in Council, issued in 1889, was promulgated and had full force and effect. Land homesteaded after this date, therefore, did not have the mineral rights included in the titles and saving and excepting where grants were made to land companies by the Federal Government and in certain other special instances, the minerals after that date remained the property of the Federal Government of Canada. Those people who homesteaded their land prior to the dates that I have mentioned, got the mineral rights when they received their titles.

Then farmers received the title for the mineral rights on the land which they bought from certain companies: the Canadian Pacific Railroad, the Hudson Bay Company, and many others, very notably in my country the York Farmers Colonization Company who received a grant of land from the Federal Government on condition that they would bring in a certain number of settlers either from eastern Canada or from England, as the case may be, settle them on the land surrounding the area of Yorkton, and thereby assist in increasing the population of the western plains, and the introduction of agriculture to this province.

Those farmers who came and made deals with the companies generally speaking had the mineral rights included in the titles to their land when they succeeded in paying for the land. Subsequently the minerals were turned over to the provinces by the Federal government in an agreement dated March 24th, 1930, and instead of the Federal Government having jurisdiction over the mineral rights in the province, the province had jurisdiction over mineral rights. That brings us down to the present mineral tax.

In the Throne Speech of 1944, as reported in the 'Commonwealth' of October 25th, 1944, we find these words:

“A new tax will be imposed on all mineral rights, which have been alienated from the Crown, and are privately owned.”

Well Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that word 'alienated'. When you alienate something, it is generally concluded that you got it by some means or another that wasn't just entirely fair. Alienated from the Crown – therefore, they said that the farmers who had their mineral rights in this province

March 7, 1961

had alienated them. There are some very good dictionaries in the Library and I can recommend them to all hon. Members on the other side of the House.

That particular piece of Legislation, I believe, was sponsored by the former Minister of Natural Resources, no longer here, and he had particular reference at that time to large corporations. But the homesteaders, Mr. Speaker, who came to this country and plunked down a ten dollar bill and bet the Government they wouldn't starve to death here, I submit that after they had done their homestead duties, fenced their land, broken up so many acres, pioneered this country, put up with the rigors and the hardships that the pioneers had to put up with, I would suggest that they deserve quiet enjoyment without vicious taxation of anything that they might happen to get by reason of the fact that they did those things. I also suggest that those farmers who came to this country and made deals with the various land companies, some of them were hard deals to live up to, some of them carried high rates of interest, and onerous terms of repayment, I would suggest that when those farmers had completed those deals that were made with the land companies, and managed to secure the clear titles to their lands, they deserved anything and everything that they could get out of it, without being taxed for something which they didn't realize was of any value then, and possibly hasn't been of any value to them since. They certainly deserved anything they got or could get.

Then the hon. Minister for Natural Resources, the Member for Kelsey had the gall and the audacity to get up in this House, and say "the farmers got the Mineral Rights by no particular virtue of their own." Good heavens! They worked and slaved and suffered for those things, and you can snicker if you like, that is the typical attitude of socialists to farmers.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snedker: — And he goes on to say, "It doesn't make any difference to farmers who own the mineral rights." Go and tell that to someone who does own the mineral rights, and wants to get some money out of them. Go and tell that to the farmers in my country who own their mineral rights, and want to get their 10¢ or 15¢ an acre, or whatever they can get in order to manage to keep going under the trying financial circumstances in which they are struggling against at the present time.

Just go and tell it to them. That's the typical attitude of the socialist Minister of Natural Resources, and he's following a typical socialist line – Karl Marx hated the farmers; his collaborator Friedrich Engels despised the farmers.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take exception to those imputations, this constant reference to the group over here as being Marxian Socialists, and National Socialists. It is not parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, and I think it ought to be stopped.

Mr. Snedker: — I have a right to take exception to what the Minister of Natural Resources said about it and about us, and I have taken exception.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Is the hon. Member raising a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, I was raising a point of order. The hon. Member has referred to the group over here, particularly the Minister of Resources, as being a Marxist, which he is not.

Mr. Speaker: — Do you suggest that is an insult that should be taken back? I don't think that any insult was meant by the term, but I am sure that you will have no objection to withdrawing it.

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that Karl Marx is the father of socialism, and I think the hon. gentlemen on the other side will agree with me.

Premier Douglas: — No we will not.

Opposition Member: — You don't like your forefathers, that's all.

Premier Douglas: — Our forefathers are as good as anybody on that side, and then some.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, have I your permission to

March 7, 1961

proceed?

As I was saying at the point of interruption, I indicated, I think to the House, if I didn't indicate it at that time, I'm going to indicate it again, that our farmer pioneers worked, slaved, and suffered sufficiently to deserve in full measure anything they got or can get without having any part of it viciously expropriated or viciously taxed. As I said previously, I don't appreciate in the least little bit, the attitude and the remarks that were made by the Minister of Natural Resources when he said that farmers got rights by no particular virtue of their own.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Stop referring to the Minister of Natural Resources; I haven't yet taken part in this debate.

Mr. Snedker: — I mean the Minister of Mineral Resources, the Member for Kelsey, let's get it right.

Government Member: — That's all we're asking is to get it right.

Mr. Snedker: — Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention, the effects of the tax. Having been instituted in 1944, and subsequently the subject of some litigation, by people who thought that it was ultra vires of the powers of this province, it was a subject, as I have said, of some litigation. The matter more or less was held in abeyance. Those of us who held mineral rights, the farmers, didn't pay much attention to it; we didn't receive any tax notices, at least nobody in my country did. Then in 1948, an oil well was struck at Leduc, and the whole area of western Canada broke into a rash of oil leasing, sometimes referred to as an oil play . . . Go back and read it yourself, if you don't like the figures I'm giving you.

We had oilmen going up and down this country, leasing land for the pitiful picayune pittance of 10¢ an acre. That was what they paid for many of the leases. The arguments that they used in many cases to encourage a farmer to sign a lease, were somewhat along the following line: "You might as well lease the land to us; if you don't the Government is going to take it." That was one of the arguments that was used, and there's hardly one farmer in this province that couldn't have got two, three, four or five times more

for his leases than he did get had the Government not instituted this tax.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snedker: — They used the same argument when they went through the province top leasing. They used the same argument when they went through this province buying 100% rights. That was the argument they used among the people, and this Government played directly into the hands of the large companies and the oil operators when they put the tax on. All the protection the farmers got from the people on the opposite side of the House was absolutely none.

What are the terms of this tax? – and the method by which the Government can take the title away from people who own their mineral rights. The Mineral Tax Act says that:

“Mineral tax administrators shall cause to be sent by registered mail, to the owner of such minerals or to each person other than the owner, who appears by the abstract or general registration certificate, to have any interest in such minerals, a notice stating that unless the arrears together with the costs described by subsection (4) are paid on or before a date to be specified on the notice, which date shall be not less than six months after the date of the mailing of the notice, such minerals shall be forfeited to and become the property of the Crown in the right of the province of Saskatchewan.”

So he’s going to send out a registered letter.

“If the amount of the arrears, or any part thereof” (Section 29, subsection 1) “remains unpaid on the date specified in the notice under Section 28, the Minister may forward to the registrar of the proper Land Titles Office, a copy of the notice together with an affidavit by a person having knowledge of the fact,” (Note this “a” person, just a person, any person, having knowledge of the fact) “setting forth that the notice was sent by registered mail, to each person referred to in Section 28, according to the terms of that Section. And on receipt of the documents mentioned in subsection (1), the registrar

March 7, 1961

shall issue to Her Majesty the Queen, in the right of the province of Saskatchewan, Certificate of Title, free and clear of all endorsements, including endorsements in favour of Her Majesty the Queen, in the right of Saskatchewan, of the minerals described in the notice, and being within or upon or under the land described in the notice.”

Not a word about due process of law but by merely issuing a registered letter, and by someone saying they saw it stamped and without due process of law, a man can have his title taken away from him. Here is the amendment 29A, “A notice pursuant to Section 28 shall not be invalidated by reason of the non receipt of a notice, by the person to whom it was addressed.” In other words, it doesn’t matter whether he got the notice or whether he didn’t he’s going to lose his rights anyhow. It is arbitrary, unfair and absolutely discriminatory against every farmer in this province who owns mineral rights. In addition, I predict many farmers will lose their mineral rights in the future purely and simply through inability to pay the tax.

I would like to draw to the attention of hon. Members opposite, the remarkable timing which recently took place. All the people in my country got their tax notices one day or two days after the election. They must have been printed over here before the election, and then cut loose just after. I noticed that the Minister across the way, he doesn’t happen to be in his seat at the present time, the hon. Member for Kelsey, mentioned that only small amounts of land had been forfeited. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we not only keep them small, but we return the land to the farmers that it has been taken away from. Therefore, I’m going to support the motion, and I take pleasure in seconding it.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, there are certain principles in this debate that have been brought to the attention of this House. Firstly, I wish to submit to the House that passing this kind of legislation would be only setting up a privileged class. It is suggested that \$4.80 per quarter section might help certain farmers in the southeast corner or wherever they have mineral rights to survive. So they think on the other side, but I don’t think this would help them very much. But it does matter

when it comes down to setting up special privilege, and the hon. Members know quite well that is what they're suggesting to this House.

We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that there are about ten million acres or so in this province where the mineral rights are held by corporations such as the Hudson Bay Company, and the CPR and others, which were obtained as the hon. Member mentioned, sometime ago under the laws that were brought into effect, because the Government was interested in this area. As a matter of fact, I recall quite well that there was some fifty-five million acres in the west, and a large part of it was in Saskatchewan, where companies obtained these mineral rights. Now in passing legislation of this nature to remove the mineral tax from the farmers, as was suggested, would mean that we'd also in my opinion have to remove the mineral tax from these particular companies. And that would mean the province of Saskatchewan would lose somewhere around a third of a million dollars in revenue.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Member a question?

Mr. Berezowsky: — After I get through. For example, the hon. Member for Moosomin has suggested that this tax has something to do with farm costs. I'm a farmer and I know that there are certain costs that have to be paid, and taxes are one of them, but certainly the mineral tax is not a farm cost. If an owner of mineral rights figures there's nothing there underneath the surface then he doesn't have to pay the tax, but there are certain areas, of course, where one might have these mineral rights, and in order to protect himself, the farmer who wants to retain such rights must recognize that he is the owner of valuable potential property. Whether the mineral is there or not, doesn't matter so much. It is potential property, otherwise he wouldn't be holding on to it, and if he holds on to what he considers as valuable property, the province of Saskatchewan has the right to tax that property just as they tax any other property, or municipalities tax other property. That I think, is the basic thing that they must remember. That this is a property, and notwithstanding what the hon. Member, who just spoke before me may think, the facts are so.

Now, when these homesteaders settled this country paying their \$10 for a homestead, if they got the mineral rights at that time; nobody has tried to dispossess them of those mineral rights. In the case of

March 7, 1961

my father who took a homestead, he didn't get mineral rights. The hon. Member's father probably got mineral rights when he took a homestead. In other words his father got more than my father got, and as a result of that, he has certain property that the province of Saskatchewan has the right to tax. He can't get away from that. If we did what he suggested, that would mean setting up a privileged class in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like to mention to the hon. Members here that it is only in certain parts of Saskatchewan where we have these areas, where settlers were granted mineral rights at the time they took up a homestead. Up in my part of the country nobody hears anything about mineral rights. It may be that in certain cases, such as that of the Hudson Bay Company, when they obtained their two sections in each township, companies received mineral rights but they retained these rights when they sold this land, while the people throughout most of Saskatchewan did not obtain mineral rights. Again I say, by relieving a certain area of Saskatchewan, whether they're farmers or anybody else, means setting up a privileged group.

I do think that near Prince Albert, we have some river lots that were homesteaded, or settled in the late part of the last century, and I think they have some mineral rights there. They are not concerned too much about the tax and most of them have given up these rights because they don't think they've got anything there. But, these other people who think they've got oil, and where they think they've got gas, refuse to pay \$4.80 a quarter section on one hundred and sixty acres at 3¢ an acre to protect their interests.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I do wish to say that in essence it is just this – that by doing what is suggested by those opposite, we would be setting up a privileged group in this province, and we cannot do that as a Government if we are to be fair.

Mr. E.A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on this motion, I think it merits some consideration, and I see that this resolution purports to provide some aid in reducing farmers' costs of production. I think, initially Mr. Speaker, we need not go any farther than to say that mineral tax is

not a cost of production. The Member from Cumberland has just emphasized this. I myself am a farmer, and I'm aware of the expenditures I must make in order to make the produce that I derive from my land. The mineral cost is not a cost of production, and therefore we should hardly need to go any further than that in this resolution.

I think the error that some people fall into in supporting this is that they confuse the mineral rights with the surface rights. They are entirely separate pieces of property, and they are taxed independently. This resolution purports to reduce farmers' costs, and I see that the word farmers is not in any way qualified. It seems to indicate that they assume that it will help all farmers. Of course, this is not the case, because removing this tax does not help the majority of farmers in this province.

The farmers opposite seem to own their mineral rights, and that is their good fortune. If they own the property, I don't see why they should object to paying a very minimum tax on this property that they deem to be of some value.

In my area, of course, very few farmers own their mineral rights, and so this resolution will be of no help to them. Of course, even at that, if I regarded the tax to be unfair, I would support it, but nevertheless, it is fair in the sense that it is on property that is of potential value. The tax that you pay is, of course, in proportion to the amount of property that you own. It is quite fair in that respect.

The resolution seems to indicate that the mineral tax on farmers' land be abolished. The Member for Cumberland raised this point very well, and there is a basic question for taxation – whether it is proper to tax one class of people, and not another. I'm skeptical of the legality of it, but even if they do accept it, there are some basic questions that arise. Who would be classified as a farmer? The Hudson Bay Company being a land owner, is it also a farmer? I think there could be some very complicated procedures, even on that basis. Of course, this tax does provide revenue, if I remember correctly, it is the vicinity of three quarters of a million a year, of which the farmers pay some portion. No one has yet indicated how much it is. However, this revenue is of value to the province, and further to that, this tax provides an opportunity for some property

March 7, 1961

owners, people who own mineral rights, who live outside of this province, some 4,000 of them to contribute to various services that we enjoy in this province.

The Member for Moosomin says that he doesn't know the value of his mineral rights. Of course, he doesn't, but he believes they are of some value, or he would not continue to pay the modest tax that he does. If we follow this logic or make an analogy on it, even though I pay my municipal taxes, that municipality doesn't guarantee to me that I am going to get any profit. The fact of having paid the tax, doesn't assure you of value on the revenue, and I think it is rather weak and futile to say that we're interested in making a gesture which will impress the Federal Government in certain respects. This I'm very skeptical of. There is no evidence in support of this opinion.

I was very much entertained by the Member for Saltcoats; he has a very strange concept of the very common and usual word, "alienate" however it has little to do with this resolution. He feels very badly about this, and he thinks that because some people work very hard, that they should get all that they can. I can assure him that people in my area work just as hard. They don't own their mineral rights, and I don't see what he is squawking about. He states that it is a vicious tax. Mr. Speaker, 3¢ an acre is approximately equivalent to a pound and a half of wheat, which most farmers, as I've observed, will pass out the end of their combine or blow off their truck boxes. It is not a major sum, and yet, in its gross it contributes appreciably to the revenue of this province.

He mentioned the various tax deals. When oil was discovered, he said people became interested in their mineral rights. Well of course, that is true, and the fact that some people may have made deals that they regretted, has nothing whatsoever to do with this tax. In fact, and I am pleased to comment on this, no Government under similar circumstances has gone any farther than this Government has, in order to give redress to these people who have felt themselves aggrieved because of deals that they thought were to their disadvantage.

In short, Mr. Speaker, as you will judge, I do not intend to support this motion. In effect it is not a resolution that would give any assistance to the farmers in general. It would deprive the province of revenue, and in fact, in view of these reasons, I think that the Members opposite should throw out this old mildewed and warped plank, and also reject this motion.

Mr. Kluzak: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The debate was, on motion of Mr. Kluzak, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.