

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fourteenth Legislature
21st Day

Thursday, March 9, 1961.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

QUESTION RE LICENSE BUREAU

Mr. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer? Is the Regina License Bureau today refusing to take cash for operators' licenses, and car plates? Is it accepting only money orders and cheques? If so will the Minister look into the situation and see if something can be done, because it looks rather ridiculous to me on the surface.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I have no specific information on it, but I would certainly be greatly surprised if it were true.

Mr. Thatcher: — It is, Sir.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — What may be the situation is that application forms may not as yet be available, I don't know, but I will look into it.

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Wednesday, March 8th, 1961, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

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

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in my brief remarks last evening, I had congratulated, I think, almost everyone, including

March 9, 1961

yourself, and I would just like to add my congratulations to those new Members on both sides of the House, who were successful on the 8th of June last year. I trust that they have been able to find comfortable living quarters in our capital city.

I will get right into figures, Mr. Speaker. Our budget amounts to \$1,224,310, a reduction of a little over \$133,000 from last year. We've been requested to make certain cuts, and we've made them, and we hope for the best. We think we will be able to get by. Now I'm going to refer briefly to minimum wage rates, mostly for the benefit of those who sit in this Legislature for the first time. There has been some criticism coming from the Opposition, and I would like them to pay close attention to what I am going to say.

The wage rate in this province is \$32.00 a week in the larger centres and \$31.00 a week over the balance of the province. It does provide the young man and woman starting out in life with a reasonable standard of living until they're able to secure a better position. It was never assumed that persons would be required to raise families on minimum wage rates, but rather to protect employees of traditionally low wage rate occupations, such as theatres, offices, shops, laundries, hotels and so forth. Thirty-two dollars a week, as I said a moment ago, is not a high rate, but it is the highest minimum rate in Canada. I would like to emphasize that point, and it has been so for a good many years. Good wages, even high wages are the lubricant of our economy. The merchants of this city, or any other city or town, are indebted to union activity for securing good rates of pay for their members, which are reflected to some extent in non-union groups.

Money received soon finds its way into the cash registers for the benefit of the storekeeper, and indirectly his employees. So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that good wages are the lubricant of our economy.

It is noted that the province of Alberta will soon increase their minimum to 85¢ per hour, effective on June 1st. We will, of course, give consideration to at least a similar increase. Alberta will also on June 1st, provide two weeks holidays with pay. We have had such provision for sixteen years in this province, Mr. Speaker, and in addition three weeks holidays with pay for employees with over three years' service.

I would just like to take a moment now to read Minimum Wage Board Order #9. I'll make it as brief as I can.

“This order shall apply to all employers and employees engaged in the operations of logging and lumbering, river driving, rafting, cutting and hewing and in any factory operating as an adjunct thereto, and to every cook, cookee, bull cook and watchman, employed in connection therewith. Every employee except the cook, cookee, bull cook or watchman shall be paid at a rate of wages not less than 90¢ per hour. Every cook, cookee, bull cook, and watchman shall be paid at a rate of wages of not less than \$150 a month.”

And then it goes on with different conditions and so forth. Here is another one . . .

“Every employee except the cook, cookee, bull cook or watchman shall be paid at his regular rate of wages, for all time necessarily spent by him, in proceeding from his employers premises to or from his place of work.”

Now, nobody will ever get rich I don't think, in this or any other province in the logging industry. But these wages, as we understand, are equal to any other in the Dominion of Canada. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if any of these people get as little as 90¢ an hour. I think the industry pays more than that as a general rule.

I usually have something to say about the motion picture industry; that's part of my Department, at least the censoring, public halls and all that, and I have here two pages from the “Readers' Digest,” I think it is the latest one, and I would just like to quote two or three paragraphs from there: The title of the article is “How to Stop the Movies' Sickening Exploitation of Sex.”

“Why should we put up with the avalanche of films that glorify depravity and evil?”

The article is by Don Wharton.

“It was one evening last autumn, columnist John Crosby strolled up Broadway, looking at the movie marquees. Here, in part, is his resulting column which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune:

March 9, 1961

‘Love by Appointment,’ whispers the marquee over the Rialto, where they have a good double feature. ‘Unmarried Mothers’ is the other one. ‘Call me Anything but Call Me Often,’ runs the caption under a half dressed girl. ‘Most daring scenes ever shown. A story of unbridled passion and wanton love. Behind the scenes of a call-girl racket. The girls who can’t stop and the ones who won’t.’”

And he goes on to say, he did the same thing a month later, and the pictures were just as daring. Here is another on the next page, he refers to a picture here, the criterion the “Girl of the Night” beautiful enough to be a model, debutante and so forth.

“The management had installed telephones next to the sidewalk with a sign inviting pedestrians to call the call girl. “Use these phones and listen to her sizzling conversation.”

That was the caption:

“Those who did heard a sultry voice saying, “I’m Bobbie Williams, your girl of the night, I’ve been waiting for your call.”

I hasten to assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that that is no relation of mine – Bobbie Williams. Then we go down a little further.

“Attacks on objectionable pictures are coming even from people in the movie industry itself. Associations of exhibitors have officially protested the avalanche of films with oversexed themes, treatment, and dialogue that they are getting from the producers. Last spring Senn Lawler, former president and general manager of the Fox Midwest Theaters, told exhibitors: “You are offered products with themes emphasizing incest, rape, homosexuality, premarital relations, adultery, even abortion.”

And the article ends up by requesting that people stay away from this type of picture, which has been classified as “sick pictures.”

To come closer to home, Mr. Speaker, in this morning’s “Leader-Post” appeared an article with the caption, “T.V. Viewers rap Offering.”

“A C.B.C. television presentation of the Zoo Story, on “Festival 61” Monday night, got more than the usual number of telephone calls. C.K.C.K. – T.V. assistant manager, Lloyd Westmorland, reports. A reasonable number of the callers were critical of the program and what they called ‘its lack of good taste’ he said. Norman Botterhill, manager of C.J.L.H. – T.V. in Lethbridge, said most of the callers to his station protested against what they called, ‘profanity and vulgarity’ and the obvious implications of homosexuality, which the program conveyed. He said the C.B.C. placed this television station and others in an anomalous situation, because the foul language in the program was a contravention of the code of ethics of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters.”

So let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the C.B.C. will do something about matters of this kind.

Now to get into the various branches of my Department, I’ll first refer to the safety branches. The Boiler and Pressure Vessels made 9800 inspections during the year 1959-60, collected fees amounting to \$34,728 a total of \$116,472 including registration, licenses, permits, certificate fees and so forth. Due to the excellent coverage and supervision, no accidents of any consequence were recorded during the fiscal year.

The Electrical Inspection Branch made 98,000 inspections, collected fees amounting to \$273,000. The Gas Inspection also had a big year, making 64,126 inspections. The Power Corporation paid to this Department the cost of all inspections. It should be mentioned here, Mr. Speaker, that the safety branches just mentioned, electrical, gas, boilers and pressure vessels, the office of the fire commissioner, are all self-sustaining, and are not charged on the Provincial Treasury, taking in as I have mentioned more money than the cost of operation and administration. This, of course, does not include the cost of heating, light, rental and so forth.

The Office of the Fire Commissioner had a busy year, having made 6684 inspections, conducted twenty-two training schools in various parts of the province. This branch is operated by 1½% of the fire premiums paid into the province, plus a small amount from the consolidated fund when necessary. During 1959, twenty-eight persons in Saskatchewan lost their lives in fires of whom thirteen were children. This is a decrease from the

March 9, 1961

previous year, when thirty-four persons, including twenty children died in fires. Property damage in 1959 amounted to \$3,280,580 representing a drop of nearly \$700,000 from the 1958 total. So we are improving along those lines, Mr. Speaker.

Statistics published by the Office of the Fire Commissioner show that in 1958 Saskatchewan had a per capita fire loss of \$4.48 which was the second lowest across Canada. In 1959 the Saskatchewan figure was still lower - \$3.73. The average annual per capita property fire loss in Saskatchewan for the past ten years is lower than in any other province, which speaks well for the efficiency of the Fire Commissioner and his staff.

The insurance companies must appreciate the comparatively low losses they are required to pay out in this province. A great improvement still can be made, Mr. Speaker, and fewer lives lost, by the general public exercising greater caution where fire hazards are concerned.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker as though the Opposition has written off the city of Regina, politically, because speaker after speaker from the Opposition has criticized the erection of public buildings here, the Court House for one, and particularly the new Power Corporation Building. Regina being the capital city, and seat of Government, it is difficult to know where else these buildings should be placed. I'm afraid that some of the Members have not outgrown the small town dislike for the capital city. Actually the city of Moose Jaw has been given the two largest 'plums' – if we can use that term – in the Training School, ten or so years ago, of which \$7.6 million was spent, and the Technical Institute built last year, costing \$2.3 million. The total staff of these two buildings, all residents of the city of Moose Jaw, amount to five hundred and fifty.

Millions of dollars each year is poured into the university buildings in Saskatoon, so that city does very well. Speaking again of the new Court House in Regina, I remember hearing of the Liberal Government electing their Members in this city in at least two elections between the wars, on the promise of a Court House on the property just north of Central Collegiate. It never materialized. This Government has gone ahead and built the much-needed new Court House, which is to be opened in a few weeks, and not too soon. It should not be too long before the old one falls down; it has been there since 1894. There has been some criticism from time to time about the splendid museum here, and I have a copy of the "Leader-Post," I think it was Monday

or Tuesday, that Mr. Allan Jarvis still thinks the museum is a silly building. Well he's entitled to his opinion. He's from down east, perhaps he's from Toronto, but I don't think very many people in this part of the country would agree with him. We think it's a splendid building.

I come now to the Labour Standards Branch. It is one of the most important in my Department, where they collected \$148,331 last year for 4,852 employees, and an additional \$2700 collected through the courts. A little over 3900 inspections. There are approximately 16,000 business places in this province, Mr. Speaker, which require inspection, and should be inspected every year. We get around to as many as we can. We have two additional men put on this year, both very good types of persons, one at Weyburn and one at Swift Current, and we expect to do a more thorough job in 1961 for the benefit of the wage earner, many of whom do not get the advantages they are entitled to by our labour legislation.

I should say a word here about the employers of this province, most of whom are honest, and wish to treat their employees fairly. But there are, of course, some chisellers who will underpay or overwork their employees. They are the ones who require careful checking.

For the past two or three years, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal from the Opposition in regard to labour and the CCF. During the Kinistino byelection two or three years ago, the former Member for Saltcoats tramped from one end of the Constituency to the other, trying to scare the voters with talk of gangsters, the Teamsters' Union, Jimmy Hoffa, and so forth, all in some nebulous way, supposedly connected with the CCF. Not many people were fooled and we won the byelection quite easily, and won again on June the 8th of last year.

Mr. McDonald: — How about Turtleford?

Hon. Mr. Williams: — The same tactics were used again last spring. Yes, I forgot to welcome the Member from Turtleford, and I do so now.

I think in the history of any Canadian province, it is unique for any person to win two elections in a row by a fluke, but anyway the Member is here, and he's quite welcome. We would rather have somebody else . . .

March 9, 1961

Mr. McDonald: — Some fluke! Some chicken; some neck.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Might I say, I was just referring to the statements from across the way from time to time about the supposed connections of the CCF and labour. Now after all, what is labour? Who is labour in this province? I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is largely composed of people who have left the farm for some reason or another and moved into our towns and cities, together with thousands of the sons and daughters of our farmers. Many of our best civil servants have come from farms, and are an asset to the Government service. The same could be said in many other classes of employment throughout the province. So let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that any reference to labour will include thousands of people from the farms.

While I'm on the subject of labour unions, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer briefly to international labour unions. Some persons are inclined to make statements with a bit of a patriotic flavor, to the effect that so much money should not be sent down to the United States, but that the unions should be all Canadian and keep the money here. This may sound all very well, but there is actually no good reason why it should be. Conditions are greatly similar in both countries, and an interchange of facts and information is always desirable and beneficial, and is practised to quite an extent.

My own union, one of the non-ops, as they are called, The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, has had its headquarters in St. Louis, Missouri for many years. There are eleven vice-presidents, two of whom are Canadian. A convention is held every three or four years, and approximately one hundred delegates from Canada attend. They are well thought of by their friends, the American delegates. Whatever money is sent to St. Louis is used to pay the salaries of the two Canadian vice-presidents. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I belong to a well-known service club in this city, the membership of which includes a number of very fine people. There are many such clubs across Canada and the United States, with headquarters in a city in Ohio (I'm referring to the one I belong to, of course.) I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to a few cents of my dues each month, going down to our union headquarters in St. Louis, and I have no objection to a few cents a month going to the headquarters of the service club in the city in Ohio.

I would like to say a few words regarding the threatened strike of the non-operating employees of the

railways, perhaps two months ago now. May I first say that I was pleased that the strike was not necessary, because of the hardship it might have created among many citizens across Canada who are not part of, or had any connection with the dispute. Some criticism has been directed against the employees which is entirely unjustified in my opinion. A few years ago the non-operating group were among the best paid of any in Canada, due mainly to the initiative of their representatives at the bargaining table. However, during the past few years, this enviable position has been lost, and many other groups have forged ahead, such as mining, meat products, paper products, printing, motor vehicles and many others. Now instead of being in first place these men and women find their wages have lagged far behind. Out of eighty industries listed, according to D.B.S. figures for August 1960, forty-four have higher hourly rated employees than have the non-operating railway group. Remember they were in first place a few years ago, now they're forty-fifth. A few years ago the railway officials agreed to keep the income of these employees on at least the same level as those persons employed in the durable goods group such as iron and steel products, transportation equipment, electrical apparatus and supplies and so forth. Now, however, this group is far ahead, and it is only natural that the non-operating employees of both railways are greatly concerned.

I suggest that in negotiating since last spring they have shown considerable patience and restraint. On the other hand the railways claim they are unable to pay, and have produced the figures to prove it. This is correct in the case of the Canadian National, which is a collection of roads which became bankrupt years ago. This company has carried a millstone of debt and interest charges for decades. Competition of trucks, buses and air travel have eaten tremendously into the revenues of both roads, and it would appear as though they actually cannot find the money for an increase. Although I notice in last Saturday's list of weekly stock yields that C.P.R. is listed at $22\frac{3}{4}$ with a dividend of \$1.50, which brings a yield of 6.59%. But, presuming they are able to prove that they are unable to pay these increases which the employees, I suggest, are entitled to, what is to be done?

On the one hand a reasonable and justified request for an increase in wages, badly needed in times such as these, with living costs going up gradually all the time; on the other hand the employer unable to pay. One solution, of course, would be an increase in passengers, freight and express rates, which would mean an added burden to business firms who would pass the added costs

March 9, 1961

on to the customers to be paid for by Mrs. And Mrs. John Citizen in the end. No, we do not wish to see an increase in these rates, and with revenues declining, there is only one solution, and that is a subsidy from the Federal Government. Such a solution must be found before May 15th, and the situation must be cleared up before that date. I understand the strike will be called the next day, unless it is settled, of course. The employees are determined and will not be put off any longer. Whatever the wage rates will be, they will be made retroactive which means that the employees will receive in the final analysis the same amount of cash that they would have received had their request been met with last June.

Passenger business of the railroads has fallen to an all time low, due mainly to increased air travel. Comparatively few people ride the trains these days, excepting a bit of a rush in the summertime, Easter, Christmas holidays and so forth. Railways across Canada and the United States have been reducing their service drastically as we well know even in this province. This service is operated at a loss when one considers the reduced traffic, expensive equipment, and motive power, together with delays passenger trains cause the real money makers, the freight trains. If the general public wishes such service retained, they will have to patronize it to a greater extent than they have been doing. Railways are a necessity and we cannot get along without them, Mr. Speaker. If the people of Canada wish to maintain the luxury of uncontrolled competitive service, such as bus travel, air travel and trucking, they must expect to pay higher rates. The employees should not be asked to subsidize these rates.

I will just refer now to an item connected with the Department of Agriculture, and they are to be commended on the Family Farm Improvement Plan whereby assistance will be provided, toward making available running water to many farms and to a number of towns, villages, and hamlets. I need not mention the convenience this will be, and together with power and electrical appliances, living standards will be greatly improved. Such plans will call for considerable digging of ditches below the frost line to bury the water mains. The Workmen's Compensation Board has issued a warning.

“Men are buried and suffocated by cave-ins, in this province every year, through carelessness, and every caution should be taken by either sloping the sides of the trench or protecting in some other way a ditch with vertical sides that is a trap and exceedingly dangerous.”

Now yesterday afternoon, the Member for Gravelbourg referred to frills insofar as Saskatchewan Government Telephones are concerned, and I think he said something about these nice little dials that we use nowadays. Well I will just refer to such things as progress. Now I will just read out of the yearly report – I found it just yesterday – the highlights for 1961 –

“The conversion to dial of the exchanges at Meadow Lake, and Outlook during 1961 will complete the corporation’s program to establish its toll centres for the dialing network. Wilkie and Unity both community dial offices connected to North Battleford will be converted in April 1961 – (less than a month from now.) Maple Creek is also expected to be converted late in 1961.”

I would just like to point out that we have played no favorites there, many of these places are in Opposition seats. In addition to these centres just referred to, the following, some of which may be completed before the year end, are scheduled for conversion to dial. Arcola, Bateman, Birch Hills, Esterhazy, Fort Qu’Appelle, Gravelbourg, Gull Lake, Hodgeville, Kinistino, LaFleche, Neidpath, Perdue, Regina Beach, Rosthern, Rouleau, Saltcoats, Shellbrook, Star City, and Webb. It is expected they’ll all have dial service and any rurals connected with them will have dial service too. I notice Gravelbourg is included in the list, and if the Member for that Constituency is opposed to dial service, I wish he would let us know pretty soon, and we’ll try and overlook his town. But, for the moment that is in our program.

New developments have made possible the increased use of microwave for communications purposes, and additional long distance facilities will be provided between Saskatoon and Prince Albert, Swift Current and Maple Creek, Weyburn and Arcola, using this medium. A new service will be established when long distance facilities are provided by radio between the base station at Meadow Lake and the communities of Barthel, Bluebell, Golden Ridge, Green Lake, Horsehead and Loon River. We are going into these areas because apparently the persons who reside there are, for one reason or another, unable to get the rural companies themselves, as is done in most other parts of the province. Actually we have had at one time 1100 rural telephone companies. Through amalgamations it has been cut down 863.

March 9, 1961

I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a photostatic copy of the "Melville Advance," Wednesday, November 30th, and Wednesday, December 7th – provincial affairs. The Member for that Constituency in Melville has taken us to task, and I have divided his remarks off into twelve sections. Now I can't possibly take the time to go into them all. But, I would like to refer to two or maybe three. Here's what he said on November 30th.

"Last year after much urging from the Opposition, and particularly myself, with my knowledge of the need through being a secretary to the rural telephone company, the Government in the dying days before the election passed a Bill to provide assistance to rural telephone companies."

This is the first time that I have ever heard of the dying days; we had been talking about it for a year before.

"This was a welcome measure, by many, but when we saw the Legislation, many were not too happy. As most people know, the assistance offered was set up in two distinct ways. One was a grant of a third of the cost of new poles replaced by the company, the second is a subscriber grant of \$2.50 per subscriber, where rural telephone companies meet certain other basic requirements."

I would just like to say in passing that the cost of these poles is approximately \$2.15 each, and at January 31st, just a little over a month ago, we had approved of 47,000 poles, which is going to cost the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, \$101,374. Now everybody seems happy about this situation, except the Member from Melville, Mr. Speaker. We never get any complaints from elsewhere that I know of, and certainly the 863 rural telephone companies have never indicated anything but approval at the program that we have in effect.

Next we have – this is still the Member for Melville in the Melville Advance:"

"Originally the basic requirement was a company having at least 400 members. I brought it to the attention of the Minister that there were some fourteen companies in the province with 400 members or more, and that this legislation would be useless unless companies amalgamated."

Now, the gentleman appears to think that the larger companies are the only ones we're thinking of. If the legislation and regulations were carefully studied, he'd find that the small companies can co-operate in maintenance units to qualify for the grants. Now here are some examples: In the Regina area, some nine companies are co-operating in a maintenance unit, and have a joint contract with the telephone linemen for maintenance work. They have a total of some 426 telephones on their lines. Similarly in Melfort area, five companies are working together, and in Birch Hills, four companies, to effect the highest standard of telephone service made possible by the Government's maintenance grants. Now I could talk a long time on that, if the clock would permit, but just one more, Mr. Speaker.

In the paper of December 7th, here is the statement there:

"This year 1960, if we had not had to pay the connection fees to the Government, it would have meant a saving to our subscribers of \$7.00 a subscriber or a total of \$1610. So far this year we have received, or will have received by the end of the year, approximately \$500 in pole grants, and if we are fortunate enough to pass the grant formula, we will also receive approximately \$575 in a subscriber grant. At most under the Government policy, we will stand to receive \$1100 this year, in place of the \$1610, which could have been received under the policy suggested by myself in the Legislature."

Now, he's fairly accurate, that \$7.00 a year is approximately what the rural companies pay into Saskatchewan Government Telephones. The exact figure is \$7.25. What do we do with that \$7.25? Well here's the list: The commission paid to the agent for switching is \$3.00; a new directory is 50¢; the administration of the rural branch — \$2.03; estimated costs of billing and so forth 50¢; for a total of \$6.03. Now, that leaves Government Telephones \$1.22 per year from each subscriber to do the following:

1. Cable or wire in our local distribution plant for rural circuits. (That is quite an expensive business too).
2. Central office equipment, such as jacks on our switchboards, required in manual offices — a capital investment of \$275 a line. Where we have automatic service in this instance commission would not be applicable.

March 9, 1961

3. Provide for depreciation of our plant.

4. On automatic conversions, we exchange set for set, with no premium charge for dial telephones. That is quite correct as anyone on the rural lines will know, when they've switched from manual sets to dial sets, we take the old set in – they're usually scrapped, they're almost valueless, and put in a new set. They cost us between \$25 and \$30 . . . grant.

5. Assistance in power induction programs, such as providing fuse protectors.

6. Provide contact space on S.G.T. pole lines at below rental costs.

7. Provide for power and maintenance of central office equipment.

Now, we do all that for \$1.22, and in addition, you've heard the price for poles, plus the \$2.50 per subscriber, if they have their plant up to a certain standard, or if they will agree to get it up to that standard, they're still entitled to the \$2.50 a month.

Now here is one of the brief statements, by the Member for Melville, in the paper. He said:

“I believe that generally speaking, Saskatchewan Government Telephones are giving good service to the province.”

Well, I think we'll all agree on this side of the House, with that.

Now, my time is nearly up, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is much use going into anything else. I have material here on unemployment and apprenticeship, which I would liked to have given at this time, but it has been discussed fairly thoroughly in the past two or three weeks, and so possibly I won't need to go on with it.

I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, again congratulate all those who have taken part in this debate. I think some of the maiden speeches given have been outstanding, and I want to congratulate those on both sides of the House.

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

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in the budget debate, I would first of all like, since I'm on radio for the first time, to say "hello" to the people in the Constituency of Athabasca, with a special greeting to the staff and students at La Ronge school.

I would further say, at this time, a sincere "thank you" for the opportunity to represent that Constituency in Regina. I will do my utmost to be worthy of your support.

In 1945, the Minister of Natural Resources, at that time, Mr. Phelps, made the following statement of policy:

"To be consistent with true socialism, future development must provide for the maximum development of natural resources in the best interests of all the people. It is the intention of the Government to effect an orderly change to social ownership, in the industrial development of our natural resources."

It is true that the socialists have tried to carry out their intention to completely socialize our natural resources, and nowhere was it more definitely tried than in northern Saskatchewan. After sixteen years, this experiment is still going on, and it is not meeting with the success that was hoped for, since the change was not orderly. There has been no maximum development of industry, and the only people that it has been in the best interests of, are those that have their jobs as the result of political patronage.

The first step in the socialist experiment was to develop our natural resources in northern Saskatchewan, by organizing Crown Corporations. In spite of the compulsory marketing features that attended these, they were hopeless failures as you are all aware. However, with the failure of these Crown Corporations, the Government was not ready to give up. Instead they decided that they must be more subtle if they were going to socialize the people in the north half of the province. The second attempt is now being made under the cover of co-operatives, of which the most vicious is the co-op fisheries. I am certainly not opposed to the establishment of co-operative societies which follow the true principles of co-operation, such as open and voluntary

March 9, 1961

membership, democratic control, and non-political. But I am opposed to government-formed co-ops that are run by the Government, for the exploitation of the members. How can you have voluntary membership, when you can't sell fish from a co-op controlled lake, other than to the co-op Fisheries? How can you have democratic control, when the local Board of Directors are not free to sell their produce where they wish, or to make decisions of their own? At present, the local members are the pawns of the central Board of Directors who, it is interesting to note, are the same that directed the Saskatchewan Marketing Service to its doom. How can you have political neutrality when the directors hold down government jobs, and field personnel are faced with dismissal, if they don't participate politically in favour of this present Government?

It was interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, and I'm sorry that he's not in his chair today, while proudly congratulating himself on the work of his Department the other day, made the statement: "That the production and market value of the fishing industry was increasing slowly upwards." On checking the annual reports for the Department of Natural Resources, 1944 – 1960, I found the following information.

The total commercial production of fish had increased slowly all right. In fact after sixteen years of socialist government, it had increased by only 250,000 pounds. I found also, however, that the market value of this fish had increased by \$1,157,451, but, what the hon. Minister forgot to mention, was that while the market value was increasing rapidly, the percentage of this market value which the fishermen received decreased steadily from 72% to as low as 37.5% today. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in 1943 under a Liberal Government, the hard-working fishermen got 72¢ out of every dollar for fish sold, but today under the CCF he gets only 37½¢ out of every dollar. Yes, the Minister of Natural Resources, forgot to mention this example of more abundant living.

To prove my point, I have here in my hand the statement of settlement from co-op fisheries in the Pinehouse area for the last summer season. Market value of fish sold through this co-op: \$87,657.94; the total available for fishermen: \$33,278.06; 37.5% of the sale goes back to the fisherman. Now one area is already feeling the effect of the formation of these co-ops. After a meeting the local members decided they could

not pay the tremendous administrative expenses, they closed down the filleting plant for the winter. This put a large number of people out of work at a time when there was no other work available. It discouraged many of the native fishermen from going fishing, and it disrupted the economy of the whole area.

The Department of Co-operatives has done nothing to try and remedy this matter with the result the fishermen are the ones to suffer. I would like to suggest that the Government give these co-ops the freedom to sell their fish where they can get the best return for their hard work, and they could also cut down the administrative expenses by eliminating the highly paid socialist drones who are continually joyriding around the north at the fisherman's expense.

Now since there was some slight misrepresentation in the facts regarding the fishing industry, I thought perhaps I should check the hon. Minister's statement, "That fur production had reached an all time high under good management of the CCF." He stated that the "Value of pelts in 1959-60 was \$1,300,000." But I found in checking the report of 1943, that in that year total value of pelts was \$2,372,000 – another definitely misleading statement. Now that the hon. Minister's stories were getting farther from the truth as he went along, I started to follow up other statements that he had made. The hon. Minister of Natural Resources said that "Last year they upped the saw timber production to give more employment." Well maybe they did do that, but if they did, the number that were employed previously in woods operations must have been at an all time low, for again comparing the reports of the Department of Natural Resources, we find that the number of men employed in the woods industry have decreased from 5300 in 1943 to 3400 in 1960, and saw mill production decreased from 128 million board feet to 82 million board feet during the same period.

Now I know the Minister is going to say, "We are practicing conservation measures." Might I refer him, however, to Table 77 of the Stanford Report, which this Government thought so favorable, where it states that in 1958 the allowable cut was 228 million board feet. This Government cut only 106 million board feet.

I noticed also that the Minister conveniently forgot to mention, when reviewing the forestry industry, the pulpwood industry of this province. Of course, this is embarrassing to the Government, to have to admit that we

March 9, 1961

have not one pulp mill in the province, while Alberta has one in operation, and two under construction, and ten more planned for ten years. Of course, Alberta is more sympathetic to private enterprise.

Since, on checking three statements that the Minister of Natural Resources made we found that he was wrong three times, I doubt if the general public can place much faith in the veracity of any of his statements.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — At the present time, there is a significant change taking place in northern Saskatchewan. Certain areas of population are becoming overcrowded due to a population explosion among our Treaty and Metis residents with the result that the fishing and the trapping, which used to be a sufficient economic base for providing a good living, now no longer does so. The obvious solution appears to be placing many of these residents into wage-earning employment. It appears also that education will be the main medium by which we will prepare these people for this employment. Although a start has been made to provide vocational subjects in our integrated schools, and a vocational training program for those out of school, I wonder if these measures will keep up with the demand and need.

We are also overlooking a very important point as far as native people are concerned. It is true that our aim should be to train them to fill positions in any part of Canada, but I believe it would be wise, during the transition period, to train these students for employment in their own environment. This would not increase unemployment in the south when they are ready to enter the employment market, and no doubt many will be much happier working in familiar, physical and cultural surroundings. The present courses available seem to me to favour job placement in the south of the province. Now, in spite of the fact that for three years the northern areas have made requests for consideration to be given towards building a vocational and technical school in the Prince Albert area, or some other northern point, to date nothing has been done to investigate the need for one in the north half of our province, although Prince Albert is a logical centre for a school to develop skilled workers for northern development.

I said three years ago, and I say again now, one of the greatest needs in northern Saskatchewan today, is a technical and vocational school, that would provide training for our Treaty and Metis adults and students, particularly in the technical skills needed for the development of our natural resources, and related industries, as well as providing them with the means whereby they can improve their income, and work on an equal basis with their white neighbors in an environment in which they can compete with at least one advantage in their favour.

If we are to increase the income and living standards of our northern residents, as we must surely do, then we must have a greater development and wiser administration of our natural resources. Since a great area of northern Saskatchewan lies within the Pre-Cambrian Shield, one of the richest mineral belts in Canada, we can hopefully look forward, I think, to the day when mining and related industries will provide a large source of income for the people of that area. The last two years, however, have shown a marked decline in mineral exploration in the north. No doubt, the depressed base metal markets have had some effect, but it appears also that certain Government policies have not been conducive to increased development. The policy of granting large concessions or reservations to mining companies has been opposed by the Saskatchewan Chamber of Mines, the Local Prospectors Association and independent prospectors. After several concessions had been given in 1957, several Prospectors Associations and the Saskatchewan Chamber of Mines, in a letter to the Minister, protested the granting of these concessions. The Minister at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Mines in the spring of 1958 assured the Chamber that no more concessions would be given. Three days later a concession was given to another company in a particularly hot area in northern Saskatchewan. Later in 1958, another large concession was granted, to another company for three years in a particularly promising area, where other development was about to take place. As a result the company has been able to work a very small section of the area, but the rest of the area has been forced to lie dormant since that time. The granting of this concession has definitely been one of the reasons for the decline in exploration in the last two years.

Now, with this Government planning changes in Saskatchewan mining regulations, I had hoped that steps would be taken to encourage renewed interest in northern Saskatchewan. However, it appears, Mr. Speaker, that just the opposite is going to take place. There appeared in the "Leader-Post" of February 9th, 1961, an article

March 9, 1961

concerning these proposed regulations, and I quote:

“Mining circles condemn Saskatchewan Change.”

“Proposed change in mining regulations, said ridiculous.”

“A confidential draft of the proposed changes in Saskatchewan mining regulations has evoked almost unanimous condemnation in mining circles, according to the ‘Northern Miner’, a newspaper published in Toronto for the mining industry. The best example of bureaucracy at work; a backward step; utterly ridiculous and downright silly.”

These were some of the comments on the changes gathered by this mining publication. Now according to the ‘Northern Miner’, the most objectionable feature of the proposed legislation, include considerable weakening of title to mineral property, sharp limitation of surface rights, a concession-type system which would tie up large areas, from which prospecting would be excluded, a stiff 12.5% royalty, and extremely cumbersome requirements for evidence of work, as well as the requirement that all ores must be treated and refined in Saskatchewan. The only way they’ll ever get any industry, no doubt.

These suggested regulations prove once more, the throttling, choking, deadening effect of socialism at work. Now the two greatest industries in northern Saskatchewan, commercial fishing and tourism, are also creating the greatest problems. The rivalry between the commercial fishermen and the tourists for control of many of the northern lakes still continues. It is unfortunate that this rivalry exists, for they both play a very important part in the economy of the north. Tourism is the fastest growing industry in the north today, and will continue to increase. However, we must not let the lure of tourist dollars blind us to the responsibility that we have to the commercial fishermen who, after all, are mostly the native people of the area, and the permanent residents of our province. They depend on fishing for a good portion of their yearly income. Their interest must be protected. It is, therefore, extremely necessary for the present Government to devise policies which will be fair to both of them, while allowing both of them the maximum of expansion.

I had hoped after the Government sponsored tours to Members of the Legislative Assembly, during the last few years, that our Government would adopt a new approach

to northern development. However, it seems we are still the forgotten people, as shown by the events of the last year and the outlook for the future. At a time when unemployment is a serious problem in Saskatchewan as a whole, the Provincial Government has a wonderful opportunity to combat this problem with a realistic approach to northern development. It is true that more money would have to be spent, but Mr. Speaker, in this case it is not where a penny saved will be a penny earned. The development of roads and communications systems must always come first in the opening of new areas. The La Ronge to Uranium City road, however, has become the greatest joke of the 20th century. How any Government could spend so much money, hire so many men, create so much publicity, and get so little done, is beyond me. In four full years, forty-four miles have been completed to a second grade standard. At that rate of eleven miles a year, it will take forty-one years to complete this road.

There is also an urgent need for more access roads to encourage forest, mineral, commercial fishing, and tourist development. The time has come when many settlements that are within short distances of existing roads, should be given a road contact to the outside. Island Falls and Sandy Bay, are prime examples of this. For many years this area has been contributing large sums of money to the coffers of this province. The total per year over many years stands at \$150,000 from their power development alone. They are at present only twenty-eight miles from having a road link with the outside. Now, surely when you consider the need and benefit that this area would derive from the construction of twenty-eight miles, you cannot believe them unreasonable when they ask the Government for some consideration of this road. But, as yet they are pounding on deaf ears.

Pinehouse, Stanley, Pelican Narrows, and many more communities must be given consideration regarding an outside road link, in the near future. A long distance telephone link is also becoming another necessity. The radio has played an important part in the development of the north, but at present it is not private enough, and too slow for mining companies and others who wish to contact markets in eastern Canada, and for tourists who wish to send word to their friends at home. A system whereby both telephone and television connections would result, would probably prove most economical to build and maintain in the long run.

Two further recent developments which have caused considerable concern to northern residents, is the closing of the Prince Albert Sanatorium and the restrictions

March 9, 1961

of magistrate services in the north. The largest number of patients in the Sanatorium come from northern Saskatchewan. Now parents and friends of these patients will be put to added expense of going to Saskatoon or Qu'Appelle to visit with the result that visits will be fewer, and in many cases not made at all.

The restriction of magistrate services will prevent northern residents receiving the justice and fairness of the courts to which they're entitled. I suppose the few dollars saved at the expense of justice for the people of the north, is justifiable. These two developments, Mr. Speaker, are further examples of our Government's lack of feeling and sympathy to our northern residents.

Now it would appear from the budget that was presented in this House a week ago, that northern Saskatchewan will fare worse next year than they did before. Although the hon. Minister of Natural Resources said that this was a budget fair to all people, I'm afraid the people of northern Saskatchewan will not agree. At a time when a realistic forward-looking approach to northern development could benefit the province as a whole during this period of increasing unemployment and general slow-down, I had hoped that there would be increased expenditures. However, that did not happen. We find decreases in estimates for practically all Departments whose main work is done in northern Saskatchewan. Just a few examples are the following: The Department of Natural Resources, Northern Affairs Branch down 6%; Forestry Branch 1%; Conservation Services 17%; Fisheries Branch 20%; and Fire Prevention Branch down 29%. Other decreases include the northern education administration services down 9%; Department of Mineral Resources down 10%; Tourist Branch down 12%; and the northern road development down 20%.

The only increase, Mr. Speaker, to be found at this time was in the Department of Co-operatives, Extension Branch, whose budget is largely spent in northern Saskatchewan. At a time when northern education, health, and welfare services were cut, the Government saw fit to increase expenditures for northern co-op extension by over \$10,000, or an increase of 9%. From this it would appear that it is this present Government's hope, through government-controlled organizations, to keep the people of the north subjected to the compulsion and exploitation of their socialist policies, and deny the residents of northern Saskatchewan the development and freedom that they desire and deserve.

Now, I wish Mr. Speaker, that the people of northern Saskatchewan could have heard the Minister of Natural Resources, the other day when he concluded his speech. He listed, region by region, the great recreational program that is to be carried out this year. In Prince Albert region he was doing this; Hudson Bay doing that; Meadow Lake was to have this; and when he came to the southern region he listed park after park, lake after lake, where he was carrying out recreational programs and development. Then he sat down. Yes, people of the north, he did not mention one recreational project that would be carried on in our area this year. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, with such utter disregard for the needs and hopes of our northern residents, this budget is not one that the people of my Constituency would support themselves, and therefore, I must vote against the motion, and for the amendment.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, before presenting my few remarks, this afternoon, I would first like to take the opportunity of welcoming to the Chamber, the guests in the galleries from the Sacred Heart Academy, the Grade XII class, and the Sisters who are accompanying them.

It is not often, Mr. Speaker, that I have risen in this Legislature and had remarks that will receive such unanimous support, as that I am going to speak about now.

All hon. Members will be pleased to know that my colleague and seat-mate, the veteran Member from Arm River, is today celebrating with Mrs. Danielson his golden wedding.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I understand the community of Davidson is arranging a proper celebration on Saturday for Mr. and Mrs. Danielson, and I know I express the thoughts and hopes of all hon. Members in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Danielson on this happy occasion, and wishing them many, many years of health and happiness.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

March 9, 1961

Mr. Cameron: — I would like too, at this time, Mr. Speaker, to say how happy I am to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs able to come to the Legislature more often. You may recall that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I were raised in the same district, in the neighborhood of Avonhurst and Edgeley. He has been a long-time friend of our family, and he has every wish from us that his recovery will be a speedy and a permanent one.

I want too, at this time, to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the people of the Constituency of Maple Creek, for seeing fit to return me to this Legislature for the fourth time. I know that the Member's responsibility is to all of the people of his Constituency, and that, I assure them, is likewise my interest.

Now, since the highway program is not being curtailed this year, I would like to remind the Minister of Highways, again, of the need and necessity of oiling No. 21 from Maple Creek to Cypress Park.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — That road is being done now.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, I am glad to hear that it will be on this year's program. With your co-operation, Mr. Speaker, as a Member, after you leave the Legislature, I hope you will be able to assist me in having the oiling of No. 32 Highway extended further west than it is at the present time.

To the Minister in charge of power and gas, I would remind him too, that I don't think we can any longer justify leaving a town the size of Leader — 1500 population — without gas, when it is so close to its door. I think he would be well-advised to take advantage of the fact now that the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines have given the province a free tap off at Burstall, and by the extension of probably a three inch pipe line could bring gas, not only to Leader but to all of those towns along No. 32 Highway.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the budget delivered the other day by the Provincial Treasurer. In assessing the speech of the present Provincial Treasurer, I probably have a tendency to compare it to past speeches of the former Provincial Treasurer. I want to read part of the excerpts taken from the speech delivered last year in the Legislature. On page 15 of

the budget address of that day, the Hon. Mr. Fines, then Provincial Treasurer, looked at the economic picture of Saskatchewan in somewhat a different light than the present Provincial Treasurer. I want to quote a few of his sentences: He said,

“It is a very large and an ambitious budget. It is a budget balanced for the sixteenth consecutive time.”

Finally:

“It is a budget which involves no new taxes and no increases in existing taxes. By far the most spectacular rise in revenue has been from mineral resources, fifteen years ago the province’s receipts were just under \$90,000. Next year they are expected to be more than twenty times this figure, nearly \$20 million.”

Now I come to the address of the present Provincial Treasurer, and I am quoting wherein he says:

“In the current year, the picture has not been as bright. Revenues forecast close to \$149 million will fall far short of this mark by some three to four million dollars.”

Then he goes on to say:

“The reason is not hard to find.”

This, I think is the reason he gives for this drop in revenue.

“A year ago the federal budget was based on a 6% rise in the gross national product. Saskatchewan’s budget was based on a 5% to 5½% growth. Now a year later we find that the gross national product will have risen by 3%.”

Now, I think the inference here, Mr. Speaker, is that the cause of this deficit budget could be laid at the doorstep of Ottawa. It’s true, we didn’t receive the \$42 million which the former Provincial Treasurer estimated we would from the tax sharing agreement, but we will receive \$40 million, a drop of some \$2 million.

I go along with the Provincial Treasurer, when he says that the reason for the deficit budget is not

March 9, 1961

hard to find. Where we differ is to where to look, if we want the reason for it. I was led to look to a different place than to Ottawa. I was led to look to a different place because I notice the Minister of Mineral Resources has had so little to say in this debate. I think the reason that he's had so little to say, Mr. Speaker, has been because there's been so little to talk about. So I picked up, since he didn't inform the House, the report of Mineral Resources branch, and I thought I would seek the information for myself. On page 3 of the report – Page 1 I'll quote first – it says:

“Mineral revenues for the year under review, show a decrease of \$4,759,000 from the amount received the previous year.”

Then it goes on to say:

“This reflects the decrease of \$7,357,000 in bonus bids on leases. The decreases in bonus bids reflects the absence of any important oil discovery in the province for a considerable time.”

The report further states:

“Revenue from bonus bids on Crown mineral rights decreased from \$8.8 million to \$1.4. The revenues dropped \$7.4 million.”

Now the table explains the revenues for the past number of years, and in 1959 the revenue from the mineral resources of the province was \$24.9 million. In 1960 it had dropped to \$17.8 million and last year the Provincial Treasurer estimated the revenue from this source at \$19.4 million. Now this year the present Provincial Treasurer is estimating the revenue from mineral resources at approximately \$14 million. Thus he estimates that the revenue from mineral resources will be approximately \$5½ million less than it was last year. That, Mr. Speaker, in my considered opinion, is the reason for this deficit budget.

The lack of growth of the national gross product, of course, had some bearing on the matter, but I submit the cause of our financial difficulties originated right here in Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — You know, Mr. Speaker, of course, that we have, to all intents and purposes, just three basic sources of revenue in the province. For all the funds that come into the provincial coffers, we must go either to the tax revenue, which takes in the gas tax, the education tax, the motor vehicles license, and the liquor profits. Secondly, the amount received from the tax-rental agreement with Ottawa, and then the third source is the amount received from the province's resources.

Now revenue from the tax-rental agreement has remained fairly stable. Any increase thus in the revenue to the Provincial Treasury, must come from either or both of the other sources: the taxes, or the revenue from mineral production.

If the revenue from mineral production increases, then the Government is in a position to take some of the tax burden off the backs of the taxpayer, and transfer it onto the mineral resources of the province. If on the other hand, the mineral resources of the province have dropped, then he must take the burden off there and transfer it back onto the backs of the taxpayer. That is the answer today as to why the Provincial Treasurer, predicting a further drop from \$5½ million in resource revenue, coupled with the fact that we have increased social aid, because of the unemployment situation, had to go back and place this burden on to the backs of the taxpayer. It must be a painful thing for the Government to come to the realization that it had been the spendthrift and the taxpayer had been the one who used his resources prudently.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — The Minister in his budget speech was called upon to say, and I want to quote his sentence:

“On this basis, my colleagues and I concluded that it would be appropriate to raise the fuel and petroleum tax, effective April 1st, by 2¢ per gallon.”

Then he goes on, and I'm quoting:

“This action will increase revenues by \$3½ million, and will mean the road users will next year be meeting the full cost of the Provincial Government's road expenditures.”

March 9, 1961

I noticed in this debate something different to last year, or other years. Every speaker who rose on your right, Mr. Speaker, stood up and sympathized with the Provincial Treasurer, in his difficult task before him. I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, before we place the halo of a martyr on the present Provincial Treasurer, and attempt to say that he has now the awkward position of trying to raise these revenues, I would say that the Provincial Treasurer must take his fair share of the responsibility for the plight the province finds itself in today. He hasn't been the martyr and the Minister of Mineral Resources the villain. He was there and he sanctioned every move that the Minister of Mineral Resources made to extract every pound of flesh from the oil people of this province; he was there when they raised the royalty to the oil people a few years back by a million and a half dollars; he was there and he approved and sanctioned the action when the Minister of Mineral Resources, again went back to the same firm and demanded a million and a half additional money because of the so-called oil that may be under the road allowances; he was there, every step of the way when this industry was hamstrung, by government regulations and increases in royalties until they found it unpalatable to continue in the province of Saskatchewan. These people couldn't wait until this fledgling industry had hatched its eggs. They kept prodding away at the nest until the bird flew away.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — That is why today the Minister of Mineral Resources has to little to say, and that is why today the most remarkable thing is that not one speaker on the Government side who has participated in one or other of the debates has mentioned the word 'oil'.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why the motorists are now called upon to pay the full cost of highways. That's the reason why the hospital tax has been increased, because there is no other way to find this revenue except to go back to the backs of the taxpayers. That is why this budget is geared to what was termed in the press "a snail's pace economy." "Saskatchewan's snail pace economy."

It is strange how every speaker who has taken part in the debate has kept a respectable distance from the budget. Never coming to grips with it at all. They have stood up one after the other; they have set up a straw man, and they proceeded to tear it apart. Well

such vigorous activities, Mr. Speaker, have created a great deal of chaff. Before I sit down I hope to remove some of this chaff and expose some of the statements for what they are with the reasons for them.

The attitude of this Government was summed up on the street the other day, I thought so aptly. A fellow said, "Those boys have as their motto – live her high, for tomorrow we may die." We realize that death is inevitable and Mr. Speaker, this budget was inevitable.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I have the distinction of being supported in that statement by the former Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. C.M. Fines. Mr. Fines took time out from holidaying at Palm Springs to comment on the budget. I want to read from the press clipping, what he had to say: "Unfortunate" says Fines about the budget.

"It is very unfortunate that Mr. Lloyd's budget after seventeen years with so many surplus budgets, had to be a deficit one, but nevertheless, it was inevitable. Clarence M. Fines, former Provincial Treasurer told the Leader-Post Thursday."

And Mr. Fines went further. Mr. Fines said:

"If Saskatchewan financed on the same basis as other provinces, their budget would have shown a surplus of about \$20 million."

For eight years I opposed the former Provincial Treasurer, as financial critic, and it's regrettable that he should have to be out of the House, and I out of that role, before we can see eye to eye on budgets.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Now, the Premier had stated that this budget was designed to pare off some of the surplus fat. Thus, he gave the Provincial Treasurer the task of paring off this surplus fat. Well, Mr. Speaker, I went to the estimates to see what fat had been pared off, and I was convinced that the Provincial Treasurer, in going about paring off the fat, didn't use a scalpel, he used a hatchet. In clashing away, he injured some of the most vital branches of our economy.

March 9, 1961

Now I will deal more fully with that on estimates, but I want to reveal just one or two of them, to give you an indication.

For instance the Lands Branch was chopped off by \$86,000. In the Family Farm Improvement Branch, administration went up \$56,000; grants to the farmers went down \$87,000. The liquor profits went up by a million dollars, but the grants to the bureau of alcoholism went down. The budgets for the Economic Advisory and Planning Board are up; the budget for the Industry and Information, the one that issues all these Government pamphlets is up; the staff is increased from nine to fourteen, and the salaries from \$57,000 to \$114,000. It is a strange thing when you get into the estimates, and you go through and study them to see just where this woodsman spared his axe.

Now in this budget debate, the Minister of Education spoke with some vigor, and I want to deal a moment with some of his comments. I had awaited his speech with interest. I had anticipated that he would have laid before this House some new approach to the problems facing education. I had hoped he would have informed the House as to what appropriate steps might be taken to remove the impasse that is developing between the teachers and the trustees in regard to salary negotiations. I had hoped, in view of the serious unemployment of people with less than Grade VIII that the Minister would have outlined some program to encourage our pupils to remain in the classrooms and complete high school. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in a previous debate, I laid before the House statistics which clearly pinpointed the need for higher education for our youth if they were to compete for jobs in this complex society in which we live.

I noticed Tuesday a survey of the National Employment Office in the city here gave further evidence to my argument. It says that of approximately seventy-two hundred unplaced applicants, only 34% had a Grade IX or better education. Seventy-five per cent of the present day male working force in Saskatchewan, has Grade VIII or less. The ranks of the unemployed are being swollen by young men and women with less than Grade VIII schooling. Boys and girls are leaving our classrooms unprepared and ill-equipped to find employment. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand idly by and see our young boys and girls defeated in life before they have a chance to begin. I was disappointed because of that in the address of the Minister of Education. After

delivering a harangue about the so-called shortcomings of the Opposition, he pulled out the oldest political trick in the book, when he said if the Opposition vote against the budget, they're voting against the CCF medical plan; if they vote against the budget they're voting against extension of power and gas. Having done that he then took up the time of the House, discussing whether he should or whether he shouldn't live in a better home and mortgage himself to do so.

Well, I want just to give a bit of advice to the new Minister of Education. I don't think the parents, and the trustees, and the taxpayers of this province will judge you, Sir, by the size of the home you live in; they will judge you by the size of the job you do for education.

Now to come to the remarks of the other new Member from Regina. I was interested in what he might have to say, and I must confess that I was frankly disappointed when he sat down. I was interested in what he might have to say, because of the position which he held, prior to entering this Legislature. It took me back to eight or ten years ago, to some of the most heated debates that we've had in this Legislature. This regards the condition of the misrepresentation and fraudulent action of landmen that resulted in millions of acres of mineral rights being lost to the farmer. I can recall a few years back, urging that we set up some Board or some Committee that would assist these farmers in reclaiming these lost rights. Two years ago a negotiating board was set up. At that time the Government had admitted that it had some responsibility toward these farmers who had lost their mineral rights because of misrepresentation and fraud. That Board has been sitting for two years, and I hoped that the new Member from Regina would have taken the opportunity to lay before the Legislature some of his work, as chairman of that board. But, since he didn't do so, we had to take the course of asking a question to see how the board was progressing.

I am positive that the Member was sincere in his work, and I am confident that he's made a contribution. But, I am disappointed that in place of enlightening the House, particularly when labour professes such a profound interest in the farmers, that in place of doing so, he should have flown to the defense of labour and to castigations of the Opposition, and not a word did he speak . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am not at all aware that the hon. Member from Regina spoke in this debate.

March 9, 1961

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, he was up just the other day.

Mr. Speaker: — It was on a resolution.

Mr. Cameron: — Well anyhow, I'll go on with the Renegotiation Board and not make further reference to the Member, if he didn't speak in this debate.

Mr. Speaker: — If you don't mind, Sir.

Mr. Cameron: — We asked a question in the Legislature: "How many applications for renegotiation of mineral contracts have been received to date?" The answer was 2,315. Question 2: "How many such applications have been considered by the Renegotiation Board?" The answer was 2,315. The third question: "How many contracts have been renegotiated?" The answer was four.

Now in two years this Board has only been able to settle and renegotiate four contracts. Now at the rate at which they're progressing, I suggest before the final settlement is made, it will take six to seven hundred years. Now something is wrong, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Your dates mostly.

Mr. Cameron: — Something is radically wrong, and not with my dates. What is far more important than the date is the lack of activity on behalf of this board and the Government behind it.

If they were sincere in their desire to assist these farmers to discover these mineral rights, they wouldn't have permitted the board to dilly-dally for this length of time, and come in and say to the House "We've only renegotiated four contracts." Is it any wonder that these farmers are still dissatisfied? Is it any wonder that the Government last night met with a committee of the same farmers, asking the Government to do something on behalf of these farmers who lost their mineral rights. Here are 2300 farmers who claimed they lost them by fraud and misrepresentation. I think those farmers would have been justified in marching and camping on the doorstep of the Legislature to urge the Government to get a move on.

Just this morning, before I came into the House, a farmer came to see me. It wasn't about his minerals, and the loss thereof. It was about the same type of activity, on behalf of unscrupulous men taking advantage

of the honesty and integrity of the older generation. I want to tell you something of the story that he told me. He said: "I am seventy-three years of age." He said, "I homesteaded in Saskatchewan in 1911, and I've lived on the same farm for fifty years." Now this farmer must have been very frugal. In spite of the difficulties experienced by farmer, he was able to have set aside for his old age some \$15,000. Then what happened? These unscrupulous promoters moved in – these slick operators – without a prospectus, with fraudulent misrepresentation of the value of the shares, and the prospects of the company.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Good old private enterprise.

Mr. Cameron: — Good old private enterprise, nonsense. What is the securities commission doing about this situation?

An Hon. Member: — Where's the chairman, the Attorney General . . .

Mr. Cameron: — What was the net result of the operations of these unscrupulous shysters.

Mr. McDonald: — Socialism.

Mr. Cameron: — The net result was, this farmer was talked into selling even his Dominion Government Bonds. He invested it with several firms, with the ultimate result that his life's savings of \$15,000 is gone and lost.

The Member from Bengough the other day, told how he wept over the grave of a friend who had died. I think it's time we wept for some of these who are living. This couple now in their seventies, in the twilight of life, find themselves penniless, because of these unscrupulous operators. I asked this gentleman, "How is such a thing possible? How could it possibly have happened?" His answer, supplied to me with tears in his eyes, was this: "He gave me a good story; that didn't impress me so much," he said, "but we shook hands on the deal." I thought that summarized the philosophy and the life of our pioneers. How many thousands of deals were made by the shake of the hand, because these pioneers are so blessed with honesty and integrity that they judge others by their own standards. They are not in a position to compete with these unscrupulous and fraudulent racketeers who have been turned loose in the province of Saskatchewan. I think there are thousands

March 9, 1961

who could come before the Members of the Legislature and tell an identical story. It is not only the farmers who lost their mineral rights. The same thing goes all down to many, many homes of the aged who've lost their life savings, and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the demand of the Member from Humboldt, for a judicial inquiry into this whole matter.

I want to deal with some of the statements made by some of the other Members. I notice the Member from Moose Jaw went to great lengths down into North Dakota and South Dakota and I think into Sweden and I don't know where else, in support of the loss of population. Saskatchewan's population has increased by 21,000 since 1956, and they said that is a commendable record. Look what the other places are increasing by. Well after he spoke, I thought I had better go to an authority on the subject, so I went to the report tabled in the Legislature by the Department of Public H

“Between January 1959, and January 1, 1960, the population of Saskatchewan increased by 10,000 or 1.1%. That is 7,316 less than the natural increase.”

Then the report goes on:

“Since 1956, Saskatchewan's population has increased by 21,000 or 2.4%. (then it says) which is one of the lowest rates of population growth among the provinces of Canada.” “The population increase is 3½ times smaller than the national average.”

This is taken from the Report of Vital Statistics which every Member has in his desk, and if he hasn't read it, I advise that he should.

The report points out further that the proportion of the age group from twenty to forty-four decreased from 35% of the population to 31.6% since 1939. It states further:

“Saskatchewan has a smaller percentage of the age group of twenty to forty-four and a higher percentage of sixty-five and over, than anywhere else in Canada.”

Saskatchewan, according to the Report of the Vital Statistics, is losing its younger age group, in the age from twenty to forty-four, and is going into the age group of sixty-five and over at a faster rate than any other place in Canada. Probably the Minister of Social Welfare would be well advised to give some thought to that statement.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — The health programs make them live longer here.

Mr. Thatcher: — You can do better than that.

Mr. Cameron: — The Minister of Co-operation, I'm sorry I don't see him in the Chamber. He's a new Minister, and a new Member of the Legislature. I listened with some interest to what he might have to contribute, not only as a new Member, but as a new Minister, and as a former vice-president of the Farmers Union. When he got up he gave us quite a lecture, on quite a high plain. You'd think it would be in the classroom rather than in the Legislature, and I compliment him for that. He went into some detail about corporate society and private enterprise, co-operative society, and co-operative commonwealth. He said, and I'm quoting:

“The same people in the Progressive and Co-operative Movements were the same people who gravitated into the CCF.”

I presume he was attempting to leave the impression in this House, and in Saskatchewan that the co-operative movement and the CCF are one and the same thing.

I noticed in a press clipping of February 7th, 1961, where the CCF publicity director, Mr. George Bothwell, out speaking, I think it was in Swift Current, in outlining the foundation of this New Party, took somewhat a different stand. He is reported to have said this:

“It is about time that the co-operative organizations became interested in politics. They are now dominated by Liberals and Conservatives, who make sure no political action is taken.”

The Member from Bengough was not quite as subtle as the Minister.

March 9, 1961

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I'm afraid I must draw to the hon. Member's attention again the fact that I cannot find any record of the hon. Member from Bengough having spoken in this debate.

Mr. Cameron: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. There are so many new Members here that I can't just tell what Constituency they come from, but I think his name is Mr. Dahlman.

Mr. Speaker: — I cannot find his name here, I think it must have been in the last debate.

Mr. Cameron: — Well I want to read, regardless of what this Member said in the House. I can read, Mr. Minister, do you think I can't read?

According to the press clipping he said:

"I was called upon to take the nomination on behalf of the Co-operative Commonwealth, which in my opinion is the political arm of the co-operatives."

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Is he quoting the Member for Bengough?

Mr. Cameron: — I'm just quoting a press clipping. I shall read it again to the Minister of Education, in case you didn't get it.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, my point of order, and it's a mere request for information, if I may put it thus. Is it in order for an hon. Member opposite, and I'm seeking information, to quote what was said in a previous debate? Secondly, is it in order for the hon. Member to quote a newspaper report of what was said in the previous debate?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — What would you like to know?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Indeed I would.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the hon. Member from Maple Creek please explain what he is reading?

Mr. Cameron: — I was reading from a press clipping in the “Leader-Post.”

Mr. Speaker: — To what is it referring?

Mr. Cameron: — To a speech made by this particular Member. Now in this press report he . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We cannot have any expressions of opinion from outside the House regarding what is going on in the House. It must be a direct report of a speech.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, may I try and put it this way. I know you are attempting to be fair in this matter. I am quoting from a newspaper article, a statement attributed to this Member. Now the newspaper didn't go on to say where or when he made this statement.

Mr. Speaker: — If this statement was made in this House in another debate, as he hasn't spoken in this debate, I will have to rule it out of order.

Mr. Cameron: — He spoke several times before he ever got into the House.

I just want to inform these Members, particularly the new Minister of Co-operatives—

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It works both ways.

Mr. Cameron: — —that this CCF Party has been looking for some years to find its parentage. Not too many years back it made the statement that it was the political arm of the Farmers Union. That statement almost wrecked the Farmers Union, and it took years of struggle to rebuild it. They had to gather in a solemn conclave, and issue a formal proclamation, and deny parentage of this hybrid.

Now they're seeking to say, that it was the co-operative movement in which they were conceived and born and nurtured and brought to maturity, until today they are the right arm of the co-operative movement.

The day is fast coming when the co-operative movement of this province will have to do exactly as

March 9, 1961

the Farmers Union had to do. It will have to call a formal conclave and issue a formal proclamation that they are not the parents of this hybrid party.

Just as sure as the CCF places its political hand on the co-op movement, it has placed the hand of death on that movement.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — They're doing pretty well.

Mr. Cameron: — There are one or two others I want to answer yet. I am not quite through.

The Minister of Natural Resources pulled out the same political trick as did the others, and the Minister of Education. We're against the power and telephone expansion; we're against the increased grants for schools. He took this as the yardstick by which you could judge the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, if you are to judge the action of Members by their vote on the Throne Speech, or by their vote on the budget, then I suggest, that that same yardstick be applied to the vote of the CCF in the House of Commons. When you apply that yardstick, Mr. Speaker, the CCF in the House of Commons, voted against family allowances, they voted against old age pensions, they voted against every progressive piece of legislation that has been put on the books of Canada since they were born. Speaking of a voter's record I don't think that they should dwell on some of their records too much. I can recall the voting record of the same Minister who introduced this subject, the Minister of Social Welfare, in the House of Commons. I was reading the debates in Hansard of 1955, just the other evening. You'll remember the debates in Hansard. The House was dealing with NATO, and the admittance of West Germany to NATO in defence of the free world. There was great opposition to the admission of West Germany to NATO. They claimed a re-armed Germany was a warring Germany.

I came to the recording of the vote in the House of Commons, and I find that the present Minister of Social Welfare stood up and voted against admitting Germany to NATO. Not only that, but the unkindest cut of all, he and his colleagues deserted their very

leader in this act. They deserted him and left him standing alone, in support of admitting Germany to the NATO Alliance. If you talk about a Member's voting record, I'll say "Just be careful, some of your records may live to haunt you later on."

I want to deal a moment, Mr. Speaker, with municipal reorganization. I would point out first, I'm not going to deal with the Continuing Committee, and I'm not going to argue the merits or the demerits of the county system. I want to go into the background and the history leading up to the establishment of this Committee. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that some years back the Government set up a Royal Commission on Agriculture to look into the problems faced by the rural people of Saskatchewan. It took some four years of investigation. I can recall the Premier then stating that he had hoped that this report would be directive in which the province may travel for the next quarter of a century. They did a commendable job, and I'm not in agreement with all their findings, but there is certainly a great amount of meat in the report. That report cost us \$400,000. That report today, Mr. Speaker, is tucked away collecting dust.

Because of the urgings of the Opposition from 1952 on, after the 1956 election the Government called a conference of the Provincial Government and the representatives of the local governments with the idea of having a genuine Provincial-Municipal Conference. We had hoped, we had urged, the calling of a Provincial-Municipal Conference with the thought in mind that the representatives of both Governments would sit down together, and would formulate some concrete and acceptable working policy that would give a genuine tax sharing agreement between the province and the local government. Instead, the outcome was the Continuing Committee. They studied the problem since that time. It has cost the taxpayer \$295,000. That together with the amount of money this Government expended on the Centre for Community Studies, and so forth. I added up the other day, and it comes to well over a million dollars. And yet Mr. Speaker, the problems that were with us years ago are with us today, and in spite of all these commissions and these committees, and these investigations, and in spite of a million dollars of the taxpayers' money, nothing has been done. And we're no nearer a solution than we were then. In my opinion, it matters very little whether you have the present municipal boundaries, or whether you have the county system. The basic root cause of the problems facing

March 9, 1961

municipal men and local governments today is financial. Until such time as this Government will take action, and formulate a genuine tax sharing agreement with the local governments, any amount of reorganization is not going to be of any assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has set out over the years to use these committees and these commissions as a delaying tactic, rather than to sit up and face the fact that the time has come when the Provincial Government must take the local government as a partner. There must be a fair sharing of the provincial revenues between the senior partner and the junior partner. If they had done that, they wouldn't have found all the opposition that they find today in rural Saskatchewan towards reorganization. You wouldn't have found the impasse between teachers and trustees in regard to salary renegotiation. You wouldn't have found the problems that we face in rural Saskatchewan, and this Government will have to accept the responsibility that during these years it has not seen fit to do anything more than to set up Boards and Commissions and have investigations, with but one intention, namely – delay.

I have been interested in education for a good many years, and I have outlined what I thought we should do in the educational field, to assist education. I was sorry the Minister didn't elaborate on his thinking on the matter. It may not be the only solution, but I've come to the conclusion that municipal governments, school officials, and all local governments in relationship with the Provincial Government are travelling down the road leading eventually to the principle of a foundation program. The only fair program upon which we can assess the local government's rightful share, and the share that should be carried by the province.

I was pleased to see that in Alberta, just the other day, their Legislature brought in a Bill to set up a foundation program for education. I may stand alone in that viewpoint, but I think the years ahead will bear me out, that we must progress to the point of view of setting up these basic programs for education, the basic program for municipal services, and then assess the rightful share to the governments concerned, and the balance to the province. I think that merits much thought and consideration, and if you wanted a constructive suggestion from the Opposition, I have attempted to be constructive in my remark. The Minister of Education would be well-advised to give it

serious thought in the matter of finances in education.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I will support the amendment, and will not support the motion.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this House for the first time in this Session, I too want to go along with the rest of the people who have congratulated you on your elevation to your high office.

As Members of the previous Legislature are aware, you and I sat together for four years, and through those four years, I got to know you as a man of high integrity, a man who worked hard to do his job well, and I'm sure that you will continue in that same line in your new office while you are here.

I also would like to go along with the remarks made by the previous speaker, in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Danielson congratulations on fifty years of wedded bliss. Fifty years is a long time, that is for a young person, and I suppose Mr. Danielson looking back, looks on it as a very short time. I too would like to offer my congratulations and good wishes that they may live together through many more years.

I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer, on his elevation to his new post, and the hard work that I know he put in to bring down this budget, which in my opinion, is a good budget under the economic conditions of Canada today.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his new post in this House. Having never met him until we met in this House, I have taken quite a kick in the last few days working with him in committee, but, I must say that every time I look across the floor and see his smile, I think of those words of "Browning."

“Just for a handful of silver he left us,
Just for a ribbon to hang on his coat –
Found the one gift of which fortune bereft us,
Lost all the others, she lets us devote.

March 9, 1961

They with the gold to give, doled him out silver,
So much was theirs who so little allowed,
How all our copper had gone to his service,
Rags – were they purple, his heart had been proud.”

Mr. Thatcher: — You haven't seen our latest membership list then.

Mr. Meakes: — In the course of this budget debate, the word socialism has been bandied around quite a bit on both sides of the House. Some of the remarks coming from your left, might cause one to think that it was a terrible word, and also that we weren't too anxious to talk about it. I think that remark was made. Somebody said that we weren't too anxious to talk about it. Well I personally am proud to be a democratic socialist.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a basic difference in philosophy between those on your left and those on your right. The way I see it is that monopoly capitalism as capitalism is based on a me first philosophy; based on might is right; based on dog eat dog. I could not help but think, while listening to remarks of a previous speaker this afternoon, levelling those strong adjectives, and I agree with him on some of these land men who went around this province robbing people of money with oil shares. This is a part and parcel of monopoly capitalism, of capitalism of any kind – me first.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, to me socialism is working together, sharing with one another, sharing our triumphs and our troubles, and sharing our problems. It is a common fellowship, and I would submit that the Legislation this . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — What can you do with those socialist fellows . . .

Mr. Meakes: — —Government has brought down in the last sixteen years is based on this concept.

An Hon. Member: — You're going to get lonesome sometime, Ross!

Mr. Meakes: — I would like to first point out that the hospitalization plan is based on sharing one another's burdens. Government

Insurance and also the savings that have come from Government Insurance to this province, and incidentally, both of these items, the Liberal Opposition in this House opposed at the time.

I would just like to deal with a few figures on the savings that have been made through this terrible compulsory, horrible thing called Saskatchewan Government Insurance that Liberals talk about. I'd like to quote the figures of a person who owns a 1956 Chevrolet sedan. If he is living in any part of Saskatchewan, outside of Saskatoon, Regina, or Moose Jaw, he pays \$45.00. In Saskatoon, Regina, or Moose Jaw he pays \$57.00. Let us compare these figures with Manitoba where they have no Government Insurance, where they can insure with any other insurance company except a Government Insurance. Well, in Winnipeg, \$73.00 instead of \$57.00 for people of Regina. In northern Manitoba they pay \$97.00 instead of \$45.00. Then let us go to Alberta. Again I say that in the rest of Saskatchewan we pay \$45.00 in rural Alberta \$122.00. Let us go to British Columbia \$148.00. Then let us go to those with a farm truck. In rural Manitoba it costs \$40.00; anywhere in Saskatchewan \$25.00; rural Alberta \$56.78; and southern rural British Columbia \$99.58.

I think that this all shows the difference between the philosophy of those on your left, and those on your right.

Then we come to the Power Corporation, and I was very interested to note that the interruption that the hon. Leader of the Opposition made when the hon. Minister of Education was speaking, in which he said, we won't allow private enterprise to come into Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — Careful now, Frank.

Mr. Meakes: — Pardon me, I just want to compare the difference between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and a monopoly private enterprise, because this is exactly what it is in British Columbia.

Mr. Thatcher: — Let's compare Moose Jaw and Regina – National Light and Power Corporation.

Mr. Meakes: — . . . There has been much said about this terrible millstone of debt that is hanging around the necks of the people of Saskatchewan. Somebody said that this would be a

March 9, 1961

debt on those who are not born yet. I want to suggest to this House, that there's a debt whether it's private enterprise or whether it's a Crown Corporation. I have here the figures from the Hydro Electric report of the Power Commissions of Canada – the 1959 annual report. In British Columbia, there is the main company, the British Columbia Power Corporation, and then there's the subsidiary, the B.C. Electric, but their total debt is over \$400,363,000. Take a look at Ontario Hydro, and see how they stand – this is public debt which is going to be paid by the people of Ontario, or the people of Saskatchewan, or the people of British Columbia. The bonded debt of Ontario Hydro is over \$1,756,000,000, but again, and this is what really amuses me, these ultra-conservative people, at least we presume ultra-conservative people of Ontario apparently believe in this terrible public ownership, monopoly, terrible corporation affair, more than my friends on your left talk about.

I want to say that when this Government came to power in this province there was no Power Corporation.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . Sure there was . . .

Mr. Meakes: — . . . I say no, I use it as in the relative word meaning very little, I'll change it to very little, so please sit down. There was very little, and if this province had not gone into debt to the point where they did, there would be no rural electrification today. If they had not gone into debt there would not be any industry today . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — There isn't . . .

Mr. Meakes: — . . . and Mr. Speaker, the only way that industry could come into this province was after we got power, and certainly there was no power to be had for industry prior to 1944.

:Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very amused in the last few days, listening to my friends across the way. They always say the Liberals are not anti-labour. Well I guess they're not. I agree, they're not. As long as labour votes Liberal, they're not anti-labour. But, just let them have any inclination that labour is going to vote any other way, then they are quite anti-labour.

There was also much discussion about how farmer and labourer couldn't work together. I want to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that farmer and labourer have worked together in this province for seventeen years,

and incidentally, while they were doing this, for quite a number of years they elected the hon. Leader of the Opposition into Ottawa by the co-operation of farmer and labourer. This I am sure he can't deny, that the labour people of Moose Jaw and the farm people of the Lumsden area all worked together to elect my hon. friend . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Saskatchewan Power . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It's a wonder he ever did get elected.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Meakes: — They're really worried, Mr. Speaker, about this proposed amalgamation, otherwise they wouldn't each be bouncing up and down, talking about what a terrible thing it would be. If they're so assured that this won't work, if I was in their place, I would sit quiet and say nothing, hoping that we would amalgamate so that it wouldn't work, but they're very worried. I say this, and I've said it before in this House, that farmer and labourer have no choice but to work together. The only other choice they have is to amalgamate with the insurance companies, or the mortgage companies, or the chain stores, or yes, the packing companies that my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition was so quick to defend the other day. This is the only choice that farmer and labourer have.

Mr. Thatcher: — I was correcting a mistake.

Mr. Meakes: — The Liberal Party talk about this terrible powerful group of labour. They talk of the conflict between farmer and labourer, and how it is impossible for them to work together. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that already farmer and labourer are working together in many other ways. We have the farm-labour coordinating committee, a committee of farm unions, labour unions, working together in Canada for a number of years, and this group has supported parity prices unanimously. We find that C.L.C. is on the record three times in the last few years, supporting farm requests to Ottawa for parity prices. They have supported the farm briefs.

The C.L.C. and the Ontario Farmers Union have worked together in recent times, for a series of educational conferences. This I think, Mr. Speaker, proves that farmer and labourer at least to my mind, although I doubt whether it will to my hon. friend the Leader of

March 9, 1961

the Opposition, but it does prove to my mind that farmer and labourer have, and will continue to work together for a common interest.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Meakes: — There is another thing that has been much talked about in the last few days in this House. We've heard a lot of this word 'communism', and about being behind the iron curtain. There were many sneers and innuendoes. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it will only hurt those people who are doing the talking; it will only hurt themselves.

Mr. Thatcher: — They ought to know, they're the only people that ever joined with the communists.

Mr. Meakes: — I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the worst enemy to communism today, in this world, is democratic socialism. I think, Mr. Speaker that I can prove my statement. What happened to the Communist Party of Great Britain after the Labour Government took over? It vanished they knew there was no hope. What happened to the communist movement in Sweden, or in any of the Scandinavian countries? It vanished.

Mr. Thatcher: — What about Czechoslovakia?

Mr. Meakes: — . . . or India, where we have a Democratic Socialist Government. Again I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest enemy to communism is democratic socialism.

In the last month or so we have read reports of the Liberal rally in Ottawa. Well after reading the reports, and I'll admit I wasn't there, but from all the reports, the Liberal Party is nearly as far left as the Communist Party. I hear that my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition wasn't there, so I am not saying that he is getting more left all the time, but I do say this: From all reports the Liberal Party is getting a little further, and a little further to the left all the time.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, it's just moving ahead.

Mr. Meakes: — That is what the Liberal Party always does when it is out of office. I just want to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that

I'm not the only one who thinks this. I want to submit to you that this isn't the first time that the Liberal Party has gone to the left. Why back in 1944, the Liberals and the Communists were together, in fact the Rt. Hon. MacKenzie King at that time shared platforms with the leader of the Communist Party, Mr. Tim Buck. The other day I came across a copy of the "Canadian Tribune," dated July 1st, 1944, and I was very amused to see the advertisement that was in it. "An important new pamphlet now ready – what kind of a Government? Liberal-Labour Coalition vs Tory Reactionary." Then there is somewhere else in here another article about this great Liberal-Labour organization. Tim Buck describes the Liberal-Labour Front proposal for Canada. This proves what I said before. The Liberal Party, when they are out of office go left. They sure will go a long way, but they always manage to get back into a little further right, or on a separate road, once they get into office.

Mr. Thatcher: — We were in Ottawa then.

Mr. Meakes: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to this Liberal rally in Ottawa. I read in some of the news items, what was supposed to be the platform for this new revitalized Liberal Party, supposed to be spelt with a small "l". I could not help but think how far left they had gone, and how far they had gone in making promises, of course. There is one thing about the Liberal Party – they'll promise anything to get into office. I could not help but agree with the remarks of an editorial of the "Country Guide" of February 1961, with a heading "Buying the Vote" – and I want to quote, I won't read it all, but I would like to quote a little bit . . .

"The Liberal Rally held in Ottawa early last month may have made the Party faithful who were present flow with enthusiasm, but on at least two counts it was a sad performance.

From a national standpoint, the major policy resolutions smacked too much of the "something-for-nothing" approach, with more largesse for nearly everybody and lower taxes to boot. As a "Toronto Globe and Mail" editorial writer so succinctly put it: "They promised to shower good things upon the young (university scholarships) and upon the old (higher pensions); upon the unemployed (jobs for all) and upon the employed (a reduction in personal income tax) —"

March 9, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — Are you against that Frank?

Mr. Meakes: —

“To the Maritimes, they offered coal-generated power; and to the Prairies, a two price system for wheat.”

Mr. Thatcher: — Pretty good eh?

Mr. Meakes: — A little further on they say: — oh yes, if I thought you’d carry it out, it would be all right, but you’ll never do it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Meakes: —

“From an agricultural standpoint, the Liberal rally seemed to be completely bewildered and without inspiration. (possibly that’s because my friend wasn’t there.) Mr. Pearson accused the Diefenbaker Government of ‘failure to produce any kind of a solution for agriculture problems.’ Well, if the Liberals think what came out of the rally resolutions is a better guide to success than what is currently being offered, they are badly mistaken. The agricultural resolutions, as far as we can make out, are devoid of any promising or imaginative proposals. They in no way adequately deal with the two most urgent fields requiring policy decision, namely, grain and dairying. Promising western grain growers a parity price on their first 300 bushels of deliveries each year is not an answer to the grain problem, any more than the supplementary acreage payments of up to \$200 per farm which are currently being made by the present Government. They are both short-term expedients. Either one must go, in many cases, to people who do not need them, and can be of little real assistance to those who are facing elimination. A continuing rash of piecemeal expedients will neither do much to ease agricultural problems nor attract the support of the majority of the farmers.”

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that certainly this is not a CCF magazine, and I want to point out that they slap down both the Liberals and the Conservatives. I just want to read one more short paragraph, and again

I am sure that no one will accuse me of reading CCF propaganda. This is not the "Commonwealth," this is the "Canadian Commentator," in which they say, dealing with the same subject:

"Politicians no longer debate the larger issues of national life and some of them appear almost proud of the fact that they know nothing about it. It does not seem strange any longer that Liberals and Conservatives can scarcely find anything to quarrel about, and when campaigning, merely indulge in a childish competition, to see who can think up the newest ways of spending more money on the dupes who have not yet caught on to the greatest confidence game of this century."

Mr. Speaker, I now want to come to a subject that is close to my heart, and something that has been mentioned by several Members, and this is the Indian problem. I want to suggest at the beginning, that I am not condemning those people who first started the policy of Indian segregation, but if they had listened to that great Indian of the American Plains, Chief Joseph, when he wrote in the "North American Review" in 1879, and said:

"Let me be a free man, free to travel, and free to stop, free to work, and free to trade where I choose, free to choose my own teachers, free to follow the religion of my fathers, free to think, and talk, and act for myself. Give me that freedom, and I will obey your every law, or submit to the penalty."

I suggest that this problem that we have with our Indian people, which some people call the "Indian Problem", I would name the "white man's problem." I want to say that when we gave the Indian the right to drink liquor in the licensed premises, and when we allowed them to take it out, it was too bad that at that time the Federal Government didn't say that they could take it onto the reservations. I know there are those who will say that it is in the Act. The Indians in the Indian Reservation can have a vote, and if they wish they can take it onto the Reservation, but I don't think this is altogether the answer. Indian people are jealous of their Treaties, and they are fearful of the word of the white man, and they have good reason to be fearful. Over the history of the last one hundred years is a chain of promises broken by the white man.

Incidentally the Reservation, which I live close by has voted and requested that they be allowed

March 9, 1961

to take liquor onto the Reservation. I think this would be the answer. But, I do feel that unless a good number of Indians vote in favour this Government should take another look at this problem, and find some solution.

I want to point out this, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say how proud I was in January of this year, when I was asked to attend a meeting of the Indians of the Touchwood Agency in the Community Hall at Punnichy. It did my heart good, and I felt so proud to sit in the back of the Hall and listen. I had nothing to say, I just listened to the discussions. I could not help but appreciate the thoughts of these people. I recognized the basic decency and the basic honesty, that these people have, the same wishes and the same aspirations as you and I, Mr. Speaker. I want to point this out though, that this political party to which I belong, over a period of twenty-five years, long before there was any thought of getting their vote, fought for the Indian and for the Indian's right, and to see that he had a decent way of life. In my talks with Indians on different Reservations, I have been absolutely dumbfounded at the times when we were discussing politics, that some Indian would quote to me what our Premier had said back between 1935 to 1944, or what Mr. Castelden had said when he had been in Ottawa, or what Tom Johnston had said in this Legislature. These people know who their friends are. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that certainly in Touchwood they knew. I know in my mind, although there is no way of proving it, that for the first time we took the rural poll of Punnichy and this is because we had a big Indian vote. Secondly, that the vote in the rural poll at Lestock was increased a substantial amount. In my heart I know that these people voted for the CCF. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to assure them, that I will never let them down.

I think that the white man should remember this. We talk about how the Indian should learn our way of life. There are many things in the Indian way of life that we should learn from them. Their custom of sharing, their custom of family relationships, parental feeling of children to father and mother has much to be admired.

Mr. Speaker, I want to do what I have done every year, for the past four or five years. When I stand in my place, I give a report on the agricultural conditions of my Constituency. Five years ago I said, that unless something drastic was done to improve the economic conditions of the farmers of western Canada,

that the farming as we knew it then would be completely changed within ten years, and a change that wouldn't be for the good. Now I want to say that again I see, wherever I go, the small farmer is being squeezed out, and many more farmers are being forced to take some other part-time work to try and make ends meet. If it was not for the cows that are milked in the Constituency, there would be a lot more farmers who wouldn't be farmers. I know that the biggest percentage of the farms in my Constituency, not only keep their grocery bills paid, not only help clothe their children, not only buy the odd bit of gas for the car, but many, many tractors run all summer, because of a cream cheque.

I was interested to go back into the Journals of the House of Commons, because one of the things that worried me was the possibility that the Federal Government might decide to lower the price of butter. I went back, and I was interested to see the stand taken by my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. I have here a Hansard of January 31st, 1955, and he says this:

“If our producers are to regain their market for butter, I don't see how it can be done, other than by a reduction of price.”

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . margarine . . . to compete with margarine.

Mr. Meakes: — I'll agree with this, to compete with margarine, I'll grant you this. On June 3rd, 1955 he again said in part:

“It seems to me that if we're going to get rid of our butter surplus, some additional steps will have to be taken. I may be alone in the House in taking such an attitude, but I think that the basic problem with our butter policy, at the moment, is that 58¢ floor price is too high.”

Then he goes on and he says:

“It is too high for the good of the consumer; it is too high for the good of the taxpayer; and it's too high for the good of the producer.”

I just want to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, on this very illuminating statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition, who then was the M.P. for Moose Jaw.

Mr. Thatcher: — Counts have since borne it out.

March 9, 1961

Mr. Meakes: — All I want to know is this, Mr. Speaker? I want to know whether the hon. Member still agrees with this? Is he still in favour of lowering the price of butterfat? This is the question that I would like to know. I would like to see him stand up and make this abundantly clear whether he still agrees with this. What's more I'd also like to see if the hon. Members on his side of the House agree with him. I would like to ask the hon. Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, who I understand makes his living from butterfat whether he would agree with this statement?

Mr. Speaker: — . . . point of order.

Mr. McFarlane: — He asked me a question I didn't . . .

Mr. Meakes: — Ask me when I am finished.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Meakes: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is typical Liberal and Conservative policy. I think it is typical. Let us consider what lowering prices would do. It will kill two birds with one stone. It will get rid of the surplus, yes, and at the same time it will get rid of the small farmer. From 1947 to 1956 under a Liberal Government in Ottawa, 690,000 farmers went by the wayside in Canada. Now, Mr. Hamilton is going to have them grow trees so that he can get rid of the rest.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Meakes: — Sure.

Mr. Thatcher: — —because he asked me one. Does he know that many of his provincial institutions are buying margarine for the very purpose I suggest.

Mr. Meakes: — I'll answer that question gladly. I do know. Now if he'll just sit down I'll answer his question. I know it; I'm coming to the budget issue, and if my hon. friend will be a little patient, maybe I'll answer him.

I will now come to the budget, and looking to the economic conditions that exist, not only in this province, but all across Canada, I say that this is a

good budget, and I for one am not afraid to go out to the Touchwood Constituency, or into the Constituency of Morse, if he wants me to, and defend it.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, I'll come out to Touchwood, Frank.

Mr. Meakes: — I think one of the things that the Provincial Treasurer had to face up to, one of the big problems, was unemployment, and this has been taken into consideration. This is the reason, no doubt, that he suggested and this Government has agreed to build the Power building. It has been pointed out before that it not only gives employment to people who are building the building, but it is giving employment to the people who are making the bricks, and the people who produce the steel and the cement, and so on down the line.

The same applies to going ahead with the Swift Current Geriatric Centre, and I am sure that if you were able you would agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that you were glad we were going ahead with it. I notice that you, Sir have a pleasant smile on your face . . . Then we come to the old sanatoria building at Prince Albert. I realize that the hon. Member for Yorkton felt badly hearing that the mental hospital was not going to be proceeded with this year in Yorkton. But, certainly I think that he will agree with me. I had the opportunity to go through the Weyburn mental institution recently, and I am one that will admit that things are maybe not quite as good as they could be, but certainly a lot better than they used to be. I think the greatest lack in the field of mental health is in the care of retarded children. I know that in my own community and my own Constituency there are homes where conditions are terrible because there is no place to take these retarded children. I know of two or three cases where, if something is not done within a year, not only the child will be in a home, but the father and the mother may well be in a mental institution too.

I am pleased to see that the hon. Provincial Treasurer did not forget education. I was sure he wouldn't, being the Minister for the Department of Education for many years. I feel that what the hon. Member for Maple Creek said this afternoon, is right that this is a very, very important field, and I was glad to see that we are again increasing grants. I was interested to note the increase in the assistance in grants in three units that are in the Touchwood Constituency. Melville North Unit will receive an increase of a grant

March 9, 1961

of just about \$16,000; Cupar nearly \$68,000; Foam Lake-Wynyard receive \$53,000. I think that the Provincial Treasurer is to be commended for the wonderful job that he has done in making certain that in the fields of education, health, and social welfare progress will continue to be made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have really talked longer than I intended to, but there is one thing I must say. My hon. friend from Yorkton said the other day that nobody suffered from lack of medical care in the 1930's. That is what I understood him to say. I want to say, as I have said in this House before, and I want to say it again – my memories are dark and dreary on this same subject in the 1930's. I have said before that my father was a municipal secretary, and I remember many, many times in the night, at midnight or later, the phone would ring and he would have to get up, and he would have to make a decision. Some hospital either in Saskatoon or Regina or Wadena or Yorkton was calling to say that Mr. and Mrs. So and so were at the hospital door, and would the municipality guarantee the payments. If he said "Yes" he could go back to sleep, but if he said "No" and many times, because of the financial condition of the municipality he was forced to say "No," then he would toss and turn and wonder how sick that person was, and whether he had made the right decision or not.

Mr. Speaker, in closing there are one or two things I want to say to the Member for Arm River and as he's not in his seat I'll go easy on him, but he said the CCF would probably prostitute the co-op movement. Well if that is so, I don't blame him, if he said that I don't blame him because I realize he always says what he thinks. He also said that the CCF had infiltrated the co-ops, and the churches, and the lodges, and the clubs, and then he said they had infiltrated everything. It is not infiltration. All it is is that ordinary people in all the communities, in the co-operative movement, in the churches, and in the lodges, in the clubs, ordinary, decent peopled have found out that the CCF movement isn't as terrible a thing as my hon. friends across the way would like the people to think. It appeals to people who have decency of heart, who have common wishes of helping others, in short it stands for humanity first.

Just before I close I want to deal with a couple of remarks that my hon. friend, the Member for Maple Creek made. I want to say first, that I respect the hon. Member from Maple Creek, and I think this afternoon he displayed more leadership than I have seen

from anywhere across the House. But I want to say this to him also, that I think he's got to catch up on a little bit of his history. He said that the CCF had voted against everything in Ottawa, and one of the things he mentioned, was that they had voted against old age pensions. Well I would like to point out, that if he would care, sometime when he is in Ottawa, to call into Woodsworth House, he would see a letter signed by the Leader of the Liberal Party, MacKenzie King, the Prime Minister of that day, in which he agreed that if Mr. Woodsworth would support the Government, the Liberal Government would bring in old age pensions, and this was done. Also the same thing with unemployment insurance, so I suggest that he should catch up on his history.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . said they voted against it.

Mr. Meakes: — They didn't vote against it.

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly they did.

Mr. Meakes: — They did not, they supported the Government at that time.

Mr. McDonald: — Every Member in the House of Commons voted against it.

Premier Douglas: — That's the only thing that kept the Liberals in office.

Mr. Meakes: — That is the only reason that the Liberals continued to be there, and my hon. friend from Moosomin can squirm and wiggle as much as he likes, but it's true. He knows it's true, and he doesn't like it.

Mr. McDonald: — It isn't true.

Mr. Meakes: — Sure it's true.

Mr. McDonald: — Like you voting against the public revenue tax . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Meakes: — He also talked about the co-operative movement. My hon. friend from Maple Creek said that if we continued, and he didn't use the word "infiltrate," but I believe I will use it, that if we continued to infiltrate the co-operative movement, we would wreck it. I suggest to him that he go to the library and read "The History of the Co-operative

March 9, 1961

Movement” – in Great Britain, and read in particular that chapter that deals with the point where the co-operative movement first went into politics. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the co-operative movement in Canada is going to have to face the same decision that the co-operative movement in Great Britain faced. The co-operative movement in Great Britain between 1917 and 1923 faced this decision as to who their greatest enemies were. This was the first thing that they had to decide, and they came up with decision that the greatest enemy to the co-operative movement was capitalism – monopoly capitalism.

Mr. McCarthy: — They couldn’t run . . .

Mr. Meakes: — Then the next decision they had to make, was who were their friends, and they looked over the political make-up of the three political parties in Great Britain, the Conservatives, the Liberals, and Labour, and they found out this, they made this decision: The only political friend they had was Labour; Labour was actually the only political party that was out to fight monopoly capitalism, and so they decided to work with the Labour Party. Down through the years this is what has happened. The co-operative movement have candidates, and they have the full rights of the Labour Party, they have full rights of the Labour caucus, and I believe, I stand to be corrected on this figure, but under the Attlee Government, I believe there were twenty-three co-operative candidates.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure, that all hon. Members of this House, by now will have realized that I am going to oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member mentioned my name, and I wonder if he would please permit a question?

Mr. Meakes: — Yes.

Mr. McFarlane: — I wonder does the hon. Member know that all the butter your Government purchased was one pound?

Mr. Meakes: — I answered that question already. I told him I knew.

An Hon. Member: — You haven’t answered the question whether or not you want . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways): — I rise to take part in the budget debate, and to make my first report on the state of the highways in the province. May I at the outset, pay tribute to the man who for the past sixteen years played such a vital part in the great improvement which has been effected in the highway system of this province. The Department of Highways was formed in 1917, or just forty-four years ago. Sixteen years of continuous service, means that Mr. Douglas has served as Highways Minister for more than one-third of the entire time the Department has been in existence.

Opposition Member: — It seems a lot longer than that.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — That so much has been accomplished regarding improvements to our highways in that period, Mr. Speaker, is due in no small measure to the energy and ability displayed by the former Minister. When Mr. Douglas became Minister the reputation of Saskatchewan's highways was at an all time low. Many miles of highways at that time certainly would not be classed as all-weather roads, for they became almost impossible in periods of heavy rainfall, while travel in winter on all but a few of our highways was impossible. During these sixteen years a reconstruction of the greatest part of the more than 8300 miles of highway comprising the highway system in the province, the widespread use of gravel and the increasing amount of bituminous surface have indeed made our provincial highway an all-weather all year round highway system.

There's been a great deal of talk in this Legislature recently, Mr. Speaker, concerning industrialization in this province. It is claimed that industry is by-passing Saskatchewan — that the politics of this Government are working against industrialization here. Mr. Speaker, how confused can some people be?

Opposition Member: — You tell us.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — In 1944, when this Government took over, there was concern and rightly so, because Saskatchewan was a one-economy province. Saskatchewan's economy depended largely on agriculture; it rose and fell according to the uncertainties of the weather. This Government foresaw clearly the need for diversification of our economy, so that we could achieve a great degree of economic stability. With this in mind, Premier Douglas in an early announcement, outlined

March 9, 1961

the need for a wider economic base here in the province. To achieve this development the Premier made it clear that there was room in Saskatchewan for public enterprise, for private enterprise, and for co-operative enterprise. Encouragement has been given to these three forms of enterprise here in our province with gratifying results.

Mr. Thatcher: — Gratifying to whom?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Crown Corporations were set up by this Government, which, in spite of the bitter opposition and criticism by Members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, have flourished and have made, and are making, a notable contribution to building Saskatchewan. The Crown Corporations have made employment for 5800 people in Saskatchewan, and have done \$90,000,000 worth of business in the last year. Surely, something as worthwhile as this deserves more than sabotage efforts on the part of the Loyal Opposition in this Legislature.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The contribution to our economy by all the Crown Corporations cannot be measured just by the number of employees, or the volume of business done; you must also consider their influence in the starting up of private enterprise business in Saskatchewan. For example, the rural electrification program of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation resulted in a wire cable company starting in Weyburn, a business manufacturing welders in Saskatoon, and a transformer manufacturing industry here in the City of Regina. And these are just a few of the business improvements that have started up in Saskatchewan because of business opportunities provided directly by the Crown Corporations or other programs of this Government.

Co-operative development in this province, Mr. Speaker, has been outstanding. So much so, that our province has become known as the banner province of co-operatives in Canada. The great co-operative development which has taken place in this province resulted from this Government setting up a Department of Co-operatives and Co-operative Development. And, in spite of the traitorous attacks by the Opposition, industry is not by-passing Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Statistics previously given in this Legislature showed that the net value of the commodity production in 1960 in Saskatchewan was one thousand million dollars, compared to \$636,000,000 in 1950. I would like to point out too that the total net value of commodity production in 1940 was only \$227,000,000,

but for comparative purposes, this is not a good year to talk about. We had a Liberal Government at that time, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal Government both in Regina and at Ottawa.

However, Mr. Speaker, 1950 certainly can be compared with 1960, and here we find an increase in commodity production of \$370 million, or an increase of more than 50% in a ten year period.

To point out further the change which has come about in our economy, Mr. Speaker, it is only necessary to recall that in the years just previous to the CCF being elected in the province, agricultural production accounted for 80% of the commodity production in Saskatchewan, with non-agriculture resources accounting for only 20%, while in 1960, although agriculture production had gone up, agriculture accounted for only 50% of the total wealth produced.

Mr. MacDougall: — Minister of Agriculture talking.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, reasonable people will admit that progress is being made here in Saskatchewan. To achieve this, Mr. Speaker, it was necessary to do more than merely announce that there was room for public and private enterprise and co-operative industry in the province.

Mr. Thatcher: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — More has been done than just invite participation. Much more, Mr. Speaker. And, it was apparent, Mr. Speaker, that before industry would or could become established—

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must draw to the attention of the hon. Member that it's now 5:30. I will now leave the chair until 7:30.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly met at 7:30.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Before the recess, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing industrial development in the province. I had deplored the efforts of the Loyal Opposition to oppose the industrial development now taking place in the province. I had mentioned that business opportunities had presented themselves because of the expansion of our Crown Corporations, opportunities

March 9, 1961

which have been taken advantage of by many business organizations in the province. I have mentioned that our Premier had invited private and co-operative enterprise to come into Saskatchewan, stating that it was our policy to encourage private and co-operative development. And, I made the statement that more had been done than just invite participation, and I'm glad to say that the Opposition Members agreed with this, for it was apparent to everyone, Mr. Speaker, that before industry would or could become established here in Saskatchewan, vital changes had to come about in our province. And, shortly after the election in 1944 the Government began making plans to bring about these necessary changes. It was apparent to everyone that Saskatchewan lacked the three basic requirements so essential to a diversified economy: namely, power, water, and roads. In the last sixteen years the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has successfully kept up with the demands placed upon it by developments taking place in this province; even though they had to expand their generating capacity on the average of 20% each year. Huge generating facilities have been constructed to provide lower-cost power in an effort to encourage industrial development.

Hydro development is commencing with construction proceeding at Squaw Rapids and the South Saskatchewan River Dam. Forward-looking plans of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation envisage ten other hydro dams between the —

Mr. McDonald: — Steady now.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Squaw Rapids and the South Saskatchewan River dam sites, taking advantage of the 800 foot fall between these two points on the Saskatchewan River.

Mr. McDonald: — You should have checked with the Minister there.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — What a difference, Mr. Speaker, between the CCF and the Liberal attitudes on this power question, an issue so vital to the progress of our province. The Liberals while in office did practically nothing to insure an adequate supply of electrical power, while the many small generating companies doing business here were not interested in encouraging industry to come into the province, nor were they in a position to do so. This is something which can be done only on a province-wide basis. And what a

contrast too, Mr. Speaker, in the CCF and Liberal attitudes to farm electrification. If the question of providing electrical power to the farmers had been left to the Liberal Party, the farmers of Saskatchewan would still be depending upon wind-chargers for their electrical power here in the province. This was actually advocated by a prominent Liberal from Saskatchewan, prominent in the Liberal provincial and federal arena. Because of the encouragement given by this Government, private enterprise too, has contributed to the development taking place in this province. Our resources development has put Saskatchewan in fourth place among the provinces of Canada as a mineral producer, with only Ontario, Quebec, and Alberta producing more minerals than we do here in Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, one has only to visit our cities, and to note the population growth – more than doubled in the last ten years, and to note also the industry surrounding these cities – to know from this that Saskatchewan has made progress industrially. Saskatchewan has gone ahead, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the efforts of the people opposite me, in spite of the speeches that they have made, inside and outside the province pointing out dangers, real and imaginary, for industry daring to locate in our province. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, did everything to prevent industrialization proceeding in this province.

It is contemptible, Mr. Speaker, when the Opposition adopts the political principle that in politics the end justifies the means, and when, to gain temporary political advantage, they would openly do permanent injury in attempting to delay progress here in Saskatchewan.

Not only are speeches running down our province being delivered in other parts of Canada, but recently we witnessed an attempt in this Legislature by Members opposite to sabotage co-operative development in Saskatchewan, suggesting that we do away with the Department of Co-operation. This, Mr. Speaker, will be viewed by the many members and supporters of the co-operative movement, throughout the province, as the height of Benedict Arnoldism. Opposition speakers say that they are supporters of the co-operative movement.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — But, they stand ready to do everything they can to see to it that the co-operative movement doesn't expand.

March 9, 1961

Opposition Members: — That's nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — And just as this Government has given priority to development of power for encouragement to industry, so that utmost importance has been attached to the provision of adequate water supply for industry, Mr. Speaker. That this is important is shown by the fact that refineries use 800 gallons of water to produce one barrel of gasoline. Saskatchewan in the past has lacked a sure supply of water for industrialization. The completion of the South Saskatchewan River Dam will overcome the apparent shortage of water in this province.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the former Liberal Government at Ottawa discussed this project with the Provincial Government but that Liberal Government can take little credit for the ultimate beginning of construction. Conferences on this topic between the Provincial Government and the Liberal Government of Ottawa, prior to 1957 were prime examples of procrastination and delaying tactics. If the Liberals were still in office in Ottawa, it is a safe bet that this dam would not now be under construction.

As for the third essential for industrial development, Mr. Speaker, namely, roads, they did not exist in such quantity or quality as to encourage a broader based economy in Saskatchewan. And surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, from what we hear emanating from the other side of the House, the Liberal Party of today wants to return to the road conditions which existed in 1944. At least, Mr. Speaker, that is the only meaning I can take from their criticism of the number of civil servants in the employ of the Government today.

Opposition Member: — That's pretty good.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — It has been stated by Opposition speakers that a prime essential now is the reduction of the number of civil servants.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Comparisons have been drawn between the number of civil servants today and those employed in 1944. Mr. Speaker, it is true that we now have a larger number of employees in the Department of Highways than there was in 1944. The Department now has slightly more than 400 salaried employees, as compared to ninety-nine in 1944. We have at present sixty-five engineers on our staff, compared to nine in 1944.

Opposition Member: — You're wrong there.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals, in suggesting a reduction from four hundred to one hundred in the Department of Highways staff, want to go back to the highway conditions of 1944. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that if the Liberals campaign on this platform, they will never achieve office in Saskatchewan. And too, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition continues to campaign on the basis of a complete return to the conditions of 1944, where a do-nothing Government was content with doing nothing to encourage diversification in this province, I can assure them that they will never be the Government in Saskatchewan. And, I can assure the Opposition that this continual belittling of what has been done, of attempting to keep industry out of the province, is not finding approval with citizens of this province. There is resentment abroad of the attacks on co-operatives, as well as resentment of the speeches, belittling the opportunities for development in this province. Mr. Speaker, I've been Minister of Highways for less than a year, but this has been long enough to learn that there is general approval of the work being carried on by this Department. Under the former Minister, my predecessor, the Department was enlarged. New branches have been added which have made our Department of Highways one of the most efficient in Canada today. The Department's planning branch, one of our newer branches, has a very accurate picture of travel in the province as a whole. Knowledge has been obtained by use of temporary traffic counters and permanent traffic counters, as well as origin-destination surveys, knowledge which is necessary adequately to meet the planning requirements of the highways in Saskatchewan. It has been estimated that travel on our highways in 1960 amounted to two million, four hundred thousand billion miles. The average mile on our 8,300-mile system carried 450 vehicles per day throughout last year. On what has been designated as a primary system, within our overall system, the average daily traffic was 1,250 vehicles a day. This primary system which comprises some 1,380 miles carried just over one-half of the total traffic on our 8,300 miles of highway.

The most heavily travelled highways in the province are the Trans-Canada and No. 11 Highway, between Regina and Saskatoon. The 406 miles of the Trans-Canada make up 5% of the highway system but it carries almost one-fifth of all rural, provincial highway traffic. The Member for Humboldt urged in this debate that we build highways on the square, that we do not re-locate

March 9, 1961

highways across farmers' property. I wondered, Mr. Speaker, if she were sincere in such a request.

In the past sixteen years the Department of Highways has made quite extensive highway re-locations, reducing travel distance and reducing it with quite beneficial results. No. 1 Highway in 1944 was 451 miles in length; now it is 406 miles long because of relocations taking place. And because of these reductions, substantial savings have resulted to the people of Saskatchewan. Construction savings alone to the Department on Number 1 Highway amount to about \$3,000,000; annual maintenance costs savings amount to \$45,000; while road users saving, estimated at 8¢ per vehicle-mile, amount to \$2,000,000 annually. These, Mr. Speaker, are savings to the Department and to the people of the province, because of savings on No. 1 alone.

No. 11, Regina to Saskatoon, was in 1944, 193 miles long. Now, the highway distance between Regina and Saskatoon is 167 miles, a reduction of 26 miles between these two cities. As a result, construction savings amounted to \$1,000,000; annual maintenance savings amounted to \$26,000 per year; while road users savings, Mr. Speaker, amount to \$1,000,000 per year. Future planned improvements on No. 11 Highway will reduce the highway mileage further, between Regina and Saskatoon by an additional ten miles, making the highway distance between Regina and Saskatoon, 157 miles. Road users savings will then be \$1,600,000 annually, and this, Mr. Speaker, refers to the travel on No. 11 Highway only between the cities of Regina and Saskatoon.

We get an even more impressive picture when we look at the relocations on provincial highways as a whole. As a result of planning by the Department of Highways over the past sixteen years, relocation of highways in the province has resulted in a reduction in highway mileage of 400 miles. This has been a saving in capital construction of \$8,000,000 to the people of the province. It has meant annual maintenance savings to the people of the province of \$360,000, and it has resulted in annual road users savings of \$5,200,000 annually. This illustrates, Mr. Speaker, what can be accomplished by proper planning. Yet some Members still advocate building highways on the square. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Humboldt would be the first to complain if the Department had paved Number 11 on its 1944 location, first, on the basis of cost to the province, and second, on the basis of travelling the extra distance between the two cities.

Mr. Speaker, a properly staffed Department of Highways has resulted in better planning, better designs, and better construction of highways in the province. The Department of Highways have seen to it that the people of the province have received value for their dollar invested in our highways. And, Mr. Speaker, because the people of the province have received value for their tax dollar and because they have received savings in reduced travel distance they are not going to complain about the 2¢ increase in gasoline tax.

We are doing what every other province in Canada is doing. Namely, taxing the users of our roads to pay for improvements to the roads. The “Star-Phoenix” of a few days ago had an editorial comparing the gasoline tax charged in the various provinces of Canada. Two provincial governments have a tax as high as 19¢. Three other provinces have taxes higher than the 14¢ we will be charging: Newfoundland at 19¢, Nova Scotia at 19¢, Prince Edward Island at 16¢, and New Brunswick at 15¢. New Brunswick is now 18¢. Three other provinces have gasoline tax at 13¢, one cent below what we will be charging April 1st, Quebec at 13¢, British Columbia at 13¢ and Ontario at 13¢. Alberta raised her tax to 12¢ a gallon, and Manitoba presently is at 11¢ a gallon. But, there’s one thing of note, Mr. Speaker, and that is that we do not use the money derived from gasoline taxes to finance the other programs in the province. The Government of Saskatchewan has used every cent collected from gas taxes for road purposes in the province. In the past year, 1960, this Government spent on highways and grid roads \$3,000,000 more than was collected in motor licenses and gasoline tax. This was not the policy, Mr. Speaker, of the Liberal Government of 1944. In 1944, the Liberal Government collected from automobile owners, \$5,000,000, and spent for road purposes only \$3,000,000.

Mr. Thatcher: — There was a war on, George.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The 14¢ gas tax plus license fees will about pay for 1961-1962 provincial expenditures on highways and on other roads in the province.

Mr. Danielson: — It was you that spent that budget.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, with the 8,300 miles of provincial highway, the second longest provincial highway system in Canada, Saskatchewan will always have need for large expenditures on highways. My predecessor informed the House last Session that we should be spending on highways in this province an amount

March 9, 1961

of \$32,000,000 a year to provide the type of highways necessary. This, Mr. Speaker, will surely strain to the utmost Saskatchewan's financial capacity. And, in this connection, J.T. Douglas also made a plea for federal assistance for highway purposes. I believe everyone in this House will be in agreement with this. The best argument for federal assistance, is that Ottawa now taxes automobile owners much more than she grants to the provinces for road purposes. From excise taxes, from customs tariffs on automobiles, from gas tax, Ottawa received in the eleven years from 1950 to 1960, an amount equal to \$2½ billion from people who use automobiles in Canada. Ottawa has paid back in the same period of time, from 1950 to 1960, to the various provinces for expenditures on roads, an amount of \$220,000,000, or less than 10% of what was collected from motorists throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this principle of taxing owners of motor vehicles for general revenue, is unfair. Automobiles today are essential. They are no longer luxuries. Hidden taxes should not increase the selling price of cars and trucks, unless the money so raised is used to build better roads throughout Canada. Saskatchewan has finished her section of the Trans-Canada Highway, the federal assistance on which was \$16,500,000. We are no longer receiving any substantial highway assistance from the Federal Government. Recently the Prime Minister stated that no additional assistance would be received, no additional assistance agreement would be entered into by Ottawa with any of the provinces, until the Trans-Canada Highway is completed. The completion date has been extended from 1957 to 1963 with every prospect now with the recent entry of Quebec into the agreement, of the completion date being further extended to 1970. This, Mr. Speaker, is decidedly unfair. There should be further assistance now for those provinces which have finished their portion of the Trans-Canada. If Ottawa is to continue taxing automobile owners on the present scale, more of that tax revenue should be returned to the provinces to assist building better roads, for the use of Canadian citizens as a whole.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to announce to the Members of the Legislature the manner in which the Department of Highways will spend the money allotted to it for the improvement and maintenance of our highways. There has been a reduction in our estimate, as noted from the budget speech, from \$25,500,000, voted for this year, to \$21,800,000 for the coming year. The amount voted for capital last year was \$15,901,000, and to be voted for this purpose this year, \$13,250,000. This will mean a substantial reduction in the work we are able to

do in the coming season. However, we still have put together a substantial program for the 1961-1962 season. We will be surfacing 122 miles of highway, grading 323 miles, gravelling 230 miles, oil treating 181 miles, seal coating twenty-eight miles. The details of the program, Mr. Speaker, are as follows: On No. 1 Highway, Regina to Balgonie, we will complete a four-lane, divided highway by building alongside of the present two-lane highway an additional two-lane structure from Balgonie to Regina. We will grade this section and bituminous surface it this year: Regina to Pense – part of this section of the highway will be seal coated: — No. 2 Highway, Moose Jaw north, 1½ miles, grading and bituminous surfacing. Tuxford to Trans-Canada Highway, we will complete bituminous surfacing which was started last year. From junction No. 11 Highway to Watrous, we will oil treat all of the remaining sections which are still gravel-surfaced, from the junction of No. 11 Highway to Watrous; Prince Albert north, three miles, bituminous surfacing. The Uranium City road will be extended to the Churchill River this season; this will be graded and gravelled: On No. 3 Highway – Erwood, east to the Manitoba border, we will do approximately half of this stretch this year, grading and gravelling. Tisdale to one mile east of Naisberry, grading and bituminous surfacing. Birch Hills to St. Louis, oil treatment. At Prince Albert west – 4.8 miles bituminous surfacing. On No. 4 Highway, from Meadow Lake, south, 8 miles, grading and gravelling. No. 5 Highway, Togo to the Manitoba boundary, 1.1 mile, grading and gravelling. From junction No. 6 Highway, west, grading and gravelling. From Humboldt, west, 7 miles, completion of grading and gravelling. From No. 2 Highway to Humboldt, bituminous surfacing. There will be a late start on this bituminous surfacing with completion in 1962. No. 6 Highway, Regina to the new junction of No. 11 Highway, grading and bituminous surfacing. From Dafoe to Watson, we will start bituminous surfacing by stockpiling gravel in 1961, completion of the surfacing scheduled for 1962. Watson to LacVert, bituminous surfacing. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that when this is completed in 1962, we will have a black-top of dust-free surface, from the United States border through Regina, to Melfort on No. 6 Highway. Perhaps I shouldn't have mentioned that, Mr. Speaker. Melfort as you know is in my Constituency.

Opposition Members: — We know. We know.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I didn't hear anybody cheering in the House . . . No. 7 Highway, from old No. 14 Highway to Vanscoy, grading and bituminous

March 9, 1961

surfacing. From Kindersley to Flaxcombe, grading and gravelling: No. 9 Highway, from 5 miles north of Carlyle to east of Kennedy, grading and gravelling.

Mr. McDonald: — What happened to No. 8?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — No. 11 Highway, from junction No. 6 Highway to Lumsden, a four-lane divided highway in this stretch, will be graded and bituminous surfaced. From Dundurn to Saskatoon, grading, with a late start, partial completion only in 1961. No. 12 Highway, Blaine Lake to Petrofka Bridge, grading and gravelling. I'd like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that No. 12 is a new highway, which will join No. 40 Highway and No. 11 Highway, north of Saskatoon. In this year, we will build a road from Blaine Lake to the new Petrofka Bridge. No. 13 Highway, Assiniboia to Verwood, 18 miles east, grading and gravelling. No. 14 Highway, from west of Unity to the Alberta border, completion of 1960 grading and gravelling. No. 15 Highway, from the junction with No. 6 Highway to junction with No. 20 Highway, grading and gravelling. No. 18 Highway, Estevan east to junction of No. 39 and No. 18 Highways, grading and bituminous surfacing, preparatory work only in 1961, completion 1962. No. 21 Highway, Maple Creek to Cypress Park turnoff, oil treatment, plus grading and oiling access road into Cypress Provincial Park. No. 26 Highway, junction No. 4 Highway to Meota, oil treatment. And the next item, Mr. Speaker, which I'm going to mention here is in the Turtleford Constituency.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Spruce Lake to 8 miles north of St. Walburg, grading and gravelling. And, if I could digress for a minute, Mr. Speaker, this brings to mind a similar byelection which was held—

Mr. Thatcher: — I thought you were going to pave that George.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — — in Saskatchewan not too many years ago. The Minister of Highways at that time had been defeated in his own Constituency, so the Member for Humboldt resigned and the Minister of Highways ran in Humboldt. Before the election, highway crews were all over the Constituency of Humboldt I'm informed. Joe Burton won the byelection and the CCF were returned in the Constituency of Humboldt. The day after the election the highway crews had silently disappeared. They were not to be seen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Coderre: — That happened in Gravelbourg last year.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I mention this, Mr. Speaker, only to point out the contrast between the Humboldt byelection and the Turtleford byelection. No. 28 Highway, (going on with the program) Mr. Speaker, No. 28 Highway, Radville to junction No. 13 Highway, grading and gravelling.

Mr. Thatcher: — Whose riding is that in?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — No. 31 Highway, Kerrobert to Salvador, grading and gravelling. No. 35 Highway, Tribune, north, 11 miles, oil treatment.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Whose riding is that in?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — No. 37 Highway, Shaunavon, south extension of oil treatment, 7 miles. No. 39 Highway, from North Portal to No. 18 Highway, grading. From North Portal to No. 18 Highway, contract to be let for bituminous surfacing, preparatory work only in 1961, completion in 1962. Yellow Grass to Weyburn, seal coating, of parts of No. 39 Highway. On No. 39 Highway, Corinne to No. 1 Highway near Moose Jaw, oil treatment on this complete stretch. No. 52 Highway, from junction No. 10 Highway to Ituna, grading and gravelling with completion scheduled for 1962. On No. 55 Highway, Mr. Speaker, again in the Turtleford Constituency, from the junction of No. 26 Highway to Bolney, grading and gravelling. In addition, there will be minor completion work on a number of 1960 contracts and also some limited additional construction of provincial park access roads will be undertaken.

In bridge construction we will continue the work on the Petrofka Bridge with the objective of a late fall completion in 1962. A railway overpass will be built on No. 7 Highway south-west of Saskatoon. A railway overpass will be built on No. 18 Highway on the eastern outskirts of Estevan. A bridge will be built over the Souris River on No. 39 Highway near Roche Percee. Completion of a railway overpass on No. 2 Highway north of Prince Albert, and completion of eleven structures on No. 11 Highway, Regina to Lumsden. A railway overpass will be built on No. 11 Highway south of Saskatoon. A bridge will be built on No. 4 Highway at Cochin. Besides this, numerous smaller structures associated with the road construction program will be undertaken, and in addition to these construction projects, there'll be routine maintenance, regravelling of about 550 miles of provincial highway and resurfacing about nine miles of bituminous surface.

An Hon. Member: — A pretty good program.

March 9, 1961

Hon. Mr. Willis: — And then, following the custom which was started in the last two or three years by the former Minister, I would announce some proposed projects for 1962-1963. You understand, these are only a part of the program to be announced a year from now in the House. These are proposed projects for 1962-1963, with possible fall tendering this year. On No. 3 Highway, Smoking Tent to Manitoba boundary, completing the connection of No. 3 with Manitoba, by grading and gravelling this section. We'll also call for tenders this fall on No. 3, from Shell River to Shellbrook, grading and bituminous surfacing of this section.

I should draw to the attention of the Members of the House that the Department of Highways is renumbering No. 3 west of Shellbrook. No. 3 west of Shellbrook now is shown on the map as going through Big River and Meadow Lake. This No. 3 northern highway will become No. 55, while the present 55, directly west of Shellbrook, will become No. 3. This conforms with the numbering east of Prince Albert, where 55 is north of Saskatchewan River, and No. 3 south of Saskatchewan River.

On No. 3 Highway, west of Shellbrook, from Deer Creek to the Alberta boundary, we will be grading and gravelling a new road here, extending No. 3 through to Alberta. At the end of 1962 No. 3 will have connections with both Manitoba and Alberta. On No. 4 Highway we hope to fall tender the grading and gravelling, from Kyle to Elrose, and the North Saskatchewan River to junction No. 5 Highway, and from Meadow Lake, south, approximately twenty miles, grading and gravelling; and on No. 5 Highway, Battleford to Bresaylor, fall tendering for bituminous surfacing. On No. 7 Highway, Flaxcombe to Alberta boundary, grading and gravelling. On No. 11 Highway, we will bituminous surface the stretch from Dundurn to Saskatoon. This will be in the new location, following the railroad from Dundurn to come into Saskatoon from the south. No. 15 Highway, Ituna to Fenwood, grading and gravelling — another fall tender. No. 22 Highway, Esterhazy to junction No. 8 Highway, grading and gravelling; and No. 40 Highway, Battleford to junction of No. 29 Highway, approximately 1.8 miles, grading and gravelling. Mr. Speaker, this completes the 1961-1962 program announcements and the items which we hope to have for fall tendering this year on our 1962-1963 program. And, it goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that I will oppose the amendment and vote for the motion.

Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister begins, it has been drawn to my attention that I said the Petrofka Bridge would be completed in the fall of '62. That should have been the fall of '61.

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — Mr. Speaker, now that my hon. friend has that little matter straightened out, possibly he and I should have a little conference with respect to the number of hydro projects the Power Corporation is going to build. I will be saying a word or two later on about hydro projects.

Mr. Speaker, when I rose on an earlier occasion I had an opportunity to offer my congratulations to yourself as well as all the new Members of the House, and the only thing that I want to do in that regard this evening is to join with all those who have preceded me in offering sincere congratulations to the hon. Provincial Treasurer for the very fine manner in which he presented his budget a few days ago. Since he presented that document to this House, there has been a considerable number of accusations. There has been a lot of charges and countercharges, and a lot of statements of fact and fancy.

I have found from experience over the years, that it doesn't pay to decide too early on what you are going to say in a particular debate, because invariably if you get into a debate toward the tail-end of it, you find that somebody has already said those things which you wish to speak on. I find myself in an extremely fortunate position I would suggest, Mr. Speaker. I seem to have at least a goodly number of supporters on this side of the House, because while my poor little Power Corporation, and my poor little Department of Industry and Information have been held up and whipped rather severely during the last little while, a number of people on this side of the House have seen fit to reply to some of the ridiculous statements and charges which have emanated from my friends across the floor. That being the case, I can save a considerable amount of time of the House by refraining from discussing many of the matters which I felt needed to be replied to, and I am sure that my colleagues felt the same way, because they did in fact reply to some of the statements which have been made.

There is one thing that I would like to mention, and I am sorry that my good friend from Maple Creek is not in his seat. Oh is he there, I can't see very well with these glasses; I only use them for reading. In his speech this afternoon he was making some reference to some of the Departments that were experiencing cuts in their estimates this year, while some others were having increases, and he referred to the Department of Industry and Information, and if I am not mistaken, he suggested that

March 9, 1961

we were having an increase in staff in the Department. I believe he made reference to nine going up to fourteen indicating an increase on the whole. Now, I am sure my hon. friend wasn't intending to mislead the House, but I would suggest if he had taken the whole Department instead of the one branch, the administration branch, he would have obtained a figure which indicates we will have a reduction in staff, and a reduction in the expenditures of something like \$51,000. As I say, I am sure he didn't intend to mislead us, but possibly he let his enthusiasm get away from him for just a minute when he made those remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom in the House for me to do much the same as my seat-mate, the Minister of Highways, and that is to report to some extent on the activities of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation during the past year, and also to give an indication of what we intend to do with the rather substantial amount of money which appears in the estimates to be provided to the Corporation for their activities in the current year. We tabled the Annual Report of the Corporation the other day, and I hope the Members have had an opportunity to peruse it. I would like to make one or two comments on some of the highlights in the report, and then I would like to say a word or two about the program that we will be undertaking during 1961.

If anyone has taken the trouble to read the report, they will find as far as the financial aspects are concerned our revenues increased very substantially again in 1960 over 1959, and rose to a total of just over \$39¼ million. We ended the year with a net income of just over \$1 million — \$1,048,000. This of course, is only about one-third as much as we recorded in the previous year, and I point out that the increase in revenues were largely eaten up by the increase in the interest and carrying charges which we were called upon to pay during that year.

We have heard a considerable amount of discussion in this House the last little while about the economic situation in Saskatchewan and in Canada, and it is interesting to note that while we all seem to agree that there is some set-back in the economy, the Corporation's revenues in 1960 were only about 1⅓% below the figure which we budgeted for in our operating budget at the first of the year. The net income realized was about 2½% of our revenue. This of course, is after we have paid all of the interest and carrying charges on our capital investment. I would suggest that in view of the extremely high level of development of the Corporation's

electrical and gas operation, this can be considered reasonably satisfactory. However, at the same time I would suggest too, that you cannot consider it as an exorbitant rate of return on the \$300 million capital which has been invested in the Corporation to date.

The report records that by the end of 1960 we were serving a total of some 257,904 customers, this consisted of 186,843 electrical, and about 71,061 customers of the gas utility. It is again a substantial increase over 1959, when we served a total of 241,785. There was an increase of more than 24,000 in our electrical customers during the year, and of this about 13,500 were accounted for by the application of new systems in Weyburn, Moose Jaw and in Alsask. About 4,000 of these were rural customers. We picked up something like 11,000 additional gas customers during the year, and of these approximately 2,500 were customers in centres where we built new distribution systems last year. The remainder, of course, were added to the system by the usual addition of customers in the communities in which service had been provided previously.

It is interesting to note that there was a considerable increase recorded in the total amount of the electrical energy that was delivered to the system during the year, and this reached one billion, two hundred and thirty-four million kilowatt hours which compared to just over one billion kilowatt hours in 1959. A lot of this additional power came from the new Boundary Dam Power Station which was opened during the year at the city of Estevan, and this came into full operation in May. Since that time the Boundary Dam Station has played a major part in the generating of the energy required by the Corporation's system. Work was started too, on the Squaw Rapids hydro project up in the north-eastern part of the province, and satisfactory results have been obtained so far. Some of the work that has been undertaken to date is the work on the dam, the spill-ways, the power canal and the power plant excavation. This plant of course, will be the province's first hydro-station to be brought into production. It will have an installed capacity in the initial stages of 201,000 kilowatts, and that is something more than about one-third of the total present capacity of our generating system. We expect that the first units will be in operation, and the first power will be available from the Squaw Rapids project in 1963. It will come in just about the time that our forecast indicated we will require additional energy in order to meet the growing loads of the system. We are going to attempt – I should say now, although I will be

March 9, 1961

saying a little more about the hydro situation a little later – we are going to attempt to close the river this year, in order that if anything happens we will have an extra year ahead of us so that we can make a second attempt, if necessary.

A considerable amount of work was done on the transmission system during the year, and this year marked this first inter-connection with another provincial power system. I am referring of course to the inter-connection between the province of Manitoba and the Boundary Dam Generating Station. The line which was built handles 230,000 volts, and it was activated in rather a rush not too many months ago when they ran into a bit of a problem in Manitoba, so we were able to put energy over the new line to help our sister province in an emergency which had developed in their system.

During the year we added a total of ninety miles of 230,000 volts – this is in addition to the other one – sixty-six miles of 138,000 volts, and approximately 295 miles of 72,000 volt transmission lines. A considerable amount of mileage – some 475 miles of 25,000 volt sub-transmission lines – were rebuilt or converted, and 2280 miles of single-phase 14,400 volt distribution lines were built. I mentioned a moment ago that one of the reasons for the increase in the number of customers during the year was the addition of the systems in Weyburn, Moose Jaw, and Alsask. I might say too, that during the year we also acquired our largest single industrial customer, when the Inter-Provincial Steel and Pipe Corporation's new steel mill on the outskirts of the city began to take service. This mill has the largest electric arc furnace west of Hamilton, and its total electrical demand is almost equal to that of the entire city of Moose Jaw.

In the natural gas picture we announced our program as usual during the Session last year. I would remind you that we added a number of new communities to the system, and we built a total of some 810 miles of transmission lines and laterals in order to provide this service to these new communities. One of the highlights of the year insofar as the gas utility is concerned was the purchase of gas fields which resulted in the Corporation becoming the owner of something like one trillion feet of natural gas in place. This I would like to say a word or two more on a little later, Mr. Speaker.

Now, my friend, the Minister of Highways has also taken to building hydro-stations, and I can understand his enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, because I know he is very

anxious to get a hydro project up in the Melfort Constituency. I think he feels that if he starts far enough back, he is bound to get one sooner or later. I am afraid though I might have to disappoint him one of these days.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Each dam means a highway bridge too.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Are you going to pay us for using our dam? Well, I mentioned a moment ago that the Squaw Rapids project is well underway. The first major contract you will probably recall, was let to the Manno and Associates Construction Co., last January, just over a year ago, and their contract is in the main for the construction of the main dam, and a spill-way, and the excavation for the power canal. About 25% of the fill has been placed in the main dam, which extends approximately two-thirds of the way across the river. The spill-way base slab has been poured, and the concrete for the dam, and is 35% completed. Approximately one-quarter of the power canal excavation has been completed by the large walking drag-line which is capable, so I am told, of moving up to ten or fifteen cubic yards at one time. Another contract was issued during the year to Pereni Company, for the construction of the power plant itself. They have been at work, and I would think have completed probably about 5% of their \$10 million contract. The main activity included coffer-damming and watering the power plant site, and excavation for intakes and power plant.

We built a transmission line during the year, a 72,000 K.V. electrical transmission line, from around Nipawin over to the dam site, and the access road was completed from Carrot River up to the site. We supplied a radio communication link with Nipawin and we have also installed a telephone system. We also have completed an air strip and that was put into service during the year, and if any of you who fly your own planes want to look at this project you can now fly in.

Now, that is about the extent of the work so far on this project. I might say, however, that we have some time ago let the contracts for turbine and generators. We have to do that of course, because it takes some three years or so to fabricate this equipment, and we have to let the contract well in advance in order to ensure they will be delivered on time, and when we want them.

March 9, 1961

The other project which is presently underway, the other hydro project, is of course the one at the Coteau Creek site, a joint Federal-Provincial project, and most of the work there is in connection with the pen-stocks, and providing the tunnel liners and that sort of thing. I might mention as a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, that the Power Corporation will be paying half of the province's share of the cost of the dam, in the neighborhood of around \$12½ million. This will be absorbed as part of the cost of our power facilities which will be provided in connection with that particular project.

Mr. Willis mentioned something of the future prospects for hydro development on the Saskatchewan River, and while I am not going to agree with him on the number of hydro projects which might be developed over the years, I certainly will agree with him there are very distinct possibilities of further hydro development along the Saskatchewan River. We have already looked at a number of likely sites, and all of these seem to be quite satisfactory, and I don't think there is any question that further suitable sites can be developed in the years ahead. I am not sure of the figure which Mr. Willis used when he talked about the fall between the reservoir on Coteau Creek and the tail-water of the Squaw project, but people in the Corporation tell me the information we have obtained from our consulting engineers is a total fall of something like 905 feet. This is between the full reservoir level at the Coteau Creek project and as I mentioned the tail-water of the Squaw project itself, and this simply means a gross head of approximately 290 feet which will be and can be enlarged with the two projects presently under construction. This means, of course, there will be some 615 feet of head still remaining, which can be utilized in successive stages in the years ahead. Now whether this will carry the number of projects mentioned a while ago, I wouldn't want to hazard to guess at this time, but there will indeed be a number of projects developed on the river. Besides that, of course, there are other suitable sites on the South Saskatchewan River which we have looked at, and there is also further possibilities in the north.

I mentioned a moment ago the fact that we have put the Boundary Dam station on line during the year, and the fact that it was producing a considerable amount of the energy required by the Corporation system. I would like to point out that by placing this station where we did, at Estevan, the Corporation was able to take

maximum advantage of the ready access to the low cost lignite coal in that area, and we have been operating both the new Boundary Dam Power Station and the old Estevan Power Station on this lignite coal. As a matter of fact, during 1960, the Boundary Dam Station – and I am speaking of this one, not the Estevan plant as well – that station alone, from lignite coal generated something like 450 million kilowatt hours. This was about one-third of the requirements of the system for the year. Lignite coal in those fields – and I think this is interesting – account for a total of about 53% of the kilowatt hours which we produced in our plants during the year. Natural gas provided for about 33½%, Bunker C fuel for about 9%, and other coal for about 4½%, and diesel for about one half of 1%. During 1960, a total of 455,965 tons of lignite were used at the Boundary Dam Station, compared with just about 86,000 the year before. The reason for the great difference, of course, was the fact that the Boundary Dam Station didn't have the second unit in operation during a small part of the year. The old Estevan Power Station has increased in the amount of lignite coal consumed; it went up from 179,000 tons to about 263,000 tons in 1960. It is interesting to note that in using this cheap lignite coal in those fields, power can be produced for about .173 of a cent per kilowatt, while using other types of coal the cost would rise to about .49 of a cent, and with Bunker C Fuel it goes up to a little over one-half cent per kilowatt hour. It can readily be seen that there is a tremendous saving in generating cost when you can base your load on the stations at Estevan, and use the lignite coal which is available at that point.

Now, a word or two about the matter of load growth. We have been saying for a number of years, or pointing out, I should say, that our rate of growth in the Corporation has been running around 20% per year, and as Mr. Willis mentioned, this has necessitated increasing our generating capacity pretty rapidly. We have to double it about every four or five years. This is the reason, of course, we have underway at the present time two additional generating stations, the Squaw project which will come in in 1963, and the South Saskatchewan which will come a few years later. As a matter of fact, with the continual increase of the load growth in the province, it's pretty obvious already that by the time we have the Squaw Rapids project finished we are going to have to have another generating project underway, and this will likely have to come in before the South Saskatchewan station, if we are going to maintain a

March 9, 1961

sufficient margin of energy to carry the increase in loads, and the increasing demand which seems to be ahead of us in the future.

Our consumption has been rising rather rapidly. In 1956 the sales of electricity were about five hundred million kilowatt hours, and in 1959 it came up to about nine hundred and sixty million, and as I mentioned a moment ago we have gone to over one billion two hundred million for the year 1960. It is possible that there may be a small decline or a slight decline in the rate of growth which we have experienced in the past few years, but as far as we can see it will remain fairly constant. Again it this year went up to around the 18% mark, and as I mentioned as near as we can ascertain from our forecast, if this sort of level is to continue we will have to continue to provide for more generating capacity in the years ahead. I don't suppose I need to mention that the increase in the consumption of natural gas has been almost fantastic in the last few years, and continued to rise from year to year, not only due to the addition of new customers, but because of the increasing use which is being made of that fuel, by those people who have been using it for some time.

My hon. friends have been doing a lot of talking about this matter of industrial development, and they like to talk about, or refer to stagnation. Well, I am not going to go into any long discussion over this, as I mentioned at the outset a number of people on this side of the House have been kind enough to carry the ball in that regard, which relieves me from the responsibility of doing it at this time. I would just like to point out that there has been a considerable and substantial increase in industrial growth in the province. One way that you can judge it or gauge it is to take a look at the question of the consumption of energy. In any community or any province that is going ahead, that is developing, more and more energy is required in order to meet the needs of business, industry and the domestic consumers. In 1956, the industrial consumption of electricity in Saskatchewan accounted for something less than 26% of the total retail figure for that year. In 1959 the industrial portion of the total had risen to about 37%, and it was still going up very rapidly in 1960. The industrial expansion in the province has accounted for an increase in the total consumption now being used for industrial purposes. In 1956, the industrial natural gas consumption was about 24% of the total consumed that year, and in 1959 it accounted for slightly over 33%. In both these cases the actual increase in

quantity of electricity and natural gas for industrial purposes has been very substantial indeed. The total consumption of electrical energy for industry rose from about 81 million kilowatt hours in 1956 to 192 million in 1959. The total consumption of natural gas came up slightly over one billion cubic feet in 1956 to over six billion in 1959. I would suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that these figures would certainly indicate there must have been a substantial increase in the industrial complex in the province.

Now, one matter that I would like to refer to briefly, and this appears in the Annual Report as one of the highlights for the year; the question of the purchase of gas in place. Now this was a matter that was kicked around considerably during the last couple of years. A number of my good friends in the Opposition took issue with us on this purchase of these gas fields, and I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition has suggested that this is a foolish piece of business, and that it was throwing money away. Well, I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman that I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt, and suggest to him that he really wasn't aware of what was involved in this, or I am sure if he had have been he would have been equally as happy as we are that we were able to conclude a deal of this kind, which will mean so much money to the users of natural gas in Saskatchewan in the years ahead. We know that there has been considerable development of gas resources here in the province of Saskatchewan, but again, we realize too that there hasn't been the kind of development of natural gas as there has been in the province of Alberta. This has meant that over the years we have not been able to obtain sufficient gas supplies for the needs of our system in our own province of Saskatchewan, so we have had to turn to other sources of supply. These have been generally from the closest source which is across in the province of Alberta. Now, we had been buying Alberta gas for quite a number of years under the usual and normal contract with the gas producers, but there is a problem involved here because we have been faced with the ever-present prospect of price variations which might be governed by the local market, or similarly by a developing export market. These variations are really not too predictable, but when one has followed the trend on gas prices and purchase prices, one can only conclude that you could expect these prices would rise upward, and in many cases rather substantially. So, with this in mind, we felt it desirable to try and insure for the Corporation, not only an adequate source of supply and adequate reserves in order that we would have gas to put into our system in the years ahead, but

March 9, 1961

also to try and safeguard our position pricewise. We felt this was extremely necessary, as I mentioned a moment ago, because there isn't any question but what the trend of gas prices is upward. As a matter of fact during the last year, the Members may recall, there was a board of arbitration set up to hear representations by some of the producers in the western part of the province with respect to an increase in the well-head prices which we were paying at that time.

Now, generally speaking we have been buying gas from the producers over the years for 10¢ per M.C.F. They claimed that this wasn't enough, and suggested that they might be able to do better elsewhere. We maintained that they were in fact obtaining a better price from the Corporation than they could get anywhere else, including sales to Trans-Canada Pipeline. This was put to the test and put before the arbitration board, and a report established the fact unquestionably that the producers were in fact, at 10¢ per M.C.F., obtaining more for their natural gas than they could have obtained if they were selling it to Trans-Canada Pipelines. This is because of the fact that our 10¢ well-head price is the price that we pay at the well; we provide the gathering system, the transmission line, the dehydration, compression, and everything else, and when they had to carry these costs themselves, deduct it from the price which Trans-Canada would have paid, which at that time I believe was 13¢, they were getting about 9¢, but in spite of this, the board of arbitration put through a recommendation for a 7½% increase in the well-head price and we now have to pay that difference.

Well, this is the trend as I said a moment ago. As an alternative we thought we might be well-advised to look at the prospects of buying some additional supplies and producing them as we see fit, and we began negotiations some two years ago and finally concluded the agreements last year. These fields, or these reserves are in what is known as the Hatton-Many-Islands Fields which straddle the Alberta-Saskatchewan border. Actually they are one continuous field; they are just divided by the border itself. As I mentioned too, we already had agreements with existing companies in the areas, and we were buying gas from them, and generally speaking we were paying the 10¢ price. We were already committed to gathering this gas, and so we didn't have to concern ourselves with any additional costs in that area. The facilities were already provided. We went ahead and we bought these reserves, and these reserves are roughly equal to about the presently known reserves

in the province of Saskatchewan, and they will provide enough gas to operate the Corporation system for some fifteen years.

We bought this gas at a price of between 2¢ and 3¢ in the ground, as compared to the 10¢ and 15¢ that would be wanted by the producers at the well-head. When we add the production cost and the interest charges until the gas is actually required, it is still very much less expensive than the normal method of purchasing natural gas. Production costs, interest, and royalties would raise the effective price, but it is still very much less expensive than any alternative sources which we might have turned to. I haven't got the exact dollar and cents picture with regard to this transaction, but I am going to suggest again that it is possibly one of the best business deals we have ever been able to arrange for the people of Saskatchewan. We now own one trillion feet of gas as a Corporation; gas which would have to be bought over a period of years, and over that period of years, in buying that amount of gas, we would have likely had to pay somewhere in the order of \$120 million. We bought this gas in place for something like \$27 million, and I am sure it will likely cost about as much again when we pay the royalties and the other fees, and the interest on the money, but nevertheless, the total of these costs, by the time the gas is produced, will still be less than half of what we would have had to pay if we had not bought these reserves and continued to buy our quantities from the normal and usual sources.

While I am on this question of gas prices, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in the House too, about the cost of electricity and natural gas in the province, and as one of the Members on this side of the House pointed out during the debate, my hon. friends opposite always like to go to Manitoba when they start to compare electrical costs, and they like to go to Alberta when they compare the costs of natural gas. Now, I am not going into a long argument or discussion on this, but I would like to point out that when we are considering the prices of natural gas, we should keep in mind what the people are paying in some other areas. I would like to point out first, that the trend of natural gas prices to the consumer has been upward. As a matter of fact, in the province of Alberta that my friends like to talk about so much when they are comparing gas rates, it is quite true their rates are low, they have been low, and there are very good reasons why they should be low, but nevertheless, between 1955 and 1960, both the natural gas utilities in the province of Alberta have increased their prices to their consumers.

March 9, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — They are still half Saskatchewan's rate.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — That's beside the point. One of them has gone up around 24-25%, and the other one boosted theirs to something in the order of 35%. Now, my friends don't like to talk about the price of natural gas to the consumer in Manitoba, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is more appropriate to compare natural gas prices . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Four hundred miles further than Alberta.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — In Winnipeg the price for natural gas is something like 90¢ per M.C.F., compared to an average in Saskatchewan of about 70¢, and I know there is about 300 or 400 miles of additional transmission line required to take that gas to the city of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, it costs you about 1¢ per M.C.F. to move that amount of gas 100 miles, so if you want to raise your price or your cost 5¢ more, then I submit to you that there shouldn't be much more than about 4¢ difference between the cost of natural gas to the consumer in Winnipeg, and the cost of gas to the consumer in the city of Regina.

Mr. Thatcher: — The same should be true of Regina and Calgary.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note too, that in the province of Manitoba, where natural gas is being handled by private utilities, you have only a hand full of communities which are being served. They haven't of course begun to undertake the kind of development which we have here in the province, and simply because they don't want to move away from the concentrated markets and lucrative areas to places where they can't make profits. In the city of Brandon, during last year, and they have only had gas a short time, their rates were increased by some 17¢ per M.C.F. In Portage la Prairie they had a gas rate there of 77¢ per M.C.F., but when they established this price, Mr. Speaker, this company that serves Portage la Prairie filed a reduced rate schedule, this was to become effective, apparently, after they had acquired themselves 1,200 customers, then they were supposed to bring in a 5¢ per M.C.F. reduction in rate. But what has happened? During the past year they have not only made application

for a retention of the 77¢ per M.C.F. rate, they have also filed an application for a 10¢ increase, and this is the usual procedure with these utilities. They commence with a nice low price, and as soon as they have the franchise, up goes the price. Now this as I say is the trend in natural gas prices. As a matter of fact if you follow the prices which have been paid and are being paid, in the various parts of Canada you will find that generally speaking the trend is upwards. It is interesting to note that the province of Saskatchewan is about the only place where natural gas rates have not gone up. As a matter of fact, they have been reduced from 88¢, an average of 88¢ in 1955, down to an average of about 72¢ in 1960.

I would like to say just a word or two about the 1961 program. I am going to hurry along as I know there are a number of other speakers to get on the floor this evening, and I will try to make this brief. The 1961 program, Mr. Lloyd, the Provincial Treasurer mentioned to some extent, when he was presenting his budget, and I believe he made some reference to some of the major expenditures which would likely be undertaken by the Corporation during the year. I would like however, to give a few details which may be of interest to the Members at this time. Among the major expenditures of the total of some \$46 million which is proposed for various aspects of the system will be about \$21 million for generation. The bulk of this amount will be spent for continuing the work on the Squaw Rapids hydro station where we expect to spend some \$16 million during 1961. Some of the work that will be completed will be the spillway, the concreting, and closing of the river, which permits work on the remaining portion of the dam, continuation of the canal excavation, and the continuing construction on the pen-stocks, intake structure, and the project itself. Most of the balance of the monies, which will be spent on the generating aspects of our system, will be taken up in payment of the 1961 share – our share – of the pen-stocks, the tunnel liners and the reservoir cost in the Coteau Creek South Saskatchewan Dam project. We will also continue the engineering studies of the river itself, to see if we can't, in fact, find those ten hydro sites. We will continue work on the construction of transmission lines and on the work of distribution, and this will take something like \$11 million of our budget, during this current year. About two-thirds of this will go towards the transmission facilities, and in that area we will be building a major transmission line between Saskatoon and North Battleford. This line will be built for 230,000 volt operation, and this alone will call for an expenditure of around \$2 million.

March 9, 1961

Now, some survey work will be undertaken in connection with our steel towers, and we will be erecting some of these for the first time in 1961. These are designed to carry mainly our 230,000 volt transmission lines from the Squaw Rapids project, we will be building down to Beatty and down to Saskatoon, and we will spent about \$1 million in that particular area. About \$1½ million will be spent on 72,000 volt transmission lines, and this will include a new line from North Battleford to Landis, and one from Wynyard over to Wadena.

One interesting project which we will undertake this year, insofar as transmission lines, is the transmission line in the northern part of the province running to Meadow Lake and Buffalo Narrows. This will bring these areas into the provincial power grid, and we will be serving from these lines Green Lake, Beauval, Ile a la Crosse and Buffalo Narrows. We have to proceed with this particular transmission line possibly somewhat earlier than what we may have desired simply because of the developing shortage of energy available from the plants presently established in those communities at this time. I think this is an extremely good move, because it will provide central station power to the communities in this area – there is a lot of mink ranching going on in that part of the province – and I am sure that a good source of electrical energy will be of benefit to the people throughout the whole area.

We have moved away from the old policy of trying to operate isolated little expensive plants in these communities, finding it much better, where possible and where the cost permits, to build transmission lines and supply energy from that source. In most of these communities the actual distribution will be handled by co-operatives with the Corporation selling the power to the local co-op, and they themselves handling the work of running the distribution system.

We will be spending a considerable amount of money, some \$700,000, on switch-gear and transformer station capacity at various locations, and a considerable mileage of 25,000 volt sub-transmission line will also be built during the year. We will be adding to the existing distribution systems in the communities which we already serve, and we will be making improvements to the extent of something like \$625,000. Again this year, we will be spending approximately \$1,700,000 in the rural electrification program.

This year, I should point out, Mr. Speaker, will be the final or third year of our operation "Complete Coverage," which we launched a couple of years ago. The basis of this was to try to clean up the job of electrifying the farms in Saskatchewan over a three year period, and I think we are well on the way to doing just that. This year we will probably add an additional 2,200 farms, and the number remaining to be done will be very few indeed.

As far as the natural gas program is concerned, the Provincial Treasurer told you we would be spending something like \$8 million on our gas program for 1961. Of this, a total of about \$2 million will be earmarked for new production facilities, and gas compression. We will also be spending a little money on gas storage, which we hope to be able to develop as quickly as possible so that we can even out our summer and winter load. Extensions and improvements of existing gas distribution systems and the supply and installation of additional meters will account for more than \$2¼ million. With that taken out of the gas budget, Mr. Speaker, we still will have a wee bit of money left, to be used for the addition of new communities to the system in 1961. Now it's not going to be what you would term an extensive program, because if anyone has been doing some rough arithmetic they will likely realize that we will only have something like \$1½ million to spend on the addition of communities to the system this year. However, we will still be carrying on a program at a reasonable level, and we will be adding quite a few new communities to the system.

Now, it is planned then for 1961 to spend something like \$104,000 on a small project to provide service to Fort San and Lebret. Now we tie these together as one project because they are almost just that. We will also be spending something like \$700,000 for a transmission line, or for a continuation of a transmission line in the north-eastern part of the province, which will permit us to provide service to Stenen, Preeceville and Sturgis, and with provision for future extensions in other years to Pelly and Arran and I suppose there may be some other communities up in that part of the province which will get it too. Besides that, we will be adding a number of communities to the system along presently existing transmission lines. These, for the information of the Members, will be as follows: we will be taking service to Briercrest and Avonlea, to Beatty, Benson, Balgonie, Mossbank, Arborfield, Aylsham, Grey, Zenon Park, McLean,

March 9, 1961

Whitewood, Wapella; these are the new communities that will be serviced this year. Now, I think after the announcement of Wapella and Whitewood, Mr. Speaker, I feel almost certain that the hon. Member for Moosomin is going to feel inclined to support the budget.

Mr. McDonald: — Can you vote for a little piece of it?

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, I have taken much more time than I intended to. I had some other matters that I would have liked to discuss; another aspect of our operation I would have liked to have discussed was the impact of the purchase of the Moose Jaw system, as a matter of fact what this means to the system itself, and also discuss some of the buildings which we will be constructing during the year, the main one of course, being the start on the new head office building in the city of Regina.

I believe I have taken up enough time of the House. I hope I have been able to provide a little bit of information on how we spent the money which was provided to us last year, and to give some indication of the manner in which we propose to spend the \$46 million which appears in the budget as earmarked for the Corporation's operations in 1961. Before taking my seat I want, at this time, publicly to pay my respects and offer my sincere thanks to the hard-working staff of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. They really live up to their motto of 'All Hours for Public Service', and any of you who have had occasion to have dealings with the people who operate and maintain our electric and gas system will know full well what I mean. Time means nothing to them; they are only concerned in providing a top type of utility service to the people of this province, and I just want them to know that I for one, as the Minister in Charge, most sincerely appreciate the great job that they are doing.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose I need to say it, but I will, I am afraid that I just can't support the amendment, but I will support the motion.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, during this debate, the old question of population growth in the province of Saskatchewan has been raised again. I don't think it

should ever be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that the most disastrous ten years in regard to population in the province of Saskatchewan, was the last ten years that the Liberal Government was in power, from 1934 to 1944. The census of 1936 and 1946 show the results, and believe me, Mr. Speaker, you know it. You had to be tough to live in Saskatchewan in those days. There were no roads or highways worthy of the name. There was no rural electrification scattered all over the province of Saskatchewan, and there were little villages either without any electric lights at all, or with a little local power plant where they were paying 20¢ or 25¢ per kilowatt hour for power, and getting light till midnight and then they were shut off.

These are the kind of things they can't remember. They can't remember that there was no educational system in this province worthy of the name at that time: that the school teachers were under-paid; that the educational plant was run down; old schools without equipment, and all the rest of it. You had to be tough, Mr. Speaker, to live in the province of Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government, and many of the people in this House know it.

I'm very jealous, Mr. Speaker, of my hon. colleague, the Minister in Charge of the Power Corporation who has just taken his seat, because he has the privilege of saying dam site and dam project, and I know that you will call me out of order, if I refer to some of the remarks made from the people opposite, and say that their information was damn misleading. Therefore, I won't say it, but I would like to say it if it wasn't going to be out of order.

The hon. Member from Athabasca talked about the road to Uranium City and he figures out how many years it would take to get him there. Does he remember, (I don't suppose he does remember, Mr. Speaker,) that while we had a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, they never got a road within one hundred miles of Lac La Ronge, let alone on the other side of it at all? They never did anything in the north country. He didn't know anything about it at that time. He talked about the fishing and the fishermen in the north, and the co-operative fisheries, and the work of the fish marketing service in the past. Well all I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to get a copy of the remarks which he made in this House, and take it up to the Indian, Metis, and white fishermen in his Constituency so they will know where he stands on that point.

Mr. Thatcher: — They did that for the deferred election.

March 9, 1961

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Anybody can toss figures around and figure out percentages, but remember that before the CCF was in power, the fish in the north were sold as they were taken out of the lake and at the lowest price. It is true that during the period right after the war there were high prices because of scarcity of those products, but now there are plants in the north that process this fish, and without those plants that fish could not go to market at all. That is one of the improvements that have been made in the north. The Member for Athabasca said that we should spend more money, but the amendment to the motion regrets this going into debt at such a terrific rate, but then he says, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to vote for the amendment. How ridiculous can he get? He says that he wants you to spend more money; here is a great chance to spend lots of money to help the unemployment situation. These people are most illogical, and I don't know if it's because they don't know any better, or whether they just don't want to know any better.

The hon. Member for Maple Creek had something to say about the oil business. He pointed out that the revenue from Mineral Resources was down. That is correct, but again I would like to . . .

Opposition Member: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . You are applauding a little too fast my hon. friend, — Again I would like to remind my hon. friends that a depression in revenue for Mineral Resources, under a CCF Government, is about ten times better than a boom under the previous Liberal Government. Sure we had booming years in the middle 50's, in both the oil business and the mineral business, and our revenues now are not so great and the activity is not so great, but that is true all across Canada.

Mr. Thatcher: — It's not true in Alberta.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member from Maple Creek talked about revenue minerals being down and that was all the trouble. Then he grumbled about the increases in royalty and so forth in regard to the oil interests. You see he wants to be on both sides of the questions so he can say to the people of Saskatchewan, "This Government doesn't get enough revenue from oil in this province," and then he wants to turn around and go to the oil companies and say, "This Government charges you too much royalty." This is the kind of a Member he is. He wants to be on both sides

of the fence, to be all things to all people.

Well, let's look at some of the facts of the situation in regard to this. First of all, when you take our royalty plus our share of the road allowance oil, combine them, and put them on a graph with the royalty in Alberta, they are practically parallel. As a matter of fact, Alberta is a little higher in more places than Saskatchewan. When you combine these two that is the situation.

(The hon. Member from Cannington enjoys this, I hope he takes it to heart.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been remarks made about taking a share of the road-allowance oil, but there is a good reason for that in Saskatchewan. My hon. friends opposite won't agree with it of course, because they didn't have the intestinal fortitude when they were in power to collect revenue, and they don't want us to collect revenue. That is the fact of the matter, but there is a good reason for this. In the province of Saskatchewan, particularly in some parts of the province, there is a very large percentage of the mineral rights privately owned. In Alberta there is a very small percentage of the mineral rights privately owned. Now, where the mineral rights are privately owned, in that area the road allowances are six rods wide, and they are around every section. There is pretty near 4% of the land in road allowance, so that the road-allowance oil is a very substantial part of the product. In those areas where you have privately-owned land the people of Saskatchewan would be just giving up to the private owner that much of the resources, so rather than have the royalty as high as Alberta, and no road-allowance oil share taken, it is more equitable and more fair to have a lower royalty as we have in Saskatchewan, lower than they have in Alberta, and then take a share of the road-allowance oil. I consider it to be my duty, no matter what the hon. Members opposite say, to see that insofar as the resources that belong to the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, that we get a fair share of those resources.

I have already pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that activity is down, we all know that, but still in oil exploration we have pretty near five million acres of land under leases in Saskatchewan. Pretty near five million acres of land under permit for exploration. The helium agreements are in the early stages and none of us can say yet whether there will be helium production

March 9, 1961

in Saskatchewan or not, but there are a lot of companies interested in it, there are nearly three million acres under agreement for helium exploration and development. In the drilling of wells, in the year 1960, 444 completed oil wells in the year. Well over one a day. You never heard of anything like that fifteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, There are ten new gas wells, and there were eight other wells of miscellaneous character. For example, for water source, for water injection, and for pressure maintenance and so forth, and 161 dry holes during the year. A total of 623 wells were drilled during the year.

This evening I was down town and I was talking to one of the oil men, and he said, "You know, we had a string of thirty-four wells in succession, and everyone was a producer, in the province of Saskatchewan." These are the people that talk as if there was nothing doing at all.

Mc. McCarthy: — Where was that Brock?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That was in different fields in the south-west and the south-east.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the north I am sorry to have to report, that the number of mineral claims recorded in 1960 was only 1,081. That isn't very good. It is getting pretty near down to the average of Liberal performance when we had a Liberal "Government, and I am not at all pleased with it, and I hope it will get better, but it's still well above the average number of claims staked for the last ten years that the Liberals were in power in the province of Saskatchewan. In the north country there are 6,500 claims in good standing. There are 43,000 acres in geophysical claim blocks, and 2,283,000 acres in reservations. My hon. friend from Athabasca referred to those reservations I believe, and gave that as one of the reasons why no ore work was being done. Well as a matter of fact, most provinces across Canada, whether he knows it or not, do have some disposition on a large acreage basis of this nature. It is desired by the industry and is in effect practically all across Canada. Of course it's very easy for him to say that if this hadn't been taken up there would have been a lot more work on it, and of course, if it hadn't been taken up he would say, why don't you get it taken up. Irresponsible people, you see, can make really interesting remarks if you pay any attention to them.

I just want to take a little time now, to deal with something else, and that is the general procedure that we have followed in the Department of Mineral

resources in regard to the development of regulations, and in some cases legislation in regard to mineral resources. We followed this in connection with the oil regulations; we followed this in connection with the Oil and Gas Conservation Act; we followed it most recently in connection with the new regulations to which my hon. friend referred in regard to the hard-rock mining in the north. The procedure is this. When, because of some reason, sometimes it is because of a new mineral being produced, or because of old regulations getting out of date, when there is a reason why we should have new regulations developed we go to work on them in the Department, and probably we work on them for a year or two years, developing a draft of new regulations, trying to streamline them to make them more convenient for people to use. We try to get them the very best we can, and finally we send out to the industry as a confidential document, a draft copy of the regulations. Now I want my hon. friends here in this Legislature to remember that this is to some extent a bargaining process, and I think it is good, right and proper that the Government, in this case represented by the Minister of the Mineral Resources and his Department, should try to get the best bargain possible for the people of Saskatchewan in regard to these resources. There is no doubt that the industry knows that first draft that is sent out isn't going to be the final one. They have had plenty of experience and they know that. Then we ask for their comments, their suggestions, and their objections. Then we invite them to send a representative to a meeting to go over the regulations in detail and discuss them. This is the process that has been followed.

After that meeting and discussion, we make a further review of the regulations, send out a second draft, and ask for further comment. In that second draft, before it is passed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, there may even be some amendments then. We did this with regard to the regulations concerning northern mining which will come into effect, I expect, on April 1st. They are not yet passed by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. Remember I said, Mr. Speaker, that these drafts are sent out as a confidential document, and I am very happy to state, that in most cases that confidence has been respected. As a matter of fact it's very seldom been anything else but the fullest of confidence, but in this particular case, somebody either inadvertently or otherwise, did not maintain that confidence and went to the "Northern Miner." The Press doesn't care much where it gets its information, or whether it is confidential

March 9, 1961

or not, as long as they can rig up something that is thrilling, and so they published this article which was not only misleading, but completely stupid, and I have the copy of the "Northern Miner" here. I just came back from Toronto attending the Prospectors' and Developers' Convention there; I told the convention these same things, and here are some of the things that the "Northern Miner" said in the article.

"That the regulations evoked almost unanimous condemnation in mining circles."

That is absolutely incorrect. It's not true by any means. These regulations are well accepted by the industry, and I know that. Then they speak about bureaucracy. Actually what we did in these new regulations was to do away with a whole lot of paper work, and streamline them so they will be easier for the prospectors to operate under.

This is the "Northern Miner," but this isn't what they say. This is the stupid article they wrote about it. Then they said there is considerable weakening of title to mineral properties. There is no change in the title, in the new regulations from the old. The title is a lease, it has always in Saskatchewan been a lease, and it is still a twenty-one year lease renewable for further terms of twenty-one years. Other things they said: a stiff 12½% royalty. Mr. Speaker, they didn't say there was a three year royalty-free period at the commencement of mining included. They say all ores must be treated and refined in Saskatchewan. That was mentioned by the hon. Member. It was completely misleading too. What the draft says is, that except with permission of the Minister, and if we have a mine that is, for example, close to a border, or if it is practical to process those in Saskatchewan they are going to be processed here, and I don't mean maybe about that. If it is not economical or not practical to process them here, they will get permission to take them out. That has been in the regulations from the first time that I saw them.

I already mentioned the term of twenty-one years. They also go on about disallowing deductions for depletion and depreciation, and they are wrong again there. There never was, in the province of Saskatchewan, under a Liberal Government or otherwise, a deductible allowance for depletion before calculation of royalty. They never existed. There always has been, since we came into office, an allowance for depreciation, so they are wrong on both

counts. As a matter of fact, in the new regulations there will be an allowance, not for depletion, but an allowance deductible for explorations.

I would just like to give you a few of the highlights of these new regulations. I gave this at Toronto; it's not private anymore or confidential, and you can talk about it, but if you do I hope you tell the truth about it. I want to say here, as I also said in Toronto at that meeting, and when I met the representatives of the mining industry here in Regina, thanks to them for their very fine co-operation in working with us on this basis to get the very best set of regulations. I want to say in regard to royalty and rentals, no company will ever agree with any Government on this subject; I wouldn't if I were a miner. Rentals and royalties would always be too high, but on many of the other subjects there is a very much common interest, and I am sure that we are going to have one of the best sets of regulations in Canada.

Here are some of the things that have been done. The limitation on the number of claims which can be staked has been removed, and now on one license a miner can stake as many as he wants. Rental on leases has been dropped. We are emphasizing in these regulations the importance of doing work; deciding whether the land is good, worth holding or give it up and let someone else have a crack at it, but there is no rental on the leases. The first year of a claim or a claim block is free of required assessment work. This gives to the prospector and the developer, an additional amount of time to check over his land and look for financial arrangements. For the first time credit for transportation costs will be allowed against assessment work. There is now no need for a Certificate of Work. A three year royalty-free year period has been established, as I mentioned, with the only limitation of \$2 million of net profits from mining. Now more roads are being built in the Pre-Cambrian Shield, and will be further extended which helps the whole business. There are good flying services in the north, and good radio communications. We are carrying on geological and geophysical surveys, and certainly the Department of Natural Resources, of the province of Saskatchewan, have established, with the industry, both in oil and in all kinds of minerals, one of the best reputations of any Department in Canada for doing business with them in a good business-like manner. I can say that because I don't do that it is my staff, the Deputy and his staff, and the Department. I have received from the various sections of the industry great compliments along that line.

March 9, 1961

I want to tell you also, Mr. Speaker, that at the business meeting of the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada, which I do not attend, the other day they passed a resolution commending the Department of Mineral Resources in the province of Saskatchewan, for this procedure which they followed in developing new regulations, and which I have described to you.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question, I will support the motion, but they haven't persuaded me yet to support that amendment.

Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I should first of all like to congratulate you upon your election to your high and responsible office as Speaker of the Legislature. While doing so may appear repetitious to the point of monotony at this time, no one, I am sure, will question the sincerity of the collective sentiments that have been expressed by Members of this House. I am sure that I also speak for the Assembly when I say that we have been impressed with your integrity, your impartiality, and your general conduct during the debates in this House. May I observe too, Mr. Speaker, your attitude towards the verbosity of these past few weeks. I must say that I have observed, on your part, composure, calm, and if I may say so, compassion. May I express the hope too, Mr. Speaker, that the duties of your high and responsible position will be a rewarding and satisfying experience to you.

To all Members of the Legislature, including the Leader of the Opposition, I want to extend my congratulations. It is of course, a great privilege to be a Member of this Legislature, and I think it must never be forgotten that with privilege also goes responsibility, and to the extent that one recognizes and carries out one's responsibilities, will be determined not only the personal satisfaction one derives from doing a job well, but it will be also an indication of one's competence to serve.

Now, in view of the fact that Members of the Legislature are first citizens of their Constituencies, and in view of our modern means of communications by radio, television, and the press, it is well to remember the ancient admonition, Mr. Speaker, 'That by thy words

of thy mouth, thou shalt be justified, and by the words of thy mouth thou shalt be condemned.” Mr. Speaker, in that connection I should like to draw the attention of both the old and new Members of the House to the kind of response that they may expect from their different constituents, by quoting a letter to Senator Harlam J. Bushfield, of Miller, South Dakota. It is written by one of his constituents, and he says:

“Dear Senator Bushfield: I have never written you before, and I wouldn’t do it now, but I’m desperate. My mule, who was of great help to me when I did the plowing, died, and after listening to you on the radio I am sure you can help me too. Respectfully Yours.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, upon his appointment to what I am sure all Members in this House will agree, is one of the most important portfolios of government, namely that of the Provincial Treasurer. In times of economic buoyancy, Mr. Speaker, the task of a Provincial Treasurer, while onerous and exacting, is less fraught with those expediencies which during times of economic recession made their demand. It is during the latter situation, which currently, not only this jurisdiction, but other jurisdictions throughout Canada are experiencing, that the real measure of his character and competence are revealed. That the hon. Provincial Treasurer will fill his position with integrity, courage, dignity, and extraordinary competence, was clearly demonstrated when he brought down his budget several days ago. In the field of education he established a reputation that went far beyond the boundaries of this province, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, in a like manner will he write his name large in the field of finance in our country.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the people of the Milestone Constituency for again electing me to represent them in this Legislature. This is the fourth consecutive time that the people of Milestone have elected me to serve them, and I am grateful for their trust and their confidence more than I can say.

I want to say to the Hon. Member for Yorkton, and I am very sorry that he is not in his seat, that neither the people of Milestone Constituency nor the people of this province, are at all concerned about the kind of car I drive, Mr. Speaker, whether it be a Chevrolet, a Volkswagen or a Mercury. But what my people and the

March 9, 1961

people of the province are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is that I do my job. And I would say to the hon. Member for Yorkton, that if he does his job, or carries out his duties to which he has been elected, he will find neither the reason nor the time, to indulge in the cheap politics which were so evident in his contribution to this debate.

Through the years, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Arm River and I have developed what I would consider is a good relationship, although I can't say exactly that we are "buddies." On the numerous occasions on which we have met, we were able to discuss matters of mutual concern with a considerable amount of objectivity, particularly if it concerned the sins of the Tories. However, listening to him last Friday afternoon, I had the feeling that he knocked this good relationship into a "cocked hat," Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — I didn't say anything about you.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Well, I hope the hon. Member for Arm River will have some second thoughts about what he did say in his speech last Friday. For instance, I couldn't help, Mr. Speaker, to take umbrage at some of the statements that he had made: For instance that the co-ops are being infiltrated by this filthy political CCF movement. Then he said that any farmer who joined this socialist labour movement ought to have his head examined. He also made some very disparaging remarks about local government, saying — I think it was to the effect — I haven't the words right before me, that it was a "Charlie McCarthy yes committee," because it repeated what its masters had told it. Mr. Speaker, such outbursts by my hon. friend, do justice neither to himself nor to the party which he represents. To say that the local government committee is a Charlie McCarthy committee, Mr. Speaker, I think is an abominable insult, to a group of people, several of whom belong to his Party, and have laboured, I must say with great devotion, on local government reorganization. Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, my good friend — I still call him my good friend, from Arm River, and his colleagues who have spoken so vituperatively about the Continuing Committee, were better advised had they been silent. I know of no instance, Mr. Speaker, where the old adage, 'that it is better to remain silent and be thought a fool, than to open your mouth and remove all doubt', could be better applied to him. My only comment on the statement . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Address your remarks to the Premier . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Well I am going to tell my hon. friend something that will fit him even better than that. My only comment to the hon. Member from Arm River's comment that any farmer who tied himself up with the socialist labour party, is to say the least a wild and irresponsible statement, and I think seriously raises the question of whose head really ought to be examined. But what I think is even more callously irresponsible, was the statement by my hon. Friend, and one subscribed to by members of his group, as I pointed out — that not only were the co-operatives infiltrated, but also the churches, the universities, and the lodges were infiltrated by the filthy CCF Party.

Mr. Danielson: — I told you that so you'd do it, by your own CCF.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Now, Mr. Speaker, a statement like this, that was made last week, is repugnant to the churches, to the co-operatives, to the lodges, and the universities, whose membership is made up of all Canadians, irrespective of their political beliefs.

Mr. Danielson: — You should have stayed out of it then.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, all our people, of different faiths, different political creeds, Tories, Liberals, Conservatives, Social Credit, and CCF, have made common cause for the principles for which these institutions stand. Judging from this kind of criticism, it is becoming increasingly apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman to your left, and the Liberal Party trekking through a political wilderness for these past seventeen years have wandered and lost their way.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . bush now.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — And it is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, because the old signposts of privilege, promise, and patronage have become eroded with time and change.

Opposition Member: — You improved on it.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Well, Mr. Speaker, they picked up a new leader, loud, loquacious and bold. One raised in affluence, schooled in socialism,

March 9, 1961

succumbed to ambition, with a penchant for power. The aspiring faithful to this coveted crown, fell like brittle reeds before the fury of his persuasion. Of course, he didn't abandon all his socialist training. He put to excellent use the idea of the convention, banquets to raise funds, and membership cards.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in this membership card – this membership for application. This is the application of the CCF. This is a masterpiece, this Liberal card – this is a masterpiece of counterfeit. It is so like the CCF membership application that one could unwittingly become a member of the Liberal Party. Well, Mr. Speaker, while these techniques, conventions, banquets and membership applications are similar to the CCF, they are not at all the means by which a party comes to power.

The Liberal Party, I submit, will have to adopt more than the CCF organizational techniques, Mr. Speaker. They will have to adopt and be persuaded by an economic and social philosophy which is in keeping with the needs and the aspirations of the people. Mr. Speaker, if and when they do that, they may as well close ranks with the party represented by the people to your right, because there will be no need for their existence.

I was intrigued, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure were my colleagues on this side of the House, over the confession of the hon. Member for Humboldt. She told us, Mr. Speaker, that she had listened to a sermon that smote her conscience, and on examining herself, she found she bore resentment in her heart. She deplored this and she was determined to root it out. It was at this point, Mr. Speaker, that my spirit soared, for it is said that even the angels in heaven rejoice at one sinner that repents. I thought, no longer now, would we need to lick our wounds from her barbed and acid tongue. The day of our deliverance was at hand. But, Mr. Speaker, like a bolt out of the sunlit, azure blue came what was a qualification of her confession and repentance. But, it applied only to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs. Batten: — Come on over and meet . . .

Hon. Mr. Erb: — And then by way of analogy, she likened the Leader of the Opposition to the Prodigal Son, who having wasted his substance with riotous living, and nondescript women, was forced to her shrine in the deal, Mr. Speaker. Then it says, and I'll quote this correctly:

“And he would fain have filled his belly, with the husks that the swine did eat and no man gave unto him.”

And then, here, of course, is where the Member for Humboldt goes into orbit, because she took it upon herself, Mr. Speaker, to embellish this sad parable of degradation, by adding further to the prodigal's improvidence by having him sleeping with swine. Mr. Speaker, I have in my time listened to many people make inferences with the intent to degrade and belittle, but I've never listened to an inference such as the Member for Humboldt tried to make in describing the people with whom the Leader of the Opposition once associated, that was so blasphemous, poisonous, and shockingly crude. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Humboldt the other day said that she was not a feminist. I submit that in our total concept of womanhood, she is not even feminine.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that until the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care had made its recommendations to the Government . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Did they write that speech for you?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — . . . that the matter of medical care would not be fought all over again in this House. (I want to tell my hon. friend from Arm River the fact is that I can write and I can read.) But, it appears, Mr. Speaker, that our friends from the Opposition are unable to comprehend what constitutes a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan. Of course, Mr. Speaker, they say that because the CCF Party only got 41% of the votes, therefore, 59% of the people voted against a medical care program. Well, Mr. Speaker, in modern times, it is not very often that a Government gets a majority of the popular vote. This is particularly true when you have several parties contesting an election.

Mr. McDonald: — You're sure getting it when there are only two.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Of course, Mr. Speaker, this could be easily resolved by getting down to a two party system, but I would suggest a two party system in which the two parties were differentiated by a political, and economic, and social philosophy.

March 9, 1961

This would envisage a Party, on one hand, of all those elements who support unbridled free enterprise, vested interests, and monopolistic capitalism – that would include the Liberals, the Social Credit and the Tories. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, would be the Party that is represented to your right. That such an ideal situation will evolve, I have no doubt. But since the election of last June 8th, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen to your left, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, have been very vocal about the popular vote. It would appear from their arguments, that although the CCF Party was elected with more than a two to one majority, they still contest that we haven't the right to govern, or carry out a mandate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that this attitude taken by our friends to your left, now explains why, when their Party was in office, Saskatchewan had a do-nothing Government, because they obviously believe in the argument, that because in 1934 and 1938, they received only 48% and 45% of the popular vote. Mr. Speaker, if that was their sincere conviction for doing nothing while in office it is pardonable. However, our experience and the experience of the people of Saskatchewan has been such that we have never recognized altruism as a particularly long-suit of the Liberal Party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Government has always considered that a majority of seats was a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan. That is precisely why Saskatchewan has today hospital insurance, free cancer services, free treatment and care mental health programme, air ambulance service, regional medical services, regional health services, building of great power stations, power to 55,000 farms, natural gas to ninety-three communities, with 71,000 customers, water and sewer programme for farmers, Saskatchewan Government Insurance, Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. Prior to 1944 none of these programmes were in existence. Mr. Speaker, we did these things because we were given a mandate to do them, and in keeping with our concept of a mandate, we shall continue in our efforts to bring to the people of Saskatchewan more abundant living.

Mr. Speaker, this Government's mandate to bring our people more abundant living, includes among other things, a medical care programme, whether the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts like it or not.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — Bring it on.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — I move the adjournment of the debate.

The debate was, on motion of the hon. Mr. Erb, adjourned.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arm River was out of his seat, and I wanted this opportunity of having him back in his seat to offer him, on behalf of all Members on this side of the House, and I'm sure all Members, our very heartiest congratulations to him and Mrs. Danielson on their 50th wedding anniversary. I would like to tell him that not only for himself, but also for his wife, we on this side and I am sure Members all over the House, do hope that this golden wedding anniversary will be a very happy occasion, and that both he and Mrs. Danielson will have many more years of being together to enjoy the companionship of their friends, and the admiration of their neighbors.

Mr. Danielson: — I just want to say that I appreciate this expression of the Premier very, very much, and I thank you for your expressions of good luck in the days to come, and all that goes with it. Thank you very much.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.