

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**18th Day**

**Monday, March 19, 1962.**

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

**CONDOLENCE**

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that by this time all members of the house have been informed of the sudden and very untimely death of the Hon. Mr. McIntosh the Minister of Co-operatives and Co-operative Development. It seems hardly possible, Sir, that on Friday afternoon he was present in the house. I talked with him Friday evening after supper. Mrs. McIntosh tells me that even Saturday before he went to the office to work he was feeling apparently well and in good spirits. He died very suddenly then on Saturday afternoon.

His illness or deterioration of health is one which has been developing for some time. He had two previous heart attacks. The second one followed an address to the rural municipal convention, just about a year ago now. He had recovered and had been back full time at the office since about July of this year. All of us had shared, I know, in the hope that he would return to health and have many years to enjoy life with his colleagues and family. Because of the fact that his record and life is well-known and has been widely commented on since Saturday afternoon, it is perhaps not necessary to make any lengthy remarks this afternoon. His long service in the province with the co-operative movement is something that stands greatly to his credit. He was early associated with the Wheat Pool in particular. He was one of the first members of the field staff of that organization. Probably a great deal of the dynamic growth of the co-operative movement in the province is owed to those people who undertook responsibility of that particular kind.

He came to the government in 1944, first as Minister of Co-operatives and Co-operative Development. He took over the Department of Agriculture on the death of Mr. George Williams, who died also suddenly from a heart attack. He went to the Department of Municipal Affairs and at the end of November last year returned to the Department of Co-operatives.

**March 19, 1962**

He will be remembered for the great capacity which he had for friendship and for feeling for other people. I said in the press earlier, I know of no person really, who drew his circle of friends from so wide and varied a group. Many of us in addition have lost a very close personal friend. For many years now Mr. McIntosh and his family, the Minister of Agriculture and his family, and myself and my family have spent Christmas and other holidays together. It is a very great personal loss.

The people of Saskatchewan and the government of Saskatchewan have lost a most valued servant and a most faithful friend in the death of Lachie, as he was known almost universally across the province.

May I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition;

That this Assembly deeply moved by the sudden death on Saturday of the Hon. Mr. Lachlan Fraser McIntosh, respected member for the constituency of Prince Albert records its profound sorrow on the loss of a valued friend and colleague and extends to his widow and members of his family its sincerest condolences praying that divine providence will comfort and sustain them in their bereavement.

If I may so suggest, Mr. Speaker, we might pay our respects, when the motion is put, by standing in our place for the accustomed period of time.

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I should certainly like to associate the members on this side of the house with the remarks which the Premier made this afternoon in connection with Mr. McIntosh. I know that the death of Lachie McIntosh shocked all of us. There are few men in Saskatchewan who had more friends. There were few individuals who were more popular. Throughout the years Mr. McIntosh has been a good public servant. I think he will be remembered not only as a member of the government but also for his work in the co-operative movement. He will be missed by his friends and by his colleagues. He will also be missed by everyone who knew him.

Motion agreed to by silent standing vote.

**Premier Lloyd:** — It may have been noticed that I did not at this time place on the records of the house, as we usually do, the biographical data with regard to Mr. McIntosh. This will be done in more complete fashion when the legislature convenes for its session next year. May I now move, seconded by Mr. Thatcher, the Leader of the Opposition,

That the resolution just passed be communicated to Mrs. McIntosh on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous enquiries with regard to the funeral arrangements and the effect which this will have on the procedure in the legislature. As all members now know the funeral will be held in Prince Albert at St. Alban's Cathedral, the Anglican Cathedral at 2:00 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon. I knew that a number of members of the legislature would be wishing to attend the funeral, therefore, I am about to propose a motion which will adjourn the legislature on Tuesday at 5:30 or thereabouts in order that attendance may be possible. It is our intention to arrange for a special bus to be placed at the convenience of the members of the legislature who are to attend the funeral. I will give more specific information with regard to its time of leaving and place of departure later on. It will leave on Tuesday evening. Once we know who is going we will then have to make arrangements for reservations at hotels in Prince Albert in order to accommodate those persons on the Tuesday evening. This will mean of course we will not sit Tuesday night. We will not sit Wednesday. The reason for leaving Tuesday evening — I am told by the transportation company that in order to be certain of arriving on time we would have to have the bus leaving here about 7:00 in the morning and returning afterward, which would be rather a long day. We thought perhaps the Tuesday evening would be the preferable procedure.

I then would move that we accept as our order of business on Thursday, the order which would have been observed on Wednesday, and that we accept on Friday the orders that would have been observed on Thursday, for purposes of the legislature.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition by leave of the Assembly (there is no time for proper notice):

**March 19, 1962**

That when this Assembly adjourns on Tuesday, March 20, 1962 it do stand adjourned until Thursday, March 22, 1962. That the order of business on Thursday, March 22nd shall be the same as on a Wednesday, namely a government day, and that the order of business on Friday, March 23rd shall be the same as on a Thursday, namely a private member's day.

Motion agreed to.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Works):** — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Last Mountain, (Hon. Mr. Brown) I would like to draw the attention of the house to a group of students to your left, Mr. Speaker. They are the Grade VII, VIII and IX students from Nokomis School who are here to tour the buildings and to sit in on our deliberations this afternoon. I trust that their tour will be interesting and that the lunch they had in the cafeteria was satisfying, and that their stay in the Chamber this afternoon will be both pleasant and educational.

### **QUESTION: MEDICAL CARE**

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Health. I understand he has received a communication from the College of Physicians and Surgeons over the weekend. Could he tell the house whether the college is yet prepared to meet with the government to discuss the medical plan?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the college this morning. I have only glanced at the letter. I do not wish to comment on it at this time except to say that the reply is not an encouraging one.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Could I ask the minister then, Mr. Speaker, what steps the minister proposes to take in the immediate future to get the college around the conference table?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — This question, Mr. Speaker, will be best answered after I have had a full opportunity of perusing the letter and after I have considered all the avenues that are open at that time.

### BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney:

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

**Mr. Robert Perkins:** — Mr. Speaker, on account of the fact that Mr. Lachie McIntosh, the late Minister of Co-operatives was well known in our constituency, I think it only fitting that I should personally and on behalf of my constituents record our deep regret at this time of his untimely death. Mr. McIntosh was well-known, highly respected, and to those who knew him well, deeply loved by the people in our constituency. His friendly manner and his ability to get along with all those with whom he came in contact, certainly placed him high in the feelings of those who lived in the northern part of the province. As I say, he was deeply respected by the people, especially in the west end of the Nipawin constituency, and I wish at this time, on their behalf, as well as personally, to extend sincere sympathy to his family at this time.

I would like at this time to continue the debate on the budget presented on Friday, March 9th by the Provincial Treasurer of this province, containing as it does numerous measures which will have an impact upon the affairs of every part of Saskatchewan. I wish to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on his masterly presentation at that time. This document must serve as a blueprint for the carrying out of the business of the province for the coming year. It undertakes to estimate the revenue and outlines the proposed expenditures and provision of services for the people of Saskatchewan.

Much has been said by the members of the opposition in criticism of this budget. The government has been condemned for spending too much and damned for spending too little. The bulk of the opposition to this budget has been of an obstructive nature rather than legitimate opposition. I am pleased to note that due consideration

**March 19, 1962**

is given in the budget speech to the importance of agriculture in our provincial economy and the fact that mention is made of the seriousness of the loss suffered as a result of the disastrous drought of last summer. It would have been natural to expect that a result of the very curtailed grain crop would have been a decided drop in governmental program. We find however that proposed expenditures in agriculture, education, public health, welfare, highways and transportation, industry and municipal road assistance are all up. In spite of the serious injury to agriculture caused by the drought, we find increased expenditures for the services I have mentioned. This belies I think the charge that Saskatchewan is suffering severe stagnation. If activity was as dead as these prophets of doom indicate, it would be plainly impossible to raise this amount of revenue for the simple reason that there would be nothing to tax to raise revenue.

The crepe-hanging activities of the opposition are a true indication of their weakness and disclose the reason for their exorbitant charges and misrepresentations. The truth of the matter must be that if the opposition stuck to logical reasoning and legitimate criticism they would have little to offer. The fact that the gentlemen opposite have so little to offer in constructive, legitimate criticism is a proof itself of the honesty and reliable administration of this government.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Municipal government and municipal taxation has come in for a good deal of comment in this house. Charges have been made that the reason for increased municipal taxes has been the niggardly and stingy treatment accorded to the municipalities by this provincial government. It was very ably proven the other day, by my colleague the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) that this charge too is also unfounded, for he pointed out that in seven municipalities lying partly or wholly within his municipality, it was not until this government came into power that anything more than a nominal amount of money was made to his municipality or his constituency by way of grants.

There is another side to this story of increased municipal taxes which has not been brought out. This is the increased demands that are made upon the municipalities for local services. In the municipality in which I live, the municipal men have for last several years very capably held the line on municipal taxes as such.

But with the added services of veterinary costs, hospital needs, doctor schemes, road maintenance and one or two others, these municipal men have very little left for construction of municipal roads. Were it not for the grid road program, instituted by this government some five years ago, municipal road construction would be practically at a standstill without the imposition of additional local taxes.

I would like at this time to pay a tribute to the officials in my constituency and other municipal men in this province. Theirs is often a thankless task. Payment is usually very moderate and a good deal of missionary work or voluntary service is usually performed. These municipal men deserve the gratitude of the people of this province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — I have referred to the proposed increases in the vote for several departments. I wish especially to refer to the votes for agriculture, municipal road assistance and natural resources. The increase in the amount proposed for agriculture for ordinary and capital expenditure is an increase of just over \$717 thousand and brings the total proposed expenditure of \$7,417,650. In my opinion this is an expenditure that is well justified with the needed expansion of the family farm improvement branch, I think an increased expenditure to this department will in the future be justified. The provincial community pastures is another branch under the agriculture department that merits increasing support. Grants and other assistance from the Department of Agriculture to the constituency which I represent, for the past year are as follows: for flood control \$17,235; for pasture development \$60 thousand; for clearing and breaking \$48 thousand for one year, making a total for the year for one municipality \$171,340. Three community pastures were operating during the year and one is in the process of development. These pastures are of considerable assistance to livestock producers and are also a means of taking some otherwise sub-marginal land and putting it to more useful purposes.

The activities of the Department of Agriculture are of great importance to our constituency. I wish also to mention the importance of the Department of Natural Resources. They too are of great importance to our constituency in creating additional employment, especially in the winter months and also in their conservation efforts.

**March 19, 1962**

Special mention has already been made of the Hansen Lake road, from Smeaton and Snowden on the south to Flin Flon on the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border on the north.

I should also mention the forest operations of the Saskatchewan Timber Board. The minister will be reporting to the house later on in the session on these operations, but I might be allowed to report that some 600 men are currently employed in bush operations and will take out over 20 million board feet of lumber this winter — three thousand cords of pulp wood and some three thousand railroad ties. The Nipawin yard employed from 50 to 60 men and is expected to ship some 15 million board feet this winter. The Carrot River yard of the Saskatchewan Timber Board employs upwards of 50 men and will ship some nine million board feet and plans a total of some eleven million board feet of lumber. Add to this activity the clearing and burning of operations being carried on in the area to be flooded by the Squaw Rapids Dam and you can understand that the operations of this Department of Natural Resources are of considerable consequence to the people of our part of the country.

I should also like to mention the municipal road assistance authority, which has the responsibility of carrying out in co-operation with the municipalities the grid road program instituted by this government some five years ago. This program is shared, as you know, on a 60-40 basis with the municipalities; sixty per cent being paid by the province and 40 by the municipalities. It has been a most beneficial effect on the country road situation in the province and second, I think, only to the installation of electric power, has done more to stabilize country and rural living than any other act of government. Grants paid out under this plan for the municipal roads assistance authority, exclusive of local improvement districts, to the three rural municipalities in our districts, to the three rural municipalities in our constituency total \$826,754 and for the one year alone 1960-61 totalled \$159,090. Including the LID's the total grants for the entire constituency for the five year period was just over \$1,100,000. This amount covers grid municipal roads, equalization grants, special grants and a small item for flood control. For grid roads and bridge construction alone a grant amounted in the five years to \$520,572.

I noticed the other day, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) condemned the government for the bad effect it was having on his constituency. He painted a very dismal picture of offices



being empty, houses being boarded up — vacant, broken windows — and painted a pretty gloomy picture of all-round desolation in his area. Then I noticed that this same constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch, under the program I have just mentioned received in the same five year period grants to the amount of \$726,187.09. This goes to prove, it seems to me, that personal initiative or local initiative is not altogether dead in that part of the country.

I wish to mention a comment of the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) speaking in the budget debate on Friday last, when he extolled the fact that the Liberal party had a history and charged that the CCF had none. I notice that the hon. member isn't in his seat and I wish that he was because I have the highest regard for the member for Wilkie. I regard him as one of the most level-headed men on that side of the legislature. But it seems to me that he has left himself wide open for correction in this case. It may be that the Liberal party has a history of sorts, but I think it can be realistically said that the Liberal party has nothing else. In the past 25 years the Liberal party has shown no indication of having been possessed of either policy or principle. Its so-called policy is formulated, usually preceding an election, as a vote-catching instrument, designed to impress the credulous and to appeal to the uninformed. Pride of ancestry indeed! The hon. member from Wilkie must know, as do an increasing number of informed people in this and every other country, that the CCF, in the origin of its birth, need take second place to none.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — The CCF, Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, was born out of the needs of the people of the time. When the people of that day, the hard-pressed farmers of western Canada, the workers of mine and factory, the teachers, the clergy, dissatisfied as they were with the existing parties of that time gathered together to forge a political institution founded on democracy and human brotherhood.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — The CCF never departed from that principal. The same declaration remains as the first objective of the Saskatchewan section of the New Democratic Party.

**March 19, 1962**

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Procedures may differ and methods change according to the needs and the wishes of the membership, but as long as the constitution, founded on equality and justice, is scrupulously adhered to we have no fear of the extinction of this party.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Let the timid desert our ranks and the self-seeking and ambitious defect. This movement shall, with divine help, continue to serve the people of this province and this country.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — The names of the leaders of this movement have gained world-wide recognition. The names of Woodsworth, Coldwell and Douglas have and will take their place with those of the most dedicated men of our times.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Mr. Speaker, I regard the proposals outlined in the budget compatible with the principles of this movement, and therefore I shall oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**Mr. John Thiessen (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the former speaker in regard to a word of sympathy for Mrs. McIntosh. The passing of the late Hon. Mr. McIntosh will be long-remembered. In my constituency he was honoured. He did a lot of work in there and everybody knew him long before he was even in the legislature. He was a pool man in that district and I want to pass along a word of sympathy to Mrs. McIntosh on behalf of my constituency.

Not having spoken in this house before, I want to congratulate you on the position that you have achieved in this house and I want to remind you of the first time that you and I met when I made you Speaker of my office at that time too. This was time when we were trying to sign up people under the first hospitalization plan of this province and I didn't have nearly all the answers to the people who came along. You as a stranger

walked in; I had never met you before, and you said, I am Fred Dewhurst, MLA for Wadena. I said, all right Mr. Dewhurst then here is a chair for you and you can answer questions as people come in. Quite a number of them came in and I learned quite a lot that day. When coming into this house you were already here and I have learned quite a lot from you since then. I know that you can well take care of the job as Speaker of this house.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — I also want to congratulate the member from Weyburn, (Mr. Staveley) who is a new member, and I hope that he will get along well too.

In turning to the budget, Mr. Speaker, this is truly the largest budget, I think, ever presented to the people of this province, and when the opposition say “socialistic” I believe it is the most socialized budget that we have never presented, and this is true.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — I think too when they talk about taxes that this is the highest taxation budget that we have ever presented. But when they use the word “socialist” they remind me of what Dr. Chisholm said last fall in a TV broadcast when he asked about socialism. He said socialism seems to complicated to the immature mind and when I heard them say socialist, I believe it comes from minds which are not matured enough to understand socialism, Mr. Speaker.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — Socialism is very simple, and the Premier I think hit upon this very nicely at the beginning of this session, and that is doing those things together which we can do better that way. That is what this budget is set out to do. Then in talking about taxes, Mr. Speaker, what the opposition would like to do is to sort of bridle our people of the province with blinders on bridles so they have tunnel vision and all they are supposed to look at is this tree of taxes. If they can achieve this then they have achieved something. But, Mr. Speaker, we have such a forest of services behind this tree of taxes and this is what I want to dwell on for a little while.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**March 19, 1962**

**Mr. Thiessen:** — I want to try and show you we have a much larger forest of service than any tax tree that they could talk about. I want to turn first of all to the services which this budget is preparing to provide, not only to the province but to my constituency. I have in the neighborhood of some 16 thousand men, women and children in my constituency, and these people do all types of work. They are not all farmers, but we have a lot of others. I would venture to say that in my constituency, possibly not more than three or four thousand people have any kind of medical coverage at all. Being a rural constituency we have not a chance to group these people like they do in the cities, and therefore we have some 12 thousand men, women and children who have no medical coverage of any kind.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, this socialist budget, is preparing to spend between \$350 thousand and \$400 thousand on medical coverage to people who have never had any coverage before. On top of this we are covering these people for hospitalization — they are paying part and part is paid by the federal government. In this field we are covering them for about \$525 thousand, somewhat over one half a million dollars going into my constituency for hospitalization. When I think back to the days when I was a councillor and reeve in the R.M. of Aberdeen No. 373, and we used to get telephone calls every little while — will you guarantee this man's hospital bill? Will you guarantee that man's hospital bill? And nobody knew where to turn about this thing, I feel that this socialist budget has done a wonderful job.

On top of this the health region services which we receive in the Prince Albert health region such as nurses, the home aid by nurses, the baby clinics held in the villages and towns and hamlets and other places, the school visits which are held bi-monthly, the inoculation and the preparation for the oral polio vaccine which is coming out at this time. I feel that in my constituency with its fifteen to sixteen thousand men, women and children, that this so-called socialist budget is preparing to spend very nearly one million dollars in health services to the people of my area.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — Mr. Speaker, never in the history of any part of the North American continent or in Canada have a people the size of my constituency been in a spot where the government was prepared to spend that amount of money for health

services. I notice that this is one of the largest services that this budget is providing, taking some 26.88 per cent of the total budget.

Again our second best people, our school children, once we can keep them healthy and keep them rolling, then we want to put them in school. In my constituency I have some ten main centres of education. In all these ten main centres, Mr. Speaker, we have pretty well new plants since this government came into power. We have approximately 3300 pupils going to school — 140 to 150 teachers and we have 75 buses operating. All this, Mr. Speaker, is done by school grants that amount of \$2 where the taxpayer pays \$1, that is two-thirds of the education costs of my constituency is borne by this socialist budget.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — When I look at the health program of one million dollars and I look at the education program in my constituency of another million dollars, Mr. Speaker, I don't care whether they call it a tax-socialist budget, because we are giving services, a whole forest of services and I want to tell my people that they shall not only look at the tree of taxes, because if that tree of taxes was not here there would be no social services. Without them you have not anything.

I want to spend a few minutes now on roads and highways. We have in the neighborhood of 185 miles of highway in my constituency and all the miles in my constituency have been built by this government, except for about 20 miles — by budgets prepared by this government on this side of the house. This year we are going to complete No. 12 highway, which is a new one from Blaine Lake to Hepburn corner, and we are going to complete a million dollar bridge which has been in the dreams of my people for the last 20 years.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that my people are happy to have a socialist budget. We are going to rebuild the road from Mont Nebo to Shell Lake which is badly needed. This budget will also begin the construction of a trans-Canada style highway from Shellbrook to Prince Albert. This is also needed. Going on to grid roads — when this grid road program is completed in my constituency, we will have in the neighborhood of three hundred miles of roads better than what we used to get in a highway system

**March 19, 1962**

of Liberal government. These three hundred miles are going to cost in the neighborhood of \$2 million, averaging around \$6 thousand a mile, possibly slightly better. This program will run to \$2 million, of which the government is going to pay 55 to 60 per cent. Again I say, one and one half million dollars to my constituency — to the municipalities for the construction of roads. Not only for the people who are coming through the country but for our school bus drivers, our farmers, and those who want to use them to go to the small centres. This is a long-term program. In 1962 the equalization grants to my municipalities are going to amount to some \$30 thousand. In 1962 the grid grants to my municipalities are going to be \$145 thousand. Again, Mr. Speaker, in 1962 our socialist budget is preparing to spend nearly \$200 thousand on grid roads in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I have a little bit on agriculture. My constituency is not a total wheat-growing constituency. We have somewhere in the neighborhood of 2200 farmers and we have them all the way from one-quarter section to six sections of land. We have the large farms there too and most of our large farms today have turned to stock growing too. I would venture to say that in my constituency we had some 50 thousand head of cattle. It has increased over the years and I know that in our own municipality we have some 12 thousand head and this has increased to approximately 15 thousand. It takes a tremendous amount of pasture. It takes a tremendous amount of fodder to feed these cattle and the provincial government has made available to my people in my own constituency two government pastures, the Crookson pasture and last year they established the Jackson Lake pasture. We did have a Lake Four pasture which now has been turned into a hay project which was very badly needed because we need the hay that is on there. We have set up some ten co-op pastures and we have the royal pasture, and some of these others to the west of us which we can use if necessary.

I feel that this budget is also assisting greatly in this field. They are getting ready to create more pasture in there. They have set up some more brushing and breaking and seeding to grass for a lot more cattle which the farmers are holding. There are grants for the purchase of purebred bulls, boars and rams, artificial breeding, calfhood vaccination, grants to veterinary areas (and this veterinary area is a good service in our part of the country), and agricultural representative service.

This is a field that we don't talk about often enough and I feel this is very important. Our ag. rep. is one of the busiest men, I think, in my constituency.

Just last Saturday when I was home over the weekend, I had a fellow come in and he wanted to know about sheep ranching. Well, all that I know about sheep ranching you could hide in your eye and you wouldn't feel it, but I had a good man I could refer him to and that was Mr. Evans, the ag. rep. at Shellbrook. He said, well I hadn't thought of him at all. I told him he could get all the information he wanted. He thought he should go to the university and I said, well you can go there too if you like, but Mr. Evans our ag. rep. can give you all the information I think you want on this. All that was needed from me was where they could locate in my constituency.

Then there are grants for roadside tree planting, testing of machinery for the farmers, and Mr. Speaker, I could go on all day. The Minister of Agriculture has broadened out on this. Mr. Speaker, through all this talk I want to assure you first of all that even though we call this a socialist tax budget, I am going to support it and not the amendment.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I would like to first of all express my personal sorrow and sense of loss in the passing of our friend and colleague Lachlan McIntosh and to express my condolences to his family in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I want to congratulate my colleague the Provincial Treasurer on the excellent content and the very fine delivery of his budget address. I have now heard fourteen budget addresses in this Assembly and I can say quite sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that I have never listened to one that does more credit to its author and reflects more credit to the government than the one we listened to a week ago Friday.

Listening to the opposition members of the legislature, one is able to detect certain almost concealed but barely revealed aspects of Liberal party policy. They don't express themselves openly on these aspects of policy, they can only be deduced from the general content of their speeches. All members of the legislature and all citizens in Saskatchewan would appreciate having the opposition party spell out more precisely what they consider would be their policies if they were to form the government.

One member in this debate let it be known that one of the first things they would do would be to repeal the medical care insurance act. Another one let it be known that they would rescind or greatly reduce the fees

**March 19, 1962**

charged to the insurance industry of this province. One of the others suggested that industries establishing in Saskatchewan should be exempt from taxes for ten years. This means, that if we had a Liberal government in Saskatchewan since 1942, this province would have gone without \$100 million or more dollars that we got in royalties from our oil industry. I think that the Liberal party needs to be a little more explicit about some of these policies.

The suggestion has been made that the so-called CCF crown corporations should be thrown out the window.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You have thrown most of them out.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — That suggestion has been made here in this house. Well, Mr. Speaker, do they really intend to give the government insurance office to some of their big insurance company friends?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Tell us about Shumiatcher, Bob.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I wish they would be a little more explicit on this point. Do they intend to abandon the idea of public development of power and natural gas? Indeed, when they make the suggestion that the government should not have borrowed some \$400 million to expand the gas, power and telephone utility in this province, this is indeed what they are saying. Saskatchewan should get out of the public development of public utilities. This of course means that the Liberal party had better do some explaining. They better tell us what their real policies are. It shouldn't be left to this house and to the public to deduce what they think by casual interjections which they make in speeches given by members on this side of the house.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the opposition seems to think that it is good political strategy to make optimistic election forecasts as to what will happen at the next election. These soothsayers on the opposition seem to believe that the cheerleader concept of political debate meets the demands of these times. According to them it doesn't really matter what a political party's policy or point of view is, as long as they can impress upon people that they are going to win. Well, Mr. Speaker, this theory I suggest attributes a very low regard for the intelligence of the voters.



We have listened to hopeful predictions from members of the opposition and I have heard some of them, as follows: "I think the government is going to be disappointed when the next election comes." Another one — "the government is facing an election sooner or later, the sooner the better as far as we are concerned. The government knows that there won't be a CCF government after the next election." This is one of the statements made by opposition members. And after complaining a great deal about taxes, the same member said and I quote "Is it any wonder they lost the by-election? Let them realize that they are going to face the people, and the same things that made the people in the by-election turn them down will make the people in the province turn them down."

Mr. Speaker, I heard some hon. member saying "Hear! Hear!" as I was reading those extracts from the records of this house. That is exactly what they said. Those are exactly the speeches that were made in this house.

The first statement was made by the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and the other two were made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thatcher). They were made in this house on February 22 and February 19, 1961. The Leader of the Opposition was at that time referring to the government's loss in the by-election in Turtleford.

This is becoming a rather tiresome refrain. The people of this province are quite capable of deciding who they want to govern the affairs of this province. When the next election comes in due course, the hon. members opposite are not going to stampede the voters of this province by making flamboyant predictions as to what will happen at that time.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What about a pulp mill?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — In spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this is the kind of statements that they were making in 1950 and 1951, I ask you to take note that in the election which followed those predictions, the CCF was returned to power with a mandate from 54 per cent of the electorate in Saskatchewan, the largest percentage that has ever been granted to any party in this province in the last 35 years.

**Mr. Coderre:** — It will never happen again boys.

March 19, 1962

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to expect when we have only a single party in the opposition, that there ought to be some consistency and some cohesion in the statements which they present to this house and to the electorate. Surely they should have a meeting of their caucus before they come here to discuss the budget and they should decide whether they really believe that taxes and services should be increased, or would they really believe that taxes and services should be decreased. I suspect that they perhaps did have a caucus and that they decided that taxes and services should be decreased, but they haven't had enough consistency or enough cohesion among their party to follow this line and some of the back benchers persist in branching out with inconsistent demands for additional services.

Our Provincial Treasurer has been in this legislature now for three sessions, and I suggest that we have a good measure of his astuteness and his acuteness when he said, as he did in the budget, "if I am correct, they, the Liberals, will oppose it on three main grounds. Namely that the taxes to be levied are too high, the borrowing program is too large and the level of services to be provided is too low."

Before turning to some of the more serious aspects of my remarks I would like to comment on some of the statements made by some hon. members opposite. Some hon. members have criticized the government for building four lane highways; for building a modern and efficient office building to house the government offices. This attitude of resistance to change and resistance to progress is somewhat reminiscent of the "no-nothing party" of the American republic back about one hundred years ago. My hon. friends may think that there are rural people in this province that are so rural and backward that my hon. friends think they can curry favour with them by deploring and condemning modern buildings and modern highways as evidences of sin and urban wickedness. My hon. friends don't seem to realize that their constituents, like everybody else come to visit our corporation officials, and they don't want to have to hunt all over Regina for the various branches of the power corporation and the various offices. They want to find them in a modern, convenient building where the public business can be transacted efficiently.

The member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) the other day said that this — he said over \$9 million building — (it is something like \$6 million, but 50 per cent exaggeration is not bad for the Liberals,) "that

this \$6 million which they are investing in the power corporation building could be better invested in bringing gas to Gravelbourg and Lafleche.” I don’t oppose any suggestion of bringing natural gas to those places, but he said this would bring a return on the money. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is so obvious that I wonder whether it pays to try and explain to the hon. members that investing money in an office building does bring a return on the investment. The simple fact is that this power corporation building which is being constructed at a cost of some \$6 million will actually be one of the best paying investments that the corporation has made. At the present time the power corporation finds it is going to have to pay about \$4 per square foot for office space that is required in this city. Any space in the building which is not required by the power corporation can be rented for that figure. There are 160 thousand square feet of office space in the building which will produce, therefore, a revenue or a saving — it is the same thing — a penny saved is a penny earned — it is a saving or an earning of \$640 thousand per year.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — What arithmetic?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On the other hand, well all my hon. friend has to do is take 160 thousand square feet and multiply it by \$4 a year.

**Mr. McDonald:** — And call it revenue?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am going to say something about my hon. friend’s arithmetic a little later on in this debate.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I am not going to stay here and listen to it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — A revenue or saving of \$640 thousand per year. Well now, Mr. Speaker, \$390 thousand will pay the carrying charges of the interest and principal payments on the \$6 million investment. That means that this \$6 million will be paid off out of the rent which would normally be levied on space on that kind in 25 years. It means the power corporation will also have the advantage of the efficiency to be gained by having all its staff in one building. It will not only have the advantage of the other facilities which the building offers but it will have the building free of cost in 25 years. Now that

**March 19, 1962**

represents a nice return on the investment, and that kind of return will make it possible to bring gas to other areas of this province quicker than if the money is invested in utilities in communities which bear no return.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — You have the cart before the horse.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the question arose, there may be some hon. members opposite who think they have constituents who never get beyond the border of Saskatchewan, I think most of the people of Saskatchewan are rather proud to know that our highways department is keeping abreast of modern trends in highway development. I think that as these new four lane roads come into more use, and more and more people become accustomed to the advantages of four lane roads at times and seasons of very heavy travel, there will be demands for four lane roads in other parts of Saskatchewan. This is something that you see in all parts of North American today. I wouldn't want Saskatchewan to be wagging the cow's tail on this matter, as we used to do under the Liberal governments prior to 1944. I would hate to think that my political progenitors opposed the building of this building in 1909, on the grounds that it was a wasteful extravagance. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look ahead, we have to be imaginative. This government is capable of doing this. Even when our hon. friends see it in reality they still can't imagine it.

The member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), complained that the government is not passing out a fair proportion of its revenue to assist municipalities. I would just like to remind him that in the last four years, I want to just add a few figures to those given by my friend from Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) a few minutes ago. In the rural municipality Nos. 12, 42, 44, 45, 74, and 75, all of which fall within the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch, the provincial government in the last four years paid out to the municipalities alone, a total of \$311,634 almost a third of a million dollars in four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I confess that our budget is five times as large as the budget of the last previous Liberal government, but these road grants are not just five times as large as the amounts paid out in the last four years of Liberal government, they are fourteen times as large.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Three hundred and fourteen thousand in contrast with \$21,000. The member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) complained that the government has been ungenerous with local governments. He claims the province has been receiving funds from Ottawa and have not been making a proper share of them with local governments. Well I went through the estimates last night and I find that grants to local improvement districts this year amount to \$187 thousand, grants to municipalities under the Municipal Water Assistance Authority, \$577 thousand, grants to municipalities for winter works, net, excluding the federal share \$600 thousand, municipal road assistance \$6,827,000, expended for rural health services, \$1,350,000, that is net again after deducting the federal government share, for the construction of hospitals, nothing to do with their maintenance or operation \$3,681,000, are all grants that are paid into the treasury of local governments. This amounts to \$13,222,000 and if you add school grants to that you get the total, a staggering sum of \$47½ million, more than double or almost double the total amount which this province shares from the Federal Equalization Branch, from federal payments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) I thought rather grandly threw out the suggestion that his town deserved some special credit for financial sagacity, and he said that the town of Moosomin had reduced the mill rate, and that this was a more appropriate policy for governments during times of bad crops. He suggested that the town council at Moosomin had more “financial sagacity” than the members of this government, I think were his words. He said in view of this the government should now give way and make room for the opposition to take over.

I have no reason to doubt the financial sagacity of the council of the town of Moosomin, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. member’s statement gives me some reason to doubt the reliability of the member from Moosomin. A reference to the annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs shows that the mill rate of the town of Moosomin was indeed reduced last year, but it also shows some other rather significant facts. It appears that the town of Moosomin a year or two ago asked for a reassessment of the improvements of the town, and as a result of this request a reassessment was made. The total value of assessed property in the town of Moosomin was increased from \$1,148,000 to \$2,045,000 in 1961, almost double. The increase was something like 80 per cent.

**March 19, 1962**

Now of course this has something to do with what happened to the mill rate in the town of Moosomin. Part of this increase was naturally due to the normal expansion of the community but in large part, it was due to the upward revision of the assessment, made at the request of the town council. This adjustment in values would account for a very substantial reduction in the mill rate.

My hon. friend also forgot to tell the legislature, that in 1959 the provincial government entered into an agreement with the town of Moosomin so that some of the streets could be paved. The town went ahead, paved the streets in 1959 and in 1960 finished the work. During 1960 the province reimbursed the town to the extent of \$14 thousand defraying part of the cost of the project. In 1961 when the work had already been completed the previous year the province paid to the town a further \$23,450 in fulfilment of the commitment made a year or two earlier by the Department of Highways.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — This means, Mr. Speaker, that in 1961 the town not only had a substantial increase in its tax levy, but it also had \$25 thousand of revenue against which the expenditures had been incurred in the two previous years. This assistance by the province totalled in the two years that I have referred to \$38 thousand.

To raise this amount more than sixteen mills would have had to be levied by the council upon the ratepayers of the town of Moosomin. The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) also seemed to overlook the fact that school grants in the Moosomin School Unit increased in the same year by \$44 thousand. With this increase in school grants applied to the assessment of Moosomin School Unit, this made possible a reduction of three mills in the local school taxes. So my hon. friend didn't tell us the whole story. He didn't even tell us enough of the story so that we got a honest picture of the situation. He thought it would serve his purpose, Mr. Speaker, to simply throw this out flamboyantly as a reflection upon this government.

Mr. Speaker, the financial critic's attack on this budget contained several even more serious errors. He pointed out, and I quote: "Taxes have been increased by \$34½ million since the fiscal years 1960-61." Then he proceeded to itemize the increases in taxes, which he used to make up this figure of \$34½ million. I don't

know where he got his figures, Mr. Speaker, because they can't be found in the estimates, but if the house will refer to the official estimates, it is possible to find the official figures in this regard. If the hon. members will turn to page 6, it will be seen that the total taxes estimated for the next fiscal year amounts to \$86½ million, compared to \$50 million in the current fiscal year. This would seem to represent an increase of \$36½ million, Mr. Speaker. However, as the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) failed to point out that this only tells part of the story. If hon. members will look a little further down page 6 they will find under the general heading of receipts from other governments, estimated receipts of \$26½ million comprising the statutory grants, and the province's equalization payments from Ottawa under the Dominion Provincial Agreement but this \$26½ million must be compared with last year's figure in the same line of \$38 million.

Now why is the \$38 million reduced to \$26½ million? Well this is simple, Mr. Speaker, the Tories recently went about repealing "tax confederation" in this country, which was worked out laboriously over a twenty year period. They refused any longer to share their income and corporation taxes with the provinces. The provinces had to impose their own corporation and income tax, this meant that instead of collecting \$38 million as our share of these taxes in revenues, we now receive \$26½ million or \$11½ million less. We have to get that \$11½ million out of direct taxes imposed by this government. This does not represent a new tax, it merely represents a transfer of the revenue from the receipts of the federal government to receipts under the provincial tax. This sum of \$11½ million now must be collected as a provincial tax.

It should be clear then, Mr. Speaker, that this increase of \$34½ million in taxes really amounts to only about \$25 million.

Now my hon. friend may call it 34½, 35 or 36 million if he likes, he is only \$10 million out when he does, and I suppose he takes a leaf out of the book of the Hon. C.D. Howe when he says "what's a million?" and my hon. friend says "what's ten million?" Of course there has been an increase, a net increase of some \$25 million in provincial tax revenue.

We make no apologies for these increases and this is of course apart altogether from any hospital or medical care premiums which may be levied. We make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for these increases in the annual tax burden. Let us look and see what the money is going

**March 19, 1962**

to be used for, and I challenge any member to stand in his place and say that he objects to any of these items: Let us see where the \$25 million increase in revenue goes. That is the only way to properly assess whether it is good or bad.

Well, first turn to the estimates — I did this the other night and I listed those estimates which show a substantial increase in expenditure.

First — education, operation grants to the university — increased \$350 thousand net, that is the provincial contribution. Does any hon. member challenge that increase? I think that will have the unanimous approval of this house. Construction grants to the university — increased by \$500 thousand. Grants to the Wascana Centre, representing a new item, \$200 thousand increase. Grants to the schools of this province — increase of \$2¾ million. No member of this house I am sure will challenge any of these increases. They add to the cultural heritage, to the social capital of our province. Highways increases — capital account \$650 thousand. Do you oppose that? I heard voices on the other side say there should be more highway construction projects. Grants for regravelling grid roads — I am sure there isn't a municipality in Saskatchewan that would object to this increase. This is an increase of \$162 thousand over and above what was paid last year to help municipalities to regravell grid roads. Bridges for market roads — increased \$134 thousand over last year. Do you complain about that? These are all necessary if the commerce of this province is to continue to thrive and expand as it has in recent years.

Then we have that great project on the South Saskatchewan Dam to which the Liberal party never gave more than lip service during their years in office. This project will cost \$450 thousand more than last year. That as I say is the net amount after the federal contribution.

More and more people in Saskatchewan are finding pleasure in Saskatchewan's natural wealth, natural resources and parks, tenting and camping, and this item calls for an increase of \$36 thousand over the amount spent last year.

We hear a good deal, Mr. Speaker, about the inadequacies of our facilities for the mentally ill. I am pleased to see that the psychiatric services branch are planning to expand this year, taking on nine more people, showing an increased expenditure of \$45 thousand next year over last year.



The operating costs of our mental hospitals shows an increase of \$434 thousand over last year, this represents about half a million dollars, Mr. Speaker, out of the hard pressed provincial budget, to improve medical care for these people who are in the "twilight" of society. This represents an advance in the social conditions of our province.

In addition to that there is an increase in the construction cost, in the appropriation of the construction of the Yorkton Regional Hospital. Last year we voted \$360 thousand to this project, this year we are voting \$500 thousand, or an increase of \$150 thousand. Does anyone want to complain about that? Is the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) going to complain about that? He is likely to vote for this budget, Mr. Speaker, if he votes for the true interests of his own constituents.

Ignoring altogether the increase in the cost of the hospitalization plan, this province is devoting a tremendously increased sum of money for health care, \$71 thousand for launching of the home-care program, a new experiment in North America, and one which I think will pay off, \$15 million, \$15 1/3 million to cover the first nine months of the provincial medical care scheme, that is from July 1, 1962, to March 31, 1963. My hon. friend shouldn't criticize if he doesn't know when the year begins and ends.

In the field of social welfare, Mr. Speaker, I find we will be spending this year \$400 thousand more, that is in the next fiscal year, than we did in the last fiscal year, on the construction of the geriatric centre at Swift Current. This year we propose to vote as I say, almost half a million more than we voted last year for that purpose.

In addition to that our program of increased pensions, increased allowances for social aid recipients, and old age assistance cases, as well as supplementary allowances, under the old age security program, will cost a net amount of about \$2,400,000 more than we estimated last year.

No one in the opposition has criticized this policy. I am sure no citizen in this province will condemn any one of these programs as being unworthy of increased public support in the coming year. Yet, adding these programs together we get a total of \$25½ million of new expenditures, more than was voted last year for these

**March 19, 1962**

purposes, exactly balancing the increase on tax revenues, and when you add to this the automatic and the inevitable increases in the cost of materials, cost of wages and salaries, up to a million dollars for the public service, the increased cost of servicing the public debt, when you add the increased cost of higher interest rate, you have the increased cost of the hospitalization plan, which has gone up about three per cent or a little better from last year. It is perfectly clear that these very necessary and vital expenditures, indeed exceed by a considerable margin the increased tax revenue which the government proposes to collect.

We have been able to reduce total expenditures down to where they just balance the increase in revenue, by a most severe and diligent scrutiny of public expenditure. We have been able to eliminate all unnecessary government programs and government expenditures, we have had to curtail many programs which we considered in the past to be highly desirable programs.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on an analysis, if my hon. friend had analysed this budget as he should have, they would have come to the conclusion that this is an exceedingly tight budget and yet I believe a realistic budget. If he does his homework the financial critic of the opposition need not have said most of the things he said in his budget address. Actually had he done his homework, he wouldn't have said most of the things that he said.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at something that is even more important. Let us look at the picture of the Liberal party's attitude displayed by their performance in this budget debate. What is their attitude? You get this by assessing their individual actions. The CCF has always advocated more generous provision for these recipients of welfare benefits. Indeed we go further — we say that all people are entitled to a certain basic minimum standard of income. We say there should be a genuine national scheme of old age security in this country. The Liberals have never done anything to show any great conviction that any such a program is desirable. Only when their hand was forced by J.S. Woodsworth that they ever did anything.

**Opposition Members:** — Oh, no, no, no.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Oh my hon. friends think that because 36 years ago was a long time we don't remember. Well, Mr. Speaker, the measure of my hon. friends' interest in the old age pensioners was the six bucks that they gave them in 1957.

This government, however, when the federal government recently offered to increase these allowances by \$10 a month, Saskatchewan was one of the first provinces to agree to pay its 50 per cent share of the increase.

**Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River):** — What about the means test?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Saskatchewan has adjusted the means test so that these people will not suffer diminution of other government aid programs to compensate for the increase in the pension. This was the first province to do so, and Saskatchewan immediately set about readjusting its budget to permit this to be done. The attitude of the opposition is illustrated by their constant complaints, their nagging criticisms about welfare and welfare programs. I think everyone here who has heard them will agree that the hon. members opposite did not particularly criticize our welfare programs in a constructive way, but they nagged, they criticized, in a general and sweeping way aimed only at discrediting and undermining the whole concept of public welfare.

It is clear, very clear to me, that the Liberal attitude is still that the soup kitchen, the bread line, and the poor house are appropriate social welfare methods.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Our hon. friends have not changed from the days they were in office, the old grocery allowance of \$15.60 per month for a family of four.

Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at the health program of this government. We have worked hard to achieve a complete medical care coverage in Saskatchewan. We started out by launching a free cancer program, we inaugurated an effective regional health service, free mental health care, free psychiatric service, free hospitalization, an air ambulance service available at nominal cost, free health care for pensioners, and now we are about to launch a complete medical care plan. I want to say that my hon. friends don't confuse the issue by saying these services are not free.

**Opposition Member:** — How free?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — They are available to the recipients without money, and without price. They are paid for out of the tax

**March 19, 1962**

revenues of this province, and the recipient does not have to go and beg a municipal secretary to underwrite the cost.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — No one has ever said, Mr. Speaker, that because a government service is free that the taxpayers do not have to pay for it. This is why it is free, because the taxpayers are prepared to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, these programs have all been exceedingly popular with the people of Saskatchewan. They have become popular with people all over Canada in other provinces. You will find parties everywhere in Canada are afraid to interfere with these programs, but they will try and oppose them sedulously, secretly in every way they can. But they are afraid to come out flatly and say they are against them.

They have tried to prevent their implementation by indirect and diversionary tactics to undermine their success. The member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) put it very well at the last session in discussing the Medical Care Insurance Bill he said, “sabotage” was the purpose of the opposition.

In this province the Liberal party has not been able to make up its mind whether it favoured a medical care plan or whether it is flatly opposed to it. Originally, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the 1960 provincial election, the opposition said we should have a plebiscite instead of a plan. At that time they noted that 42 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan voted CCF and they said 58 per cent of the people voted against the CCF, against the medical care plan and it should be put up to a plebiscite. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that their true hopes and aspirations were pretty transparent at that time. Obviously when they found their own supporters were in favour of this medical care plan they had to change their tactics. Shortly after the election they came to realize the plan wasn't supported by only the 42 per cent that supported the government, but it was also supported by the 29 or 30 or 31 per cent to support the opposition candidates. The Liberal leadership was then driven by its own supporters to change its stand. They say now they are in favour of the medical care plan. I will have a difficult time trying to explain to my constituents why it took weeks to get the legislation through this house, Mr. Speaker. I find my constituents have difficulty in understanding why, if the Liberal party favours the medical care plan, it took so long to get them to agree to allowing

it to get through this house, and then finally voting against it. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal opposition has to try to stand on both sides of every question.

In 1964 and 1968 when my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is being challenged by his constituents he will say that when the CCF accuse him of having opposed this medical care plan, it is a "filthy lie." Yet every member of this house and every person that sits in the gallery knows that the Liberal party is afraid and scared to death that this plan will work.

**Mr. Danielson:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Attorney General repeat that, I didn't hear what he said. He mentioned a lie and I want to tell them what the lie was. We heard a lot of them this afternoon, but I would like him to repeat what he said.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You have raised a point of privilege.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that posterity will see the Liberal party claiming they were not opposed to the medical care plan.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, again he has prophesied what is going to be said at the next election, and then . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Repeat what you said.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker,

**Mr. Danielson:** — Or else we will walk out of the house and you can talk . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I say this, Mr. Speaker, he has no right to put words in my mouth or any other member of this government of what is going to be said two or three years from now. He said it was a filthy lie and I am going to say to him that it is a filthy lie if he doesn't, and that is in line with everything . . .

**March 19, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said. My hon. friend did hear what I said. All I can say is this, that when a political party on an issue such as medical care, puts up spurious proposals, — when it says that the commission, as one member said should be responsible to the health regions, and another member said the medical care commission shouldn't be responsible to anyone, except perhaps the doctors, another member said the medical care commission should be responsible to the legislature, another member said it should be done by a government department.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is you that said that, nobody else.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this kind of nonsensical drivel, put forward by the hon. member is really nothing more or less than an attempt to try and befuddle the minds of the people. The people are not that easily fooled, Mr. Speaker.

**Opposition Member:** — What did you do with your private plans?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The people are coming increasingly to a realization that the people on this side of the house are the only ones that are positively supporting and proposing a medical care plan that will benefit them.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Opposition Members:** — Why don't you put it into effect?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . and are not deceived by the film-flam that is put forward by my friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and some of his colleagues. The fact is, the opposition is trying desperately to achieve just one of two things — first of all to try and interfere with this plan coming into operation, and secondly to try and throw muddy water and cloud their tracks so that it would be impossible for a hound dog to follow it after a year or two has passed.

Then a year from now when this plan is in effect as I am confident it will be, a year from now when the opposition are trying desperately to escape the inevitable

that will be haunting them, in 1964, they will try to say that they were never opposed to it. Just like they did with the hospital plan — just like they did with the automobile insurance — just like they have done with every progressive measure instituted by this government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, . . .lies — he is a liar from way back.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If you have risen on a point of order . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — He is a liar from way back.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If you have risen on a point of privilege I wish you would say so.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He couldn't tell the truth if he wanted to.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — In 1964 and 1968, when my hon. friend is running for an election I will come up to his constituency and I will say he and the Liberal party opposed this plan, and he will get up and he will say it is a filthy lie.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes and that is exactly what it will be.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And I call now as witness every person who has been here in the galleries to testify whether or not my hon. friends have given support to the medical care plan of this province or whether they have not.

Mr. Speaker, we all know — the record is perfectly clear — my hon. friends have done everything within their power to undermine and sabotage this scheme, and I suggest that the full weight of retribution will come upon their necks in June of 1964.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why don't you call an election now?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, that was the refrain in 1950, and in 1950 when he said that I was new here, and though there was something in it. I remember my hon. friend saying we will do to them just what we did to the Anderson government. I remember that in 1950.

**March 19, 1962**

**Mr. Danielson:** — You are all mixed up.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1952 when the election came as it inevitably did, my hon. friend just squeezed through with as many votes to spare he could hold in the palm of his hand. My hon. friend almost didn't make it, and the opposition was cut down to I think it was ten seats.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — You had a pretty close one too Bob.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — That was known as the election of count down . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I submit that this budget is a declaration of faith in the future of our province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — We propose to borrow \$55 million for the expansion of our power utilities and \$7 million for the expansion of our telephone company, to prove that we have faith in the future of Saskatchewan. A stagnant province would require neither of these investments.

This sum together with the approximately \$1½ million to provide for the advance to the Government Finance Office for the Industrial Development Fund, brings the vote to \$65 million. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, this money does not come from tax revenue. It comes from borrowing.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What a confession — what a confession.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It will appear as an increase to the public debt. My hon. friend will get up and say instead of a public debt of \$500 million, it will be \$565 million — the gross public debt of this province. They will be able to say quite truthfully and accurately that the interest bill to be borne by the people of Saskatchewan will be about \$3¼ million higher this year than it was last year.

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Are you bragging or complaining?



**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — My hon. friends, these are facts — that there is a continuing expansion in our province. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation must be prepared to deliver another twenty per cent increase in the production of electric power. We are required to spend tens of millions of dollars harnessing the South Saskatchewan River, as Squaw Rapids, and at Outlook. It means that we will have to construct many more high voltage transmission lines — it means that Saskatchewan Government Telephones will have to provide for more telephones and more automatic equipment to handle a larger volume of telephone calls at the lowest possible cost. It means we will be called upon to bring natural gas to a dozen or more new communities in the province. It will mean that \$65 million which we propose to spend on these capital projects will be represented on the other side of the ledger by concrete physical plants and equipment worth \$65 million.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It will mean that the persons who use this extra electricity, this extra gas and telephone service will have to contribute along with their rates, included in their rates, sufficient to pay the extra \$3¼ million in interest, and to service the extra \$65 million principal.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the situation is exactly the same as if these were private facilities, except for this, that any profit made after providing for the expenses, then those profits would go to bondholders, shareholders, in New York or in England, instead of going as they do in this province, either to provide additional government services or a partial remission of the provincial tax burden.

There is one other difference, Mr. Speaker, that is that these utilities, coming under the control of a democratically elected government, must be responsible to public demand and public desire, in the policies which they pursue. They can't afford to say "the public be damned", like private utilities can, and do. They are required to take power to farmers with the farmer called upon to bear about half the capital cost instead of all the capital cost, as is done in those provinces with private facilities.

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — What about Manitoba?

**March 19, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Or they can be required to bring gas to the small communities of this province, something with a private utility would not be compelled to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one other thing that the Leader of the Opposition said, which I think ought not to be let go unanswered. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition made some reference to the debt position of Saskatchewan.

My hon. friend came into this house about the same date as I did, about 1948.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think the Leader of the Opposition spoke on this.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He corrected his statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh he is all mixed up anyway, he is all confused —

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The hon. financial critic, Mr. Speaker, came into this house about the same time as I did. I must say that I am not as flexible minded as the hon. member opposite — I didn't change my political party since I came into this house, but the Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry, the financial critic — the ex-Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Opposition Member:** — Well get it straight.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I liked him best when he was the Leader of the Opposition. He is certainly flexible minded enough so he is capable of understanding that the apparent difference between the situation in Saskatchewan and the other provinces, is simply this — this is the only province where we have a publicly owned gas, electricity, and telephone utilities, and since these utilities are publicly owned the capitalization of these utilities must be borne publicly. Now we could do like other provinces, we could say that the utilities must borrow privately because the people will not guarantee their debentures — this way we would have smaller direct debt and larger contingent liability.

**Opposition Member:** — You only do it for steel plants.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the utilities would have to pay higher interest rates. This is exactly what happened in the province of British Columbia, and I draw my hon. friend's attention to that situation — while we in this province have a gross debt of \$470 million as at the end of December, plus contingent liabilities of \$15 million, look at the province of British Columbia. It has a gross debt of \$91 million, only a fifth as much gross debt, but it has contingent liabilities of \$615 million. Their contingent liabilities plus their gross debt are far higher than this province yet British Columbia is rated as a province that is debt free.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they claim the advantage of being able to pose as a debt free province is worth paying an extra half or one per cent per annum on \$615 million, then I don't agree with them. I don't think the taxpayers of this province would condone action on the part of this government, adding to the interest bill, in order to have our debt in the class of contingent liabilities rather than under the class of gross debt — it isn't worth it, an extra \$6 million a year to be able to make that kind of empty boast. If my hon. friend wants to give the house the whole story he would not have compared Saskatchewan's gross debt with that of the other provinces he would have compared Saskatchewan's gross direct debt with the contingent liabilities of the other provinces, and he wouldn't have been able to make the statement that Saskatchewan has the highest per capita debt in Canada. My hon. friend is aware of those facts, but he does it only in order to be able to make statements which he thinks are grist to the political mill.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, you will remember when British Columbia was paying off its direct debt, piling the burden upon its crown agencies, the general manager of the power utility resigned, because he said this was unfair to the utility to put the utility in a position where it must pay a higher interest rate merely for the purpose of showing a nil debt position for the provincial government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is what Fines did — exactly what he did.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — This province, Mr. Speaker, —

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is exactly what he did in Saskatchewan.

**March 19, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — My hon. friend has been at least twice that I can remember and perhaps three times the financial critic for the opposition, and he still doesn't know that this province did not follow that course. This province did not put the burden of a direct debt on its corporations; this province borrowed the money on the sole credit of the province. It did not require the corporation to borrow money at high interest rate with a provincial guarantee. This province borrowed money on the sole credit of the province, exactly the opposite to what British Columbia did.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No you are wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And my hon. friend I think knows this if he will stop and consider before he interjects.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You transferred yours on to the Power Corporation and Mr. Bennett transferred his on to the British Columbia Electric. That is what they did and you know it. If you know anything.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — For the purpose of making it clear to my hon. friend we have on occasions said that of the provincial debt of \$470 million it should be remembered that almost \$400 million was borrowed for the Power Corporation, but by the province on the sole credit of the province, with the interest being borne by the people of the province. Mr. Speaker, we have never tried to deceive the people about the situation here, and my hon. friend knows that we have not made the Power Corporation, the telephone utilities borrow on their own credit. We have borrowed on the credit of the province, turned it over to them, and then showed it as a receivable, as a asset set off against this debt. For the purpose of arriving at the net debt we subtracted the amount, but it is a legal obligation of the treasury of Saskatchewan, and this \$22¾ million in interest that shows a burden after reimbursement to the treasury of the province by the utilities, and consequently it is only something less than \$2 million, actually has to be borne out of general taxes, the bulk of it being reimbursed to the treasury by these corporations on whose behalf the money was borrowed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in the interest of ordinary public morality, it is honestly and only decent when hon. members want to refer to this debt situation in Saskatchewan, they should make an honest effort to study the situation and represent it truly and fairly.

In conclusion I want to say the opposition members in passing judgement on the borrowing policy are in effect trying to destroy and undermine our public corporations. They are in effect saying the government should not engage in public utilities. Well one doesn't need to be very clever, Mr. Speaker, to be able to see the basic philosophy of the Liberal party, gathered from the interjections of the Leader of the Opposition, and to gather from the party's general attitude, their approach to public finance for public utilities.

Mr. Speaker, down deep in their hearts they believe that the purpose of customers is to provide an excuse for production and the purpose of production, Mr. Speaker, is to make a profit.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this budget, I am sure this Assembly will support this budget and the people of the province will support this budget because it promises to fulfil the aspirations and the hopes of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate this is the first occasion I have had to associate myself with those who have congratulated you on attaining the highest position that the members of this legislature can bestow on any member. I believe you will use your best endeavours at all times to see that the decorum and dignity of this house is maintained, and I know you have a very difficult task, but I hope all members of this Assembly will co-operate with you to the fullest extent in your efforts to carry on traditions that have been built up in this legislature since its inception. I want to personally extend you my very best wishes during the time you hold this important office.

I also wish at this time to associate myself with those who paid tribute and expressed their sorrow and shock at the sudden death of the Hon. Mr. McIntosh. I too was very shocked on Saturday evening when I first heard the word, because Friday last I happened to have a chat with Mr. McIntosh and commented on how well he looked as compared to a year ago, never dreaming from what he had to say as to the state of his health and the way he felt, that I would hear on Saturday evening of his demise.

I

**March 19, 1962**

I am sure every member in this Assembly as well as the people in the province will mourn his passing. I wish to extend my personal condolences and sympathies to his family.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for a moment or two to welcome to this Assembly the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). I am certain the people of Weyburn made a very good choice in the by-election when they elected Mr. Staveley as their representative. He is a man of integrity, a man of wide business and public service experience, and he is a gentleman that has made a success in his own business. I am sure he is going to contribute a great deal to the sessions of this Assembly while he is a member here, and I believe he will if he so chooses be able to represent the constituency of Weyburn for many years to come. We on this side of the house, to be quite frank, are very pleased indeed that we have added to our number one more, and that one person being as well qualified and as stable a man as the hon. member for Weyburn.

I want to also just take a minute to congratulate all other speakers who have taken part in this debate, for the contribution they have made. The Provincial Treasurer, I am sure, did a very good job, in the very fine presentation of a most difficult task. I am afraid the remainder of my remarks this afternoon will be directed in the very opposite direction to that of the speaker who just resumed his seat, the Attorney General. I want to congratulate also the man who was so severely criticized by the Attorney General within the last hour or so, the hon. member for Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) the financial critic of the opposition. There are differences of opinion in this house, otherwise we wouldn't be separated and some sitting on each side.

Now I want to for a few moments, deal with the budget itself. I am certain many people in the province of Saskatchewan a week ago Friday received a very decided shock when this budget was revealed to them in the presentation made by the Provincial Treasurer. This is a budget that provides for the highest expenditures in the history of this province. It provides for increased taxation. It provides for more heavy and substantial borrowing, which will make an addition to our overall debt, and it is certainly going to increase the burden of the interest load that the people of this province have to carry. To wind up of course, the forecast is there will be a deficit at the end of the fiscal year.

My personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is the same in the minds of many people in the province of Saskatchewan, no doubt by none on the opposite side, that this particular budget at this time was unjustifiable and to a degree irresponsible. When we take into consideration the current economic conditions in this province, I think that something quite different could have been and should have been expected, and I am quite sure the general public and members in this house were not at all impressed with the crystal ball gazing and “the take a chance policies” expounded by the Provincial Treasurer in this debate. In fact I think on the contrary many people were alarmed by this, and I believe certain reaction that has taken place and will take place by the public as a result of this shock at this time, is quite justified.

We have in Saskatchewan today, which is well known to every member of this Assembly a substantial number of unemployed people. We have hundreds, yes, thousands of others who are presently employed, but don't know from day to day, whether they are going to retain the employment they have. There is a great uncertainty because if economic conditions in this province worsen over the next few months, then certainly many more people are going to be unemployed. I don't need to go into detail to mention to members of this Assembly, many of whom are farmers, the serious problem confronting a large majority of farmers in Saskatchewan at the present time, and there is another class of people today who are having serious problems to deal with and are confronted with problems which are aggravated by some of the provisions of this budget, and I refer to the small independent business operators in our villages and our towns and rural areas.

If by chance we have, and we hope and pray it won't happen, drought, insect infestations, unfavourable weather, and such like, this could increase the problem manifold. I think under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan and the government of this province should have considered these conditions and we should have heard a quite different fiscal policy being forecast for the next twelve months in Saskatchewan. I believe many people expected this government to be very realistic and to adopt sound prudent business principles, and a certain amount of retrenchment. This is the time they should conserve the revenues of this province to be prepared to meet any emergency that may arise. If we are confronted, and again I say, I hope we are not, with a series of droughts and difficulties in the province such as experienced in the thirties and it could return, then it will take every resource available to this government

**March 19, 1962**

to do the right thing and carry over the victory of the farm people and the people in the small rural communities. I believe only essential spending is justifiable and until a crop in 1962 is assured, should be curtailed to the utmost.

During the years I have been in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, the government opposite have taken unto themselves from time to time a great amount of credit for spending money. It was referred to the other day by my colleague the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and it seems to me they consider this is a unique feat and a great accomplishment, the more spending of money, and they seek public commendation for spending these millions and millions of dollars. Now I agree that they have established a very decided reputation in Saskatchewan for spending, but at the same time they have established along with it, a decided reputation for extracting money in the way of taxes from the pockets of the citizens of this province. Spending alone is no criterion of good management of any business or of efficiency or integrity. When the proper yardstick is applied, the true assessment is forthcoming. The yardstick I refer to, Mr. Speaker, is determining the ultimate in value or benefit received for every dollar spent. Applied to this government's spending the results are anything but complimentary to them and certainly most undesirable. This government has been characterized with excessive administrative costs, extravagant expenditures, and waste of funds during their whole term of office. I believe that at last in more recent years, the public is recognizing this and are more recent years, the public is recognizing this and are becoming more aware as time progresses and I am going to be a prophet along with my friend the hon. Attorney General. I believe the time has come, I believe a former Provincial Treasurer realized some time ago that the time was fast approaching, when the people of Saskatchewan are going to call to account for reckless expenditures and the waste carried on by this government during their term of office.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — The hon. Attorney General made some mention of interest payments. He tried to minimize the amount we are paying in interest on the public debt. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter I believe should be the concern of every person in Saskatchewan, because we are having, and again it is forecast for this year, an ever increasing debt burden and the carrying charge of interest will naturally have to be increased also.

The estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year provide \$22,673,000 to pay the carrying charges of interest



on the public debt of this province. That is an increase of approximately \$3 million from last year. According to the latest census figures which were released not too long ago this particular payment that has to be made in the year 1962-63 means that for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan there is \$25 on an average of interest alone to be paid. This isn't to mention the repayment of principal of huge sums of money. I want to compliment the Attorney General. For once from the other side of the house I heard the figures that we had used, and been condemned for using years past, when he assesses and gave the true picture of the public debt.

Now I know that our friends opposite, both in this legislature and outside have frequently made the statements that the major portion of the interest paid on the Saskatchewan debt was paid by two crown corporations, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Saskatchewan Department of Telephones. These statements are technically correct, but these corporations receive their revenues principally from the people of Saskatchewan. The taxpayers and the consumers of electricity, natural gas, and power, and the users of telephone service are exactly the same people. It is the Saskatchewan people who are called upon in one form or another to pay this interest levy that is made every year on them. There is no fairy godmother who comes to our rescue or assistance in this particular regard.

I hope that the statements made and the attitude apparently taken in one regard by the Attorney General this afternoon is a forerunner of what we can expect from other members on the opposite side of the Assembly. I hope they will continue to try to confuse the public as they have done in the past and mislead them by figure juggling and statements and explanations which were not altogether based on facts.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the matter of recently released figures on population. This has a great deal of significance to the people of Saskatchewan and they should be of concern to this government. Just a few minutes ago in this house, the Attorney General laid great claims to the paradise the socialists opposite have or are supposed to have built up in this province. He dwelt at great length on the benefits and advantages this socialist planning has brought to the people of Saskatchewan. Well, I would say that with all this great volume of benefits there should be a great attraction in Saskatchewan for people from not only other provinces in Canada but from outside the boundaries of Canada as well. The facts reveal

**March 19, 1962**

Mr. Speaker, an entirely different situation. In the past ten years, according to the recently released census figures, I am sorry to say the province of Saskatchewan is one of the two slowest growing provinces of the ten in Canada. The other one is Prince Edward Island. Alberta and British Columbia, two other west provinces top the provinces in increased population, and surprisingly they haven't a socialist government. I think these facts surely must explode the advantages of what we have had established in Saskatchewan under socialism. I wonder what is wrong with Saskatchewan? I believe this is one of the penalties we have to suffer in having had during the last eighteen years a socialist government in this province. I said before this has great significance. These population figures have great significance for every resident and citizen in Saskatchewan. I see some of my friends opposite laughing, they are very smug about this, but it means that everyone you chase out of this province, and you have been chasing them out at a pretty good rate, that those who are left have that much greater burden to bear. How long we can stand it, I don't know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a moment or two to my own constituency, the Pelly constituency. I want to extend my appreciation and that of the people of the Pelly constituency to the Minister of Highways for the consideration he has given us in the 1962 road program. I can assure him that we appreciate very much the construction of No. 8 from Kamsack to Pelly and the oil treatment of No. 57 from the Manitoba boundary to the junction with highway No. 5.

**Hon. Mr. Willis (Minister of Highways):** — It cost a lot of money.

**Mr. Barrie:** — This road, No. 8, is to be constructed, I hope this summer, and we appreciate this very much. I hope that it will be a very good road because I have repeatedly heard the people from the other side of the house say that prior to 1944 the Liberals in this province did nothing. Well I want to remind those members opposite that 33 years ago, in 1929, the present highway between Kamsack and Pelly was built by a Liberal government and it must have been a pretty good highway to have stood up to the traffic it has been called upon to bear for that term of years. I want to give the Department of Highways credit that during these years there has been regraveling, but no reconstruction in this particular section of highway in 32 years. I only hope, Mr. Minister, the contractor or whoever builds the highway this year will be able to build just as good a road and it will be 32 years before it will have to be rebuilt again.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — It is a ditch now.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Now I want to mention also, the Minister of Public Works, I think probably the Minister of Public Works, when this report was made, was the hon. Minister of Public Health. I am sorry he is not in his seat because I wanted to thank him for having given such great publicity in his annual report for 1960-61 to that beautiful summer resort, the best in the province, that we have at Madge Lake, in Duck Mountain Provincial Park. I notice he devotes four pages in his report to this particular resort. I have handed out the bouquets and now I am going to hand out some criticism with regard to some of this development in the Duck Mountain Park.

The first thing I want to mention is that after the disastrous fire destroying the old buildings that provide the facilities in the park, the Department of Natural Resources I understand, drew up the needs they considered were required for new commercial facilities and the Department of Public Works, based on these needs, I believe, provided a building. Now it states in the report I have in my hand that this building is of a rather unusual and attractive design. I go right along with that. It is a very a very unusual design and they go on to say it is very eye-catching. Any of the members who look up their report will see a picture of it lit up at night and it is quite a sight. The contracts for this building were \$68,636 and possibly there is a good value there. But what I want to point out in this building is not a functional building for the purposes it is expected and supposed to provide at the park. It will be a very short time, indeed a very short time, before there will be demands for some additions or some change in this particular building if they are going to provide the services that this resort requires. I might mention one thing. The huge glass front faces the west and I know the person who was in charge of the concession there last year had a very difficult time. Chocolate bars run out on the shelves and the building couldn't be kept cool, in spite of the fact that he had blinds and shades on the windows. I say this, for the same amount of money much better accommodation could have been provided at Madge Lake, which would have provided the required accommodation for many years to come.

There was one other large expenditure made in recent years at this resort. It was construction of a lagoon for mooring boats. Unfortunately, it was constructed or dug very close to the children's bathing beach. A most unfortunate and tragic accident took place there last summer before the lagoon was fenced off, a three year old child was drowned one afternoon. Since that time

**March 19, 1962**

the lagoon area has been fenced, but I still contend it is not a proper place and there is a hazard for anyone whether they are young or old in trying to moore, load or unload a boat in that lagoon. What we need, not only for private boats at this resort, is a boat dock for the private mooring of boats and certainly for the mooring, loading, and unloading of the government-owned boats which are let out for hire. This is all I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, regarding Madge Lake.

I have one other item to mention and that is in connection with another extremely important historical site situated in my constituency, Fort Livingstone, I think most members know that the first seat of government for the North West Territories, when Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the North West Territories was all one, long before the formation of this province, this is where Lieutenant Laird and his council met in the year 1876-77. The federal government or a branch of the federal government saw fit some years ago to erect on the site or location of Fort Livingstone which is on a prominent bluff overlooking the Swan River a very fine natural stone cairn. this has been a tourist attraction for many years. It is surprising the number of people passing by the village of Pelly or in that vicinity, who want to visit this particular site and for many years the only way of access to this particular site was across certain crown land pasture. The lessees of this particular land in the past and up until a few years ago, always made provision that the old Pelly-Fort Livingstone Trail which I suppose was in use even before 1876 was available to the public to gain access to this particular monument. In recent years a comparative newcomer to our district obtained the lease for this pasture. He immediately went about fencing off the trail, locking up the gate and the people were denied this access. We in Pelly, The Chamber of Commerce, I believe the village council and myself personally along with other people brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture or members of his department, without any results. The only reason, Mr. Speaker, that I can see for this having been ignored is this gentleman, who I know is a most ardent and active supporter of the party of this government in the Pelly district.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Shame, shame.

**Mr. Barrie:** — He is know only too well to the hon. Minister of Social Welfare, I see he is not in his seat.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member give me the name of the lessee and the description of the land? I will be certainly glad to look into it.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Yes, I will give it to you. Now in connection with certain remarks I made in this house in the short special session of 1961, in connection with water conditions in my constituency, I want to say that we still have a problem, both urban and rural. I had hoped when I spoke in this house to possibly seek or request certain assistance. I know the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Agriculture whose department takes care of this kind of thing will be happy when I say that so far this year we have had an abundance of snow. I hope that another year, or early in the spring, the problems confronting the town of Kamsack and the town of Norquay and many of our farm people, will from the runoff be alleviated. We have however, certain problems. As most people know, our particular area is made up of small farmers, we have no large acreages and as a result there were no surpluses of grain. I know that this spring some people are going to have extreme difficulty, some of our smaller farmers are going to have extreme difficulty in being able to take care of their requirements in order that they might be able to seed another crop. I understand and I want to give credit to the government that certain arrangements have been made and I only hope that these arrangements will be such that there will be a minimum amount of red tape, and administration so that the assistance when required and deserved will certainly be given.

Another group in my constituency that I would be remiss if I did not mention are the small merchants, particularly along the Manitoba boundary. I know this is a very difficult problem indeed, nevertheless it is a problem, and that is that they are confronted particularly with the increase of the sales tax, a condition that doesn't exist in most of the province. I am not going to criticize the Provincial Treasurer, I am just going to ask him if something can be done, possibly to remedy, even to a degree, the situation. If he does I assure him these small merchants will appreciate it very much.

There is one other problem that I expect every member of this legislature has had brought to his attention from time to time in the press and over the radio and that is what is called the Indian problem. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem in my constituency, particularly for the towns of Kamsack and Norquay. Those responsible for the greatest part of the problem insofar as law enforcement, crime, and violence are concerned are a comparatively small number of native Indians, but it has posed a great problem for the law enforcement officers and for the residents of these communities. Many of the older Indians on the reserve are just as concerned as are

**March 19, 1962**

the white population, and if I was asked the basic cause, I would say that it is idleness. This idleness is brought about to a very large extent in my opinion by the policies of the federal government and the Indian department of the federal government in their particular regulations regarding social aid as applied to the native Indians on the Indian reservations. This of course, I know is a problem and the responsibility chiefly of the federal government. They have failed to integrate or bring forward in the past years a program that would integrate chiefly these young Indian people into our society and thereby provide them with gainful employment and make good citizens out of them. I criticize most severely the programs and the policies of the Indian department over the years. I know that liquor is something that is one or a part of the problem. This too, in my opinion, is brought about, not so much from the extension of privilege that was given to the treaty Indian in the province a few years ago, but the fact that the federal government stick to out-dated regulations that unless the Indians hold a plebiscite on the reserve and vote in favour of having liquor on the Indian reservation the Indian is penalized and prosecuted if he takes liquor on to an Indian reservation. This results in much of the trouble, much of the difficulty, and many of the problems we have in the towns of Kamsack and Norquay. I am going to be quite frank in the matter, if somebody asks me for a solution, I have none. I do hope that while the law enforcement in these communities to a large extent is the responsibility of the provincial government that co-operative action can be taken between the federal and the provincial government to try and resolve these particular problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal this afternoon from the Attorney General. I was thinking as he spoke, if I had had the opportunity to read his speech before he delivered it, mine couldn't have followed along the same line more closely, because he dwelt at great length this afternoon in regard to how concerned, not only recently but over the years the socialist party has been and the socialist governments have been in the general welfare of the public and mankind. He would have us believe the socialist party, the CCF party of the NDP, or whatever you call it now, are the only people who are concerned with the welfare of the general public, and they hold a monopoly insofar as political parties are concerned in that particular regard. They would try to paint a picture and he did this afternoon that we of other political parties are great big, bad wolves and ogres.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — That we would try and are trying and attempting at all times to destroy and take away from the general public some of the benefits which have been given them. This of course, Mr. Speaker, is pure and typical socialist thinking and propaganda. This is the identical pattern followed by the communist in international affairs, they support other philosophies and ideologies except their own, and this is the attempt that has been made not only here this afternoon but on many occasions throughout this province. What I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members opposite in the record of Liberal government, both provincial and federal indicates most clearly the consistent interest of Liberals in social services. This record points out how mistaken are the socialist claims of a monopoly or interest in these matters. I was rather surprised that the Attorney General this afternoon used the old acorn or chestnut when he said Mr. Woodsworth was the man responsible for all the social legislation and the benefits the people of Saskatchewan have.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — Well we might as well get up here now and say that we, the Liberal opposition, are responsible for The Hospitalization Act, are responsible for all the benefits that have been made, there wasn't even a CCF party in existence when some of these measures were brought in to the federal house at Ottawa by a Liberal government. How ridiculous can these people be? Well it appears to me, in my observation over the years that the function, insofar as the socialists are concerned, of a government is to dictate to the public what they consider is good for them, irrespective if the public agree or not. This has been their attitude, this is their attitude today.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Nonsense.

**Mr. Barrie:** — These socialist planners consider themselves so wise and efficient that their decisions and their policies should not be questioned. Resulting from such an attitude of the socialist policy to regiment, dominate, and oppose the wishes of the people they govern, we have two very prime examples in recent months.

The first one I am going to mention is the local government re-organization. Here was a program of indoctrination, promoted by this government opposite and financed

**March 19, 1962**

from public funds, contrary to the wishes of the majority of the rural people in this province. Evidence of this are the votes taken a year ago last fall where each and every vote was overwhelmingly against any forced or regimented re-organization of local government. I ask you to deny that you didn't promote holding meetings throughout the whole province by men and women, who were paid their expenses by this government.

**Mr. Kramer:** — That is an insult to the committee.

**Mr. Barrie:** — I don't care who it is an insult to, but I will say this is one prime example of regimentation or attempted regimentation.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Socialist dictatorship.

**Mr. Barrie:** — And I am sure that it is well borne out by a recent SARM convention held here in Regina.

The other matter that is a prime example of this very thing is the Medical Care Plan. There has been a lot said about it here this afternoon. Here was an example, an outstanding example of this government attempting to dictate, dominate and regiment certain sectional groups in this province. One of the most important partners was completely ignored at the outset, the medical profession. I have no great brief for the medical profession or the doctors but the result is that had they used good common sense and judgement, this medical care plan could have come in smoothly and with the fullest co-operation of not only the people that are going to pay and receive the benefits but also those people who are going to render the services that are necessary if you are going to have any plan. I would have thought that the first step that would have been taken by this government would have been to call together representatives of rural people, urban people, representatives of the medical profession, and their own representatives and sit down around a table — there would have to be compromise, certainly there would have to be compromise — but I am quite certain that given the opportunity, if that had been done in the first instance, that you people wouldn't be in the trouble that you are in today.

**Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — And you are in serious trouble as much as you want to deny it. You are in serious trouble and I certainly



have no sympathy for you, but I have some sympathy for the people of Saskatchewan, who have been made the victims and were made the victims of political expediency on the part of the former Premier of this province, in order to further his own political ambitions and aims and every member on that side of the house, Mr. Speaker, endorsed and supported it. they now reap what they sow, and they must accept the responsibility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one very peculiar thing happened here during this session, and that is when certain members opposite seemed to be very sensitive about being called socialists, about us mentioning the word socialism. It is on the record of the house. I want to tell the members opposite and you, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals are very proud at any time and all times to be called Liberal, we are not ashamed of it and we make no apologies . . .

**Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Barrie:** — And we make no apologies to anyone.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — There is not a true Liberal on that side.

**Mr. Barrie:** — . . . because I am very proud to think that I am a Liberal, I support policies and support principles that not only provide but protect the common ordinary man in the inherent rights that he has, of a maximum of freedom and liberty to every individual in the state.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Yes, swallow that.

**Mr. Meakes:** — How about that pipeline?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — That is the voice of freedom over there.

**Mr. Barrie:** — They talk about democracy, these people opposite, Mr. Speaker, talk about democracy . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — They don't know what it is.

**Mr. Barrie:** — This is the true democracy that I have just mentioned, which forces today within Canada and outside the boundaries of Canada are trying to destroy. I am sure that on many occasions certain speeches that have been made by

**March 19, 1962**

members of the party opposite outside of this house, have given great comfort and great solace to some of those people who would destroy what so many of us prize so much.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, the socialists of Canada — I hope they don't take exception to be called that — met at a founding convention in the city of Ottawa and apparently they must have been ashamed of the names socialist and socialism because you can't find it any place in the new name.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You are sure worried about it.

**Mr. Barrie:** — You can't find it any place in the new name, they have carefully avoided incorporating either word into their new party title. The NDP seemed better to them. I don't know whether they were ashamed or whether they thought they could possibly fool some of the people. I say to the members opposite, if you are socialists and if you believe in socialism, then be men and women and stand up and say so. Don't be ashamed of it because you can twist and you can turn and you can use any label you like but you are not fooling anybody but yourselves.

**Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — We don't need to fool you, nature saved us the trouble.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to something that a great deal has been said about in this house, something that was referred to this afternoon, and that is pertaining to the administration of social aid and social welfare in this province. I want to make an observation right now, that I hope most people are not confused. I hope those people opposite don't try to confuse the public or anyone else that social aid, social welfare, and socialism are one and the same thing, because they are so far apart there is as much difference as between day and night.

I want to state at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am very happy, and I know this will bring great comfort and happiness to a large number of people in the province, to know that the government opposite has made arrangements whereby the increases of \$10 a month provided by legislation brought in by the federal house in Ottawa to our old age assistance recipients, to the blind pensioners

and to disabled people, to know that they will receive the full benefit of the \$10 increase without any deduction on a means test or needs test whatever you like to call it. I think I understood the Minister of Social Welfare, when he spoke the other day, and I think I understood the Attorney General this afternoon, when they said arrangements have been made where there would be no deduction whatever, the full increase of \$10 there would be extended to all these people, it wouldn't affect their supplementary allowance or anything of that kind. I am very pleased to hear this. This also will be extended to the supplementary allowances and the aid to dependent families. This will bring great hope and happiness to many people in the province.

I noticed during this debate when the Minister of Social Welfare spoke, he complimented himself on the lack of criticism, I think he meant from the members, in connection with his social aid policies and felt his policies and regulations were very satisfactory. Well I am one of the people who think differently and I propose in the next few minutes to try and make certain statements and back up these statements. One thing before I proceed any further is that I am afraid the Minister of Social Welfare was very mistaken because I notice that arising out of the convention of the SARM a week ago, as reported in the Leader-Post, they don't seem to be too well satisfied. They say the regulations should be amended so that applications must be submitted and approved by the municipal council. They say as regulations stand now one person appointed to the council considers all applications and accepts or rejects them without any referral to the council. I will make some comments regarding this a little later.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I wonder if the member will tell me whether that passed the other day or not.

**Mr. Barrie:** — That was accepted, that was a resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — But was that passed the other day, on Friday when it was reported?

**Mr. Barrie:** — Yes, in the SARM convention. then I want to go on and I want to read some comments the mayor of the city of Saskatoon made, the city which the hon. Minister of Social Welfare represents, following the last Association of Urban Municipalities Convention. this was reported in the Star-Phoenix, and this is what Mayor Sid Buckwold had to say:

**March 19, 1962**

“That government officials including the social welfare minister had been really startled at the dissatisfaction expressed in a panel discussion at last week’s urban municipal convention, with the curse of current policies of social aid.”

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — What is the date of that?

**Mr. Barrie:** —

“He considered the government would accede to resolve the request of the convention and set up a special committee to reassess social aid finances.”

This was dated April 4, 1961.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Yes, we have met the committee since then.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Fine. Well I find, Mr. Speaker, in a great part of the province that our municipal authorities, the municipal council, the municipal secretary-treasurers, and many of the municipal people are greatly confused. There has been a constant change of regulations, and I must concur wholeheartedly with the outline given by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) in this house the other day. I find in discussions with many of these municipal men particularly last week from all parts of the province, that they are far from being satisfied, and I question the wisdom of a rural municipality having one official appointed to decide on the ordinary applicants or the first applications made. I wonder at the wisdom of this particular provision. My personal opinion from the information that I received from experience and discussion with municipal people is, that this is most unfair to the councils, it is most unfair to that social aid official, in many cases or in most cases I believe the municipal secretary-treasurer, and certainly is not fair to the applicant. The big problem they are confronted with in many parts of the province is the administration, the policy of administration, but in particular in the handling of applications made by people who have received PFAA and acreage bonus payments. This particular matter is one that is of greatest concern to many people and it certainly is a discrimination against the honest man who wants to and has honoured his obligations to the small merchant or the small business man, who helped him out last summer and last fall. This is a discriminating against the small business operator and if it is carried to its limit, as it is being

applied today, it will result in the bankruptcy of many of our small business operators in the province. It certainly is a discrimination against many of the applicants.

I don't know how well aware the members of this house are with regard to the procedure which is taken in cases of this kind, certain instructions have been sent out to those social aid officials and I am not criticizing them for the action they have taken, because while it is true that they administer social aid they administer it according to the rules and regulations and the policies laid down by the government.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — As a result of their agreement.

**Mr. Barrie:** — . . . laid down by the government.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Barrie:** — In some cases I understand it is intimidated, not in writing, but intimated to certain farmers that they shouldn't pay their obligations or their current debts that they had incurred during the last twelve months. It has been intimated to them that the storekeeper or anyone else can do nothing, that their debts are frozen. Well I haven't heard of any moratorium set going through this legislature and if such action as that has been taken then I think it is up to this legislature to know something more about it.

What I find is this, the ordinary man receiving a PFAA payment or an acreage bonus payment and has carried himself along for a certain length of time, and as I mentioned before, was honourable enough to meet the obligations he incurred last summer and paid the small merchant and small storekeeper and oil dealer in order to keep him going, this man, when he cannot carry on with his own resources and goes to the municipal office or the social aid official and makes a formal application for assistance, then that social aid official has no alternative but to turn him down — no alternative. What he can do I understand is submit an application after he has disposed of any surplus cattle, after he has exploited his resources to the limit. I don't know what is meant by these resources to the limit, whether it includes seed grain, whether it includes any surplus machinery, or whether it includes all cattle and basic herds and so on.

**March 19, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — You know perfectly well it doesn't.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Barrie:** — I am not aware . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — You know better . . .

**Mr. Barrie:** — I am not concerned with the interruptions of the hon. minister, but I do not know what this particular interpretation is based on. All I know is the wording used interprets to me, that these people must exploit every possible resource they have in order to be able to qualify for what is called extreme hardship allocation. Then the municipal officials have nothing to say about it, all they do is take the application and submit it to the director of social welfare, a government official, and it depends on his rejection or acceptance whether that particular applicant receives aid.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is the procedure and I believe there are possibly thousands in this province today who probably haven't made an application yet, they are honourable enough people to have got along and will go along as far as they are able, but there is going to be suffering and hardship and I believe there is suffering and hardship now in many cases in this province due to these particular policies and due to this . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Tell us about one, tell us one at a time.

**Mr. Barrie:** — . . . particular regulation. Well I am going . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Send them on to the minister. You are too stupid to understand.

**Mr. Barrie:** — When I look at the tremendous number of employees hired by the government and the Department of Social Welfare, when I see the tremendous wage bill and the cost of service of automobiles I don't see why the administration of social welfare and all its branches in this particular province couldn't be conducted in quite a different manner, and then the excuse and the alibi the hon. minister tried to interrupt me with when I am speaking, is that I should run around and bring them to the minister.

Well I have something more here and I am not going to stop at 5:30, except for supper. I have some files here that if the members opposite and the minister are agitated now I don't know what they are going to be before I get through this evening. I claim, Mr. Speaker, these regulations and these policies are unfair and undesirable, and I am going to go further. Insofar as the minister standing up in this house and making public statements to the effect that if any person in Saskatchewan who needs assistance or social aid is not getting it, then it is the responsibility of the municipal officials. That is an insult to the many municipal officials and the many municipal councils in this province, because here are these people as I pointed out before, here are these people certainly and correctly administering social aid, but let me repeat once again, they are administering it under the provisions and regulations and policies set down by this Department of Social Welfare and which are rigidly enforced. This is something that is inexcusable — statements of that kind.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! We cannot have two debates in at one time, I wish the hon. members would refrain from interjections.

**Mr. Barrie:** — I think this type of criticism of municipal officials who are trying to do a job under very difficult circumstances, the attempt by the minister to shield himself and his department and officials is most unfair and most unworthy. I know it is resented and bitterly resented by a good proportion of municipal men in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of social aid to other than farmers. There is no question with the present policies, the present schedules, and provisions for social aid, but that the people in the large urban centres are receiving, due to these regulations and the provisions of them, a much more generous treatment than those in the rural or small urban centres, and I am going to point out why I say this. There should be some distinction. When we come into a city under the present deficit budget plan, which I take it for granted applies to every application for social aid assistance we find, there are provisions made for food, clothing, fuel, electric power, water, rent, personal incidentals, and I understand even instalment payments on appliances. Now I am not finding fault with this. I want to point out to you what you are going to be up against before very long, because the man that has a small shack in a

**March 19, 1962**

village or in a municipal location or in a smaller town where he has none of the conveniences — he probably carries his water, or as the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) said the other day, many of them have to melt snow for water. They certainly don't get this kind of treatment, because they can't qualify under the regulations and if rent has to be paid, it is much less than it would be in the city of Regina, Yorkton or elsewhere. This isn't the point of criticism I am trying to put over at this time at all. All I am telling you is there should be changes made and there should be a certain difference made whereby this exacting deficit budget formula should be a little more lenient in some of the country points than it is. I will say this to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members opposite, that what you are going to do is create a situation that the cities of Saskatoon, Regina, and Moose Jaw in a very short space of time will be climbing right down your necks because I can't see why any person under existing policies and regulations should sit in a shack at McLean or Canora or Pelly or Kelvington or any place else. They are fools if they don't move into the city. This is a situation that is going to be created and I warn you now, there should be some different regulations applying to some of these people that are not fortunate enough to have utilities, are not fortunate enough to have modern homes.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m.

The Assembly resumed at 7:30 p.m.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned for supper I had dealt extensively with the social aid policies and programs of the government and I know I had been very critical of the administration of these policies and regulations. As a result I respectfully submit that in my opinion the recipients needing and receiving social aid particularly in the rural areas are in many cases far from satisfied. Those who need assistance and fail to obtain it, of course are dissatisfied. Those people who are fortunate enough to not need assistance in the way of social aid, when they observe the unfairness and discriminations in connection with existing current regulations, then I am sure they are very much dissatisfied. I also know that a great majority of those people who are administering the social aid program in the rural municipalities and who are in a very unenviable position to say the least, I know that they are far from being satisfied. I would say, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of a small minority it appears to me about the only satisfied person is the Minister of Social Welfare. All this dissatisfaction and confusion, Mr. Speaker, is the



result of the policies and the regulations of the Department of Social Welfare and the Minister of Social Welfare and he alone must accept the full responsibility for existing conditions throughout the province. He certainly can't hide behind the municipal officials.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad and a very tragic state of affairs, when individuals are penalized for having the virtues of honesty, initiative, and who attempt to retain some personal pride. These are conditions that exist in connection with social welfare and social aid in the province today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another phase of the social welfare program, that of supplemental allowances and aid to dependent families formerly known as mothers' allowances. But before dealing with these items I wish to detract, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments and make some observations regarding the choice of, and the duties of social welfare field workers. I realize that there is a need for technically trained persons in some branches where university degrees and specialized training are most desirable. Field workers dealing with old age assistance cases with those elderly people receiving and applying for supplemental allowances, and aid to dependent families, widows, and orphans, these are the cases where I feel it is not necessary to have specialized trained university graduates to handle these cases. On the contrary I feel that more mature persons whose qualifications would be experience with aged people, probably their own relatives, people who have had experience, problems with families in every day living and above all I would say that mature persons with this type of experience and persons who have a good measure of common sense and good judgement would make the ideal field social welfare worker. Such people, I believe, are available in the province, and would welcome employment doing this very necessary work. I believe people of that stature would possibly be quite willing to accept much less salary than possibly a person who has spent time in a university or school or training who would be in a higher bracket of salary.

What I find from my observations is the emphasis has been on employing young men and young women who have degrees at a high rate of salary for these particular positions, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, in many cases this is unfair, particularly to the young women. I know in my own area they run into many unpleasant situations that a young girl or a young woman I feel should not be subjected to. They have to travel around the country on all kinds of roads and in all kinds of weather, this is also very

**March 19, 1962**

difficult for a very young woman. I find aged people in particular more or less resent the fact they have calling upon them a young person who might be a granddaughter or a grandson and who make some very personal enquiries and hand out certain instructions and advice. These old people are not happy with this particular situation, and with all due respect to these young people I hope the minister in charge of this department will take some cognizance of the suggestion I have made, for particularly the field workers handling the cases of aged people, widows, and orphans. I hope we will adopt a policy where engagement of personnel for these particular positions would be limited to more mature people. I believe the department would benefit, the government would benefit, and certainly the recipients of these particular allowances, pensions, and those applying for them would be much happier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a few extracts from the announcement regarding the changes in supplemental allowances and mothers' allowance programs which were placed on our desks last March, a year ago, by the hon. Minister of Social Welfare, and this particular bulletin or letter commences in this way:

“Before the orders of the day, I have an important statement to make in connection with the supplemental allowance and mothers' allowance programs. These two of the provinces' public assistance programs will be converted to a needs rather than a means test basis. This is a milestone in the welfare history of the province. These changes constitute another step in developing a comprehensive social security system within this province which will ensure that no one need lack the necessities of life or the wherewithal to live decently. For a long time the government has been concerned about the level of assistance and the methods for providing assistance to both the supplemental allowance and mothers' allowance program. Supplemental allowances and mothers' allowances benefits have been provided at levels set on an arbitrary basis which established arbitrary maximum levels of income and resources which people might have. These levels of income did not necessarily have a positive relationship to the actual needs of the people involved. These allowances are established on what is commonly called the means test whereby resources but not needs

are calculated and measured against an income ceiling. This has proven to be an inadequate and outdated method whereby needs as well as resources are considered and assistance is granted to fill the gap or deficit between resources and needs. We are now in a position to convert the supplemental allowances and mothers' allowance program to the more positive needs test method of calculating eligibility similar to the present social aid program. Negotiations of the federal government which have been under way for some considerable time, have very recently been finalized. Through these negotiations supplemental allowances which have been financed entirely by the province may be shared by the two governments on a 50-50 basis under The Unemployment Assistance Act, providing the allowances are paid on a needs test rather than a means test basis. I want to make it very clear that in my reference to the social aid I do not mean municipal government will be expected to carry additional responsibility."

These were at the time, Mr. Speaker, very fine sounding predictions. It states, as I have read, that no one need lack necessities of life or the wherewithal to live decently. The actual fact is, Mr. Speaker, we find that these things are somewhat different. Current regulations being applied to supplementary allowances and aid to dependent families are causing confusion, anxiety, insecurity, hardship, and in some cases are responsible for very desperate circumstances. Mr. Speaker, I submit, efficiency in administration is lacking, and delays in processing applications and attending to the needs of some of these people is most distressing.

To give the house some examples of this, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I propose to read to the house a few communications between myself and the Department of Social Welfare officials. These communications will be self-explanatory and I believe will save the time of the house, by using this means of example. All the letters I will refer to or read are in the files of the Department of Social Welfare, the names of the individuals are not important and I propose to use merely initials for identification. The names or the signatures of the department officials in all fairness to them will not be quoted. Later I will only be too pleased to reveal the names now being withheld, to any of the members present who are interested. These are examples, Mr. Speaker, of the certain claims I have made in connection with social welfare administration and cases, and the application of current social welfare regulations.

This is a letter dated February 8, 1962, addressed to an official of the Department of Social Welfare:

**March 19, 1962**

“Today Mrs. D. of Pelly, a widow with two school age sons and a very elderly mother to care for, called to see me regarding the suspension of her mothers’ allowance assistance for the month of January last. I am at a loss to understand the action of the department in this regard, which has caused considerable anxiety to this woman and she is really distressed.

Mrs. D. owns a small home on the outskirts of the village of Pelly and has resided here since the death of here husband in 1957. The roof on the house has been in poor condition and she has been saving every extra dollar she could over and above what it took to maintain her home and her two sons with a view to having new roofing material applied to the house. She had accumulated approximately \$175 and had it in the bank. The lumber yard agent has estimated the cost of material for a new roof would be in the neighborhood of \$150, the cost of labour extra. She had planned on having this work done as soon as weather permitted this spring, as the condition of the roof is such that it is ruining other parts of the building in its present condition. She received a letter from your Yorkton office on January 25th last to the effect that her monthly allowance was being suspended until such time as she advised them at Yorkton that she had used up her bank account, until it was not in excess of \$25.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — Shame! Shame!

**Mr. Barrie:** —

“As a result of this letter she withdrew \$154 from her account and advised the officials at Yorkton. It was her intention to purchase the shingles and material for the new roof with these funds. However, due to the severe weather and need for extra fuel, and no January cheque, she was compelled to use \$70 of this money to carry on until now, leaving here a little over \$80 on hand in cash. February 2nd last, she received an acknowledgement of her letter from the Yorkton office, and it states that they noted that she had withdrawn \$154 from her bank account to be used to re-shingle her home. They requested that receipts be forwarded to them for the money used.

Also this letter advised her that her allowance would be suspended for January, 1962, but would be reinstated from February 1, 1962. I apologize for the length of this letter but considered it advisable to give you these details of this particular case and indicate clearly the predicament this unfortunate woman was placed in.

I sincerely hope the current regulations are not such that they will occasion such circumstances on many of the widows requiring assistance. I feel sure that such results are not intended by any departmental regulations governing small amounts of cash that certain recipients may have on hand to meet emergencies for absolutely necessary repairs to their dwellings and furnishings. Just what Mrs. D. can do about having the house reshingled before the usual weather of the spring arrives, I am at a loss to know. If her allowance for January was available, then she would be able to pay for the material. However, I am now of the opinion that we can get help to apply the shingles and effect the repairs without cost to her now that the circumstances are known. I trust this matter will receive your personal consideration and as a result favourable disposition will be forthcoming. Thanking you in anticipation, I remain,"

I received a letter in reply to this letter, dated February 21st.

“In reply to your letter of February 8, 1962 I was sorry to learn what happened and perhaps this explanation will clarify our position. As you are aware, the mothers’ allowance regulations permitted the clients to retain cash assets. The aid to dependent families regulations permit the client to retain only \$25 if no question of short life expectancy is involved. The new regulations which become effective July 1, 1961 included a special provision for those in receipt of mothers’ allowance to permit them a period of six months in which to use assets to provide for repair of the home, for the purchase of some conveniences in the home which would make it more economical and comfortable to maintain in the long run. They were informed that effective January 1, 1962 anyone retaining more than \$25

**March 19, 1962**

cash assets would be required to use it for maintenance and would, if it exceeded the monthly budget requirement as calculated according to our schedule, cause the suspension of the aid to dependent families award. A wide discretion allowed to every client in using assets gave them an opportunity to use these monies in their own best interest. The new regulations are in accordance with our thinking that people who have assets should use them for maintenance and the apply for assistance from public funds as required. Emergencies can be met by an application direct to the municipal welfare official, the social aid, the local administration of this program should be able to provide for every prompt attention when the circumstances require it.

We were forced to suspend the award in accordance with the regulations for Mrs. D. had assets in excess of that allowed effective January 1, 1962. If she had completed the purchase of roofing materials in the fall, or even in December, there would have been no need for us to take this action. The award is being reinstated February 1, 1962 at \$68.70 which meets the family budgetary requirements for a minimum adequate living for one month. Social aid could be considered as a resource for necessary repairs to a home in the circumstances where there was no more economical alternative. Since Mrs. D.'s three-quarter section of land produced very little revenue she might be expected to sell some of this land before being considered eligible for social aid for such material."

(This is an aside, this is very poor land, I doubt if you could find a buyer.)

"I appreciate your interest and the time you gave to this enquiry and hope Mrs. D. will be able to meet her family needs in a satisfactory way."

Another similar case which has a little different bearing, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with a letter dated February 5, 1962 which I personally wrote to a Department of Social Welfare official:

“The above captioned lady has called at my office and claims the current allowance she is receiving of \$20.24 per month is inadequate for her to provide herself, her school-age son, and her invalid husband with the necessities of life. This is also taking into consideration the \$55 per month that her husband receives. Her husband has been an invalid for a number of years. He had a leg amputated a few years ago and has been bedridden since and in constant pain. As a result of this the bulk of his pension money has had to be used for drug, special food items, etc. This man should really be in a hospital or geriatric centre.

I note on the assessment form which indicates her income, two items which to me seem ridiculous. One item is shown as an income from the farm of \$12.21 per month deducted, and she has no farm and no farm income whatsoever. Another item is an alleged income from a garden, a deduction of \$6.45 per month. In 1961 her garden was a complete failure, which is typical of gardens in this area last year due to the drought. How these two items amounting to \$18.66 per month were or are arrived at as in this instance is a mystery.

Further income item that is deducted is shown as an income from eggs as \$2.05 per month. This can also be questioned. With the actual monthly income this woman and her husband are in receipt of, and the need for her supplying lunches and books for her school-aged son, along with certain transportation costs in connection with his attending school, no stretch of the imagination can be used to indicate anything but these people have a mere existence and a very poor and niggardly one at that. I consider that this is a case that requires immediate reconsideration and an increase in the allowance.”

The reply to this particular letter is dated February 19, 1962.

“This is to acknowledge your letter of February 5, 1962 regarding the above noted. We understand and appreciate your concern for this family. Mr. R.’s aid for dependent family allowance has not as yet been reassessed for the 1961-62 year, this is due mainly to confusion

**March 19, 1962**

regarding the circumstances surrounding the transfer of the southwest quarter of 9-34-32 from Nick R. Jr.

You may recall that I spoke to you about this matter in the fall of 1961. I was given to understand by both and the recipient that Nick Jr. had made all the payments on this land and with the transfer to him involving only a change in title on August 8, 1961, without any cash payment involved. However, a search from the Land Titles Office indicates that property has a value of \$1 thousand. In an effort to establish that Nick R. Jr. had made all the payments on the land, the original owner was contacted and he claims that he received the money from Nick R. Sr. and had no knowledge of the payments actually being made by the son.

If we take the land titles search at face value Mr. R. would be considered to have cash assets of \$1 thousand and hence ineligible for aid for dependent family. We are writing to Nick R. Jr. in the hope that he can clarify this matter for us and provide any necessary proof.

Thank you again for your interest and concern for Mr. R. and his family. I hope this reply to your letter is satisfactory.”

I have another letter, Mr. Speaker, a little different case. This letter is dated January 30, 1962, and is addressed to an official of the Department of Social Welfare:

“Dear Sir:

Mrs. L. of Pelly, Saskatchewan, a recipient of mothers’ allowance called at my office today and advised me she had been told by the social welfare person from Yorkton that their allowances would be discontinued until she had reduced her bank balance down to \$25.00.

This widow has one child attending school and she is in a very poor state of health and unable to undertake any work to supplement her income. She and her son jointly own a small farm in this district, which is poor land, and income from same in the past year was



insufficient to pay the taxes. She owns a modest home in the village of Pelly, and apart from this has no other assets except approximately \$275 in the bank.

She feels this bank account is necessary to cover any emergency which she or her son may encounter, also that in the event of her death it would provide some ready cash for burial expenses. It appears to me that if this widow is denied the allowance until she has expended funds on hand, until she has only \$25 in cash as a reserve, that it is most unfortunate and leaves her and her son in a precarious position if they encounter some emergency that might require some ready cash. In my opinion and in accordance with what I can understand from the pamphlets distributed from your department, it is permissible for a recipient of this allowance to have \$300 on hand for burial purposes or emergency. This woman is between 50 or 60 years of age with a serious heart condition. Anything might happen to her at any time and as she has no close relatives this school boy would be left most likely to the care of local authorities.

This concerns this mother very much and since she received word of the allowance being discontinued she has been very upset to the point of being seriously ill.

I would appreciate being advised if the current regulation preclude such an allowance recipient from having in excess of \$25 on hand or in the bank.

Trusting I will be favoured with a reply at your convenience, I thank you in anticipation.”

I see the reply was dated February 14th.

“Dear Mr. Barrie:

In reply to your letter of January 30, 1962, I appreciate your concern for this widow, and I was surprised and also concerned to learn about her possible short life expectancy, because there is no record to indicate that she advised my staff of this fact. As you know those who receive mothers' allowances were allowed to retain assets. When aid to dependent families

**March 19, 1962**

regulations became effective July 1, 1961, all former recipients of mothers' allowances were advised that assets were no longer permitted in excess of \$25, but the new regulations included a special provision for this. Six months were to be allowed in which the award would continue at the same rate to allow the client to plan to use the assets to improve the home or required conveniences in the home that should be of mutual benefit to the individual family as well as to the taxpayers, in providing a household that was more economical and comfortable to maintain in the long run.

Mrs. L. advised our worker at the time of his visit in October that she understood that an aid to dependent family recipient with assets over \$25 would have to be suspended to January 1, 1962, were accordingly forced to spend the allowance because the cash assets available as at December were over the allowance.

I appreciate that you made a note of the question of her heart disease. Our worker did not interpret about the allowable amount for short life expectancy to Mrs. L. because she is only 52 years of age and the question of any serious disease should only be taken into account if she advised our worker of its nature. Where life expectancy is considered to be short with a written opinion from medical doctors to life expectancy she can be allowed to retain \$300 cash assets. The sum for burial expenses cannot be allowed under the remote possibility of an early death, but only if life expectancy appears to be short in all probability due to illness.

For other clients who are over 70 we may allow the retaining of burial expenses in terms of age and average life expectancy. If the family encountered some emergency after using cash assets in the bank we expect the mother to apply immediately to the municipal welfare official for social aid which is necessary. Local administration should provide for town assistance in an emergency. When there is no urgency and special need arises such as school books, an aid to dependent family recipient can inform my staff and arrangements then can be made for social aid to be issued by the municipality.

In the meantime we expect Mrs. L. to use the assets on hand for normal living requirements, and if her doctor considers her life is probably going to be short she can reapply for aid to dependent family when she has \$325 on hand plus enough funds for one full months requirements for the family.

If her illness is not considered serious in terms of her life then she should notify our staff at Yorkton a few days prior to the time she will have on hand enough for a full month's maintenance plus about \$25. If the latter should be the case this means she could maintain herself and her son for about six months without help from public funds.

I know that a change in regulations such as this is difficult for a recipient to accept. Thank you for informing me of this case. I am passing the information to my staff who will write Mrs. L. explaining what allowances will be made for those who have a short life expectancy."

This one, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say is much shorter, this is a letter written on behalf of an aged lady dated September 11, 1961. This is an example of delay.

"The \$10 per month supplementary allowance formerly received by the above captioned pensioner was suspended in July last. As a consequence the medical services card she had possessed was also withdrawn. The circumstances as related to me by this elderly lady was that she was unwell in the early part of 1961, in January, and her son, a Manitoba resident took her to Winnipeg for medical care on the recommendation of the local doctor. This period was to be of short duration was extended for several months, due to Mrs. K. having suffered a heart attack while in Winnipeg. Her Winnipeg doctors would not allow her to return to her home until they were satisfied she could make the trip, which was in June last. Now that Mrs. K. is at home in the Arran district as formerly and has been since June last it is hoped that her supplemental allowance will be restored and also the medical care services care in reinstated.

Trusting I will be advised at an early date as to the disposition of this matter."

**March 19, 1962**

In reply to that letter, days later, on November — no two months later, November 8, 1961.

“This is to acknowledge your letter of September 11, 1961, concerning the reinstatement of a supplementary allowance, a ward of the above named. We have recommended that Mrs. K.’s supplementary allowance be reinstated under the new regulations effective November 1, 1961. Until we received your letter we were not aware of the change in this lady’s circumstance. We trust this will meet with your approval and we thank you very much for your interest in this matter.”

You will note the date, Mr. Speaker, November 8th. I had occasion over two months later, on January 16th, to write the department again regarding this particular lady, and this is the letter I directed to the department at Yorkton.

“I received a letter from your office under date of November 8th last in connection with the above supplementary allowance recipient, wherein you advised you recommended reinstatement of Mrs. K.’s allowance, including health service benefits. Today I have been advised that to this date, January 16th, Mrs. K. has not received any additional word from your department, nor has she received a supplementary allowance or health services card.

I trust upon receipt of this communication you will check this matter and advise me as to your findings at an early date.

Thank you I remain.”

On January 24th, I received a reply:

“In response to your inquiry of January 16th we would like to advise that we have recommended a supplementary allowance in the amount of \$10 per month be paid to Mrs. K. This will be effective as the first of January, and she will receive her first cheque the end of January. Health services card will go along with this and will be effective at the same time. We should be able to give Mrs. K. confirmation in the very near future.

We trust this is the information you desire.”

That particular example is in connection with a delay from June until January.

Another case, and I am sure the members will be relieved to know this is the last.

This is a letter dated November 10th, written by myself to the Department of Social Welfare.

“Both the above captioned parties are past 70 years of age and are receiving the Old Age Security pension for \$55.00 per month. They are not receiving a supplementary allowance and find it most difficult to maintain themselves on their current income.

They have no assets other than their home property in the village of Pelly, and their household furniture. They have no outside income and have no surplus of cash.

A few years back Mrs. H. transferred a quarter section of land to her son Alex by a previous marriage. When her first husband died there were certain lands left which were for her two sons.

She transferred, as executrix of the estate, one quarter to one son but at the time felt it was in the best interests of her son Alex that she retain the title until he had matured before giving him title to the quarter section.

It may be that this transaction has some bearing on their not receiving a supplemental allowance. Under these circumstances I cannot see where this should interfere as at no time did she or her present husband receive any income of any kind from this particular quarter section.

I trust this case will be reviewed and hope it will result in a favourable consideration for this elderly couple.”

I received a reply on November 20th to my letter of November 10th, wherein they say:

“Thank you for your letter of November 10th. It was partly because of calculated income from farm produce that Mr. and Mrs. H. were found to be ineligible for supplementary allowance at the time of our last review of their circumstances in January, 1961.

**March 19, 1962**

On reviewing the file I find that the land in question was transferred in the 1956, so that five years have elapsed since the transfer.

It may now be possible for us to disregard this property in determining eligibility for the allowance. As you probably know under the revised supplemental allowance regulations the allowance is paid to only one of the parties.

We will be pleased to consider a new application for Mr. H. I believe the most satisfactory plan would be to have our worker visit the family to review their present circumstances, and if it appears they may qualify, process a formal application.

I trust this will be satisfactory.”

That was on November 20th. I had occasion to write on February 10th to the department again, three months later in this particular connection.

“On November 10th last year I wrote you in connection with the above mentioned party and their eligibility for supplementary allowance. You replied under date of November 20, 1961, wherein you stated in the last paragraph of your letter that the most satisfactory plan would be to have one of your social workers visit the family and review present circumstances. If they could qualify to process a formal application. I am advised today that no worker has ever called at this home to date, and there is no doubt they have been in Pelly on many occasions since last November. In fact not too long ago on one particular day, two of your workers were in Pelly on department business, and each called on cases in Pelly on the same date.

Surely there has been ample opportunity to call at the home of Mr. H. and carry out the proposal stated in the letter referred to of three months ago.

I trust that without further delay this case will receive the attention suggested and that a favourable report will result in these elderly people receiving additional assistance which they need badly.”

Mr. Speaker, I have read you this correspondence, I don't propose to make any comments regarding it. I think it amply shows or indicates the statement I made that there is inefficiency in the administration and some of these delays are most distressing. I have no doubt whatever that these cases I have referred to, and I have many more similar ones in my own files, are no doubt multiplied many times over throughout the province, and I think this is a very sad state of affairs indeed.

I will leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this Assembly to judge from what they have just heard as to the merits of the arguments and the statements I have made.

I want to now read a short extract from a very good speech made by the Minister of Social Welfare in the House of Commons at Ottawa, when he was a member of parliament representing the MacKenzie constituency and this speech is in connection with veterans' allowances and pensions, but it is most applicable, the remarks he made in this speech, to these cases and many others I have referred to, and I hope by refreshing his memory of the particular attitude he had at that time, that possibly some assistance other than there is now, will be given to some people, and consideration given to the feelings of some of the people who unfortunately have to apply for public assistance.

his is what he said at that time, this is in reference to two veterans:

“They would not have considered appealing for consideration if it were not for the fact that extremely difficult conditions have arisen making what appeared to be a secure old age, a life of uncertainty.

It is not easy for these proud Canadians to get down on their knees and beg for a little larger crust of bread.”

I fully agree with the sentiments expressed by the minister in that speech. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize for taking up so much time of the house today. There are other cases of the departments of the government, of the Department of Social Welfare I would like to deal with, but I am not going to do so at this time, with the exception of one, and that is connection with the institution known as the Boys' School.

**March 19, 1962**

This is an example in my opinion of extreme waste of public money. A few days ago I placed a question on their order paper asking for certain information regarding the cost, number of employees, number of government vehicles, number of inmates in this school, the average number, and I must say I was astounded at the answers I received.

The costs to the province over a year ago, from the answers furnished me by the government, for one boy for one day in this institution was \$19.08, that means \$572.40 a month, on an average to maintain one boy, or nearly \$7,000 a year. These boys range according to the information given me between the ages of 12 and 16 years, with slightly over an average attendance during the year of 16 boys. In order to look after these 16 boys and spend this amount of money, they require 18 employees, and for some reason or other they found it necessary to have two government-owned vehicles, what they were used for I don't know, but I find in the 1962-63 estimates that a provision is made for an increase in staff by one, I believe also in the current fiscal year, they were increased by one, making 19 employees, and the estimates for the coming year make provision for a sum of \$92,230 for staff salaries alone. That figures out at an average of about \$5 thousand a year for each staff member. The total cost of operation for this institution is estimated for the next fiscal year will amount in all to \$128,880, an increase over last year of over \$8,000. If the average number of boys maintained in this school does not show an increase, then the estimated cost to keep a boy in this school for one year, in the coming fiscal year will amount to \$8,050.

Mr. Speaker, I can't possibly conceive of any justification for the expenditure of public money on that scale and for that purpose. Furthermore, I would respectfully suggest and submit that rather than have this institution in the city of Regina, it would be far better at some rural location where these boys would be raised on a farm, and given the surroundings of farm life.

**Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — Mr. Speaker, due to the policy, regulations, confusion, inefficiency, and expensive administration costs, certain wastes of public funds, I respectfully submit that nothing short of a full scale inquiry and a complete overhauling of and reorganization of the Department of Social Welfare, will remedy the current undesirable situation.



In good conscience, Mr. Speaker, I cannot and will not support the motion on the budget.

I will take great pleasure, however, in supporting the amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down I wonder if he would be good enough to indicate how many of the cases he discussed tonight have been referred to the minister.

**Mr. Barrie:** — One, one to your deputy minister and the others to the director of the department.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — I would like to join with other members that have spoken today in extending my sincere sympathy to the family of the late Hon. Mr. McIntosh, who passed away over the weekend. I am quite certain that I can say as other hon. members have that in the years that I have known the former minister that I have always found him a very friendly person and a very helpful person. Coming into the legislature as I did, a younger man, I can assure you Sir that I always appreciated his kindness in the house and his consideration for members on both sides of this legislature. Also in any dealings I have had with him and his department during the years that I have been in the house I found that he was always very sympathetic to the problems of the rural people of this province, and I am quite certain that in his loss the rural people of Saskatchewan have lost probably the best friend they had in the government of this province.

I can well remember as a boy hearing Mr. McIntosh on the first occasion that I had an opportunity of listening to him, when he used to travel with the old Chautauqua that travelled around the province under the guidance of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Those are among the first memories that I have of Mr. McIntosh and since then both on the political hustling and since coming into this legislature I have had the opportunity of getting to know him better, and I think I can say here today that I considered him a friend and I think a helper on many occasions since coming into this house.

I would also like to join, because of the fact that I did not take the opportunity to do so in my previous address in the house, to join with other members in extending congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment.

**March 19, 1962**

I do not know whether I can make the promise that was made by the previous speaker today when he said he would try hard and not cause you any trouble. I find quite often you have to meet fire with fire, and of course when you are dealing with people like you have on your right, Mr. Speaker, quite often it may be necessary to use the same means on this side of the house. Therefore I will not promise to be too good. I promise to be just as good as the members on your right, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to add to the words of others my congratulations to the new member for the constituency of Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) for his success in the by-election of not very long ago, and I think for the success he has shown and at least indicated in his first session of the legislature. I am quite certain he is going to have a long career in service to the people of the Weyburn constituency and to the people of this province.

Now to go to the budget address of the Provincial Treasurer, I think there have been remarks made by members to your right, Mr. Speaker, during this debate which need some correcting in this particular debate, and I think there have been remarks made in the address by the Provincial Treasurer that warrant some perusal in the light of the history of this province. I think the Provincial Treasurer can be excused for not knowing too much about the history of this province, because he is a johnny-come-lately as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned and has only been a resident of the province since 1950. While he does not know the history of the province prior to that time I think he should be excused, because of the fact that he has not been a resident of the province too long. But in certain of the remarks that were made during the course of his address he indicated a complete ignorance of past history in the province of Saskatchewan of the record, not only of the previous Liberal governments in this province, and the course which they followed in the operation of government in this province, but that even the record of one other government that we had from the years 1929 to 1934, in the Anderson government, that was in charge of the affairs of this province at that time.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some of the remarks that were made by the Provincial Treasurer during the course of his address to the house in the presentation of this year's budget. He made this statement:

“There is however another aspect of the background against which budgets are prepared,

and that aspect is the object which the government sets for itself to follow. Politicians must choose between at least two views as to the proper role of government. The first view is to regard government largely as a device for keeping law and order, and for protecting and preserving the private sector of the economy. The politician who adopts this view seeks to minimize the role of government. He does this because he believes that in almost all instances the services provided by the government are inferior to those provided by private means. He rejects the notion that government can be and should be a positive force for the betterment of human society, and supports the view that such progress can normally be made only by means other than government.

A second view of the appropriate role of government of modern days is very different. It holds that it is both possible and desirable for governments to be a positive force in the economic and social life of the community. The government may properly be used as an instrument for providing services that cannot be provided individually, for facilitating stable and balanced economic growth and for achieving that greater measure of social equity which is the cornerstone of our social values. My colleagues and I are committed as the people of this province know to the second role of government.”

Here is where I would like to digress for a moment or two to relate some of the past history of budgets in this province, and the parts that other governments have played in the past history of this province in taking care of the very matters that he mentions in these few remarks in his address, and of course I relate here to the matter of government expenditure in this budget and in budgets of the past in this province. I go back quite a good piece in the history of this province, and I can continue it from the year 1921-22, and 1922-23 that I have here before me under both Liberal and Conservative governments. We turn to the year 1922-23, and compare it with the division of expenditures that we find in the budget that was presented to us this present year. Let us look for a moment at education. Here the government quite often chide members of the opposition with a record of the Liberal party with regard to education

**March 19, 1962**

in this province in the past. I don't think the minister has ever taken the trouble to see what percentage of the budgets of this province that the previous governments allocated to the problems of education. We find that the minister in the budget that we are considering now, is providing 26.08 per cent of his budget to education. What about 1922-23, when we had a Liberal government? In that year there was 30.79 per cent of the budget in that particular year allocated to the cost of education.

Now let us look at public health and here I am only relating to the portion of the budget that the minister himself allocates as expenditures for public health. As far as medical and hospital plans are concerned, these monies are entirely new taxation and are separate and apart from the general revenues of the province of Saskatchewan and should not be taken into consideration when considering the difference in expenditure on public health in 1922-23, and the expenditures of the present date. In 1922-23 on public health a Liberal government on that date contributed to 14.82 per cent of the total budget toward the cost of public health care in this province. In our present budget for the same expenditures our government is allocating 12.22 per cent of the present budget for exactly the same expenditures that the Liberal government dedicated 14 per cent of the budget in the year 1922-23.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — You can ask your question at the end of the address. Then, Mr. Speaker, we go on to the question of highways. We hear a great deal about the contribution of the present government to the highway problems in this province. Let us take a look for a moment, and this has to do strictly with highways, not with the expenditures that were made to the Department of Municipal Affairs, and in the year 1922-23 and this was one of the lowest ones the total portion of the budget of that year allocated to the expenses of the Department of Highways was 15.93 per cent of the budget. This year it is slightly higher and this includes the grid road expenditures and totals 16.53 per cent of the budget in this particular year.

Then, Mr. Speaker, to indicate even a further improvement in the expenditures along the line that the Provincial Treasurer was referring to in his remarks, we need only turn to the year of 1929-30, which was the last budget presented by a Liberal government before it went

out of office in that particular year. Here we find a slight change in the various allocations of budgetary expenditures, because of the fact in that year old age pensions came into effect in this province and we first budgeted for expenditures under the old age pension act in this province. In that year, with regard to child protection and old age pensions which would be comparable to social welfare at the present time there was allocated to that particular branch of government 8.04 per cent of the total budget of the province. In this year 8.80 per cent of the budget has been allocated to this purpose.

When you go on to the 1930's we find that they rise up to 14 per cent of the total budget of this province allocated for social welfare purposes. So when the Provincial Treasurer gets up in this house and tries to tell the people of this province that there is some change in the trend of thinking because of the fact that there is a CCF government sitting in the ruling place in this province, if he would only take the time to look back at the history of this province — and I am going to indicate to him tonight that when you go back and consider that in the 1920's the problems were a great deal different than those that exist in the province today, even with lesser problems with regard to social welfare in a position where most of the people that were coming into the province of Saskatchewan or had come here, had jobs and had come here for the reason that this was a province and an area of Canada which was developing, which offered to them a future, which offered them a right to have ambition and a desire to go ahead. Most of our population at that time were younger people who did not require the services that many of our people require in the province at the present time. In spite of that the governments of those days placed as great importance, if not greater because of the difference in circumstances, greater importance on the social welfare and the well-being of the individual people of the province than our present government has through the budget that has been presented to the house at the present time.

As I indicated before the only advance in the field of health and social welfare that has been made possible by the direct contribution that this government is going to take out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. There is no contribution coming from the activities of this present government in this province. There is no contribution coming from the revenues that have been derived because the economy of

**March 19, 1962**

this province has been going forward, because of the fact that industry and business has been brought into this province by this government to provide revenues and to provide services — no that has not been the reason. The only reason why there is any increase shown in this particular budget for the type of thing the minister referred to in his budget address is because of the fact that every dollar of it is going to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this province.

The member for Saskatoon says nonsense. Well I have heard, within the last few days, quite a bit of nonsense and there is a little more in the address of the Provincial Treasurer, where he chided the opposition for suggesting that taxes could be reduced and services either maintained at their present level or services improved under a Liberal government. Well here again the minister can be excused because he wasn't here in 1944. Perhaps he has never read the promises that were made by his own political party before they came into office in the province of Saskatchewan — and were made in the election of 1944. If he had read those promises he wouldn't have been making those remarks because if there is any party ever came into office in this province on political promises, on promises of reducing taxation, and providing increased benefits to the people of this province it is my friends who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker.

**Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I think it is worthwhile to repeat again, because my friends to your right seem to forget that people that live in glass houses shouldn't throw rocks. Here is the first promise and one of the major ones. Full health services were promised without any taxes. The services were to be paid for by profits of government-owned industries or by reduced government and debt expenditures. There was the promise that was made by my friends who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, and yet the Provincial Treasurer has the gall to stand up and before a radio audience tell the people of the province — look at these fellows who are sitting across the way, they think they can fool you into believing that they can give you increased and better services and at the same time reduce taxes. Now, Mr. Speaker, they may feel that they are the greatest trick artists in Canada because that is actually the story that they managed to sell the people of this province and it is a story that they have failed to carry out during their eighteen years in office.

This one reason alone should bring every member in this house, on both sides, to look back in the past and ask themselves in relation to the budget that has been presented this year, whether or not the actions of this government have borne out the promises that were made by this government prior to coming into office in 1944.

Here we have the statement of T.C. Douglas, the broadcast reported in the 'Commonwealth' which of course is the paper printed by my friends across they way, so it must be true — this isn't from the Leader-Post:

“Just as we have made education available to all, the time has come when we must make all the benefits of medical science available to all, without money and without price.”

“Let there be no blackout of health.” That was the big cry in 1944 and there hasn't been much relaxation, if any, in fact I think there has been costs heaped upon costs because of the waste and extravagance of the government as was indicated by the member for Pelly, (Mr. Barrie). There has been waste and extravagance in every department, including the Department of Health since this government came into office that could have provided many of the services that were promised to the people of the province in 1944.

Then we come to the question of education; this was another big one. The first thing which a CCF government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the provincial government. This was the second big promise. There has been a tendency on the part of the provincial government to pass the buck to the municipalities and local school board for maintaining our educational facilities. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely on the provincial government and it cannot be passed on to any other body.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is continuing to be passed on. The Liberal government in the twenties paid thirty per cent of the budget and it increased during the 1920's up to 35 and 36 per cent of the total budget of the government of this province toward education. Now after eighteen years this government has reached the highest point that it has been able to reach in that eighteen years and that is contributing 26 per cent of the total budget toward education. This is the way in which the CCF government has carried out its promises to the people of this province.

**March 19, 1962**

Those, Mr. Speaker, are just two examples of the promises of the government as to what they were going to do when they came into office in Saskatchewan. Of course we all know that there were going to be many increases in social welfare payments but we also know and history shows us, no matter what my friends might say about Mr. Woodsworth, that every increase that has been made in this province since this present government came into office was only made after legislation was placed on the statute books by a federal government in Ottawa, whether it was Liberal or Conservative. Every change that was made in social welfare benefits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to them, the three promises that I have suggested to you in the last few moments have definitely not been carried out. How were they going to provide the money to carry out these promises and I don't see any of it in the budget of the Provincial Treasurer. If there was an indication to the people of this province that the program that was enunciated by the former Premier of this province and those who sit to your right in 1944 was going to be carried out in this present budget there might be an excuse for someone to vote for them. But there is no indication in this budget that even one of the methods that was to be used to raise financial backing for government projects is going to be carried out through the implementation of the budget that was presented by the Provincial Treasurer.

Now what were some of the ways in which this government was going to fulfill its promises to the people without cost and without charge. Well one of them — they were going to save considerable money by taking the civil service out of politics and by setting up purchasing boards to buy government supplies. Well they set up what they call a purchasing board and there is one thing about it — it has definitely purchased more stuff than anybody every heard of before. It definitely purchased government supplies and it purchased a lot of unnecessary supplies in the eighteen years that this government has been in office. When it comes down to the ridiculous promises to the people of this province that they were going to save taxpayers' dollars and provide the services that were promised by the CCF party by taking the civil service out of politics, nothing could be further from the truth today, than that very promise to the people of this province in 1944. In fact, this is the only part of the British Commonwealth of Nations where we have in The Civil Service Act that a civil servant is allowed to take part in political activities. The only part of the British Commonwealth of Nations where this has been made



part of legislative law — to make it possible for civil servants to engage in political activities. We have plenty of them, particularly the high paid servants of this government, who have been brought in by the hundreds in order to provide income for CCF workers and supporters and the supporters of socialism in this province and other parts of the Dominion of Canada. This was one of the ways in which this government was going to provide services to the people of this province.

Now of course I don't think there is anyone in Saskatchewan that would even attempt to indicate that this government is attempting to carry out that promise which was made to the people of this province in 1944. Then another way they were going to find money was this. They would refuse to pay the high interest charges currently levied to service the provincial debt. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. They have increased the interest on the provincial debt, I think in this present year from the year they came into office by approximately \$20 million. So I am quite sure the Provincial Treasurer has done very little in that way in order to provide the services that are needed by the people of this province. Then, Mr. Speaker, they went on and they said a CCF government could obtain revenues from the wholesale distribution of petroleum products. This, Mr. Speaker, would have been an attempt to actually implement the policies that they claim they believe in socialist policies. But they haven't had the courage, Mr. Speaker. They haven't had the courage to even try and carry out the policies that they have stated that they believed in. Here again they have failed, not only through this budget, but through past budgets, to honour their promises that they have made to the people of this province.

Then of course they have come up with the one bogey where I think they have made some money. I don't actually think it is one that they should be making money on, because I think public utilities should be providing service at cost and should not be providing profit in order to assist with the operations of government in the province. That is the purpose of public utilities — to provide services to the people at cost and here we find the CCF in 1944 told the people, and here is one place that they were honest. The CCF government can obtain revenues from the further development of electrical power distribution. Here is one place where they have partially carried out this policy, but it is actually contrary to the idea of orations of public utilities, that they should be operated at cost and not at profit.

**March 19, 1962**

My friends across the way used to accuse others of operating for profit. They said they were going to change that and they were going to do away with profits. Then the CCF government can obtain revenue from the wholesale distribution of other staple commodities and machinery along the lines indicated above for petroleum products. How much machinery have they distributed to anyone in order to gain any of the revenues in order to pass back to the people of this province in services. Not one implement. The only thing they have done is added to the cost to the people of this province by testing implements that belong to other people here in the city of Regina. That is the only way in which they have added anything. They have added to the cost to the people of the province through anything they have done with regard to machinery for the farm people of this province.

Then of course they say the CCF can raise money through the development of natural resources. I don't know what natural resources they have developed. Any natural resources that I know of that have been developed have either been developed by private enterprise if they have been, or with the assistance of the federal government such as the uranium exploration in the northern part of the province — not with the help of my friends across the way, but either with a federal Liberal government or with private enterprise. That is the only way there has been any development of our natural resources — not by the people who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker. Yet this was one of the ways that they were going to provide revenues to the province to make possible the glories of socialism in the province of Saskatchewan.

I think if the Provincial Treasurer had taken a little care and examined a little further into the past than he did, he would have found that two of the arguments used in his remarks were off colour — that they did not stick strictly to the truth, and the previous governments of this province, as those on this side know and most of the people in the province know or at least should know — that all governments in this province have added and contributed to the progress in the fields of health and social welfare, no matter what they call themselves and I think governments always will as long as the province of Saskatchewan exists and long after the present government is gone from the scene.

Just for a moment I would like to digress to problems affecting my own constituency. I have one thing to be thankful for in this present budget, through the announcements that have been made by the ministers across

the way and that has largely to do with the operations of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I understand from an announcement by the minister that three towns in my constituency have been included in this program for natural gas. I can well imagine the regret of other members on my side when some of their towns weren't included. I think at least for once that the Melville constituency deserves a little bit of consideration. They get little enough from most departments of government and I want to thank the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for giving the consideration he has in this instance and providing gas for Abernethy, Lemberg, and Neudorf.

I also want to thank the Minister of Highways for his small contribution towards the welfare of my constituents. I believe there is about twelve miles of highway that he is going to be good enough to do some work on this coming year. The plan is a little bit delayed. The people in the area had expected the particular road would be finished by now, according to the promises made in the last election campaign, but of course I think some of them expect that perhaps when his candidate didn't win the election maybe they couldn't expect anything. They are glad to have at least the little that the minister is offering in this present year and I hope that in years to come that he will manage to increase this.

I would like to add to what the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) remarked with regard to one of his roads when it comes to the question of road construction in the province. I have a road that was built at even an earlier date than the one made reference to here by the member for Pelly this afternoon and that is No. 22 highway, which runs from the town of Lemberg to the junction with No. 47 highway which was built in 1928. The Minister of Highways says it is so good today that he doesn't think he is going to have to rebuild it — because the road is in such good condition that it doesn't need it at the moment. So I think there is a great deal of credit coming to governments of the past that with the limited amount of scientific advancements, the limited amount of advancement in the field of road building machinery, that they were able to build roads that would stand up not only to the pressures of the past but could withstand the pressures of the traffic that they must stand in our modern day. When the Minister of Highways boasts about some of his roads he should perhaps send some of his engineers back to talk to some of those who built roads many years ago. Then maybe he

**March 19, 1962**

wouldn't have to go back and build roads three times in twelve years as they have had to do in some parts of the province of Saskatchewan since they came into office.

With regard to other problems of the people whom I represent, I am not going to make any reference to the telephone corporation in the city of Melville today, because that is going to come later in the session. I think I would be remiss if I did not make mention of the problems facing the rural people in my constituency, those who have to depend on agriculture for their income. Last spring when the drought appeared to be facing the farm people of this province and the people that I represent, I put their problems before the Minister of Agriculture and asked that action be taken. Now I admit that there has been a certain amount of action, but I do regret that the Minister of Agriculture in this province saw fit last summer to announce, during the summer, that the feed situation had been taken care of and there were no further worries. The two governments had taken care of the situation. Well I don't know what the condition is in other parts of the province but I do know this. I know that there are many farmers in my area that are still trucking in feed today. There are many other farmers who can no longer afford to truck in feed and there are hundreds of cattle today going without proper feed because of the fact that the government of this province and the federal government have not taken sufficient action in order to support our farm people in their hour of need, such as they are facing at the present time. So I say that this government, along with the federal government in Ottawa stand indicted for their failure to take proper action to see to it that the problems of the farmers were met during this past year.

Only two weeks ago I attended a function at which the agricultural representative of this government was present at in one of my communities. He told me that day of some of the problems that were facing the people in his particular region in this province. They were going to be short of feed if winter conditions continue as they are at the present time very much longer. Hundreds of head of cattle in his region have gone with insufficient feed and in many cases the wrong types of feed because of the fact that the farmer couldn't afford to purchase any more feed than he did last fall.

Yet the Minister of Agriculture of this province and the federal Minister of Agriculture have said on various occasions that the feed situation was solved. No more ridiculous statement has ever been made and I indicated to both ministers in letter after letter

last summer that the situation had not been solved, that the condition had not been met and that it was the responsibility of the two governments to take action to assist the livestock producers of western Canada. I am afraid perhaps that any action that might be taken now might be too late to solve the problems of many of our farm people who already are losing livestock due to the lack of insufficient and improper diet at the time that we are meeting here.

Then there is the problem of water. I think everyone in my seat appreciated the fact that in every constituency in this province pumping outfits were made available not only to the farm people but to urban people as well. Let us also remember this, and I can remember well phoning the Minister of Agriculture on one occasion and asking him about these pumping outfits. He said you know we are being very generous. He said we are doing this at cost (I mean a little better than the power corporation). He said all we are doing is charging the farmer what we think it is going to cost us to handle this operation. Well that is a great contribution isn't it to the welfare of the farm people of this province. The farmer is paying every cent, yet the government of this province feel that someplace somewhere there is some credit for the government of the province behind this whole action, in spite of the fact that the farmers and the communities are paying every cent of the cost of the operation in order to provide them with water which will make it possible for them to continue their operations as livestock producers or make it possible for towns to live during this past year.

I know that members across the way and members on this side realize the extreme problems that have been faced by the people of this province, people of our urban communities and our farm people with regard to a shortage of water. There was insufficient action taken, there is no doubt about it, during this past summer to resolve this problem, and of course there was insufficient action taken prior to this. The warning signals have been there for the past two years. The warning signals have been there that drought could strike the province of Saskatchewan and we could be meeting conditions that we have had to face during this past summer. But no action was taken. They managed to buy a couple of pumps and have them on hand this spring so that when the drought conditions came they were able to go out and charge the farmer money and I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if we find before this whole deal is over that they haven't made a little bit of profit in order to provide some of these services that they are talking about to the people of Saskatchewan.

**March 19, 1962**

When we are discussing questions relating to a budget, Mr. Speaker, I think there are two or three basic things we must keep in mind. One of course is the economic condition of our province and our country as a whole. That one basic factor that we have to keep in mind when we are considering a budget of a province or a country such as ours is the economic conditions that exist. Secondly we have to look at factors to see whether or not the budget which is presented to us makes allowances for these economic factors and at the same time provides to the people the services which are necessary in a manner which will be most economical and which will provide the most sane and sensible government in that particular time. I think this is one of the places where this budget falls down and falls down badly. At a time such as this when the Provincial Treasurer indicates that economic conditions are not good in the province of Saskatchewan, all we have presented to the people of this province are increased taxes, not increased revenues. There hasn't been one new increased service guaranteed through the budget that has been presented to the people of this province by the Provincial Treasurer.

Our friends across the way will say how about the medical plan. Well I would turn right back to them and say — how about it? I don't think there is anyone on the other side of the house knows any more than I do, whether we are going to have a medical plan provided under revenues to be collected under the budget that was presented by the Provincial Treasurer.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — You will have a medical plan.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Now of course, Mr. Speaker, does it meet the basic rules that in a year when the economy is not at its best, is not buoyant, that relief should be given to the taxpayers of this province or any other area of Canada? Well, Mr. Speaker, needless to say, this budget does not meet that requirement. There is absolutely no relief for the taxpayers. As a matter of fact in reading the latest issue of the Leader-Post I notice that in remarks made in Saskatchewan that the president of the trustees association in this province stated that the new grants provided by the Department of Education to the schools of this province will not be sufficient to look after the increased operating costs in this present year, which of course will necessitate, if those facilities are going to be provided, will necessitate increased taxes on land to the people of this province in this

coming year in order to provide educational services. So I think we could quite rightly say that the basic view that in times of depression there should be relief to the taxpayer without neglect of the necessary services and of course in that way the budget falls very far short.

Now of course another factor that we must look at in budgets is this. We must ask ourselves if the government in a time when the economic conditions are not the best, if the government has attempted to economize, particularly in administration in government affairs. Well I think here again this budget falls down badly because in almost every instance with one or two exceptions but in almost every department there is an increase in the administration branch of that particular department, even in some cases where that department has a smaller budget than it had last year. I think it goes without saying that here again the Provincial Treasurer and this government have refused to meet that basic requirement that the government in time of economic difficulties must provide some of the answers to this problem — they must provide leadership to the people themselves to economize to the point where necessary services do not have to be reduced and where taxes can be reduced in order to give relief to the taxpayer in a time of depression. Again I say in this field the budget has fallen far short and the Provincial Treasurer has failed to carry out good economic rules in presenting the budget to this legislature at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that my friends across the way will probably state to increase services for the people of this province, I should have some way of finding relief from expenditures of the government which would take the place of those monies. I think you could go through this budget that has been presented to us and I know we will in the next two or three weeks and I think we will indicate to the government of this province that by the time we have completed our estimates on this government, that we could say that the very least on this budget that has been presented to us, we can save at the very least \$10 million in unnecessary expenditures, administrative waste and incompetence of the government that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker.

Last fall when we met in the special session I made a mistake in congratulating the new Premier of the province, Mr. Lloyd for reducing his cabinet by one member. You will remember at the time that he took over the leadership of the government that all of a sudden we found ourselves one cabinet minister short. Well I was a little bit early in my congratulations because it was

**March 19, 1962**

only about two weeks after the house had risen that the Premier announced that he had put back that old cabinet minister and he had a full slate again. He had his full slate of fifteen cabinet ministers. I want to withdraw my congratulations to the Premier for at least himself accepting some responsibility for cutting the cost of the operation of government in this province.

I think there is one other interesting point that comes out of looking at some of the past history of this province and it has to do with a department which my friends across the way think is very important today. But it is quite odd that when you read the expenditures of the government of this province there is not one mention of the word labour in it. There is not one mention of the percentage of expenditures of the government that go to the Department of Labour and Industry — not separately. You know the old enemies of labour and the working man back in the 1920's — here they have in the divided expenditures of the government a portion allocated to labour. There was one for highway, labour, agriculture, and natural resources. Here is the friend of the working man, the government that take credit for the fact that they developed what they call a Department of Labour in order to look after the interests of the working man. There is no mention of labour at all in the divided expenditure illustrated in the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer in this present session. So I want to indicate here to members across the way, some of them thought there was no labour department back in the days of Liberal government, but all they have to do is pick up the budget addresses of former Provincial Treasurers, turn to the back of each one and get the comparative statement of distribution of expenditures for each of the years. While a Liberal government was in office they will find every year that labour was included in that provision of the expenditures of the government of this province.

I think you will also find, Mr. Speaker, that when you think of agriculture, as I was mentioning a few moments ago, the page I am turned to at the moment, in the year 1934-35 the portion allocated to agriculture was 7.50 per cent, whereas in this present year the portion allocated to agriculture is 4.39 per cent of the total budget of the province. Here again I think in these two examples you will find that previous governments in this province gave a higher percentage of the total monies expended for those things that are most important to the people of this province and they were not frittering away to the budget on many of the frills, many of the socialist expenditures, many of the increases in the public



service that we have had in this province and when we even look out I wonder just how large our province is going to grow. I haven't got any general complaint about this little show out in the lobby here in the last few days, but when I look at the new government buildings this government says are going to be built in the next hundred years, I wonder what kind of a group of civil servants we are going to have one hundred years from now or how many people are going to be living here in the province of Saskatchewan. If we think we have a lot of government buildings now all you have to do is look at that illustration to indicate what we might have a few years from now if this present government remains in office. In fact I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if they were to gain office again, if before too long most of us in this province would be working for the government. That includes particularly the farm people of this province because as has been indicated by previous speakers the tax position that our farm people are in at the present time may make it possible for this government to take over many farms by default in the next few years if present conditions continue for very much longer.

So I say perhaps they will need these buildings, perhaps most of us, if this government were to stay in office, will find ourselves working for the government of this province and rather than the government being the servant of the people, the people will find themselves the servants and slaves of the government. I hope that that day in the history of this province will never come and for that reason I know that the people of this province are going to see to it that at the first opportunity that they are given that this government is turned out of office because of its failure to conduct the government of this province in a manner in which they could carry out even one of the promises that they made to the people of this province in 1944. If they had carried out even one of their major promises then they might have some reason to go to the people of Saskatchewan and say to them we deserve your support in an election campaign in this province.

I think I have indicated in the remarks that I have made and for the reasons that I have pointed out that I don't believe the members of this house could rightfully vote for the budget that has been presented by the Provincial Treasurer because it does not meet the basic requirements of the times in which we are living, that it does not provide any solution to the major problems existing in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time. So, Mr. Speaker, I think we would all be remiss in our duties as members of this legislature if we

**March 19, 1962**

supported a budget when it has been presented in the manner that it has been presented, without providing any solution, without providing relief to the taxpayers and also without providing the leadership necessary at this time by the government of this province to provide the leadership to meet the problems that exist in this province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and I will not support the budget.

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, in standing to take part in this debate I would first like to join those who have earlier in this session congratulated you upon the high office which you now hold. It is possible that my feelings are a trifle different from some of those who have already offered you their congratulations. It is just possible that I might know a little better some of the problems and some of the satisfactions with which you are faced, Mr. Speaker. I feel that in presiding over this house conducting its debates with the best decorum you are able to muster, that you are providing for the people of Saskatchewan a real and a lasting service. I cannot pose as any expert on parliamentary procedure, but in the days that you have occupied this Chair I have noticed many occasions, and I am sure you will fill this Chair with distinction and honour.

I would also like to say a few words in honour of our former Minister of Municipal Affairs, former Minister of Co-operation, Lachie McIntosh. Last Saturday forenoon I was sitting in my study at home, drafting a few words that I might say on this occasion, and I wrote this on a piece of paper:

“One of the outstanding features that I find upon coming into this Department of Municipal Affairs is the great popularity of the former minister, both in and out of the department, and the high esteem in which he was held by all. My hat is off to Lachie McIntosh for the fine work he has done and the huge number of staunch friends he has made over the years, and I can only hope in a small way I can approach that which he had accomplished.”

Only a few hours after I wrote that I was called to the telephone and told about his untimely

passing, and I can only add that Lachie McIntosh was a man who was loved by all who knew him. There are many times in the last few months I have gone to him for help and advice, and this was always freely and kindly given. On behalf of myself, and on behalf of the department which he was minister for so many years, longer than any other man in the history of Saskatchewan, I would like to say that we have seen the passing of a great man, a good and kindly man. Saskatchewan was enriched by his life and we are all poorer by his death.

I would also like to congratulate at this time the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). I don't want to be hypocritical, I am sure I would rather that the member who was elected from Weyburn had sat on this side of the house, but at the same time I want to congratulate him, and I trust that he will remain possibly for only a short time, though I still believe he will make a good and useful member of this house.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, before going any further that I am very proud to be a democratic socialist.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — Political democracy has been gained through centuries of struggle. Back in the middle ages there was no democracy. The king was the ruler and that was it. They believed in the divine right of kings and it took centuries, a good deal of blood and toil, and hard work for us to achieve that degree of political democracy which we have today, and we do have a good deal of political democracy today. I feel that political democracy is incomplete without economic democracy and that is the thing for which we as democratic socialists are trying to attain, and I believe it is being achieved in a good many ways today.

For the past fifty, sixty, seventy years the labour unions have worked, they have laboured, and they have gone through a good deal of turmoil and trouble in order to achieve a good deal of the economic security and the power they have today, which taken all together has been a real benefit to mankind in this 20th century.

The farm organizations have through their work in achieving such things as the wheat pool, the wheat board, have attained a certain control of economics that

**March 19, 1962**

was not there before, and our co-operatives have also done a great deal along these lines. And besides these things economic planning is being recognized through the world as something that is good and necessary.

Last summer I was over in London as you know attending the Parliamentary Conference, and had the opportunity to speak to that conference, and I chose as my subject "Aid to Underdeveloped Countries." In making that speech I had to do a good deal of research, and there was one thing I noticed in going through material on this subject. Whereas countries like the United States proclaimed very strongly their belief in private enterprise at home, when it came to helping the under-developed countries, they insisted that these countries have economic planning. This was one of the elementary things that they believed in, one of the elementary steps to be taken first before help was given to the under-developed countries — that they had to have economic planning in that country before they would go into a program that would be of benefit to them.

Many nations throughout the world have at this time a democratic socialist government, and all the major nations of the world have adopted at least some of the measures which through the years we have advocated. We have still a long way to go, Mr. Speaker, but I believe we are making progress. There are some we find from time to time fall by the wayside, and get led off into what are apparently greener political pastures, but we are going forward and we are marching toward the day when we will have true economic as well as political democracy.

I am proud also for what the CCF government has done in Saskatchewan by our policies and our belief in public ownership. It is true that in Saskatchewan whereas we have been here for this number of years endeavoring to do what we can along these lines, we have not the powers that we would have in a country where we were able to develop and control the economy as a whole. Here we have to work with the tools we have, and we do work in a limited sphere, but still we have accomplished a good deal, through the years.

We have built the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for one thing. This has taken power to virtually all the towns and villages and hamlets of this province, as well as over 62 thousand farm homes — we are supplying power for industry and the average rate for electricity has been cut from 5.54 cents per kilowatt hour in 1944 to 2.82 cents in 1961 — cut in half while we have been

doing that. We have been taking gas to 112 communities in the province with sixteen more slated for this summer.

Now this afternoon while he was speaking the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) said some things along this line. I got rather well acquainted with the hon. member from Pelly when we served on the Liquor Committee, back in 1958. I don't know if the type of committee we were on had anything to do with it, but I have always rather liked this gentleman ever since, and he did say this afternoon something that was rather true. He said in regard to the debt that had been accumulated (this is what I understood him to say) the debt that had been accumulated by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation — this has to be paid off by the same people as are the taxpayers of the country. I wish that were true. I did say that we have taken electric power to 62 thousand farmers in the province, but I am sorry there must be at least another 25 thousand farms that we have not taken electricity to, and I don't think those people are paying any money toward paying off the debt of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. We have taken the gas to 112 communities of the province, but there are hundreds of communities that do not have gas I am sorry to say, and these people will not be helping to pay off the debt of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

We have besides these things the Government Insurance Office, Automobile Insurance Act, provided for the people of Saskatchewan the cheapest insurance in North America. Crown corporations have developed our resources, given employment to thousands, and excluding the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Saskatchewan Government Telephones have earned nearly \$13 million for the people of this province up to the end of December 1961.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of our slogan of humanity first.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — We take a little beating sometimes because of this slogan; we are sneered at and scoffed at. So what? I am still proud of it. So far as our payments in regard to social welfare are concerned we get kicked on one side because we are too high and we get kicked on the other side because we are paying too little, but I do believe the Department of Social Welfare is doing a just and a good job in this regard in this province, in administering

**March 19, 1962**

the monies which are entrusted to their care, and no one in this province goes without.

We are not as rich as some other provinces, we don't have their largesse to distribute, but we were the first province to give supplementary allowances and there are a good many provinces to this day that do not give them.

We have taken the lead in regard to the building of senior citizen homes and providing geriatric centres for our older people. We have our air ambulance program which is still unique in North America and our free cancer treatment program is only now being followed in other provinces. Our hospitalization program has been adopted throughout all of Canada, and we are in the lead in regard to the number of hospital beds per thousand of population. These things, Mr. Speaker, are the proof of our beliefs in humanity first, and I think they go to prove that we have made good our stand in this regard.

Now we are bringing in another program, a prepaid universal medical care program which I think in spite of the objections of the people opposite is going to be another great milestone in this program of humanity first.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — Again I find myself quoting the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie). He was speaking this afternoon of the high taxation and how terrible it was to impose this on the unemployed. I think he must have been referring to the education and health tax, it seems to me that would be the one that would be applicable to the words he was saying. I would like to say that in paying for the hospitalization people who are unemployed would be paying a good deal less than the average people in the province for the cost of their medical care program, and I think it will be a real boon to them in times of unemployment, in times of want. You know we have had rather hard times at Swift Current the last year too when our crops were not too good, and we are not looking forward to too good a time possibly in the coming year, unless we have a good crop. We have had a medical care program there, but you don't hear anybody saying "Let us do away with it because of the hard times." This is the time when we need that sort of thing. These are the times when you want that guarantee that you are not going to find yourselves in a bad position on account of no coverage for medical care, and besides that in the Swift Current area we are paying the sum of \$24 as a poll tax which will be at

lest twice what is proposed under our government of Saskatchewan Medical Care Plan. For this year, the hard year you are talking about, no poll tax is being proposed. I think this is a good thing to have in a hard year. I want to say again that we of the CCF NDP are going forward in the best traditions of democratic socialism anywhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about my department, the Department of Municipal Affairs — about one of its branches, the assessment branch. I am sure all members of the house know the principle under which our property taxation is laid out, not only in this province, but I believe property taxation anywhere. The municipal council has the assessment of their municipality drawn up, they go through and prepare their budgets and they decide how much they are going to spend on the various items in the coming year. Then they divide the amount to be raised by the amount of the assessment and they strike what the mill rate is going to be for that year. The higher the amount of the assessment the lower the mill rate will be, and vice versa — the lower the total amount of the assessment, and they have to raise a given amount of money, the higher the mill rate will be. I think this is basic, quite understandable. Under these circumstances if a ratepayer increases the amount of his assessment, if he buys more property, or increases the value of it, he will pay a larger percentage of the overall taxes of the municipality, and it is important in a property taxation set-up of this kind that the assessment be very equally and fairly carried out.

It is the duty of our assessment branch to do this, and in so doing they have a long and a very good record behind them. Back in 1939, Mr. C.H. Freeman, proposed and developed a system of property evaluation which has since been known as the Freeman system, and has been well received in this province and other provinces beyond our borders have recognized the value and rightness of the Freeman Assessment principle. At that time, before 1945, all the province was assessed except the cities over 15 thousand. They were all assessed throughout the province at that time. Since then our basic concept in regard to assessment has not changed, the same principles and the same values in regard to land values are used today as they were then. Some of the land has changed.

You take a person who, back in 1945, had a quarter section which was probably largely unbroken land, and on that he was assessed at a certain value and he paid certain taxes in regard to that land. Possibly a few

**March 19, 1962**

years later he broke this land up and the value of that land increased, but through the years the man next to him whose land had been broken prior to the last assessment has been paying taxes on a certain assessment which is no doubt higher than that of the man who had not his land broken when the assessment was made. Through the years a lot of unfairness was bound to creep in, in the changes in regard to land through time.

Another way in which land values have changed is at the time the assessment was made that I am referring to, it was near the end of the drought in the 1930's and much of the land was in rather poor condition, from wind erosion, had been allowed to grow up with grass and weeds and the assessors looking at that land were inclined to place it at a lower value than what they would if they had come a few years after and seen it after it had been cleared up and brought back into good cultivation, and they would have been prepared to put the assessment up.

Through the years a certain amount of discrepancy is bound to creep in with regard to our assessment, and municipalities have from time to time asked that their municipalities be reassessed in the interest and fairness to the ratepayers of their municipality.

Another way in which some land values have changed is, although the basic concept of taxation in regard to the amount paid for certain types of land have not changed, our assessment men in their studies of soil have come to change their opinions in regard to some soils compared to other types of soils, and their ideas have changed of the relative values.

So when municipalities ask that their municipalities be reassessed and reassessment is carried out, because the actual assessment base has not changed, the assessment value of some quarter sections will be raised, and the assessment value of some other quarter sections will be lowered, because they have improved or because of some change in the assessed valuation of different types of soil they rise. Because it has deteriorated or because the assessment people have changed their ideas in regard to the values of certain types of solid the assessment may go down. In an overall picture throughout the province there is more improvement than deterioration in regard to the land and in the overall picture our assessment has gone up, where they have been reassessed, and besides that there has been added to them the assessment of oil and pipelines and other industrial developments,



so these all tend to raise the assessment.

Besides doing this work our assessment people are called in where there are appeals called for in regard to courts of revision, and they assess many different parcels of land in order to endeavor to obtain for the municipality a fair and an equitable base on which to assess the taxes of that municipality.

We have a different pattern in the urban. When assessed back in 1945 the urbans were assessed on the basis of 60 per cent of the 1938 value of the property. In recent years this basis of assessment has been changed to 60 per cent of the 1947 value of the land. It gives a more realistic valuation and in assessing land these figures were found desirable by many of the urbans because it assists them in obtaining a high enough assessment to enable them to put in waterworks and other improvements. Where one town is assessed and the property value raised in comparison to surrounding villages or towns in the given school district or school units, the property taxes are based on an equalization figure in order to achieve equity in that regard, so that overall taxes paid by the community are not raised because of the assessment. The place where a man has through the years not been paying as high as taxes as his property demanded in relation to other peoples' taxes is the only man who in having his assessment raised, has had his taxes raised, because of the assessment men coming in that area. The taxes in general are not raised by the assessment. The only people who have their assessment raised is one who aside from this reassessment would not have been carrying their fair and equitable share of the tax load of that community, and that is why these reassessments are requested by the municipalities involved.

Our assessment branch is only interested in arriving at a fair, equitable basis of taxation throughout the province, and has given excellent service in this regard through the years. It has neither the power nor the desire to raise taxation, but simply to provide a fair and equitable basis for taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize I have been rather vocal and long winded in describing to you and to the members of this house this work of our assessment branch, and I do however have a reason for being very explicit in trying to clarify this subject for the members of this legislature.

**March 19, 1962**

If I might burden you with a short illustration of why I am doing this, I would like to tell you about a certain well known lawyer of this city, of very good reputation, who some years ago I understand was pleading a case in the Court of Appeal. In so doing he went into all the intricate details of the law in regard to the case he was pleading, and was going on at great lengths with some things that were elementary in regard to the principles of law, until the judge who was trying the case stopped him. He said, "Sir you are insulting the intelligence of this court by going into such details. Everybody in the court knows the principles of law that you are expounding and you are insulting our intelligence by going into such details." The lawyer replied, "My lord, that was the mistake I made in assuming that in the Court of the Kings Bench, and I don't intend to make that mistake here."

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear and that it is understood what I have to say. I have in my hand a clipping from a newspaper, Leader-Post, December 8, 1961, where the Leader of the Opposition was speaking at Ceylon, Saskatchewan and this was the quote:

"In a year where the economy is as difficult because of drought and repression you would think they would leave us alone, but instead they have a flock of tax assessors going around the province raising your land taxes."

I think this is inaccurate, unfair to our men who are doing their utmost to do a good job for the benefit of the municipalities, and just plain silly. You, Mr. Speaker, would not allow me to impute any motives that were not good, and I can only thus gather that the Leader of the Opposition was doing this in ignorance.

Another branch of the department of which I would like to draw your attention at this time is that of the auditing, accounting, and inspection branch. This is an important branch of our department which draws up our statistics. When you go to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics you get a lot of statistics in regard to municipal government and this is the branch of our department, the branch of government which provides this sort of thing.

They also give guidance and help to municipal secretaries and municipal councils. Their duty is to recommend the best procedures that they know, and which

they know will be of benefit to the people of that community, to the council and to the secretary-treasurers. Three have been in the past some instances of where there has been maladministration and they have had to put an administrator in to do the work in that municipality. This has not happened in Saskatchewan for a good many years. The controls that are administered by them are meant to be a help and a guidance to the rural municipalities and it would be appreciated by any municipality if we were in a position to be able to give this kind of help and guidance to all municipalities.

I know when I was a municipal man, a municipal reeve or councillor, in the R.M. of Saskatchewan Landing, we were always glad to see the municipal inspector come around. They were welcome visitors in our office, and I am sure that is still the case throughout Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are quite a few things more I would like to say about the work of the Department of Municipal Affairs, but I do not find myself in a position to be able to do that today, and I would beg your leave to adjourn the debate.

(debate adjourned)

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Act, 1960.**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, just a brief explanation of this bill. The explanation is outlined but just briefly to recap for the benefit of hon. members. The first amendment — an amendment to give authority to the board to employ agents to not only sell crop insurance but to also look after appraisals and this sort of thing, and No. three is a change to set back from February 1st to April 1st the date after which the board may terminate contract of insurance, and number four again is a change of date. At present the premiums are required to be paid not later than January 31st, and this has been extended in time to June 15th.

This will probably involve not only an extension of time but time payments, payments on instalments with deferred payments to a later date.

**March 19, 1962**

Section five is an amendment that probably needs a bit of explanation. At the present time the section reads 20 per cent of all premiums paid and payable and the premiums paid to the board in the fiscal year. It amounts to the same thing. For example in the case of the original section it was 20 per cent of 100 per cent of the premiums paid and payable and in the case of the amendment it is 25 per cent or 100 per cent of the total amount of all premiums paid to the board in that fiscal year.

The only difference in section 6 is self-explanatory and it is a provision that would provide that no license would be required by the insurance agent of the board for a municipality.

The other amendment, 24A, this would provide for an entering into an agreement — I am sorry it is amendment number 6, amendment to section 23 which is repealed and rewritten. It is rewritten to comply with an agreement with Ottawa, whereby authorization can be provided for reinsurance with the federal government.

With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

**Mr. Bernard D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not any of these crop insurance sales agents have been appointed before the bill was passed.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — No.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, I think with the answer that has been given to that particular question by the minister . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The question has not been proposed yet.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Excuse me.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, as I was just saying, in view of the answer that was just given by the minister, which is a surprise I want to say at least, there has been advertisements in all the papers for some weeks now by agents of

the board soliciting business in the province, and yet the minister claims no agents have been appointed, and due to the lateness of the hour tonight which I think would preclude the conclusion of any discussion on the particular changes in this bill, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

(debate adjourned)

**Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Western Development Museum Act.**

**Hon. I.C. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — This act would give authority to the museum board to select its own chairman and secretary, and with this explanation I would move the second reading.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Before the hon. member takes his seat I wonder if I could ask him a question. How is the board appointed and where from?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The board is appointed by the minister — the minister also appointed the secretary and chairman of the board previously, and this provides that the board itself will elect its own chairman and its secretary.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Brand and Brand Inspection Act.**

**Hon. I.C. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, this is a simple amendment to let Indians on the reserve register a livestock brand.

With this explanation I move the second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I move the adjournment of the house.

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