

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature  
19th Day

Tuesday, March 20, 1962.

QUESTION RE EXPLORATIONS

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Premier. I was going to ask this question of the Minister of Mineral Resources, but since he is not in his seat and because of the importance of the question I am going to direct it to the Premier. Has the government received a telegram from Kerr-Addison Gold Mines, that they are halting all exploration work and prospecting in Saskatchewan, because of unfavourable government legislations? If so will the government immediately consider changing the mineral disposition regulations of 1961?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources is absent today because of an invitation to take part in some proceedings in the city of Calgary relative to the mineral industry in the province and Canada. Since the Minister of Mineral Resources is absent today because of an invitation which takes him to Calgary to take part in the meeting in connection with the petroleum industry, I have no information with regard to the statement which the hon. member has made. I have every doubt that there is anything in the regulations which would in any way cause such a decision to be made. Certainly the government will look into it and see if there is anything unfair or untenable with regard to any of its legislation or any of its regulations at any time.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, might I direct a further question to the Premier. Does the Premier know that if these regulations are not changed there are other companies who may within the next few weeks take similar action to that which has already been taken by Kerr-Addison Gold Mines?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier doesn't know and I doubt very much whether the Leader of the Opposition knows either.

**March 20, 1962**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . this province under the socialists.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We cannot debate a question.

### **QUESTION: MINERAL CONTRACTS**

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called would the Attorney General tell us the present state of affairs with regard to mineral renegotiations that are being carried on between the farmers and the government?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I could not accept that as a question because that would take a very lengthy answer. A question is something that could be answered in a short form, and I couldn't permit a question of this kind.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order may I say that it is also objectionable because the whole question is presently before the courts.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a further question then. What offer has the government made in an attempt to settle this matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! As was pointed out this question of renegotiations is before the court and cannot be discussed here.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask before what court in the province?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, this is presently before Mr. Justice Disberry.

### **QUESTION: MEDICAL HEALTH**

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister

of Health. Is he yet in a position to tell the house and the province what progress he is making in getting the College of Physicians and Surgeons to sit down at a table, and negotiate with the government as to the medical plan. I am sure by now he has had a chance to read their letter.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — I have, Mr. Speaker, had the opportunity of reading the letter, but I have not yet had the opportunity of replying to it. When this is done no doubt the College of Physicians and Surgeons at that time will know what is in the mind of the government and at that time perhaps we will be able to let the Leader of the Opposition know.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Is the government considering altering or modifying the bill for medical care which they brought in at the last session?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is contained in the letters that we have sent to the doctors' organizations, namely that we are prepared to consider any change that they can establish will assist the profession in adapting its position to the act. Until we have a meeting, and I told the Leader of the Opposition the other day, it is impossible really to know what is in the act precisely that seems to offend.

### 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)

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, in continuation of my remarks of yesterday evening, I would like to stress the importance of municipal government in this province. I notice in the budget that is proposed at this time there is an item of some \$2,400,000 for this purpose and I think that this matter of local government in the province of Saskatchewan is a very important matter and deserves our utmost consideration. Back in 1944 when addressing the SARM convention, Mr. J.J. Smith, who many of you will remember as deputy minister of this province for nearly 26 years had this to say:

**March 20, 1962**

“Municipalities were the birth-place of democracy and democracy still depends on their vitality. A vital local government is absolutely essential to a successful operation of democracy.”

This is very true today and it is up to all to see that local governments in this province remain vital and increase in vitality as the years go by.

I believe one of the more interesting items to be discussed today that is under consideration by my department is that question of municipal reorganization which has had a good deal of discussion throughout the province in the last couple of years. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a new question. In fact in the latter part of the last century in what was then the Northwest Territories which is now Saskatchewan there was a move made to endeavour to organize local government throughout that part of the area. It was attempted on a basis of one township to four township areas. It was not too successful. At the last session of the Northwest Territories legislature there was appropriated some \$5 thousand for an enquiry into the subject of municipal organization but nothing was done at that time in this regard. In 1906 at the first session of the Saskatchewan legislature a commission was set up to study the organization of municipalities and municipal taxation. As a result of this commission, in 1908 acts of the legislature were brought down setting up The City Act, The Town Act and The Village Act. In 1909 The Rural Municipalities Act was passed. Mr. Speaker, this has proved to be good legislation. This has stood on the books of the province for over 50 years and like the municipal men who had administered this act, it has served Saskatchewan well.

I would like to say a word here about municipal men, both rural and urban. It just may be that I am slightly prejudiced because I did spend nine years on a municipal council, but I feel that municipal men are the salt of the earth, that there are none in the country who give better service for less pay and take more abuse in endeavouring to carry out a job and doing a good job in serving the public in regard to doing what they are asked to do.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — I would like to say also in my opinion that these small nine townships and rural municipalities which were

set up by the Department of Municipal Affairs at that time have a good deal to recommend them — that they have served a good purpose in the province and that they have been useful to the province and that they still to this day have a good deal to recommend them. The councillor with this township and a half division which he has to service is well acquainted with this area. He has a close contact with the people and there are many ways in which he can do service for the area and the people in an economical way that possibly might not be so easily done in a larger set-up. I maintain to this day that there are many things in favour of the smaller municipal areas as they are today, but I wish to point out also that there are some disadvantages as well.

The first that I would like to point out to you today is in the matter of size. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a larger municipal area could be used to advantage by the rural municipalities of this province to obtain a more economic operation and better use of their machinery and other equipment. Just the same as a large farmer can obtain better use of his machinery and equipment and can usually produce grain more economically than what a smaller farmer can. I think the same principle can be applied to the benefit and profit of the municipalities today if they had a larger area. I believe also that a larger area for municipal government could help to provide a stronger government economically and one able to provide the better services that are desired by the people of the community, just as a large urban centre can provide services which cannot be provided by a small urban centre. You have a stronger government in the larger urban centres and large tax base so they can do things in towns and cities that just can't be done in the villages and hamlets. Just the same as our nine township municipalities today can provide a better service along these lines than could have been provided by a one township and four township municipalities that were envisaged in the last century, just so I believe a larger area in municipal jurisdiction could be of benefit to the people today, and our better travel and communication facilities that we have at the present time make such a thing possible. Back in the horse-and-buggy days you just couldn't have had these larger areas but what I am speaking of today in regard to larger areas for municipal local government is quite feasible.

Secondly, I believe that in building municipal areas around a service centre has much to advocate it to us. It is different from these nine township municipalities that are just drawn on the map of Saskatchewan like a grid and the municipalities at the

**March 20, 1962**

present time are in many cases just a block in this grid with no specific relations to community or of any service centres in the area. I feel that this larger municipal unit, built around these service centres would give a larger sphere of unity in the area. At the present time you have, even the small municipalities, some people whose interests go this way and others whose interests go the other way, whereas in a municipality which is centred around a certain service centre there would be more unity of interests in that area. You would also give farmers in all cases an interest in their specific roads to this centre. At the present time there are many cases where the road towards the town which he wishes to go lies for a short distance in his municipality and the rest of the way he is travelling in another municipality. This specific farmer pays nothing for the upkeep of his road and he has nothing to say about the upkeep of his road. I don't think this is a good situation to exist.

It also would do away with a problem which often comes to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, where a municipality has built up a grid pattern in their own municipality and they wish an outlet to a centre or a highway or some other outlet in the municipality, but there are a few miles in there which are not in their jurisdiction and they depend upon neighbouring municipalities to build these roads for them. In many cases, the neighbouring municipality is not interested in building this road and justifiably so as it doesn't serve their ratepayers so why should they be interested in building a road which serves the ratepayers of another municipality. If we had municipalities drawn on a basis on which the main service centre of the area was in that municipality then these roads would lead toward that centre and a good many of these troubles which we have today in the rural municipalities would be eliminated.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that coterminous boundaries between school units and the larger municipal units would be of great benefit. It would simplify the relations between the rural municipal councils and our school units as well as possibly such other organizations as ag. rep. districts or union hospital districts or others along that line. At the present time we have school units who have to deal with a dozen or more rural municipalities and at the same time we have rural municipalities that have to deal with more than one school unit. It unnecessarily complicates the work that is carried on between the school units and the municipalities. If you have one school unit dealing with one municipality it would greatly facilitate the work that is to be done. I think this is elementary and all will agree with this point.

Going further, point four, in a country system in which the function of the school and municipal government were brought together it would also provide beneficial results for the people of the area. I believe it would eliminate a good deal of friction, not that there is such a lot of friction between municipal governments and school unit boards, but it would eliminate this where it does arise, because it would be the same people handling these problems. It would give opportunity for better overall planning. When you have one group planning their share of the budget in regard to education and another group planning their share of the budget in regard to municipal work, you don't have the same co-operation between them. When it comes to deciding on roads, the school people are wishing certain roads in regard to the bus routes, but the municipality is not always consulted in regard to these things and build roads elsewhere. I feel if it were under the same board that this sort of planning would be facilitated. It would lead to more equitable finance. Instead of leaving municipal men to pick up the balance of the tax money which is available for their use and allowing other local governments to requisition what they need, when the budgets were being proposed they could sit down together and discuss these things and work together in developing what the budget and the tax rate should be for a given county area.

I think it would also give more clear-cut authority and responsibility to the people who are in charge of the government. At the present time one group handled other things in the area and it is a little hard sometimes to decide where authority starts and where authority ends and where responsibility starts and where responsibility ends. If they were under the one board, and all these things were handled by the one board, this sort of trouble would be kept to a minimum. This is very briefly what I think would be some of the benefits that could be derived from reorganization of municipalities.

As I have said before, I freely admit that there are many virtues in the smaller municipalities and I am quite prepared to admit that there are drawbacks in regard to larger municipal units. But as I have pointed out I believe that the larger municipal units have a good many virtues as well. I believe it was Mr. Lincoln who said:

“That the true rule in determining whether to reject or embrace anything is not whether there is evil in it but whether there is more evil than good.”

**March 20, 1962**

Mr. Speaker, on balance I believe that the larger, community-centre, coterminous areas have much to recommend them and we should earnestly consider reorganization along this pattern.

Now this is not something that has been dreamed up by the Saskatchewan government. This has been successfully used in the province of Alberta for many years. It has also been successfully used in the states to the south of us. It has been recommended to the government by the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life as well as by the Local Government Continuing Committee. After seeing these things carried out in other places, adopted and used successfully and recommended for use in this area, if this government had failed to make it available to the people of this province — this that has been recommended and set out by these other people — we would have been guilty of gross neglect and mismanagement.

The Local Government Continuing Committee looked at this problem. As you know they spent a good many months in doing so and when they presented their report they recommended that no vote be given to the people of the province in regard to the setting up of this reorganization principal. They presented quite convincing arguments. After a good deal of study and in consultation with local government groups throughout the province, the government decided to reject this proposal. They decided to allow each area to decide for themselves whether and in what manner they wish to be organized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a good many people in the province today who maintain that it would have been better to have organized the whole province without a vote the same as was done in Alberta. We would have a more uniform picture of local government than what we are liable to have by allowing each area to decide for itself. Many maintain that this would have been the better way to go about it. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to argue that in the long run the best form of local government is that which is chosen by the people themselves.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — See if you can stay with it.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — They don't clap over there.



**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — As far as boundaries are concerned, we have not been able to devise any way in which we would have a vote on boundaries. This is a many-sided problem, whether the boundaries should go here in this case, or over there in another case. It seemed to us that the only way that this can be satisfactorily handled is by a boundary commission. I believe there has been a good deal of agreement on the part of local government people in regard to this.

We have set up a boundary commission by enlarging the municipal advisory commission which is now composed of Dean Cronkite, former Dean of Law at the University of Saskatchewan; Dr. Fisher, former president of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities; Mr. McGillvary, former president of the School Trustees Association; Mr. Thomas Garland, the former president of the Association of Rural Municipalities and a former school unit board chairman; Mr. Les Johnson, a former reeve of a municipality; Mr. A.B. Douglas, former president of the School Trustees Association. Mr. Douglas at the present time is acting in an advisory capacity to the commission. Now this commission is working throughout the province, meeting with people on the local levels, at the municipal councils, the school unit boards, village councils in many cases and other interested bodies, endeavouring to find out what would be the best possible boundaries for local government in the province of Saskatchewan — not only school unit boundaries but boundaries for any type of local government that might choose to use them. They are endeavouring to find what would be the best possible boundaries that can be decided upon. They will form their tentative decisions and then they will go back to inform the people of what their tentative decisions are and give them an opportunity to express themselves in regard to these opinions. They will make a final report to the government, quite possibly area by area throughout the province. The government will study their submissions and will decide what the local government boundaries should be and will proclaim them — possibly again area by area throughout the province.

It is expected that school units will adjust immediately or as soon as possible to the areas in most cases. But the rural municipalities are under no compulsion whatsoever to adopt these boundaries for themselves. They may remain exactly as they are except that in a case where people of the area do decide to set up a larger municipal unit. Where the boundary of that

**March 20, 1962**

unit cuts through a municipality, that part of a municipality that falls within the area will become part of that area and the part that falls outside the boundary will become part of a neighbouring municipality may remain as it is, or may join into another larger municipal area. Aside from that, rural municipalities may remain exactly as they are and no compulsion whatsoever will be brought on them to change.

If the people in those areas wish to reorganize their local governments it is my intention to bring into this house, within a week or so, an act which will permit them to do so. At the present time, if an area wished to set up a county or a larger municipal unit they could not do so under present legislation. We expect to bring down an act which will allow them to do so if they wish. In this act will be set out procedure by which they will be able to go about setting up votes for the people of those areas. I will make it clear here that people will have a free vote in regard to this, to vote for what they want — the larger municipal units or whether they want to remain as they are or whether they want to go into a county. They will have a very good opportunity to express themselves and to vote in regard to this.

Last summer the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities requested that a local government council should be set up to advise with the government in regard to municipal organization in this province. This council was to be set up from members of the organization of the urban municipalities and also the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. Three members from each. This has been done and is now composed of Mr. Nicks, the president of the School Trustees Association, Mrs. Kinglsey also of that association and Mr. Thornton their secretary; Mr. Robert Dahl, the president of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association; Mr. Bye, a member of their executive and Mr. Connors their secretary; Mr. Hamilton, the president of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and Mr. Irvine, the vice-president has served with him as well as Mr. Wilkinson, their secretary.

We have had several meetings with the local government council. They have met with the Hon. Mr. Turnbull, the Minister of Education and myself as well as a couple of meetings with the Municipal Advisory Commission. We have found these meetings with them to be very worthwhile and have been productive of a good deal of understanding and of assistance to us in forming our policies regarding organization and in bringing down the legislation which is proposed for this session. In

fact I might say that quite a few of their suggestions that were advanced at these meetings have been accepted by the government in regard to these things.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank publicly these people who have made this contribution to municipal reorganization in this province. They have given their services freely. They are not paid for their time in regard to this and I wish to thank them for the time they have taken and the work they have done in this regard.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — It is our intention, Mr. Speaker, that boundaries of the local government areas will be set up as we receive the advice from the Municipal Advisory Commission, when they make up their minds as to what they feel are the best possible boundaries for local government in the province. It is our intention that these boundaries will be proclaimed and made available to the people of the province to reorganize their local governments if they see fit and so wish. I believe in view of the recommendations that have been made to us by committees and commissions, in view of the example of neighbouring provinces and states, and it is up to us to make these things available to the people of the province if they so desire. It is not our desire in any way to weaken local government in this province but to strengthen and to revitalize it. I believe it can be done by making these things available and allowing the people to move forward in this way if they so desire.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — I believe that we should press forward, alert to the possibilities of new ways and new things and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, cherishing the best traditions of the past and profiting by the experience of what has gone before.

At this time there is another matter that I should like to mention in regard to the situation which due to the short crop last year may prevail in a good many areas of our province. I realize that many farmers this spring find themselves short of the finance they need to put in their crop and to do their summerfallowing and to do their farm work as it should be done. The government is again this spring making available to these people assistance through The Seed Grain and Supply Act.

**March 20, 1962**

Under this act the rural municipalities pass a bylaw which is approved by the Department of Municipal Affairs and then the municipality may go to a local bank and borrow the money which they need and make these advances to the farmers and the provincial government is prepared to guarantee 75 per cent of any ultimate losses. It is our desire that sufficient finance be made available to all the farmers of the province for their farming operations during the spring and summer.

There are quite a few more things, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to speak on in regard to our grid road program this coming year which will be going forward. We have now some 7,100 miles of road out of our proposed 12 thousand miles and we propose to carry on our program this year under this proposed budget the same as was done last year, in spite of the rather restricted financial position that the government finds itself in. I feel that this grid road program is a very good one and one that is well accepted by the people of this province. In fact we have out of some 296 municipalities, we have 287 taking part in this program as well as eleven LID's and a good many towns and villages.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made it clear that I cannot support the amendment but I will support the motion.

**Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, before entering this debate I wish to go along with others who have spoken in this house since yesterday afternoon and add my condolences to the family of the late Mr. McIntosh. We who have been associated with him through the years have grown to love him and to admire him for his kindly nature, for his sincere belief, and his friendly advice. We, his friends, will miss him in months and years ahead as I know his family will.

I would first like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the bringing down of his first budget. I think that his delivery was outstanding and I might say that of all the budgets that I have heard brought down in this house, his was the easiest to follow. This budget, that I believe is based on the philosophy of the CCF — New Democratic Party, proves the Provincial Treasurer's faith and his visions, and his confidence in Saskatchewan, and its people.

Before going any further I would like to thank my colleague the Minister of Highways. I was quite

pleased, and I am sure my constituents were pleased when they heard his announcement on the program of highway improvement in Touchwood for the coming year. I would like to say that I certainly am pleased, and I am sure that all residents realize that the oiling of No. 35 from the valley to Lipton to Junction No. 22 is a most important move. Anybody who had travelled that road on a Sunday or a holiday weekend knew that the dust conditions were terrible. I also want to congratulate him on the new program that he announced of sharing the costs of making the highways through villages and towns dust free. I am sure that all residents of villages and towns who have this done will certainly appreciate it.

I listened closely to the financial critic's remarks a week ago Monday and although his presentation may have been better than usual I will say that it was practically the same cracked old record of by-gone years. Thinking back I would have imagined that after the Liberal Party lost the elections in 1952, 1956 and 1960, they would have dreamed up a new red herring to drag in front of the people of Saskatchewan. I was especially amused, Mr. Speaker, when he started off by saying there were certain things that he agreed with the Provincial Treasurer on. After listening to him I found out that the only thing he agreed with the Provincial Treasurer on was when the Provincial Treasurer criticized the federal government. This is a little different then — a few years ago when there was Liberal government at Ottawa. Now he finds it is quite easy to agree with the Provincial Treasurer on any criticism that is made of the federal government.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Different government you bet.

**Mr. Meakes:** — But he did make a few remarks that I feel I must challenge. In his usual wild and irresponsible manner . . .

**An Opposition Member:** — Here we go again.

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . he made a lot of statements which I consider of necessity were not all facts. He went on and he blamed this government for the financial plight of local governments and he said, "This provincial government has refused to share with local governments the monies received from Ottawa." Mr. Speaker, I say that this statement is not true. Let us look at the

**March 20, 1962**

record. Last year the provincial government received from the federal government around \$41 million. What was done with this money? First, in education, the provincial government spent \$41 million in advancing education, in comparison to 1943-44 when it was less than \$3 million. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this neglecting local government?

I noticed that in 1961-62 this government spent \$6½ million in agriculture in comparison to \$493 thousand in 1944. Again I ask is this neglecting local government?

**Mr. MacDougall:** — What was the total budget?

**Mr. Meakes:** — In 1961-62 there was \$9 million spent in municipal affairs and grid roads in comparison to \$400 thousand in 1943. This certainly is not neglecting local government.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What is the percentage?

**Mr. Meakes:** — In 1961-62 there was \$29 million spent on health in comparison to less than \$2 million eighteen years ago. There was \$14 million spent on social welfare in comparison to \$4 million in 1943-44.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What about the percentage?

**Mr. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, I say to this Assembly that this is not neglecting local government.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — That is the speech you read last year.

**Mr. Meakes:** — No. I am not reading it this year either my friend. You can come over and look at my notes.

He then went on and he referred to the good policies of previous Liberal governments. I would like to know what these good policies were. When this government took over in 1944 they found that there had been no highways or no buildings that had been paid for and that we still owed all of it. Is this the good policies that our hon. friend the financial critic is referring to?

I say that the rural people of this province appreciate what this government is doing. For instance

in grid roads: In 1955-56 when I was campaigning in my constituency I was afraid to drive anywhere after a rain because I was getting stuck half the time. Now if I can get two miles to a grid road I can go any place regardless of what the weather is. When I go back and think of 20 years ago and the education facilities of the rural children I marvel at the progress. I know that when I went to school that for the average child, if he got Grade VII or Grade VIII, this was a good education. Today with transportation, better schools, we are finding that rural children have the opportunity to finish their high school education. If they want to continue there is assistance from this government in helping them to continue on to university.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Let us look at what this government has done in the electrical field, electrification of rural communities, and I am not going to say much about this because the people of Saskatchewan know and appreciate it. I am going to use the words the Minister of Agriculture used one time — that the rural electrification program had not only lit up the farms of Saskatchewan but it had lit up the hearts and the souls of the farm people of Saskatchewan.

Now we are going into a plan of sewer and water which again is another plan to try and keep the rural people of Saskatchewan on the farms by giving them a few more of the amenities of life. Mr. Speaker, the financial critic wandered all over the world but he did land at one time in Western Germany. He made the statement that in Western Germany prosperity was unequalled in the western world. I am not going to challenge this statement, but what he didn't do — he didn't tell us that Western Germany has the highest taxes in the western world. Western Germany has had a medical care program for all its citizens since 1870. He didn't point out that since the last war the United States, (and I am not condemning this) the United States is pouring billions of dollars into Western Germany to make it the showcase of the western world. Again, I want to emphasize, I am not criticizing, but he didn't tell us this. Of course, Mr. Speaker, he didn't mention the fact that in Sweden and Denmark and Norway — all with democratic socialist governments — unemployment is practically unknown. He poked fun at the word 'togetherness'. He said it was only good for a cold night. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan for the last 50 years or more have been noted for their togetherness. In the early

**March 20, 1962**

part of the century the people got together and built rural telephones. They got together. Then they started building schools and they got together with togetherness. It was not only good on a cold night, it was good anytime.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — They left the province together too.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Then coming up into the mid-twenties and the thirties they formed the anti-tuberculosis league. Again the people got together with government and municipalities and by working together they were able to fight the scourge of tuberculosis. Again I would like to say it is good not only on a cold night but good anytime. The people of Saskatchewan were the first to have free medical care. Again they got together with government and attained free medical care and it was good not only on a cold night but good anytime. I think of another example — hospitalization. The people of Saskatchewan by sharing and paying a fee got together and they were prepared to pay one another's hospital bills. Again I know that the people of Saskatchewan realize that it is not only good on a cold night but it is good anytime.

Then the financial critic went on and he made a statement that I cannot let go unchallenged. he proceeded to give his verbal support to the co-operative movement but then made the statement that he thought that private enterprise should have the same break as the co-ops did in the income tax concessions. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this shows not only the thinking of the hon. financial critic but of the Liberal Party. I would like to point out that there is only one income tax act in Canada — only one. The same act for co-operatives as for private enterprise, and if any company wants to — and some companies have — pay back refunds or dividends to their customers they do not have to pay tax on this money they have paid out. Let us get this matter straight once and for all. Co-operatives have no special consideration as far as income tax is concerned. Co-operatives do pay tax, the same taxes as any other business and I suggest that the hon. member and the Liberal Party are doing the co-operative movement in this province and of this country irreparable harm with their irresponsible talk. Of course these remarks sound very much like the remarks of their friends the Chamber of Commerce. This is the same insidious propaganda that is being spread endeavouring to destroy the co-operative movement. Of course the Liberal Party gives lip service to the co-operative movement but lip service only.



**Mr. McCarthy:** — You are wrong.

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . but behind the backs of the co-op they will use the knife.

I want to say that the attacks of the Liberal Party on men and women of this province who have spent a lifetime working in the co-operatives has forced these people to support this government. The attacks of the Chamber of Commerce and their friends the Liberal Party . . .

**Mr. MacDougall:** — You are talking about the dealers now are you?

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . will force the co-operative movement to take political action the same way as the attacks of the Liberal Party on labour forced them to take political action. If the Liberal Party continues to act as they are, spreading the propaganda of the Chamber of Commerce then it will be too bad for them. This was the reason that the co-operative movement in England, going back to 1921, decided to take political action, because they realized that the only political party in England of that day who had the same friends and the same enemies was the labour party.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Trying to get on the band wagon.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine made the remark in talking about whether co-operatives pay taxes or not he emphasized it this way. “Some people own a dog and pay taxes. Some people don’t own a dog and don’t pay taxes.”

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you that the Liberal Party is no longer liberal with the ultra-conservative leadership that they have in this province.

**An Hon. Member:** — I thought we were socialists.

**Mr. Meakes:** — I want to say to them that if there are any of those small ‘l’s’ left with the Liberals, I suggest that they would be better to leave that party and to join a dynamic political movement, the New Democratic

**March 20, 1962**

Party, under the provincial leadership of our Premier who is respected and loved across this province and under the leadership federally of not only whom I believe, but many others believe, the greatest living Canadian in government, T.C. Douglas.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — We wouldn't let you defect over here.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this budget and I am going to vote against the amendment because I believe that this budget represents the philosophy and the belief of the political party which I represent in this house. I am sure that the majority of the people of my constituency want me to support the budget brought down by the Provincial Treasurer.

**Mr. James E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, first I wish to associate myself with those words of sympathy that have been extended by my colleagues to the family and friends of the late Hon. Mr. McIntosh.

Mr. Speaker, the year 1961 was one of the most disastrous crop years that this province has gone through since 1937. In the winter of 1960-61 snowfall was light, spring run-off didn't fill the sloughs and in my country it was obvious by the middle of May that unless timely rains came to save the situation the hay and the grain crop would be complete failures. By the first of June complete cereal and fodder crop failure in the eastern part of the province was obviously inevitable. By the 15th of June it became apparent that the drought conditions affecting the eastern part of the province would be prevalent over the greater part of the entire province of Saskatchewan. All farmers and those closely in touch with farming realized by the 20th of June that the whole province faced a major disaster and that feed, both roughage and grain with which to feed a greatly expanded livestock population was going to be in shorter supply than ever before since the thirties.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I did on the 21st day of June write to the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan, drawing his attention to the

supply position of oats in this province, which according to the Board of Grain Commissioners' figures at June 7, 1961 showed total bushelage of oats in storage in the province of Saskatchewan as being 3,016,0363 bushels. In view of the drought and the potential scarcity of feed oats I urged that all stocks in elevator storage be frozen by the government in the interests of our farm economy. I further drew the minister's attention in my letter to the fodder situation. I quote herewith my letter of June 21, 1961 as follows in part:

"I also urge an immediate survey of all available and potential supplies of feed in order to insure conservation and also that a financial and transportation program be set up for the purpose of moving feed surplus to deficit areas."

Mr. Speaker, while my suggestions in regard to the movement of fodder produced some results my proposals in regard to the freezing of all available oat stocks in elevators in Saskatchewan, pending clarification of the situation, was not acted upon. The government refused to act and passed the buck to our rural municipalities suggesting that they assume storage charges which under the circumstances I think hon. members and particularly farm people will agree they could ill afford to do. As of June 21, 1961 at the eighteen shipping points in the Saltcoats constituency there was in . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — On a point of privilege. The hon. member mentioned that we passed the storage charges to the municipality. I know he wouldn't want to be incorrect. We shared the costs.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of privilege.

**Mr. Snedker:** — The minister made the suggestion that they assume the storage charges and that is what I said. Mr. Speaker, I will continue where I left off when I was so rudely interrupted.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It was the Speaker who interrupted you and not the member.

**March 20, 1962**

**Mr. Snedker:** — My apologies to you, Sir, and what I said goes for the other party. As of June 21, 1961 at the eighteen shipping points in the constituency of Saltcoats there was in off-farm storage in the elevators at that time 72 thousand bushels of oats. Now the wheat board price basis No. 1 feed at an 18¢ freight rate point at June 21, 1961 was 71¢ a bushel.

That is what anybody could have gone to any elevator in that area and bought those oats for at that time. Had the government frozen or bought the oat stocks at that date, they would have cost 71¢. Now presuming that the government would have had to hold those oats for six months, until farmers gathered up enough money to pay for them, and until they saw what their needs actually were, we must add to that price six cents a bushel or a cent a month storage charges. We then come up with a figures of 77¢ a bushel. Now at the present time oats are being shipped into my area and are being sold at 80¢ a bushel. The government, had they taken the action I recommended, could have saved my farmers at least three cents a bushel without any cost whatever to the government, but that is not all the story.

The government is presently paying approximately 22½¢ per bushel transportation subsidy on the oats that are being shipped into my area. Now when we take that into consideration and I wouldn't expect the government to pay both the storage and the subsidy, but when we take that into consideration, there is the possibility that had the government followed my advice, had they done what I suggested there would have been a net saving to farmers in my area of 19¢ a bushel for all the farmers in my area on the total amount of oats that were available in storage in the area at that time. Had that policy been adopted farmers could have obtained oats at 60½¢ a bushel instead of 80¢ which they are now paying. The saving on 72 thousand bushels of oats at 19½¢ a bushel would have amounted to \$17,280. That much at least could have been saved for the farmers in my area. That situation might also have been duplicated in other parts of the province because at the time I mentioned there were three million bushels of oats in storage in elevators which should have been made available to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Now let us look at the other side of the coin. I refer to grain that is being shipped into the municipalities. Let us take a look at the wheat board prices. The wheat board sale price then and the wheat board sale price now. The wheat board price of No. 1 feed oats

at an 18¢ freight rate shipping point, basis No. 1 feed today was 88¢ a bushel, that is what you could have gone to the elevator and bought it for. The June 21, 1961 price was 71¢ a bushel, and that is what the government could have frozen them at.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — May I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Snedker:** — No. Mr. Speaker, he can't ask a question. He can ask all the questions he likes when I get through.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — All right.

**Mr. Snedker:** — When we add eight cents a bushel for storage, allowing storage from June 1st to February 1st or for eight months, we find there is a possible saving there of nine cents a bushel at no cost to the government at all under those circumstances. Had the government been willing to pay the same subsidy on stored as on imported oats, of 22½¢ a bushel, the saving would have been 31½¢ a bushel to the farmers in my area. In other words wheat board oats that would now cost out of the elevator 88¢ a bushel, had the government of the province of Saskatchewan followed the policy of freezing oat stocks in storage at the time I recommended it be done would cost farmers 56½¢ a bushel, instead of the 88¢ it is costing in the elevator now, had the same government transportation subsidy been taken into consideration.

Surely instead of passing the buck to our rural municipalities in regard to storage the government could and should have taken action to freeze these oat stocks, and see that they remained available to our farmers. They didn't do this — they proceeded blindly down the road of waste, spend and tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just in connection with waste. When I came to this house last year I went down to the cafeteria in the basement to get a meal, one of the first things I beheld at the bottom of the stairs was a very good but old fashioned platform scale. The same type and the same kind that farmers have weighed thousands and thousands of bushels of grain on for years and also other farm produce as well. I have used one on many occasions. It was a good scale, there was nothing wrong with it, it weighed to an ounce. I weighed myself on it, and it worked very well, I can guarantee this. Then we passed through one of the worst summers we ever had, and all the

**March 20, 1962**

members of the government said that we were entering into a period of austerity and that money was getting tight. But what did I behold when I went to the bottom of the stairs in front of the cafeteria at this session of the house — a brand new nicely painted streamlined Toledo scale, costing \$152.50 of the peoples' money.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You broke the other one.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, a government that is wasteful in small affairs would be equally wasteful in large matters. Some of my people are having to pay as much as \$50 a ton for hay in my area to try and keep their cattle alive, and you squander money like this. The economic situation that the farmers are facing is becoming desperate and in this budget they have been viciously taxed by a rapacious government in order to support a gigantic propaganda machine with which to perpetuate a hide bound hierarchy of socialists in power.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — I turn now to expenditures in regard to the highway system in the province of Saskatchewan. The nature of our economy, the products which we produce and the vast area of our province makes effective transportation of vital necessity to our people. Last year, Mr. Speaker, I drew the attention of the government to the request made to the Board of Transport Commissioners by the railroads for the abandonment of railroad lines in the province of Saskatchewan. The Canadian Pacific Railroad has submitted requests to the Board of Transport Commissioners as I understand it, for permission to abandon during the next five to twenty years 1,129.8 miles of railroad. The Canadian National Railroad has similarly submitted requests to the Board of Transport Commissioners at Ottawa for permission to abandon within the next five to twenty years 1,237.3 miles of railroad. The grand total of mileage involved which the railroads have requested permission to abandon is 2,267.1 miles. Mr. Speaker, the people who live on those lines which are proposed to be abandoned, run into the thousands. The number of delivery points on the Canadian National Railroad is 194, the number of delivery points on the Canadian Pacific Railroad is 196. The total number of delivery points on the railroads which are proposed to be abandoned is 390. These points will be without rail service should the proposed abandonment proceed. Abandonment of railroads, Mr. Speaker, makes it all the more imperative that we have an efficient highway network for the fast

and speedy transportation of saleable products, and the means of production, particularly in our outlying areas.

Last year in the highways' program the government disregarded my warning which I have just repeated by making fabulous expenditures adjacent to the city of Regina. On the minister's own statement last year the Regina to Lumsden road, a distance of eighteen miles, was estimated to cost \$3 million, for an average cost per mile of \$166,666. The Regina to Balgonie road was estimated to cost \$1,200,000 for a distance of fourteen miles, or an average cost per mile of \$131,255. The all-inclusive total of 32 miles of road was to cost \$4,200,000 or an average cost per mile of \$131,250. All, Mr. Speaker, within a 21 mile radius of the city of Regina, to construct two lane, limited access highways. Almost one third of the entire capital expenditure budgeted for last year or \$4,200,000 was spent within this twenty mile perimeter of Regina. The sum of \$13,789,000 was budgeted for capital expenditure; \$4,200,000 was expended that close to this city, for a type of highway which one would expect to find, not leading to a city of only 110 thousand people, but to cities such as Kansas City, Chicago, St. Louis, or other cities with populations in excess of one million people. The tremendous expenditures in 1961 on highways adjacent to the city of Regina were a major cause of the neglect of our highways in other parts of the province. It has had the effect of forcing more and more traffic from the highways which are built and maintained entirely at the cost of the government to the grid road system, the capital cost of which is borne roughly 60 per cent by the government and 40 per cent by our rural municipalities. The maintenance costs of our grid road system are borne entirely by our rural municipalities.

Now traffic, like water, Mr. Speaker, always follows the line of least resistance. The life expectancy of a road is in direct relationship to time plus traffic volume. Having neglected our outlying and extensive highway network in the past year, the government in its present budget is making a desperate effort to stave off massive highway deteriorating in the province of Saskatchewan, by a program of expediency of too little and too late, a thing of rags and tatters and bits and pieces, a few miles here a few miles there and nothing connected together in the middle. The government this year has made no provision for new highways and inter-connecting links which are so needed an necessary, and by their failure to do so are placing an every greater strain on our grid road system.

**March 20, 1962**

You know, Mr. Speaker, I can almost sympathize with the Minister of Highways, I am sorry to see that he is not in his seat. He finds himself in the embarrassing position of trying to administer a department of government in a government which in my opinion is being operated by remote control.

The estimates for highway maintenance last year, ostensibly due to the so-called austerity program, a program which bit deeply into essentials but left the dissemination of propaganda untouched, slashed almost \$1 million from the maintenance estimates.

This should have been the very last department for any government facing rough financial weather to cut, for quite obviously if money is going to be short, and highway construction has to be curtailed, then of course the highways we have should have been maintained and kept in as good shape as possible. Already massive deterioration of our existing highway system is becoming evident, as a result of last year's maintenance appropriation reductions. This year there is to be a further reduction in the highway maintenance department of \$351,630. The total decrease for maintenance in the fiscal year 1962-63 in comparison with the fiscal year 1960-61 will be the massive sum of \$1,451,510. Here again the government is economizing at the expense of our rural municipalities by allowing the highways of our province to deteriorate still further and forcing a still greater volume of traffic from the highways to the grid road system. The maintenance of the grid roads does not cost the government a cent.

The rural municipalities made a just and a fair request when they asked that the government pay a percentage of the costs of maintenance of the grid road system. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to all the Reeves, councillors and secretaries of the rural municipalities of the province of Saskatchewan for their excellent and able administration. They serve our people well regardless of personalities or political affiliation and for no personal gain. The municipal convention which we have just witnessed is a true and democratic voice of our people. No wonder the socialists seek to destroy it, for the end of the socialists is to destroy that which they cannot control.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — I can do no other but oppose a budget which shifts the rightful obligations of the provincial government



from the government to the backs of our rural municipalities and onto our farm people. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which we have submitted to the budget is as follows:

That this Assembly urges the government to give consideration to such policies as will (1) avoid budgetary deficits; (2) reduce the public debt; (3) reduce the huge annual interest payments thereof; (4) reduce excessive administration costs; and (5) reduce the heavy and oppressive provincial taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the budget. I shall support the amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The hon. member said I could ask a question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Point of privilege?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The hon. member said I could ask him a question when he sat down.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I am going to be so offensive on the air that the hon. minister has to take up my time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all if I may, extend my congratulations to you. I don't know if I can promise to be the best behaved member in the house, but I can promise that I will be better behaved than the hon. Attorney General — but I realize this might not be very cheerful news to you.

Being a neighbour of yours in constituency as well as seat I will try and stay on your good side, Mr. Speaker, and obey the rules of the house and your rulings.

I wish too, Mr. Speaker, at this time to add my condolences to the family of the late Minister of co-operatives. I know I speak for all members on this side of the house and the people of Saskatchewan when I say that we shall miss this good and gracious man, and Saskatchewan will be the poorer for his death.

**March 20, 1962**

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have found it very difficult to get up and speak in this budget debate. I think maybe because when you get to my age, and are of the feminine sex, you get to feel more maternal than anything else, and looking across the way at these people I can't help but feel a great deal of motherly pity for them. The poor things are deserted by their leader, they have put forth a most depressing and depressed budget, and their whole attitude this session has been of sorrow and weeping. You can understand therefore it is very difficult to get up and criticize them, after all you don't like to kick anybody when they are down no matter how gently you do it. I will endeavour to be gentle.

I think actually, Mr. Speaker, all that needs to be said about this budget, in fact about this government was said by the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) when he said that "any blank fool can spend money," and I think this describes the whole thing adequately, distinctly and sincerely, and he added, and I certainly agree with him, that it takes a socialist fool to hire experts to help them spend money, and these socialists have certainly done that. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a depressing budget because this is the kind of budget that is brought forth by a government after eighteen years of socialism in this province.

As I said these people are sorrowful because they have been deserted by the former Premier, at least I hope they are deserted by the former Premier. The hon. member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) just referred to Mr. Douglas as Premier of this province, and I am wondering if he is still governing by remote control, or if there is some spiritual affinity whereby he is giving instruction to the people across the way. The hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) used to say, "them Gold Dust Twins", when Mr. Fines and Mr. Douglas were here. Well the gold has obviously gone or we wouldn't be in debt and we can't see the twins for dust, so this is a depressed government in this situation.

In addition to this the government is strait-jacketed in its own socialist theory, and be they democratic socialists, or be they any other kind of socialists, if they are truly socialists and adhere to socialist economic principles, they are in a strait-jacket. This government, Mr. Speaker, and this budget shows the effect; is burdened by debt, debts contracted by this government but of course borne by the people of Saskatchewan. This government is carrying the full weight of Parkinson's Law.

They have accumulated civil servants for civil servants for civil servants. This government is torn by suspicion, racked by self-doubt, and by an internal struggle for power. All of this shows up very plainly and I am sure the debate has demonstrated this most aptly. If these people are socialists of course, Mr. Speaker, they don't really feel they are to blame, they believe in the behaviourist theories of child psychology. It is true that the Hon. Premier certainly does and I imagine he has convinced the others. They are really the result and act according to their environment. They really haven't too much will power to do anything about this, and being the result of their environment you can understand why things are so pathetic across the way, and why this budget is a pathetic attempt. Sometimes I wonder when I see Mr. Fines is missing and no longer able to control the Attorney General, and I notice how different the Attorney General has been this session, I wonder if he has now become the spokesman for the party opposite, and if so, if the government is going to be run by him, we will probably be governed by the Hon. Attorney General's ulcers and I can understand the bitterness that is going to result.

Now sometimes when I look across the way it reminds me a little bit of East and West Germany. I think there are a number of people over there who would like to come across, but there is this invisible wall.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — Sometimes I think the people across the way realize this, certainly the hon. member from Canora (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) has the habit of yelling "fascist" to everything that is said that isn't socialist, exactly as the people over in East Germany do.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — You are expounding.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Everything we have said that was at all good about West Germany has been combatted on the other side by crying, "Oh the American dollars, the American dollars." There has been very little credit given to the good sense of the German people in the free enterprise society under which they are operating.

Now the sad state of affairs here is a contrast and a very depressing contrast, to the virility

**March 20, 1962**

of the people outside of this house, and I was very happy to take a day off from this house and go back to my own constituency to a Rural Life Conference that was held there. There were people there, Mr. Speaker, of every political color, of every type of religion, who sat around and calmly and conscientiously and sincerely sought for a solution to the problems that are facing rural life and the people living in the rural districts of this province. They wanted to help themselves, they wanted to help others, and for one day it was simply wonderful to hear no mention of politics and I didn't hear the word Hazen or Argue mentioned once. This certainly was a change from being in the house, and sometimes I think it is most essential that the hon. cabinet ministers get back to the country once in a while, to have a breath of sanity and good sense instilled in them, and this would certainly show in better government and a better budget.

Unfortunately in this budget debate, Mr. Speaker, and due to the lack of time, we debate only general principles, and sometimes I do think that people that are in the country, and who listen to this debate on the air, wonder what is really being done about their money and the budgeting of it. They don't realize we are going to go into estimates where item by item, when the opposition will have an opportunity to scrutinize the spending or the contemplated spending of the government and where we will be in a position to give constructive criticism as to what this government should do.

The budget sets out the general principles governing the spending and the debate of course covers these general principles. What are the general principles set out by the new Premier of Saskatchewan and the new Provincial Treasurer? First of all, and this is a theme on which the new Premier can wax very eloquent, they say we should be very proud to pay taxes. Perhaps they have something there, but I think most of the people of Saskatchewan would agree with me when I say that I could be twice as proud for half the money, if they only spent it reasonably.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — Well you would hardly call me big business if you saw my bank overdraft. I think we speak for all the people in Saskatchewan. I don't think this is a matter of class distinction. I think this is a matter of common interest. The cost of government should be as light as possible, because the cost that goes out of the pockets

of people to pay for government is not spent by them usefully in other purposes to bring new wealth into being. I think this is an economic fact that most people in Saskatchewan have faced even though the government hasn't.

The Hon. Attorney General told us yesterday that services are free only because the taxpayers are prepared to pay for them. Now this is quite a change. You know, I do think our new Premier and the new Provincial Treasurer have had some effect on the Hon. Attorney General, because Premier Douglas, or Mr. Douglas, when he was Premier promised that we wouldn't have to have taxes, not the ordinary common people such as you and I — the only people that would pay taxes, according to Mr. Douglas, and he is saying this now in the federal field, are mortgage companies, big corporations and the rest of the tab should be picked up by the crown corporations which would be creating new wealth for Saskatchewan because we would be turning wheat into plastics, and dirt into oil. All these technological advances were predicted by him and promised by him prior to 1944, and are being promised by him today on a national scale, and yet today after eighteen years of socialism in this province, the Hon. Attorney General suddenly wakes up and says, services are free only because the taxpayers are prepared to pay for them. Now this is really a change. The crown corporations were going to pay for all social services, and if you will remember some of the speeches of the ex-Premier, all medical care including dental and drugs, was going to be paid out of the terrific profits of the crown corporations, instead of going out of this province into the hands of the greedy capitalists. Then the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs said last night, "My! These crown corporations are wonderful, they have returned \$13 million to the people of Saskatchewan." Well, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't even pay the interest charges that the people of Saskatchewan have to pay in one year.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — These mortgage companies that were going to pay all the taxes, these big corporations today are going to account for \$10 million, according to the Hon. Provincial Treasurer in his budget. They expect corporation tax to amount to \$10 million. Surely this is not going to pay for very many services. People are still going to be taxed. Now the technological changes, the manufacturing, the employment, the vast industry that was going to be brought into this province — I

**March 20, 1962**

will go into detail with this later on, but I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that today the per capita income in Saskatchewan is \$1,309. this isn't very much money, this is less than the Canadian average, and it is out of this money that the bulk of this budget is going to come. This is not the promise that the socialists made us originally.

The Hon. Attorney General last night got a little confused, or maybe he was trying to be confusing, it is very difficult to tell, but he said, after telling us that all this comes from taxes, he said, "But you know it doesn't all come from taxes; some of it comes from borrowing." I was most amazed to hear this because it reminded me of when I first met my mother-in-law. She went to Regina on a trip and when she came back she was loaded down with gifts for everybody. We were all very pleased, but my father-in-law said to her, "Now, look dear, you only had \$50.00, how did you bring all these things home?" She replied, "Oh, they won't cost me anything." He said, "They won't?" She said, "Oh no, I charged them." And this is exactly the thinking of the Hon. Attorney General. That this borrowing is something that is free. Surely the Hon. Provincial Treasurer is going to have to take him in a corner and tell him a few facts of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any budget must be judged not by the principles of the person judging it, but by the principles of the person proposing the budget, because after all if it is a good budget according to the socialists' principles you should accept it as such. After all the people did vote this government into power. The efficiency of the government certainly could not be criticized if they lived up to the principles that they expressed in the budget. Let me read to you what the Hon. Provincial Treasurer and apparently the rest of the cabinet agree should be the principles underlying this budget. He says:

"We have set ourselves a twofold task — one to stimulate and develop the economy in order that the promise of more abundant living may continue to be fulfilled."

Now let us just take the first one — this is the tenet that socialists hold, that only the state can utilize money for social purposes. This is true, you read your own budget and you see this is exactly what you are propagating. The thinking of socialists seems to be that if anybody else is using money, they are using it wastefully, extravagantly and for selfish purposes.

Only the socialist, according to the socialists, only the government can use money for public purposes, and I will go on with your second principle, and I will show you that you are saying exactly that. Now let us take this — had this government done this, had they carried this out, the question has to be judged according to what they have already done.

Let us look at Saskatchewan after eighteen years of this kind of thinking, and see whether it has resulted in an economy that has been stimulated and developed so that everyone has an abundant life. I don't think I have to say very much about that because the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) pointed out exactly what an abundant life those of our people who most need government help have. This government after eighteen years of planning, after eighteen years of socialism, says to the poor people in our society, those who are dependent on the government for their very livelihood, for their very daily bread; they say, "You can have \$25 in the bank or in your pocket, but if you have anything over \$25 then you will not get any more aid from the government." "Use that up first, unless of course you can prove to us that you are going to die very soon!" Of course, this is planning. I suppose it is absolutely stupid for people to die unexpectedly, the socialists expect them to plan this, unless the government knows in advance, they are not allowed to save up this money. But where they are going to get the money out of the allowances made to them for funeral expenses, I don't quite know, and the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare didn't explain that to us. But can you imagine saying to a widow with a young son, as the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) pointed out last night, "You give us a doctor's certificate to prove to us that your life expectancy is very short, that there isn't much hope of you lingering on and we will let you keep your own money for funeral expenses." Humanity first, socialist planning and abundant life. The very people you were elected to protect, the very people you should cherish, because they helped elect you, believing your promise, and this is the way you treat them today. The old, the aged, those who need supplementary allowances, the widows, the orphans, the people in the geriatric centres. Your planned economy has not resulted in very equal treatment for those who need geriatric treatment, and I have today received a letter from a group of people in Saskatoon, the members of the health committee of the Saskatoon Council of Women, who have finally had to turn to the members of the opposition. I am sure they did this with a great deal of reluctance in order to convince the Hon.

**March 20, 1962**

Minister of Social Welfare that something had to be done in this province to meet the needs of the chronically ill citizens of this province, and especially for those who do not qualify for care within a provincial geriatric centre, but who are unfortunate enough to require continued institutional nursing care and accommodation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Provincial Treasurer, and his predecessors in this government had done as they promised to do, and had been as skillful in giving us a well-balanced economy, an economy where everybody is wealthy and everybody is equal, we wouldn't need geriatric centres; we would have nursing care right around the clock in every home. We wouldn't be short of accommodation for our aged, if we all lived in large mansions, we could look after our own grandparents. Because the Hon. Provincial Treasurer has failed we have to turn to the Minister of Social Welfare, and this is the only reason we need social welfare. How badly we treat these people. These people in his own constituency who over and over again have asked for a change in the regulations of the geriatric centres, who have asked for an investigation of the geriatric centre in Saskatoon, and who have been turned away time and time again, who set this out in a letter. I will not read these cases. I am sure the hon. minister has already had all these pages, where there was actual neglect, where there was pain and suffering and where nothing was done about it. This is the resolution they are putting forth to this government.

They are asking first of all, I can summarize it rather than reading the whole thing, they say, "We believe it is imperative that the geriatric centers have local governing bodies," and this seems logical. To hear the speakers on your right, Mr. Speaker, they are very much in favor of local governing bodies. They are in favour of having the government close to the people, and yet they refuse to have local governing bodies in these geriatric centres, where complaints could be brought to them and where sometimes something could be done about them. They say secondly, "We believe it is imperative that patients in a geriatric centre have free choice of doctors." Surely these are not very heavy requests, and I think there is a third one which says there should be a full investigation of the geriatric centre in Saskatoon.

There is no equality or social justice there. There is no abundant living.



**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Will you tell us who sent the communication?

**Mrs. Batten:** — I will be very pleased to. You don't want it now do you Mr. Nicholson?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I think it should be on the record if the hon. member wouldn't mind.

**Mrs. Batten:** — I would rather not put it on the record for the reason that the last time names were put on the record, the hon. minister got up and gave a terrible harangue about two people who happened to be of Conservative politics, and I don't like to expose these people to that type of harangue. These two people were not of my political faith; they are not personal friends of mine, but I didn't appreciate sitting here and listening to an attack on them, when they weren't here to defend themselves, when they only tried to do something for the poor people in that geriatric centre. If you insist, Mr. Speaker, and that is the ruling, I will of course give the names, but I prefer to give it to the minister afterwards.

I think it has been made abundantly clear by previous speakers, that this abundant life has not been very equitably distributed among the people of this province, that this abundant life exists more in the government than it does in the citizens of this province, and that this is not the kind of abundant life that our people will continue to vote for.

The second objective which the Hon. Provincial Treasurer set out was “to provide through government those services which are so important that they should not have to compete for the consumers' dollars in the market places. These services are well enough known; education, the development of our culture and public health and welfare.” Then he goes onto elaborate on that theme.

This is a very strange statement to me, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. minister knows as well as I do, that all these things that he has named, although certainly they need government help, I think can only be done by individuals, things that touch the very core of each human being who inhabits this province. This is a matter of an individual right that is being challenged when the

**March 20, 1962**

government takes over completely and says this is a government function, because things by their very nature cannot be taken over completely by the government. Now at the Rural Life Conference one of the speakers got up and interpreted the papal encyclical in a way contrary to what the speakers on your right would have had you think last fall and this year about the papal encyclical. You will remember there was so much reading of the papal encyclical on your right that I thought everyone was converted to the Roman Catholic church for awhile. Somebody was interpreting the papal encyclical at this particular meeting and said, "Surely there are not people in this province who want the kind of welfare state that perform all but the most personal physical functions for you," and surely this is not the case. Surely we still have some things in Saskatchewan that we like to do by ourselves on our own.

In this connection I would like to read one paragraph from a book called "Orthodoxy" by G.K. Chesterton, he puts this much better than I can. He is talking about democracy and the fact that he believes in democracy, and he says:

"There are some things that a man wants to do for himself even if he does it badly. I am not arguing the truth of some of these concessions I know that some modern people are asking to have their wives chosen by scientists, and they may soon be asking for all I know have their noses blown by nurses. I merely say that mankind does recognize his universal human conscience and that democracy classes government among them. In short the democratic base is this; that the most terribly important things must be left to ordinary men themselves; the mating of the sexes, the rearing of the young, the laws of the state. This is democracy and in this I have always believe."

I would add this is Liberalism and this we will always believe.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — It was just yesterday that one of the hon. members on your right was quoting Dr. Brock Chisholm

as being a socialist and saying that here was a man who was learned and he could prove that socialist planning was necessary. I don't know whether this gentleman realizes that Dr. Brock Chisholm has also preached for years that the state should plan your family, tell you how many children you should have and when you should have them. If this is socialism, I wish you people would come out in the country and say so. I don't think there are too many people who would want to listen to you.

This government seems to think that by this planning they can give us a healthy economy. Well let me look at the healthy economy they have given us for the eighteen years they have been in power, because I don't think the Hon. Provincial Treasurer is such a conceited man that he thinks he is going to do very much better than his predecessors, for whom he has a great deal of respect and reverence, and I won't go into the question of minerals and oil. I think that has been well covered and will be well covered by experts in that field. I want to say though that I was called out of the house the other day when the hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) was speaking by . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You mean the expert.

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . a lawyer from Calgary phoning me and he asked me what the hon. members were talking about in the house, and I say, "Oh, we are just demanding that the socialists produce some oil," and he said, "Mrs. Batten, that is ridiculous," and I said, "It is," and he said, "Certainly! Don't you realize that our Premier has a covenant with the almighty that all oil is to be found under Alberta?" Apparently the socialists haven't even got an "in" with Him, because they haven't done as well as Alberta has.

But let me talk about another resource, and this to me is the most deplorable failure of this government, and it shows up and it can't be argued away. I wish it could, as this is the most important resource that we have, that any province has. We hear a lot of talk about it at convocation and we say to our young people, you are the richest resource of this province. You are the future of the country, and what have we done to our future? What have we done to our richest resource?

Under this socialist government, year after year, we have failed to retain even our natural increase. We have lost enough population to equal the four major cities of this province.

**March 20, 1962**

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — They are so good they are taken away.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Every single year we have voted millions of dollars to help education, we have prepared our young people, and then we have turned our backs on them and said, there are no opportunities here for you, you must go elsewhere. If there is any sin of omission and commission that this government should feel guilty for, should be labelled with and should never be allowed to forget, it is the fact that they have driven our young people out of this province, year after year.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Government Members:** — Nonsense!

**Mrs. Batten:** — It isn't nonsense.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The Liberals drove the bulk of them out.

**Mrs. Batten:** — From June 1944 to Jun 1961, Saskatchewan had a natural increase in population of 274,000. In addition to that there were immigrants from outside of Canada who came into Saskatchewan, and these numbered 52,000 which gives us a total increase that we should have had of 326,000. We would have just held our own without attracting from any other province, and yet the census figures show we have an increase of only 81,000. This means we have lost a population of 245,000 people, and these, Mr. Speaker, are mostly young people. These are the people that have cost the taxpayers of this province millions of dollars and these are the young people who could contribute to this province, who could build up the wealth of this province, who could contribute to our spiritual and cultural heritage and yet we haven't been able to give them the opportunity for employment, the opportunity to make their own life in Saskatchewan, and they have had to move out. Every single family in this province has somebody who has had to leave. This is a loss, not only materially, but this is a loss in spiritual and human factors, because these families have had to break up simply because there was not room for them all in Saskatchewan if they were going to make a living. There has been no answer given to this by the budget. There is nothing in this budget to indicate that things are going to be different from now, on that in itself should be sufficient reason why we could not support the budget.

There is no doubt that our economy has become more varied during the years, this is inevitable. The way we can compare it is to compare it with other provinces and here we see how far we have lagged behind. I have the figures here for new investment and manufacturing which is expected in 1962, and this is given by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and this is how we compare: Manitoba expects in the next year to invest in manufacturing \$35.2 million; Alberta expects to invest \$72.8 million; and Saskatchewan expects to invest \$15.4 million. This is the booming economy, this is the development that is promised by this budget and by this Provincial Treasurer, and they expect us to support the budget!

The distinguishing feature in this budget and the government is their faith in government planning. This “planning business” is an old word, and every single farmer I know of has made use of it; every businessman I know has made use of it; every student that ever went to school made use of it. But the socialists think this is perfectly original, that it was never heard of until the socialists captured the word. It is not as vicious as socialism so they like to use it, and they have a plan for everybody. They insist they can plan better than anyone else in this province in every field. Now let us look at their record of planning. Let us see how efficient their planning has been. Look at the crown corporation — they have been a failure right down the line, and the famous debate at Mossbank proved that one once and for all.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — I was glued to the radio like the rest of Saskatchewan and I heard it.

Let us look at co-operatives. This is where really great work was supposed to be going on during the sojourn of this government. Now what has happened? They have tried to infiltrate and perpetrate their political thinking, thinking colored by their own political faith, to the point where co-operatives have lost a lot of the respect in many ways that they had. The people that are in co-operatives and have worked there for many years are shocked to find that they are being labelled as socialists merely because they are in co-ops. Unless these people have the courage to clean that type of thinking right out of co-operatives they will be hurt

**March 20, 1962**

and they will hurt badly to the detriment of themselves and this province. This is the kind of thing that goes on under this government — this is their planning.

I have told you about the inequalities that now exist. You heard the socialists before they came into power — there was going to be equality in economic status, and all that has happened is the poor are poorer and the rich are richer, and some of them have left for Florida. This is not social justice, this isn't the type of equality that we want. Mr. Fines made no bones about the fact that he hoped there would be many millionaires in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — He was a good example.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Look at the treatment of unions by this government, by this party. First of all they are willing to trample on the rights of the individual union man and buy his vote on a wholesale scale, and secondly they turn around to another union and they do things they would consider most despicable if management ever tried to do it. Have you ever heard of a union putting up with the management going to each individual union man and saying, "You write us a letter telling us how you dislike the people on top, and we will keep it secret, we won't let your name be known." And this is exactly how you people have treated the College of Physicians and Surgeons. You have called them a union; you said they were a powerful union. You only like the unions that are affiliated and paying dues, and if they don't, it is too bad. You don't hold with union rules then. Then there are no holds barred and you can approach the individual and you can try and corrupt a union organization, you can try and have member act against member. You would destroy the executive if you could and as management set up your own union in that case.

This is quite all right if they don't go along with your way of thinking. Such inconsistency! Yet this is your government planning. This is the government that you hold up as a type of God, that people can look up to because it is incorruptible. It can do things that any capitalist would certainly be spit upon even by other capitalists if he did, and yet this government can do it and sit here in judgment of private individuals.

I have another word or two to say while I am talking about the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Yes, I guess you thought I might. After all the balderdash the Hon. Attorney General said the other night, I

am going to try once more to set the records straight. I know it is hopeless because I know that he and others like him, but I hope not all of you, will go out and speak everyplace you can find anybody to listen to you, and say that the Liberals oppose the Medical Care Plan and yet every single Liberal member in this house has got up and said, we support a comprehensive medical insurance plan for all the people of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — But not this one.

**Mrs. Batten:** — What one?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Not this plan.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Well I don't know what it is, and neither does anybody else in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Look at the act.

**Mrs. Batten:** — And you, the Hon. Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, can go out in the country, as he apparently did, at least so he reported the other night, and tell people, "You know it took us hours and hours to get this bill through." Three weeks I believe the Hon. Attorney General said. It is going to take years probably to get it through. Now it is going to be the fault of the Liberals.

If this government had listened to the Liberal opposition, they would have had a bill that would have been acceptable to the doctors and to the people of Saskatchewan. They would have had a bill that could have been made law and carried out.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — And, Mr. Speaker, we would have had comprehensive medical insurance in this province today.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Poppycock.

**Mrs. Batten:** — And that is the only reason it took three weeks, because we spelled out laboriously amendment after amendment, and when one was turned down we hopefully submitted another to make this a good act, to make this a good law.

**March 20, 1962**

The minister can laugh about it — sincerity is often laughed at by those who don't know what it means, who don't know what it is in their own lives, but we were sincere, Mr. Speaker. We do want a comprehensive medical care program in this province; we want medical insurance. We have had it in our platform, we have worked toward it steadily when we were government, we will continue to work for it, and we will have it when we are the government.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Your sense of humor is . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — An all the laughing in the world certainly isn't going to help the Attorney General in the next election unless he can convince the people of Hanley who don't read the newspapers, who don't listen to the radio, then he might be able to convince them that the Liberals did oppose this medical care plan.

These are the instructions that the hon. member's party has given their workers in the country, to divide the people and make them think it is the doctors that have failed to give us a plan and this is exactly the type of thinking and propaganda that is going out into the country. I don't know how many people are going to be fooled by it. You won one election by this type of division, with this class hatred that you managed to stir up. I don't know if you are going to be able to win another.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — . . . people know what they are voting for . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — I think you think that. I think the hon. members across the way actually think the people don't know what they are voting for. I disagree, I think they do, and we will see when the next election comes about.

Now we have the same matter coming up with the county system. I don't know what stories the hon. members across the way are going to tell the people about the county system, because over and over again members in this house got up on the government side and said they would not give people a vote on this issue.

**Government Member:** — That is not true.

**Mrs. Batten:** — They voted against a resolution that we submitted . . .



**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Cite one instance.

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . and this went on for year after year until finally they saw this was going to be quite a dangerous issue that they were not going to get away with it, and now apparently they are prepared to give the people a vote, and there isn't any question in my mind it is only because of the opposition in the country, and the opposition of the Liberals in this house who are able to express the views of the people in the country.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — Now we are going to go into detail. Mr. Speaker, I have no great desire to carry on a conversation with the Hon. Attorney General privately and I am certainly not interested in carrying one on publicly.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Can you speak with authority.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Shall I go back to the beginning of my speech — I have figure after figure . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You made the statement here that members of the government had repeatedly denied this. There should be a vote of ours . . .

**Government Members:** — Is she willing . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mrs. Batten:** — This authority is your own words — all you have to do is look up the Journals and you will find where every single one of you that was in the house at the time voted against the resolution brought in by us that there be a vote given . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You know better than that.

**Mrs. Batten:** — I realize there is little coordination between the hon. Attorney General's tongue and his feet, but he was up on his feet on that vote, and we asked for a standing vote, so certainly we didn't miss him when we counted.

**March 20, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . that vote had nothing to do with this question.

**Mrs. Batten:** — No. He . . . it has nothing to do with the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, . . . for the records . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Let the hon. member continue her debate.

**Mrs. Batten:** — I don't want to keep members here any longer, and I am sure parts of this have been rather unpleasant for everybody to listen to. Certainly I have not enjoyed saying them.

Basically let me summarize what this budget does: First of all it provides for excessive taxation; it provides for an expenditure of \$1,071,826 and this, Mr. Speaker, must be paid by 925,000 people. If we had kept our population, this budget would not have been excessive, it would not have been difficult for us to carry out. First of all we would have achieved a type of industry that would have given us additional revenue. We would have achieved a higher standard of living and higher wages for our people, higher income for our young people. It would have been very easy to raise this money, but in a depressed agricultural situation with our small population it isn't going to be easy. Then in addition to this, this budget provides for a debt, a lovely debt situation. The hon. Attorney General says he is very proud of it, there is going to be more next year.

We have a gross debt now of \$505 million — well the hon. Attorney General says it is going to be at least \$50 million more next year. Interest payments alone are going to be \$22,674,000. This means that every man, woman and little child owes as a result of this budget \$546 and must pay this year interest charges of \$24.50 — in interest charges alone, and not calculating the amount of taxes that must be paid on a per capita basis. This budget, Mr. Speaker, has given no equality or hope of equality in the matter of education; it hasn't proposed any foundation system; it has voted a lot of money for education, but it isn't even paying 50 per cent of the total cost of education, not even paying as much as local governments are going to be paying towards education, let along the parents of children. This budget, Mr. Speaker, is not going to give our people who need social aid any relief whatsoever. It is begging them worse year by year, and offering them very little hope of

rehabilitation. This budget, Mr. Speaker, makes no distinction and gives on equality, no social justice, between the people in rural areas and the people in city areas. There has been no equality, no promise of better services for our people. In addition to this, it gives us no hope, Mr. Speaker, in the attraction of industry or population to this province, no hope of stimulation to either industry, population or development.

However, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to end on that sad note. There is one ray of hope. There was one beautiful thing in this budget. You have to wait until you get to the very end to find it, and here the Hon. Provincial Treasurer says as follows:

“In this connection I would like to make special mention of the Wascana Centre project. I believe this to be one of the most imaginative, exciting developments of its kind in North America.”

Now I agree, this is only imaginative, exciting thing there is in this budget. I don't know that we can afford it — I don't know if we can afford to ignore it. I think certainly we have to have some plans for capital expenditures, for government building expansion and I think it is a fine thing that the Provincial Treasurer and the Hon. Premier have now bent their energies towards building a monument for themselves. It reminds me a little bit of that bridge that we all drive and walk over, and the Anderson government has since been forgotten for the bitterness it generated, but people still talk about Jimmy Bryant's bridge, and after this government has gone, very shortly, maybe they will still talk about the Lloyd Wascana Centre. Maybe this is a good thing — that there will be something left. maybe that high mountain that they are going to bring in and put across the lake there will make people look up and say “Remember when we had the socialists here — the socialists who tried to infiltrate every organization; who tried to destroy unions, who tried to destroy co-operatives, who did their best to destroy local government, a thing that no other party would every indulge in,” and I quote from the Star-Phoenix of November 6, 1961, when this founding convention or amalgamation convention met (I am not sure what it was).

“At the CCF and NDP convention in Regina, it was held that they as a party should organize municipal elections.”

**March 20, 1962**

That they should bring party politics where there have never been party politics in the history of this province, where neither Conservative nor Liberal would stoop to bring in party politics. In my own constituency, where of course even the socialists are sensible people, we wouldn't think of bringing party politics into our local government, and I don't think there are very many across the way, Mr. Speaker, in spite of that convention, in spite of those leaders who are so hungry-power-mad, that they would do anything to stay in power. I don't think there are very many of those who are honorable back-benchers that would stoop to bring politics into the local government arena, who would vote for a man because he belonged to a political party, whether or not he was capable of carrying out the office or councillor or school trustee. I hope there aren't and I trust there aren't.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down allow me to say that I will support the amendment and I will not support the budget.

**Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn):** — I have no intention at this late date of attempting to cover the entire budget speech which was so ably presented by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer. This was done in a very capable manner by my hon. colleague, the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) and other members of the opposition.

However, there were a few items and some rather glaring ones on which I would like to comment, but before doing that I would like to take a moment or two to do three things:

First, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my personal sympathies to Mrs. McIntosh, to those that have been expressed before this afternoon, on her sudden sorrow and on the sudden passing of the late Hon. L.F. McIntosh.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the late Mr. McIntosh was the first minister of this government with whom I became acquainted when I was carrying certain civic responsibilities in the city of Weyburn, and later with the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association. Mr. McIntosh was always most friendly and co-operative to me. I have at all times had a very high personal regard for him, and I am sure he will be missed not only by members of his family and the members of this legislature, but also by his many friends throughout the entire province.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add my congratulations to those already expressed to the Hon. Provincial Treasurer for the very fine presentation he made of his rather complex document. I even admired his tie, Mr. Speaker, which from this distance glowed with splendor and was one of the few bright spots connected with the budget.

Third, I think it was yesterday afternoon, I was interested in one or two statements made by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, one particularly when he said that he was proud of the success that this government had made in its efforts in the business world. Of course this is a matter of personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I must admit that my opinion does not coincide with his. He mentioned the fact also that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation had reduced the power rates so terrifically. Well, it just so happens that I have here three power bills on domestic rates. One for the city of Calgary, one from the city of Edmonton and one from the city of Estevan in our own province. These are all small bills, Mr. Speaker. The rate in the city of Calgary is 1.05¢ per kilowatt, the rate in the city of Edmonton is 1.48¢ per kilowatt, the rate in the city of Estevan is 2.1¢ per kilowatt. Now the difference between 1¢ and 2¢ may not seem very great but here we find that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation rates are twice what they are in the city of Calgary, and 35 per cent greater than they are in the city of Edmonton. I think that this is just another example, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that government is not as efficient in business as private enterprise is and the members of the opposition have said this many, many times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly interested in personalities in politics; I am much more interested in policies of government — but there is a connection between these two to this extent, that the personalities responsible for these policies must accept the responsibility for their actions as individuals, and so I am not going to make any comments whatsoever with respect to the national situation, but I would like to confine my remarks entirely to the provincial scene. I would like, in beginning my comments on the budget, to refer to a statement the Hon. Provincial Treasurer made concerning private investment. He said this:

“Another serious weakness may lie in the field of private investment. Although industrial production has been increasing, there is some fear that the increase may not be great enough to provide any substantial stimulus to new investment capital.”

**March 20, 1962**

Now, Mr. Speaker, this reference of course is to the national picture, but if it is true nationally how much more does it apply to our own province. I want to quote just a few figures from the budget speech and I think you will realize why I am concerned about private investment, which is so sadly needed in this province. And I am sure you will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that these are not my figures — these are figures that are contained in the budget booklet and are the figures of the government. Primary and construction industries down \$1 million from three years ago; manufacturing down \$11 million from three years ago; utilities down \$3 million from three years ago; trade, finance and commercial services down \$1 million from three years ago; housing down \$16 million from three years ago. Now these figures reflect a decrease in private investment in Saskatchewan and do you wonder, Mr. Speaker, why I am concerned about this situation. But I am not the only one that should be concerned. Certainly every hon. member across the way should be much more concerned than I am because these hon. gentlemen are responsible for this situation. These are the people whose avowed intention it was to destroy an economy based on private capital, and it was their leader, their former leader, who described those with investment capital as “hucksters and quick buck artists.” That was a sad day for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I think even the former Premier realized that he had gone too far, because he changed his tune and he said, figuratively speaking, that there is room for everyone and that the soundest economy is that based on government capital, co-operative capital and private capital. As far as major private investment capital is concerned, he might just as well have recited that old nursery rhyme, “Come into my parlour, said the spider to the fly.” Could my hon. friends in the government hope that private investment capital would come into this province as it should under these conditions, when its position is so insecure due to the attitude of this government, to the type of legislation we have and also to the possibility of government subsidized opposition? I think that the figures that I have just quoted have given the answer, and that this situation will not be corrected until the proper political climate is provided. That will never be provided by a socialist government, Mr. Speaker.

I think that my hon. friends in the government side of the house are living in a fool’s paradise today — their house of cards is just falling about their ears and they don’t even know it, or maybe they do.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the policies which this government has promised, and nothing else, are responsible for this deficit budget. These policies are responsible for my being in the legislature today and they will also be responsible for the hon. lady and gentlemen presently sitting on your left, to be sitting on the right hand of Mr. Speaker, after the next election — and that may come sooner than some people think, too.

The Hon. Provincial Treasurer also suggested that in Saskatchewan our economic prospects will again, and I quote, “Be conditioned by the state of the national economy, and by the vagaries of the weather.” Since agriculture is the largest single unit in our economy, we all realize how vulnerable we are to the whims of nature, which determine our crop returns. We have no control over nature, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as a government, the hon. members across the way are in a position to make many changes and to have some control over these other factors. Because they could do this by constructive policies — policies which could strengthen our society and our economy instead of weakening them, and they are being weakened. The largest public debt in the history of Saskatchewan, deficit budgets — are these signs of economic strength? The so-called welfare state being promoted by this government, and this “cradle-to-grave” policy is weakening the moral fibre of our people and the hon. members across the way know this — but they encourage it. They are not interested in a strong self-reliant people, they are interested in a strong autocratic government, a socialist government.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — We are a young province in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, with untold wealth in our fields and in our forests and with untold wealth lying beneath our fields and forests. But what about our people — the lowest rate of population growth in the Dominion of Canada except possibly Prince Edward Island and the people that we are losing are our young people, as was pointed out earlier by the hon. member for Humboldt. We are young province, and with the proper leadership by government we could also be a strong province. But we are not getting the leadership, and we will not get the kind of leadership we need, from the present government. Mr. Speaker, we

**March 20, 1962**

need bold policies which will encourage private enterprise and which will not stifle them. We need bold policies which will bring major private investment capital into our province. The wheels of economic progress would then turn again in Saskatchewan, and our young people would not be deprived of their right to remain in the province of their birth. Now if the hon. members of the government had the interests of the people of Saskatchewan really in their hearts they would probably resign their positions today. But they will not because they know that the Liberal Party will form the next government. The people of this province will then be in a position to see the difference between the milk-and-water leadership which is being given by this present government and the dynamic leadership of responsible government with free enterprise as the basis for the economic development of this province . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You boys won't even be the opposition.

**Mr. Staveley:** — . . . which we are missing today.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to draw your attention to some of the results of the crown corporations as shown on page 12 of the budget booklet and covering the budget speech. There are some very interesting situations here. Certainly I was interested in them and I think that the hon. members of the government will also be interested in them. I note that the advances at the year end total \$8,352,688 and the surplus for the year totalled \$854,729 which, on the basis of these figures, shows a net profit of 10 and a fraction per cent. This makes very nice reading but of course this does not include the power corporation or the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, so let's lump them all together and get the complete picture. We find that the advances at the year-end amounted to \$388,378,330 and the surplus for the year amounts to \$24,325,180 and this is not quite so good. This is only 6.35 per cent. But, Mr. Speaker, this is before any interest charges whatsoever and we don't know what the interest amounts to and so as usual we do not have the full story of the operation of the government.

A week ago I asked two very simple questions in this house and I have not received an answer to either one yet, and they were very simple questions. I wanted to know what the accumulated investment capital of the crown corporations amounted to as of March 31, 1961 and I just wanted to know the amount of interest that was



charged to or paid by the crown corporations during the fiscal year of 1960-61. Certainly with all the planning experts that this government employs and with the elaborate and expensive administrative set up, did the hon. minister mean to say that he cannot get an answer to two simple questions like this within a week's time? What kind of records does this government keep? Or is this just another case where the government doesn't feel that it is in the best interest of the people to know these things and we will not get the answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would draw the hon. member's attention that those questions that he asked are still on the motion paper as an order for return, but they are still before the house to be debated at a later date, so we can't debate them at this stage.

**Mr. Staveley:** — I appreciate this and I will not be making any more comments — except that I would have expected that I could have had the answers within this time, Mr. Speaker. But I think that maybe we can get part of the answer without any help. If my hon. friends in the government want to check the list of debentures issued in 1961, I think they will find there are \$12 million of debentures at  $5\frac{3}{4}$  per cent, \$22 million at  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent and \$16 million at 5 per cent. I think that we would be quite safe in using a 5 per cent interest charge in this case, Mr. Speaker. So what do we find? Instead of a \$24 million surplus on borrowings of \$388 million, we have a surplus of only \$5 million, or less than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. This is not based on the capital investment — this is only based on the borrowings at the end of the year, and I would suggest that if the whole truth were known there might not be any returns at all on the original capital investment.

Let us just take a look at some of these individual crown corporations to see what we find. Let us take the Saskatchewan Transportation Company first. Here we find borrowings of \$1,450,000 and a surplus of \$69,778, before interest. But at 5 per cent there would be a legitimate interest charge here of \$73,500. And so this crown corporation actually operated at a loss of about \$3,000 instead of a profit of almost \$70,000.

Now let us take the famous timber board, with borrowing of \$3,877,000 and a surplus of \$71,541. Now the interest which should have been paid on these borrowings

**March 20, 1962**

or at least charged to the corporation in that fiscal year would have been \$193,850. And so this timber board actually operated at a loss of \$122,309 instead of a profit of a little over \$71,000.

Then there is the Saskatchewan Guaranty and Fidelity with borrowings of \$365,688 and a surplus of \$24,209 — before interest. Interest payable here at 5 per cent would amount to approximately \$18,250 and so we have a surplus of less than \$6,000 instead of a little over \$24,000. You know, Mr. Speaker, I found a very interesting situation in connection with the Saskatchewan Guaranty and Fidelity and I would refer you and the hon. members of the government to the annual report of this company for 1961. On page 2 you will note here that the insurance premiums on government properties in Saskatchewan grew from \$4,680 in 1960 to \$46,780 in 1961, an increase of over \$42 thousand dollars. In other words, Mr. Speaker, public funds were used to create a surplus for this company of roughly \$6 thousand from an actual operating deficit of \$36 thousand. Now I have always said, and the members of the opposition have also said, that the people of Saskatchewan have never had a true picture of the operation of these crown corporations and I am more sure of this than ever after looking at this budget. I would respectfully suggest that the hon. members of this government just take off and throw away the rose-colored glasses they have been looking through at this budget, and take another look at the budget in the light of cold, hard facts, because they are not fooling anybody but themselves.

I would like to take just a quick look at the revenue side of the budget, Mr. Speaker. I have had a look at these figures — checked them over and they are listed as revenues by major source, I believe, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1952-61. I was not particularly interested in a comparison of revenue by years, but I was interested in the source of these revenues and I was shaken by what I found. What an artificial base on which we build a provincial economy! I would refer you to page 28 of the budget booklet and to the chart at the top of the page which is so very attractive to the eye but which is so devastating to the mind. I am going to liken this chart at the top of page 28 to a clock because it is so very obvious that time is running out for my hon. friends across the way. At the top of the clock — at 12 noon, we find that 20.66 or approximately 1/5 of the total budget revenue comes from the education and health tax — 1 o'clock approximately 1/7th of the budget revenue comes from the gasoline tax. At 3 o'clock about 1/8th comes from the

natural and mineral resources of the province of Saskatchewan. At 4 o'clock 1/12th of all of our budget revenue comes from liquor profits which are mostly taxes again, and at 5:30 about 1/20th from motor license — another tax. From 6 or a little past 6 o'clock to 7:30 slightly over 10 per cent of the budget revenues listed as other revenues and then from 7:30 on, the rest of the day, between 1/4 and 1/3 of all of our budget revenue comes from federal, provincial tax collection arrangements — more taxes.

Do you know what this means, Mr. Speaker,? This means that less than 1/4 of all of our budget revenue comes from our natural wealth and production. The balance, over 3/4 of approximately \$175 million, comes from the pockets of the farmers, the business and professional men, salaried workers and from the teapots that their wives keep in the kitchen cupboards. That is a fine basis for a provincial economy, isn't it? If ever an economic house was built on sand it is the economic house of Saskatchewan, built by this socialist government.

I have heard a lot of talk since I have been in the legislature about togetherness and I think this afternoon my hon. friend from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) dwelt on togetherness at some length. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the most enlightening example of togetherness is shown right here in this budget. When the government says that our net debt is \$19,500,000 and our interest is \$22 million, I think that is about as cosy as you could hope to get.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, very little has been said in this budget, or in the budget debate, about the sharp increase in the budget of this year over the last — an increase of approximately \$25 million which we must find somewhere to pay for the irresponsible dreaming of this government. The hon. ministers and members say that the people of this province should feel privileged to pay this extra \$25 million in taxes but I feel that these figures represent a privilege without which our people could do very well. Let us examine some more of these government figures and try to find some economic basis, or some reason, for spending an additional \$25 million. I think that we would hope to find an increase in our economy to justify the actions of this government, but what do we find? My hon. friends across the way tell us that industry is expanding in a wonder way — that

**March 20, 1962**

the crown corporations are pouring money into the treasury and taking the tax lead from the shoulders of our people and that our oil and mineral production is booming. Well, I am very glad to see that our mineral production is booming. Well, I am very glad to see that our mineral production is up almost \$9 million from about three years ago. But our spending is up about \$41 million in that same time, Mr. Speaker, and in that same time our private investment is down about \$32 million — our commodity production as shown by your own figures is down in that same time \$184 million — and here is something that should really shake my hon. friends across the way — personal incomes within the past year have dropped by \$198 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, where do you think that the people of Saskatchewan are going to find the money to pay all these taxes which the government says we should feel so privileged to pay.

I want to say just a few words about taxes before I close this and I want to refer to just one more statement made by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer during his budget presentation. I want to quote as follows:

“I can readily anticipate that some hon. members will oppose it, and if I am correct they will oppose it on three main grounds, namely that the taxes that are levied are too high, that the borrowing program is too large and that the level of services to be provided is too low.”

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — That statement, Mr. Speaker, I accept as being absolutely correct. We do think that the taxes are too high; we do think that the public debt is too large; and we do think that the level of services is too low. The Hon. Premier and the Hon. Provincial Treasurer have both either said or implied that members of the opposition have stated that services to be supplied without taxes — and I challenge either one of them or any member of the government to state one instance when any member of this opposition has ever said that services could be supplied without taxes. I think the hon. gentlemen across the way are just a little bit mixed up, Mr. Speaker — it was their former leader who coined the phrase ‘without money and without price.’

We have been told in this house that the opposition stated that it would reduce taxes. This we

will do, Mr. Speaker. We have been told in this house that the opposition has stated that it will maintain an increase in services and this we will also do. We have been told in this house that the opposition has stated that it will reduce the public debt and this also we will do, Mr. Speaker. The hon. ministers and members of the government have either deliberately or inadvertently omitted the key to the solution of the economic plight in which we find ourselves in the province of Saskatchewan today. And that key, Mr. Speaker, is the burning and consuming desire of this socialist government to perpetuate itself in power — and that purpose has been carried out in a program of waste and extravagance by this government, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan, and by the creation of unnecessary and high salaried jobs for many of its friends. I would suggest that this will be changed.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — This afternoon we have been travelling on probably the roughest highway in Saskatchewan — our financial highway and I think it is only fair to warn the hon. members of the government that the road is washed out just about 2¼ miles ahead — and I sincerely hope that they will stop this irresponsible spending before we are all wrecked.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said this afternoon, I am sure that there is no doubt as to how I feel concerning this budget, I shall vote for the amendment. I will not support the motion.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT: HAZEN ARGUE'S NOMINATION**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege before the minister starts, I wonder if I might speak on a point of privilege. I am sure my hon. friends would be interested to know that Mr. Argue on the first ballot received the Liberal nomination in Assiniboia by a 10-1 majority.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

#### **BUDGET DEBATE**

**Hon. A.G. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I want to first associate myself with the other members of the house in extending my personal sympathy

**March 20, 1962**

to Mrs. McIntosh and the family. Mr. McIntosh was one of the finest, kindest and most diplomatic men that I believe I have ever met in my life. He was loved and highly respected by all who knew him, he will be missed and remembered by thousands of people in the province.

Since this is the first time that I have had the opportunity to rise in the debate, I want to congratulate you on your elevation to the high office of Speaker. You have already over the past few weeks proven yourself more than worthy of the confidence that we placed in you.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate our new and youthful Provincial Treasurer. He made a magnificent job of preparing and delivering his first budget speech.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, as usual following the bringing down of the budget, the financial critic starts out with the debate and since then many from both sides of the house have participated. The debate I understand will be concluded this week.

May I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of expressing my candid impressions on the participants that have already taken part in this debate. The opposition speeches, as far as I am concerned, have been loaded with wild exaggerations, inaccuracies and half-truths. The opposition seems to be instructed to follow about the same line of attack and the line seems to be criticize, undermine and sabotage and repeat the same process over and over again. They seem to have taken the attitude, pay no attention to being accurate or in any way substantiating your statements, pronouncements or charges. On the other hand from the government side you have heard a number of ministers refuting some of the outstanding inaccuracies and the inconsistencies of the opposition always with supporting facts and records.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Wonderful!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — And then they go with the program of their department. I intend to do the same thing in this debate. The MLA's from the government side of the house have given an intelligent report on the popular programs of their constituency and then again if they deviated to the other social fields, they usually gave supporting

authority or record to substantiate their statements or declarations. Every member of the opposition who has taken part in the debate has come out repeating taxes, taxes, taxes . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There are 1,200 of them Alex.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — . . . and I notice that even the new member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) has followed the same line. The opposition again is hoping to convince the people of Saskatchewan that they are paying more taxes than any other province in Canada.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — True . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — By the time I get through I will prove with facts that that is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I believe that all taxes in every province of Canada have been increasing and they have been increasing, I will repeat again, since 1946, when the federal Liberal government lifted price control in Ottawa and allowed these sky-rocketing costs and taxes.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh! Alex, we are not back to that.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I know that the opposition is trying in this house as well as on the hustings, to get over to the people in Saskatchewan that the increased taxes are a peculiarity of this province only, of the province of Saskatchewan. I am going to say that increased taxes are as common as increased costs have become under a Liberal-Conservative capitalistic society.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The financial critic opening the debate stated the hospitalization tax lately was increased by 37½ per cent. A half truth, the actual truth is that the hospitalization family tax rose from \$35 to \$48 but \$8 was for the purpose of capital hospital construction . . .

**March 20, 1962**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What is the difference, the tax went up.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — It is in a big difference, it was a new service.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The tax went up. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — And the truth is that the actual hospitalization increased from \$35 to \$40 or 14½ per cent increase and not 37½. Again he did not inform the house that the sister province of Manitoba, when the federal hospitalization scheme came into effect, the first hospitalization tax that they brought in that province was \$72 and not \$48 or \$40.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No 5 per cent sales tax though.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Considerably higher under a private enterprise government. They do not admit or inform the house that for Alberta there is a 4 mill levy on all the land of the province of Alberta.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No 5 per cent sales tax.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — . . . for the purpose of hospitalization. You know the financial critic talked of the damaging effect of high taxes on our economy, but he didn't say anything about the damaging effect of sky-rocketing costs of goods by private enterprise. He wouldn't admit that for example the increase in hospital construction, 300 — 400 per cent was damaging the economy.

Now leaving that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go the revenues within this budget. The budget shows a total revenue of \$171,826,000, and I want to point out that just over 50 per cent of this amount is collected in the form of major direct taxes by this government. Some \$68 million, and the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) just a few minutes ago made mention of some of these taxes, these major direct taxes are \$35½ million from education and health tax, or will come in; \$25,400,000 from the gasoline tax and some \$8,100,000 from motor licenses — 50 percent of the revenues comes from these direct taxes that we levy on the people of Saskatchewan.



Now let us compare these taxes to the very same taxes levied in the other provinces of Canada. I am going to take the gasoline tax that brings in some \$25,400,000. Gasoline taxes, and I am going to admit, went up from 7¢ to 14¢ in Saskatchewan, 100 per cent increase, this is to provide improved highways and grid roads. The financial critic mentioned how bad increasing taxes are on our economy, but again he did not point out that there were other increases. For example, private enterprise increased automobiles from \$1,200 — \$3,600. Doesn't this have a damaging effect on the economy of the province or the country? Combines to the farmers rose from \$2,800 — \$8,000 — 200 — 300 per cent increase. Would this not have a damaging effect on the economy of the province? I am going to go back to gasoline taxes. Let us see how these taxes compare with the other provinces of Canada, and see whether the statement that was made even a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Weyburn that the Saskatchewan provincial tax levy was the highest in Canada is true. May I point out that Newfoundland, a Liberal province levies a gasoline tax of 19¢ a gallon, the highest in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) doesn't have to go to West Germany. Talk about Canada, talk about Quebec, a Liberal province, New Brunswick, a Liberal province, Newfoundland, a Liberal province, talk about Canada not West Germany where the United States has poured in billions of dollars to open it up as a show window for the world.

Now going on with gas tax, let's take a look at Nova Scotia, a good Conservative province. This Conservative province levies a gasoline tax of 19¢ a gallon and has the honour of being even with the highest Liberal province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Let us take a look at New Brunswick, another Liberal province. This Liberal province levies a gasoline tax now of 18¢. It has the honour of being second highest in the Dominion of Canada, the first two of the three Liberal provinces of Canada, the first highest and the second highest gasoline tax in the Dominion of Canada. If it is bad on the economy of Saskatchewan to have a 14¢ on the gallon, how bad is it in the Liberal province to have 18¢ and 19¢, the highest in Canada and the second highest.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You had better go over and liberate them.

**March 20, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — What utter nonsense emanates from the left side, Mr. Speaker. A leopard never changes his spots, and I am going to say that a Liberal government in Saskatchewan would not be any different than a Liberal government in any other province.

**Mr. Guy:** — It would be better than the one we've got.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I want to substantiate my facts. This information, any member of legislature can obtain. It is available from the Chamber of Commerce. The opposition has confidence in the Chamber of Commerce, therefore, the authority must be right and agreeable to them.

The Liberals in the legislature and on the hustings, criticize automobile and farm truck license fees. May I say that automobile licenses have practically not changed at all since 1944. Farm truck licenses have been changed slightly in the small trucks and a little more in the more heavier ones. I am going again to refer to this automobile manual of the Chamber of Commerce and they claim that their source was the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and give you some cold hard facts on licenses in the other provinces. For example on automobile licenses on a new Chevrolet, Ford or Plymouth in Saskatchewan you all know the cost is \$15. In Liberal Quebec it is \$29, twice as high, and the heaviest license taxation. The next province in line from the highest, you and I see the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) is agreeing, moving her head up and down, that it is right.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Not from you.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — We go on to the next province and it is the Liberal government of New Brunswick with a license on that same Chevrolet or Ford automobile of \$26, the second highest in the Dominion of Canada.

The next in line is Conservative Manitoba and immediately behind that is Liberal Newfoundland with \$18 for that same license.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Thank God we were delivered in 1944.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now let us take a look and compare the farm truck license in the provinces, and here I am going to compare to the three prairie provinces of Canada. If you take a ¼ ton farm truck with a gross weight of 5 thousand pounds, the license in Saskatchewan is \$10.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — What would you do with a ¼ ton?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I mean a half ton truck with a 5,000 pound gross weight. In Saskatchewan the license is \$10, in Manitoba it is \$12.50, 25 per cent higher than Saskatchewan, in Alberta it is \$15, 50 per cent higher than Saskatchewan.

Let us take another farm truck, 7,500 pound weight, in Saskatchewan the farm truck license for that one is \$12.50, in Manitoba it is \$20, or 60 per cent higher than Saskatchewan, in Alberta it is \$25, 100 per cent higher than Saskatchewan.

Let us take another one, 14,000 pound truck, I stated that we had increased the licenses on the heavier ones. I am going to take one of the really heavy ones, 14,000 pound gross farm truck, in Saskatchewan the license is \$20, in Manitoba it is \$32.50, or 62½ per cent higher than in Saskatchewan. In Alberta it is \$35, 75 per cent higher than in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, according to the statistics here that I have gathered from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics it shows that as far as automobiles and farm truck licenses, we have the lowest licenses in the Dominion of Canada. If, as the financial critic stated, the taxes are curtailing the economy of the province, then there is the least curtailment in the province of Saskatchewan, as compared with other provinces in Canada.

I want to go a little further, I am going to read from a newspaper clipping. This comes from the Prince Albert Herald of November 9, 1961 and I am going to read it, in connection with vehicle revenue rises. The newspaper says, and I quote:

“Saskatchewan derived a revenue of \$29,630,000 in 1960 from motor vehicle registration, licensing of vehicles, drivers and motor fuel taxes, reports the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Average cost of taxes and licenses required to operate a motor

**March 20, 1962**

vehicle in Canada in 1960 was \$108, little change from the 1959 average of \$107. It cost Saskatchewan people an average of \$88 as compared to \$87 the year before.”

Mr. Speaker, it just backs up all the figures that I gave that in Saskatchewan the fuel taxes, the license taxes, the drivers' licenses are the lowest in Canada. All put together Saskatchewan is \$20 less on the average that it is in Canada. Therefore, if Saskatchewan is \$20 below the Canadian average, there must be provinces in Canada that must be \$20 above the Canadian average. If you will take a look at those provinces, they are the three Liberal provinces.

Now I see, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 o'clock p.m.