

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 22, 1963

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

On the Orders of the Day.

1963 HIGHWAYS MAPS

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to inform the house that the new 1963 official highway maps are now printed, ready for distribution. I call the attention of the house to the picture of the bridge which we have on the front of the map — the major undertaking of the department this year. Another fact of interest would be the little table of accomplishments, highlights of the department's program for 1962 . . .

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — Pretty short, George.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — And then too, Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable stretch of dust-free highways which are black now, here in the map and I am sure that the members will be very interested in this — 450 miles extra have been black-topped this year, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will be very pleased to hear this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I ask the boys to pass these around, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce a fine group of students from my constituency. They are from the Birch Hills high school, they are grade 12 students and they have come a long way. They are led by their teachers, Mr. Kudrick and Mr. McKenzie, and their bus drivers, Mr. Morris and Mr. Hunt. I hope that their trip here will be a pleasant and beneficial one.

QUESTION: RE REPORT OF HOSPITAL SURVEYS COMMITTEE

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health but since he is not in his seat I wonder if I might direct it to the Premier, who would perhaps refer it to him if he can't answer it. Is it the intention of the minister to table the report by the Hospital Survey Committee at an early date?

Premier Lloyd: — I would draw attention to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is burning up. I can't give a specific answer to it. I know that the report is in the hands of the minister and he is considering plans in regard to announcing it. Whether or not it is to be tabled or not, the minister will be back I expect on Monday and perhaps a specific answer can be given then.

EXEMPTION FROM SALES TAX

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — Might I also direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Has the government received representations recently from any group or groups in towns bordering on Alberta or Manitoba, for exemption from the 5 percent sales tax? If so, has any action been taken in connection with such representation?

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — The answer is no to both questions.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Semchuk for an Address-In-Reply.

Mr. W.J. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment of the debate last night I had spent a few moments dealing with remarks of some of the government members that had been made previously in the debate. You will remember that for a few moments I dealt with the question of population figures in the province of Saskatchewan which has become one of the paramount arguments on both sides of the house as to whether or not Saskatchewan is a province of prosperity.

I think that in dealing with relative matters of prosperity, possibly each and every one of us as members in this house tend to look first at our own constituencies, possibly we should look first at our own constituencies

and the conditions that most closely affect the people that we represent as members in this house. I also feel that in so doing, if we are caring for the problems that affect our own people at home we will, at the same time, be dealing with many problems as well that affect all the people of the province, and of course in dealing with the problems of those that we know best we can possibly give the best attention that we can possibly give to the problems of the people of this province.

And so for a few moments this afternoon I intend to take you to my constituency to deal with some of the local problems in that area and, at the same time, I think I would be remiss in my duties as a member in this house if I did not at the same time, during the course of those remarks, as well give credit where credit is due to some of the departments of government for things that have been carried out, particularly in the last year.

I think that as far as my constituency is concerned that, up until the last year, it has received very little attention for some time in certain fields from government departments in this province. And that is why this year, possibly different from others, that I feel that I should express appreciation for those things that various government departments have seen fit to do during the past year. But I also want to indicate to members in this house that most of the things that I am going to refer to are advantages that have been provided to the people in every constituency in this province, on I think — or should be — on a fairly equal basis. And so actually, it shouldn't really be coming as a special token of appreciation — it should be coming as something that should have been expected at an earlier date but we feel — better late than never, and so I am going to say this today that during this past year I feel that the government has at last given some recognition to my constituency and probably more so than they have for some particular time.

Now, I would say this, that I hope that this attention will continue, both for the welfare of the people that I represent and also because I feel that they have many major problems facing them in that area that have not been dealt with adequately in the past by this government. I think first I would like to make a reference to a record which I believe in this session will be established by myself in so doing. I would like to express appreciation to the constituency that I represent in sending me back as the first representative of that constituency that was ever elected for a second term in this legislature. However, today it's the seventh year that I have represented the constituency of Melville and there has only been one other member who sat here for six years — Mr. Herman, who was elected as a Social Credit — that represented that seat for a period of six years, and now I am serving the

February 22, 1963

seventh year as a member for the Melville constituency. So I want to take this opportunity of expressing to my constituents my appreciation of the faith and support that they have shown me in re-electing me as the first member to sit for their constituency for a second term.

I also want to assure the government, since we are now on the air, that the people of my constituency do appreciate any assistance that is provided at any time by government departments. However, at the same time I want to point out, as I have in the past few moments, that most of the recognition that is granted from time to time is granted to every constituency in this province and we in the Melville constituency for some time now, I believe, have been neglected and so I would like to say that this is something that we should have expected — the greater attention that we received in the past year.

I would like to extend to the power corporation and the minister in charge of the power corporation the appreciation of those residents in my constituency that received gas services during this past year. But I also want to remind him that there are still many communities in my constituency that have not received gas services, places such as Killaly, Grayson, Goodeve, Fenwood, Duff, and other centres in the constituency which would appreciate receipt of gas services by the corporation. So I would hope that when the minister addresses us in the budget debate that he may report that some other centres in my constituency will be served during the present year.

With regard to highways, I would also like to extend appreciation to the Minister of Highways because I was pleasantly surprised to see this fall that his department was able to complete the section of no. 15 highway from Ituna to Fenwood. I am only sorry they weren't able to continue and finish their job on that particular stretch of road. But as I know that it has been brought to his attention by people in that area, that both highways 47 and 22 deserve recognition and deserve work being done on them by his department. And so I would like today to urge him in his program this year to give consideration to the work that he has reported to the people of Melville, in particular, is to be done in the future on no. 47 highway, that he will be able to announce to us that that work will be undertaken this present year. Also, as regards no. 22 highway, between the junction of no. 10 and no 47, the minister is well aware that the money was voted in the session of 1956 for the rebuilding of a section of that road and it has never been done to this day. So I would say that the people on no. 22 highway have the right to expect the expenditures that were voted by this house some number of years ago. So I would hope that, as well, his department will take

into consideration the rebuilding job on no. 22 highway from the junction of no. 10 to the junction of no. 47 in this present year's program.

In regard to the program of the Department of Public Works, I feel that here is one place that the Melville constituency has been completely ignored in the past. I believe that the city of Melville was one of the few, and perhaps the only city, but one of the few larger centres in Saskatchewan, that has not received some public works construction since this government came into office in 1944. As I travel the province I see many centres that are smaller than the city of Melville that have as many as three public buildings that have been built by this government since 1944, and so I think I am being quite fair when I say to the Minister of Public Works that the city of Melville should receive consideration from his department. There is need for the construction of a public building in the city of Melville and I would hope that the minister might put this in considering his estimates in this present year.

I would again, for a few moments take over from where I left off last evening in relationship to the position of prosperity of the people of this province. Members will remember that I made reference last night to the basis of using population figures to prove whether the province is prosperous or whether it is not. I pointed out that in 1946, and I think in taking this figure I took a figure that is very realistic and a date. The year 1946 was after the end of the war and it was also after a period of depression in this country in the thirties and so I think I have chosen a point to start at which will definitely indicate the comparison of prosperity in the three western provinces since that date.

In 1946 the population in Alberta was 803,000, in Manitoba 726,000 and in Saskatchewan 832,000. The figures for 1961 were Alberta — 1,331,000, Manitoba 921,000 and Saskatchewan 925,000. This indicated therefore that in the same period of time, when Alberta had increased some 500,000 and Manitoba 200,000, Saskatchewan had only increased its population by a meagre figure of 90,000 people. I also pointed out that the government members in the debate had again trotted out the old bogey of nothing having been done in Saskatchewan since before 1944. I pointed out that Saskatchewan under Liberal government had grown truly from a wilderness in 1905 to the third largest and most influential province in Canada in 1929, at the end of the term of Liberal administration in this province at that time. I also stated that all the facilities that were provided to that date were accomplished with the same amount of money that it would this year cost to govern for one year alone.

February 22, 1963

When I concluded my remarks I was dealing with the question of social aid in Saskatchewan. I had indicated that instead of holding public meetings to defend the government's policies at the expense of the taxpayers of this province, that the minister would be well advised to do something constructive about the administration in his own department. I charged the department had caused many of the existing difficulties in this field by shifting responsibility from other government welfare programs to the municipalities under the social aid act. I would add to this criticism, Mr. Speaker, my belief that less advertising of the program would cut the abuses a great deal. Those that are irresponsible in seeking government assistance will find out quickly enough where to go and how they can get this assistance and I believe that people who are truly in need that those in the community that know this to be a fact will soon see to it that they are taken care of by the powers that be, and so I say that I think the minister would be well advised to cut down to a great extent the advertising that is done in the field of social aid by his department. I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a great deal gained by giving to the municipalities a greater control than has been given in the past over the issuing of social aid in their own communities and how the problem is going to be handled. I think here that over the last two or three years the minister has gradually been persuaded toward this point of view and I hope that he will continue to give to the municipalities, and those in control in their own local area, more of the control over the handling of our welfare program.

The problem of social aid is becoming an ever-increasing one today. Today one out of every 40 individuals in this province is receiving direct payments in aid from either the federal or provincial government. At the rate of increase over the last five years, in the next decade this figure could well be one out of 10 individuals, with the same increase that has taken place in the past few years we could well look to the day when one out of ten of our population will be living on some form of government handout or government assistance. This fact I know will stagger the imagination of every one in this province but I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we as members in this legislature, those that are in charge of the affairs of the government in the years that lie ahead are going to have to face this situation and they are going to have to face it in a sincere manner — not to seek the votes of those who will be receiving this assistance but to try to work out a responsible system whereby local organizations, local governments, and provincial and federal governments and the people themselves will accept full responsibility for the assistance that is being paid by the taxpayers in this province and the dominion of Canada. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in the last 19 years this government has failed to provide the type of program which would bring about the type of co-operation which would make our social

welfare program one of which we could all be proud in this province of ours.

The throne speech is absolutely devoid of solutions to any of the major problems facing the people of Saskatchewan today. The major problems, we all know, have been stressed by other speakers in this debate. First, I think, is the question of excessive taxation. I am not going to try to compare the position of taxes in this province with any other province — I don't think that that is necessary. I think it's the individual out in the country when he pays his taxes at the end of the year, it's the individual in this province when he pays his taxes when he goes to the store — the five percent tax this government now places on many of the goods that he purchases — I think the individual well realizes that taxes are high and so I say I don't think there is any necessity to particularly compare them with any other part of Canada. We have high taxes in this province and it should be a matter of concern to all of us as members of constituencies in this province.

Secondly, the problems that are facing local government in this province today — no mention made of many of those serious problems in the speech from the throne, no mention made of what the program of this government is going to be in the year that lies ahead with regard to the many important questions facing our local government officials in this province. That, I think, is one of the primary problems that we are facing today. But yet the throne speech is devoid of any suggestions to help out in that situation.

Thirdly, health and social welfare. None of these problems are more than a passing reference in the speech from the throne that is before the members at the present time.

The problem of taxation revolves around the failure of this government to provide the climate for industry and expansion in this province to help carry the heavy load of taxation that our people must carry. It is not fair to say that there has been no industrial development in Saskatchewan during the last 19 years but it is fair to say that that expansion has been retarded and slowed to the point that during the prosperous years following the last war we did not take advantage of the possibilities that were sitting there right in front of each and every one of us. The Stanford report brought down by this government definitely indicated, not in so many words, but in the evidence of the report, indicated that it had been a failure on the part of the government to take advantage of the natural resources of this province at the same time as our neighboring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. There is little question that this was made impossible due to the statements and actions of an excessively militant government freshly elected in 1944 with the fire of socialism in their eyes and the desire to see the birth of Marxian socialism in Canada a

reality. Legislation passed by the government in the early years, and the statements of the Leader of the Government, would frighten the largest industrialist when he could undertake the same development in one of our neighboring provinces. I do not think that any one even sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, who honestly believes that their socialist theories did not retard the progress of this province in the field of industrial growth since 1944. Some suggestion has been made in the speech from the throne that indicates the intention of the government to take some action, after 19 years in office, to alleviate this situation. However, as was reported in the Stanford report this action is too late. It was definitely stated there that the new industries in Manitoba and Alberta had already used up the possible markets for a period of another 20 years in most of the fields that are open for industry in the province of Saskatchewan. This means that we have not only lost 20 years of progress but we have lost 40 years of progress due to socialist administration in this province. There is only one way in which the government which sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, at this time can alleviate the problems that affect this province, and that is to go to the people in an election and give them a chance to elect a new government which can carry out the necessary measures in order to put this province on its feet again.

An Hon. Member: — The Premier wouldn't dare do that. Kuziak isn't going to run again anyway.

Mr. Gardiner: — The second problem that I mentioned was the question of local government in this province. There has been no indication in the speech from the throne that the government is prepared to make concrete proposals to local government bodies in this province if there is a reorganization undertaken. I believe, before any reorganization of boundaries is made by this government, either in relationship to the school system or to our municipal government, that the government must be forthright and come out with the financial program for our local government bodies that they can give serious consideration to. And I think until that is done, none of our local government bodies should approve of the changes that are being recommended to them at the present time. The basic issue facing our local government bodies is not one of organization it is one of financial necessity, and so I say here today that the financial problem must be solved before the question of administration will cure the problems that are affecting our schools and municipalities at the present time. I think everyone will agree that even if there is a general change in the position of the larger units at the present time, this can do nothing but cause confusion for at least a short period in the school system in this province. Over the period of the last 20 years our schools have been put into a state of confusion by a general

change in the administration system. If this is carried out in this present year or in the near future, and I am quite certain all of us realize that if that is done it cannot help but increase the operating costs of the administration of our schools at least through the transition period. And today all of our local people are wondering and asking themselves what is the government going to do. And there has been no clear indication coming from the government as to what their actions are going to be this year or in the future, and so we find at the present time that our local governments are in confusion with regard to the handling of their affairs.

We have had during the past year or two a commission going about the province attempting to establish the boundaries for so-called county systems that this government would like to see established in the province.

I would just like to say that when the Baker commission reported on agricultural rural life they laid down certain basic regulations, which they felt should be used by a commission determining the boundaries of this province. Well, I know in many cases in the areas that have been established in my own part of the province, there are supposedly new counties set up without any community of interest, or without any particular centre of interest within them.

The other basic requirement was to be an equalization of the tax burden and the tax load and the cost load of municipal governments. Here again, in my part of the province and I understand that this same problem is being felt in other parts of the province in consideration of the new boundaries, I understand that the problem has been the boundaries have already been indicated in many of these counties but they have not been set up with regard to the matter of equalizing the tax burden on particularly the rural taxpayers in this province. So, I say that the commission should have been working and studying on this problem that the government had given to them, instead of going about trying to convince the people of this province that the county would be a good idea and that they should undertake it and put it into effect.

I think that this government, the first time that the chairman of the commission came out and indicated that he was not carrying out his task and was trying to act as a propaganda instrument for this government, in promoting the county system, that they should have asked him to either stop this promotion and get down to the work that he was assigned, or get off the commission; and I say that in the last few weeks the utterances that have been made by the chairman of the commission with regard to members in this assembly at the present time, are not the type of statements that should be made by anyone who is receiving pay from the people of this province, so I say here today, that I hope the government in future, when it appoints commissions and commissioners, that it will see to it

February 22, 1963

that they stick to their job and stay out of things that they have no business considering.

I would like to turn now for a few moments to the remarks of the Premier in his address with regard to medicare. Here again, he refused to indicate either in the speech from the throne, or in his own remarks, how his government intends to proceed to try to make proper arrangements with the doctors of this province, to carry out medical services. Instead, he directed a tirade against the Leader of the Opposition for his actions during the medicare crisis. Had the Premier and his government accepted the recommendations of the opposition when this act was placed before this house, not only would the medicare act been in force, three months before it went into force but he also would have had the approval and consent of the majority of the people of this province and I believe the doctors as well, had he considered the recommendations that were made by the official opposition in the original debate.

I would like to state that it was the Premier and not the Leader of the Opposition, who had no regard for the health and the welfare of the people of this province, in his attitude during the medicare crisis. He was in the position, particularly after his friend Tommy left the premiership, to reverse the previous attitude and attempt to work out a measure which would be acceptable to the majority of the people of this province. However, he refused to give in but continued the abuse formerly levelled by the Premier at those who were to provide the services.

The government at no time, prior to July 1st, had a contract from the doctors of this province, to provide medical care under a government plan. The Premier, therefore, by going ahead at the time he did when he was not in a position to guarantee services, as provided under the legislation, was himself, I believe, acting in contravention of the law of this province. He had guaranteed a service which he could not deliver and usually under circumstances of that kind, at least in general business, one would find himself in a great deal of trouble. It is the Premier that must accept the whole responsibility for any of the unfortunate happenings of last July. It is the Premier who must accept responsibility for the loss of medical personnel to the province of Saskatchewan, when so little in the way of reason could have prevented the loss of those men to the province of Saskatchewan. No vituperation on the part of the Premier or his government, can for one moment erase the responsibility they had to provide a service which had been guaranteed under a law of this legislature. There was absolutely no legal responsibility on the part of the medical profession to provide a service which they had been no party to, and to which they had not guaranteed service.

In the fall of 1961, had the government accepted the

advice of the opposition and as well of their own Minister of Health, who now sits on this side of the house, the plan would have been in effect three months earlier . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — and the bitterness and strife of the last year would not have materialized. At that time we, the official opposition, gave 100 percent support to the principle of prepaid medical services for the Saskatchewan people; however, we refused to become party to a scheme which would not only threaten a group in our community but might threaten the health and welfare of all our people. I regret to again have to point out that the cardinal principles of the opposition desired to see implemented on that occasion: We urged that an independent commission be appointed properly representative of the medical profession and the general public; we urged that all parts of the act, which indicated any form of government control of medicine in general should have been removed from the legislation; we urged that tax powers under the act should be placed in the hands of the legislature, so that the health and welfare of the people could not be used for political considerations; we urged that all funds ear-marked originally for the plan be placed in a separate fund, so that all monies collected for provision of medical services would be there, and the public would be aware of the cost of the scheme, and payment would be made in a direct form for this purpose.

In the compromise that was finally worked out with the medical profession, the first two principles were accepted at least to a degree by both parties, but unfortunately, the last two were not. This provides revenue that can be used this year by our government that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, for purposes of helping to balance the budget and improve the financial position of this province, instead of for the health and general welfare of the people of this province as it was intended originally. As well, the government still remains in a position to raise and lower the individual tax rates on the people of this province whenever they desire. Usually lowering them before an election and increasing them after, so that they can make political use out of the health and welfare of the people of this province.

The government today is finding itself being bombarded with suggestions as to what they should use this money for. Now, I wish that no one in this province would want to take any of this money from the purposes for which it was intended and I would hope that the government would give re-consideration during this session to the placing of the money received from the increase in income and corporation tax, into the medicare fund, so that we might have the greatest possible use of the money that has been paid by the people of this province for health purposes.

February 22, 1963

I remember in listening to the Premier's remarks the other day, the fact that he spent a fairly large period of his address, attacking the Leader of the Opposition for his actions during the medicare crisis last July. But I would want to remind the Premier and the people of this province that long before the day of the K.O.D. rally here in the city of Regina, the Leader of the Opposition and members of his party had urged the Premier to call a special session of the legislature so that these matters might be discussed and so that health services would not be cut down on July 1st. Had the Premier accepted these requests, then there would have been no slow-up of medical services on July 1st, so that when the Premier attacks the Leader of the Opposition for the position he took, he should attack the position he, himself, took, which made it impossible for an agreement to be made with the medical profession. And then what happened? I can remember the Liberal members on this side of the house, held a meeting in Saskatoon before July 1st, and we sent a message, I don't know whether it was actually delivered in person, but at least it was publicized by the press, the fact that the meeting was held, and the members of the opposition promised the Premier that if he were to call a meeting of this legislature on 24 hours notice, we would agree to attend without pay or without cost to the taxpayers of this province. All he had to do, was to call this session in the month of June, and there would have been no slow-up of medical services, and we could have had the same arrangement worked out that we did a month later, after the unfortunate conditions during the month of July.

However, then we come to the actual day that he made so much of in his address. When he referred to the manner in which he received notice of the fact that the opposition had requested that the legislature be called into session . . .

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — They were all hiding in the building . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . they sent the message with a messenger to his office, the messenger rapped on the door, there was no answer, he tried the door and the door was locked; he heard people behind the door and I can only surmise that here was the scene he would have seen if they had ever opened the door:

The Premier of this province with his brave cabinet huddled around him, worried about whether there might be an assassin coming in the door, and so he had the door of his office locked so no one could get in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . and yet he would like the people of this province . . .

An Hon. Member: — He was looking out the window . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . to think that the Leader of the Opposition was using a cheap method of approaching him by slipping a letter under the door. I don't know how any messenger is going to get word to the Premier of the province if he has his door locked and won't answer when they try to get a notice to him.

Premier Lloyd: — The door to the office through which all people enter was not locked at any time.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, Mr. Premier, that is not the information we received on that occasion . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They were hiding. The Premier is like an ostrich with his head in the sand.

Mr. Gardiner: — I feel, Mr. Speaker, that had the Premier the courage on that occasion to appear before those who had gathered here in the city of Regina, and presented the case of his government to those individuals, that they would have had a lot greater respect for him as Premier of the province, and for his government, but he met a few people in his office and I understand that there were some on his side of the house, who abused those individuals that were allowed into his office as a delegation to meet with himself and some other members of the government. And then shortly after he didn't have time to meet with thousands of citizens of this province on the occasion of the K.O.D. rally, but he did have time, not very long after, to attend a rally of the "Ban the Bomb" that marched on the city of Regina . . .

Mr. D.T. McFarlane: — A family gathering . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Here is the man that accused the Leader of the Opposition and the members sitting on this side of the house, of trying to upset legislation that was passed by this legislature; trying to indicate to the people that something illegal was done; well, I would like to indicate to him that I always took it for granted, that his party was one that thought there should be a democratic approach to government. I know that there have been parades to other centres in Canada and his people were always the first off the train in order to present their protests to the people of that particular government, whether it was a Liberal government or a Conservative government. But he says that the people of Saskatchewan should not have the right to bring their proposals and protests right to the government of this province, and in so doing, they were in some way

February 22, 1963

committing some illegal act, trying to prevent legislation passed in this house from being proceeded with.

This is the type of campaign that is being carried on by the Premier of this province against the Leader of the Opposition and the members on this side of the house, who ever since this question came before the legislature, have taken all the time to give serious consideration, have given recommendations to this government, which were finally accepted in order to make the scheme as workable as it is today. And I am quite certain that if they had accepted the main recommendations made by the opposition a year and a half ago, that today we would have a much more workable plan than we have at the present time, and they would have the co-operation of both the medical profession and the majority of the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — References have been made since this debate began with regard to the co-operative organizations in this province. I believe it was the mover took time out to indicate that the Liberal party was not in favor of co-operatives; had not been in favor of co-operatives in the past. I would like to indicate to that member that either he has not taken the trouble to read the history of the co-operative movement in this province, or else he doesn't want to give the facts to the people of this province, and he would like to play politics with an organization in this province, which should be above politics, and should not be used as the instrument of any political party. And as I say here today, all that gentleman would have to do in order to find the evidence of the beginning of the co-operative movement in this province, is to go to his own government publication, put out in 1945, which indicates at least briefly the history of the co-operative movement in this province. And this is the statement that is made in this publication, put out since this government came in to office in 1945:

In 1914 the co-operative organization branch was established as a division of the department of agriculture,

and then it goes on in the second paragraph to say that —

during the period from 1914 to 1944, the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan experienced spectacular growth

Now I am quite certain that that spectacular growth would not have come about without the co-operation and the assistance of the governments of the days in which that growth was realized. Of course, we realize that in every province co-operatives existed before we ever heard of the CCF party, and so when they

today try to claim credit for the existence of the co-operative movement they are only trying to play politics with an organization that should be over and above that type of thing.

When we make reference to the co-operative movement, I think that in the example of what happened in the medicare issue, every member on the government side of the house that calls himself a co-operator should realize that political issues brought into the operations of a co-operative organization, do not intend to improve the operations of that organization or the co-operation within it. I am going to indicate what took place with regard to the publishing of the statement and the issuing of a letter under the name of the brother of the Premier of this province, who is the president of the Co-op Union in the province of Saskatchewan, in which he stated that the co-operative movement was backing the government on the medicare issue.

What happened, Mr. Speaker? I know that in the city of Saskatoon, I understand, that at that point the Co-operative Creameries lost a lot of the business that they had in the area, and they had orders cancelled, so the Co-operative Creameries issued a statement saying that they had nothing to do with the statement issued by Mr. Lloyd with regard to the medicare crisis, and that they had not expressed as part of that organization, any desire to be involved in the controversy.

What happened then, Mr. Speaker? The co-op store in Saskatoon withdrew the products of the Co-op Creameries from its shelves, and cancelled the contract, until the Co-op Creameries would change their minds on the medicare issue.

This, Mr. Speaker, indicates the length that members in the CCF party will go to try and destroy an organization that has been built up over the years in this province by our own people for their own personal political ambitions, and so I say here today that in regard to the co-operative movement in this province, I hope my friends to the right, after this issue last summer, will have learned a lesson, that politics in any organization like the co-operative movement can do nothing but harm and can be nothing but divisive so far as that organization is concerned, and it would be my hope that in the future co-operative members on the other side of the house will encourage their own organizations to refrain from politics in the co-operative movement.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we can justifiably say that there was very little in the speech from the throne, which gave an answer to the problems affecting the primary producers in this province — our farm people. In fact, since this government came into office in 1944, with the exception of one or two major pieces of legislation, which proved largely ineffective, very little new has been done. Yes, they have added to some of the policies that were here; they have extended some of the policies of the Department of Agriculture. But, I can think of two measures that they have put into effect that were new.

The one chiefly, after agitation by the opposition, with regard to implementing a farm loan plan for our younger people in this province. Well, we have a provincial farm loan plan that was instituted by this government; but it has not been a very great success. Largely because it wasn't aimed at the problem that the opposition had asked to be handled by an organization of this type. We had asked for loans for young farmers, or beginning farmers, to make it possible for them to get a start in farming in this province; but the act that came forward was actually a supplementary act to the then Canadian Farm Loan Board and today the Farm Credit Corporation and has added little of benefit to the situation that young people in our farming area find themselves in at the present time.

The other legislation that was brought down was the Crop Insurance Act, which again I think, largely because of the lack of enthusiasm of the government for its own legislation has proved of little value. We can all remember that when the legislation was presented, I think the least enthusiastic member in the house was the minister himself, and yet, these are the people that accuse the opposition of trying to retard the legislation that is passed in this house, and yet the government itself puts legislation on the statute books and then it fails to indicate the enthusiasm and give the leadership that should be given to the people of this province if its proper legislation in that field. And so I say the Crop Insurance Plan has largely been a complete failure, as it has been operated by the present government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in the addresses that have been made to date by members on this side of the house, it has been conclusively shown that in the speech from the throne that has been presented to us, that there have been no answers whatsoever to the problems that face the people of this province at the present time. I might also say that due to the political experiences of the past few months, I don't think there is any one, anywhere in this province, that will deny the fact that this government has lost the confidence of the voters in this province. I need only point to the four by-elections that have been held, which have been mentioned by other members of the house, and not only that we need also point to the very important legislation which has been put on the statute books in this province against the wishes of a great majority of the people that were concerned in that legislation. Here, I refer not only to medicare, but to the municipal legislation that has been placed on the statute books of this province in relation to the county system. All of these various forms of legislation have been forced to be changed by the wishes of the people of this province against the wishes of the government of this province, and so I think not only that fact that the people have indicated in their votes that they have no confidence in the government, but they have also indicated in their approach to the legislation that has been proposed by this government since 1960, that they will not countenance the actions

of this government for any longer, and I feel it is about time that the Premier of this province had the courage, before undertaking any of the major proposals of this government in the next two years, had the courage to go to the people of this province, and give them a chance to a say in the operations of their affairs in Saskatchewan. For that reason . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I desire to move an amendment to the address-in-reply, I move the motion, seconded by Mr. McFarlane, the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley

that — the following words be added to the address:

We respectfully submit that Your Honor's advisers do not possess the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan.

I so move, Mr. Speaker. And in closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the speech from the throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Moved by Mr. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. McFarlane

that the following words be added to the address

We respectfully submit that Your Honor's advisers do not possess the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan.

It is the wish of the house that we shall proceed as on previous occasions and that the debate will be on both the amendment and the motion. Is that agreed? The debate is now on the motion and the amendment.

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — First, I want to add my congratulations to those of other members of this house, congratulations which have been extended to both the mover and the seconder of the motion in reply to the speech from the throne. I must agree, Mr. Speaker, that both of these members did a very excellent job. They had a very good document on which to base their speeches, and they gave an adequate account of the accomplishments of this government during the past and a very good indication of a lot of the good things which will be extended to the people of Saskatchewan, by this government, in the years ahead. I want also to extend my congratulations to the new member for Prince Albert constituency, Mr. Steuart, and to welcome him to this legislature. I

February 22, 1963

think the hon. member gave notice yesterday that he, at least, oratorically, is going to be a worthy addition to this house. I think that he also gave a good illustration of the fact he is going to be an excellent follower of the cult of Thatcherism. The way in which he delivered his speech was very much like his worthy leader. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that a good part of the material was quite similar to that which was used by the Leader of the Opposition, when he spoke in this debate a few days ago.

My little effort in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I hope will be accepted as non-controversial; more as an effort to educate my honorable friends across the way than anything else. I still have not lost hope that I can sometime get a few facts of life across to my friends across the way. I had intended to deal mainly with some of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, but what I have to say this afternoon, I think, well applies to the speeches which have been made by other members on the opposite side of the house when they have spoken the last day or so, because it seems to me that the speeches were very similar. There may have been some variations, but on the whole, it seems to me that the speeches have been designed to do about two things really. I might add that, as usual, the contributions to the debate by my friends opposite, have been full of the usual number of half-truths, misrepresentations. But it does seem to me that the speeches have been designed primarily to do two things.

One: My friends in the opposition are trying desperately to convince the people of this province, that they are very much dedicated to free enterprise and, on the other hand they are hoping to convince the people of this province, that this government is so staunchly opposed to free enterprise. Their speeches have been designed to convince people that the economy and the development of this province is lagging; they are trying to convince people that private enterprise is afraid to come into this province. It is these things, Mr. Speaker, that I want to comment on for a few minutes this afternoon.

While listening to my good friend, the Leader of the Opposition, deliver his speech the other day, it seemed to me that it was full of more than the usual amount of bombast and venom, and I seemed to gain the impression that he was trying even harder than usual to vilify the government which sits to your right. I can't help wondering why he seems so determined, and is trying so much harder this session, than he has in the past, to put across these particular points. I can't help wondering, Mr. Speaker; and I can't help comparing my honorable friend with another rather frustrated individual who, some years ago during the war, was so anxious to force his particular ideology on the world that he stopped at nothing to gain his ends. This other gentleman, who we all know ended his life in an underground bunker amid the shambles of the city of Berlin, resorted to quite similar tactics to the honorable

Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — That is pretty shabby.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — The more he saw his support falling away, the more he attacked his opponents, the louder he screamed, and the more he resorted to any tactics available. All because, Mr. Speaker, like my hon. friend, the member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher) he realized that his days were numbered and it would not be too long before he would go into oblivion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Like in Weyburn.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — I think my hon. friend realizes, Mr. Speaker, that he cannot hope to continue to fool the people of this province. The people of this province are not blind, they can see what is taking place in this province. His only hope then, is to try and convince the people that under a Liberal government something more would . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Like in Turtleford.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — . . . happen, something more in the line of development might take place. He can only hope then, to continue his efforts to keep business and industry out of Saskatchewan, by continually trying to frighten them with a non-existent bogey-man. I want to say this, and it has been said before, that I am very much afraid that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would rather see this province an economic wilderness than prosper under this government. Now, to support his contention, Mr. Speaker, that this government is opposed to free enterprise, to bolster his contention that private business tends to bypass Saskatchewan, he talked of harassments, he talked of the fear of expropriation, the fear of government interfering in some field of business by setting up crown corporations. Well, I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, or suggest to you, how well grounded are these fears. How real is the fear in the minds of private business?

Well, my friend and his colleagues, for evidence that this government is expropriation prone, uses two particular cases; at least he did the other day, for examples to support his case. He mentioned, as you will recall, the Riverhurst bus line. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a sort of hazy recollection of the Riverhurst bus line, but quite frankly it happened so long ago and was so inconsequential, that I am

February 22, 1963

sure that everyone else in this province like myself has long since forgotten it. If I am not mistaken though, there was some sound reason that involved the public interest, why this particular little line was taken over. I am absolutely sure it wasn't because the government expected to make any money out of the transaction.

The other example that my hon. friend uses, is the box factory. Well, this is a long time ago too, and I imagine it is pretty well forgotten. I imagine that everybody in this province by now is fully aware why this little plant was taken over. Here was a plant locked in a serious labor dispute, which seemed impossible to settle, and there really wasn't much choice but to undertake that particular action. However, I would remind you that even in this instance, you could hardly properly use the term expropriation, because the sale was actually negotiated and it was generally conceded that the owners of that particular plant profited rather handsomely.

Does the hon. member across the way have any other examples? Any other examples of expropriation with which to frighten people. The answer, of course, is a flat no. Can you wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that this so called fear of expropriation is paid little attention by private business interests. That it is recognized that it is only in the minds of my friends across the way and his colleagues.

Yes, how about Quebec? I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to expropriation, this government, socialistic if you will, is quite a babe in the woods; we are mere pikers, compared to some of these so-called free enterprise governments in Canada today. How about the province of British Columbia? The recent expropriation of the electric utilities in that province by Premier Wacky Bennett. A Social Credit premier of a government that is supposed to be so devoted to the protection of private enterprise. How about the province of Quebec? A Liberal province, where they just recently decided to expropriate the electric utilities there. And I heard on the news today, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of that province has apparently given notice to the companies concerned, that they will accept his offer by, I believe, April 8th, or else.

I want to suggest to you that if these kind of actions took place in this province; if these things were done by this government, you would hear my friends across the way screaming to high heaven; but, when it comes to being done in a so-called free enterprise province, apparently it is perfectly all right. I wonder just how ridiculous some people can be.

Well, I would just like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friends across the way would have said if a couple of years ago, when we were negotiating for the purchase of

National Light in Moose Jaw, if I had suggested that I was considering expropriating that utility, just what would they have said? Would they have said "Well, it is perfectly all right, it is required in the public interest" Oh no, this would have been trampling on the rights of free enterprise, but you can trample on them anywhere else and they don't concern themselves at all.

Now how about this other fear? This fear of encroachment by crown corporations. This fear of government entering into business, in competition with private enterprise. Again I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this exists only in the minds of the members opposite. I want to remind you that this government hasn't established a crown corporation since 1947. It seems not likely to do so in the future.

What were the reasons behind the establishment of the crown corporations which were set up? I want to remind you that almost without exception these were commenced to provide services where none had existed before; to develop a natural resource in which private enterprise had no, or little, interest. They were set up to lay the ground work for badly needed expansion in this province; they were steps on the ladder to begin the climb out of the slough of stagnation in which this province wallowed under a Liberal government for so many unhappy years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Brown: — I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that where opportunities for a new industry have existed in recent years, and where services to Saskatchewan people have been required, this government has literally bent over backward to encourage private capital into the field.

Some examples of the willingness of this government to pump capital into new industries, yet being determined to keep them under private ownership are: The Saskatchewan Cement Company; Wisewood Limited, the wafer board plant at Hudson Bay; The Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation.

The Premier mentioned something about Interprovincial Steel the other day, he chastised, and I suggest rightly so, the Leader of the Opposition for some of the unfounded attacks which he had made on that company and I want to say, to my mind, these charges not only were unfounded, uncalled for, but they certainly were far from being in the best interests of one of the major industries in this province.

I have personal knowledge of the fact that because of some of the statements that were made by my hon. friend, that this company lost millions of dollars in orders, which were

February 22, 1963

in their hands, and they were cancelled because my friend's statement frightened the people who were prepared to purchase.

Mr. Thatcher: — Prove it.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Don't worry, it can be proven very easily. The evidence can be produced too. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we are told that private enterprise fears encroachment by crown corporations into their normal sphere of operation, this is just so much nonsense. There is no such fear in the minds of private business, either inside or outside of Saskatchewan at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Brown: — They laugh at the childish babblings of my friends opposite, Mr. Speaker. I might say, Mr. Speaker, again, when it comes to encroachment on private industry's sphere of operation, this government is again rather a babe in the woods and are actually a bunch of pikers in that regard. Here, in Saskatchewan, we have deliberately refrained from permitting the power corporation to go into widespread sale of electric appliances, and in household utilities and I can just imagine the howls that we would receive from my friends across the way if we did permit the power corporation to enter that sphere of operation. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in many other provinces the utilities do merchandise appliances; they sell them, they install them and they subsidize them. Furnaces, hot water heaters and so on. I had an experience in the province of Ontario not so long ago, when I was interviewing a manufacturer who had expressed some interest in the possibility of establishing a little plant in the province of Saskatchewan, to manufacture hot water tanks and heaters. And the first question he asked me was this "Mr. Brown, what is the policy of the utilities in Saskatchewan in respect of subsidization of hot water heaters?" I said, "What do you mean?" and he said "Well, here in Ontario, the utilities handle these things and they sell them like hot cakes, they subsidize them, and they put them in". And I said, "My friend, you can do this in any so-called free enterprise province, but if you dared try to do this in Saskatchewan, I am afraid that some of my free enterprise friends would howl their heads off."

I would like to look, Mr. Speaker, for a moment or two, a little closer, at this charge that free enterprise is afraid of Saskatchewan, is not coming into Saskatchewan. The Premier when he spoke the other day, put on the record a number of statements which I think clearly indicate the confidence of responsible business leaders in the political climate for industry here in Saskatchewan. There are a lot more that could be quoted. I have a lot more down in my files at the office. One of my friends, across the way, and I believe

it was the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) referred to the Stanford report. Well, I would like to quote a little statement that appeared in that report. In dealing with the government's attitude with regard to industry and development the Stanford report said this:

In observation and analysis during the extensive field work in Saskatchewan, indicated that there is a favorable public and official attitude towards industry. This conclusion is substantiated by the achievements and prosperity of various newly established enterprises which constitute Saskatchewan's growing industrial complex.

I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that one of the best answers to this charge that private industry is not coming into Saskatchewan; is afraid to come into Saskatchewan, is the number of Canadian and foreign companies which are already established in Saskatchewan at the present time. Companies which have come in here and set up business, made investments, and as far as I know, they are all doing extremely well. And I have a list of these, it constitutes almost four pages, and you can go all the way down the line and you will find companies of every nature. From anywhere in the United States to anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this hardly supports the contention of my friends opposite that outside capital is afraid to come into the province of Saskatchewan.

When he spoke the other day the Premier gave a number of facts and figures pointing out the development of the non-agricultural sector of Saskatchewan's economy which has taken place in the last few years. There is no need for me to repeat these facts and statistics but I would however like to draw attention to some of the things which people outside of the government have to say about what is going on in Saskatchewan.

Very recently an official of the British American Oil Company spoke to the 75th anniversary banquet of the Moose Jaw Chamber of Commerce. This is what he had to say — part of what he had to say about recent developments in Saskatchewan. He said this “that great strides towards balance, stability and resiliency made by the Saskatchewan economy in recent years can be attributed to diversification” — D.A. Campbell, Executive Vice-President of the B.A. Oil. He said that as a result of increased mineral production, manufacturing and other non-agricultural activities, the provincial economy has come a long way since the years when the Saskatchewan province had all of its eggs in the wheat baskets.

Mr. Thatcher: — Would the minister give the date of that speech?

February 22, 1963

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Yes, this was — you will find it in almost any paper but this particular one was in the Star Phoenix dated February 1, 1963.

I was interested too, Mr. Speaker, in receiving a copy of the report — the annual report of the Retail Merchants Association. And what they have to say about what is going on in Saskatchewan at the present time. I am not going to read a lot from the report. The report was dealt with in quite a bit of detail by the newspapers in this province. It was interesting to find that in the Leader Post, for example, the headline on the story was “Retail business expected to hit \$1 billion in 1963”. Referring to the economy, Mr. Walker, the Secretary-Manager of the organization, referring to the year’s production figures, Mr. Walker noted that Saskatchewan was moving away from its sole reliance on agriculture. Farming was still the mainspring of the economy but a mixed economy was fast developing. The Leader Post, in their story, said, towards the end of the article, Mr. Walker’s report termed Saskatchewan’s industrial development as enormous. And you can find these kind of reports in the papers constantly, Mr. Speaker, reports which give a lie to the kind of propaganda which we are so used to hearing from my hon. friends across the way.

Now, I am sure that my friends will come back at me and say, “Oh, well, yes, you can point to something that is being done”. But they will say, “Well, but of course we still think you are behind some of the other provinces”. And I am not going to argue the point on that score, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say this, that if Saskatchewan — and I am not going to agree that we are very far behind anybody — but if we are behind at all I want to suggest the blame rests squarely on the backs or the shoulders of the political party which is represented by friends sitting across the way. I want to suggest that Saskatchewan undoubtedly could have made much greater strides over the years if it had not been for the heritage of handicaps left to the people of this province when the Liberal government was tossed out of office in 1944. I was rather amused the other day, Mr. Speaker, when, and I think I’ve got just about what my friend said and he can correct me if I’m wrong, but I wrote this down and it seems to me that my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, said something to the effect that 20 years ago Saskatchewan was the biggest province in many fields. I think this is what he said . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I will correct you. What I said was — the biggest province west of Ontario in population and other fields . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Fine, I stand corrected because I wasn’t quite sure — I didn’t hear all of what he said — but it makes little or no difference, Mr. Speaker. I am still wondering in what fields.

Mr. Thatcher: — Population to start with.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — The only area in which Saskatchewan was anywhere near in the lead at that time, as near as I can discover was in the amount of dead weight debt that we were carrying and the restrictions that were placed on the credit of this province.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — And like we are today . . .

Hon. Mr. Brown: — I was amused too, Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend speaking about the causes of stagnation as we termed it mentioned travelling about the province of Saskatchewan and he said that he saw an abundance of resources. He saw an abundance of oil, gas, and potash, and timber and power.

Mr. Thatcher: — I didn't say power.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — You didn't say power — well, I take that back. It is rather gratifying to hear my hon. friend admit that these things are here in Saskatchewan. It is good to know that he is finally seeing the almost 5,000 oil wells, working to capacity, the hundreds of gas wells producing natural gas for our homes and our industries, the potash plants turning out millions of tons of potash to nourish the food growing lands throughout the world, the power stations and transmission lines providing energy to every corner of this province, to supply the needs of our commerce, our industries and our homes, — it is rather nice to hear my friend finally acknowledge that these things are here in Saskatchewan today. When he talks about 20 years ago and where Saskatchewan was I wonder whether he took the trouble to ascertain what the Liberal government of the day, 20 years ago, had to say about these very things.

I wonder if he took the trouble to see what Mr. Patterson, the former Premier of this province, said about oil and gas possibilities in Saskatchewan, when he reported, made his submission to the special committee of the House of Commons on reconstruction and re-establishment. I have looked it over and I find in here that the hon. gentleman made some mention of the fact that there was some search going on in the hopes of finding oil and natural gas in the province. Some searching, but, Mr. Speaker, no production. I have looked through this report pretty carefully, Mr. Speaker, and I can find no mention of potash at all. When it comes to timber, I think this was referred to in this house the other day, about the only cogent statement there was that if something wasn't done about it within 10 years the forest resources of this province would be completely depleted. And it is interesting to read what they had to say about power, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to just have a look at this one because I am sure you will appreciate

it. It says this:

Approximately one-third of the population of Saskatchewan had electric service, some major transmission lines and others from local plants where only part-time service was provided. In small urban centres there are 35,000 people who should have service from major transmission lines.

But what did it say about rural electrification. This — about 13,000 of our farmers have a modified electric power service in the form of wind chargers. I am glad my hon. friend can look around now and see power lines going into every corner of this province and can see the new power station that is being developed in order to take power to the people as they require it. You might take a look through this report too, Mr. Speaker, and find out what they had to say about some of those other things, some of those factors which affect the economic development of any community. You might want to look through and see what they have to say about highways. And if I am not mistaken, the only thing they had to say was to point out that Saskatchewan had over 8,000 miles of highway at that time that badly needed rebuilding. You could look through this report and you could find all kinds of things, any number of instances where it was pointed out that we had inadequacies, our educational institutions, hospitals, health services, social welfare services, sewer and water facilities, and so on. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of a heritage which the Liberals left the people of this province when they left office in 1944. And I say to you again that if this province has been slow in any regard, the blame for it rests right across the way with the political party which is represented by the members to your left.

Now, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is some reference to industry in the report, and I think that this is one that we should have a look at, Mr. Speaker, because when my hon. friend was talking about no industry, no development, nothing being done in Saskatchewan, I would like to remind them what the situation was back at the time we came into office. And it says this under the heading of industry:

Saskatchewan from the point of view of industrial development is in a poorer position than any other province in the dominion of Canada with the possible exception of Prince Edward Island, despite the fact that we had in 1939 8.39 percent of the population we had only 2.9 percent of Canadian industrial development. This places Saskatchewan citizens in the position of having an overwhelming dependency

upon primary industries and of trying to gain their livelihood under many handicaps under which their more fortunate fellow citizens in the more highly industrialized provinces do not labor.

There was a little reference in here too about the possibilities of employment. The possibilities of employment for the service personnel coming back from overseas and getting out of the armed services. I won't bother digging it up but as I recall, it said well, there is some small chance that a few jobs will be available — clerical jobs and in services, and this sort of thing, but all in all it held out little hope for the thousands of young men and young women that were coming back to Saskatchewan after having served their country in the armed forces.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, not only did the Liberals leave us a heritage of handicaps when they left office, but they continue to provide one, provide us with a handicap by their constant slander of their own province and the completely unfounded charges that Saskatchewan is becoming an economic wilderness. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this house, that our work of inducing development of new industry in Saskatchewan is made immeasurably more difficult when in Eastern Canada and elsewhere you have to sit down with people and first overcome a certain prejudice which has been built up by the irresponsible statements made by my friends opposite, and I want to say to you again, as I have said before, that I think that it is high time that they showed a little more responsibility and began to help Saskatchewan rather than for their own political purposes to crucify it.

I was interested too Mr. Speaker, in another remark which was made by the Leader of the Opposition. I stand to be corrected if I haven't got the remark quite right, but I think I did. I think he said something like this. That industry would only come into Saskatchewan if it was assured of a profit. I rather imagine that he was inferring of course that industry was not coming to Saskatchewan because for some vague unstated reason, because of this government it could not be sure of making a profit or continuing to make a profit. Well in spite of the obvious inference, because I know what he was thinking at the time, I am going to agree with him. It is quite true of course that private industry will only come into a province, will only come into an area when there is an opportunity for a successful operation and an opportunity to make a profit. Rather than disagree with him, I am glad to know that my friend and his colleagues finally recognize this fact. I have been trying to convince them of that for quite a number of years. Industry does not, of course Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman across the way would have us believe, come into a province just

February 22, 1963

because someone says they want it to, just because someone says they are in favor of free enterprise. All the protestations of wanting industry, of favoring private industry won't bring one new industry into a province. There must, Mr. Speaker, be an opportunity, an opportunity to operate successfully and to make a profit. And when is there an opportunity, Mr. Speaker? Well, I think you can describe it like this — an opportunity exists when a combination of factors make it possible to produce a product in an area and move it into an established market in competition with similar products; an opportunity exists when new and expanding markets make it possible to establish additional manufacturing facilities producing a particular product at a cost that will permit it to enter the new and expanding market in competition with similar products from older established plants.

This simply means, Mr. Speaker, whether my friends opposite believe it or not, whether they recognize it or not, you don't just obtain industry by beating yourself on your chest and saying you are in favor of free enterprise. There must be an opportunity.

I want to point out too, Mr. Speaker, that you may possibly have an opportunity for a particular industry in one province or in one area and you don't have that opportunity in another. For anyone to say then Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan should have this industry or should have that industry simply because we would like it is just so much utter nonsense, and just plain ridiculous. I want to suggest to you Mr. Speaker that Saskatchewan can only expect to obtain a given industry when all the pertinent economic factors are equal to or better than any other province of any other area. Now, my friends opposite, to listen to them talk, seem to abhor the thought that governments should in any way participate in industrial development. They seem to feel and express the view, they have said before that all a government needs to do is to say you are in favor of private enterprise, and according to them the floodgates are opened and every company in Canada will come charging in.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally accepted across Canada today and in most other countries that government participation in the development of the economy, in the development of our resources and in the development of industry is not only desirable but absolutely essential. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of management, labor and government working more closely together with a view to improving our productivity, with a view to expanding the industrial base of this country is being recognized everywhere. Canada, as a whole, and the individual provinces are looking more closely at what has been accomplished by this kind of co-operation in many countries across the Atlantic, countries in which, due to

co-operation between management, labor and government, great strides have been made in improving the economic conditions of those countries to the point where, in many cases, unemployment is almost unknown. Now I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of co-operation is emerging here in the province of Saskatchewan through the medium of the local and provincial productivity councils. I have great hopes that these organizations will contribute much to the development and welfare of the industrial community of this province in the year ahead.

I want to suggest to you then, Mr. Speaker, that governments can and should take some responsibility for establishing industrial opportunities because without an opportunity you have little hope of getting any new industry to come into your province. Governments should take some responsibility for establishing that there are industrial opportunities available. And having established that there is an opportunity, governments can and should participate in, and yes, take the lead in selling the opportunity to prospective sponsors of such industry. This of course is exactly what this government has been doing, and doing for a great number of years in spite of what my hon. friends across the way may say; and I might add Mr. Speaker, doing it rather successfully.

I want to admit quite frankly that we don't get them all. Sometimes after a great deal of time and effort, months of hard work, the proposal just doesn't jell. You find the combination of factors indicate that it would be more profitable for the industry to locate elsewhere. When that happens, Mr. Speaker, all the talk about being in favor of free enterprise won't do you one bit of good because unless the industry can see its way clear to making reasonable levels of profit, then it is just not going to locate. I would like to give you one small example of this type of a situation. Not so long ago we did a tremendous amount of work in our department with respect to a particular industry to be located in the southeast part of the province. And after working on this for months and months and months, the project seemed to be coming along extremely well, as a matter of fact the studies indicated that the particular products could be produced from a plant in Saskatchewan at a cost about \$10.00 a ton less than a similar plant located in the United States — and then the blow fell. The market area happened to be mainly south of the border and by the time they took into consideration the transportation costs, the differential in transportation costs, instead of having a \$10 favorable cost comparison that particular product had a deficit of \$2 per ton, consequently, in spite of the fact that we had given every possible concession, the industry had no other alternative but to decide that it was going to locate somewhere else. Again I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that all the talk about being in favor of free enterprise would not have helped one iota in getting that industry into Saskatchewan.

February 22, 1963

I had intended to take a little time this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to review very briefly some of the work that the department has been undertaking in the field of industrial development. The Premier has already mentioned, when he spoke, many of the forms of assistance which have been provided to prospective industry, some of the services which are available. I was going to comment on the number of trips which the personnel, myself included, of the department, made to other parts of Canada and the United States calling on prospective clients, sponsors of industry, going from door to door if you like, to see if we can't induce more people to come into Saskatchewan with more manufacturing plants. I am not going to take too much time with it today. Possibly I may have an opportunity sometime later during the session.

There was, too Mr. Speaker, a number of other matters which I intended to refer to, a number of matters which have been raised by some of the members opposite which I do feel need to be commented on. However, I think there is a very good possibility that I may have an opportunity to do something about these later on. But we have been doing a tremendous amount of work, Mr. Speaker, to bring new industry into Saskatchewan, in spite of what my friends might think. But what of the future. Well, the throne speech forecast some additional incentives, some additional assistance to industry, provision for enabling private business to more formally participate in development of programs designed to speed the economic development of this province. I heard my friends across the way say that this is deathbed repentance, that we are just now acknowledging private industry. This is the same kind of nonsense which one usually hears from my hon. friends opposite. I want to point out that, as the throne speech indicated, the proposals will be an expansion of the present programs of assistance with some new programs, proposals, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, that will put Saskatchewan in the forefront insofar as assistance to private industry is concerned. And why now, you might ask. Well, again, not deathbed repentance, not a belated bow in the direction of industry, rather to put Saskatchewan in a position to continue to compete on a fairly reasonable basis with the other provinces of Canada.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that every province in Canada today is faced with the problem, faced with the problem of a growing labor force, with the problem of finding jobs for thousands of people who are entering the working force every year. The magnitude of the problem and some idea of the competition which you have to meet for new industry can be realized and understood when you know that the province of Ontario, for example, has stated that in order to take care of the people entering the working force in that province annually in the years ahead, they will have to find some 60,000 new jobs. Here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we estimate that over the next five years we will need some 8,000 new jobs annually. The new and

expanded program of assistance to private industry then, Mr. Speaker, is designed to help to attract more new industries, to assist new industries to expand in order to make the required number of new jobs available to the people in Saskatchewan who will be entering the working force.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this. One of the hon. members opposite, in fact several of them, have joined in suggesting that this government is living on borrowed time. Well I have heard this same sort of thing in this house for a great number of years now, Mr. Speaker. I can recall on a number of occasions coming back into the house immediately after a provincial election when the government was re-elected somebody over there will pop up and say, "oh, you are living on borrowed time. If you called an election you would be defeated." Well, I get kind of a kick out of listening to silly statements of that kind. Frankly when they say that we are living on borrowed time it really doesn't disturb me too much. I am going to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government's credit with the electorate of this province is just as good as it is with the financial institutions which think so highly of the manner in which the provincial affairs are being managed they are prepared to loan us all the money we require. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the time comes the people of this province will give us all the time we ask for.

I will support the motion.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the motion before the house I would like first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder who so easily launched this debate. I personally, Mr. Speaker, would have been content to vote after the seconder had sat down because I thought that the issues had all been very clearly and competently dealt with at that time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I want to congratulate the new member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on the maiden effort which he made in this assembly and I want to say that I believe he offers more promise of being a good member than many of those whom I have faced in this house over the past 15 years. I would only warn him, however, that if he wishes to maintain a reputation as a capable and effective member that he ought not to start to emulate or copy any of those who sit near him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to engage in a jousting rebuttal of every statement that has been made from the other side. I want to, however, say that after the Leader of the Opposition had spent a considerable time pawing the

February 22, 1963

ground and bellowing in this house, thumping his chest and saying what a great hero he was going to become next election. I couldn't help thinking back over the last 15 years of other persons who have occupied that seat, and other members of the opposition, who have made similar brave boasts as to what they were going to do. One opposition member I recall, in the session of 1950, had made the statement that come the next election the Liberal party was going to do to this government what it had done to the Anderson government in 1934. Well, there have been three provincial elections since that statement was made and in the election which immediately followed in 1952, this government was re-elected with the largest percentage vote that any government had received in the third of a century since 1925. The Premier so aptly said earlier in this debate that the strength of the opposition was cut in half after that period of chest thumping, boasting and bragging that we had to endure between 1948 and 1952.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of Saskatchewan would be much better pleased if Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and all members, would address themselves more directly to the real issues of this assembly and devote themselves less to juvenile bragging and boasting of future exploits and conquests. After all, one only has to look at the last two general elections in Canada, look at the results in Saskatchewan, if one excludes the single constituency of Assiniboia, both the opposition in this chamber and the government were skunked. Now that didn't prevent this government from being re-elected two years later in 1960 with the same majority in this assembly that it had prior to 1960. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it may not be entirely flattering to the government to recall that the voters of Saskatchewan who vote for the present government at Ottawa and who vote for the present government in Saskatchewan are apparently prepared to vote for any party that offers any promise of keeping the Liberals out of office in Saskatchewan or in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think that when it comes to speculating about the results of future elections we would be better off to concern ourselves with issues that are presently before this house. I think the people of Saskatchewan can be trusted as they could in the past with sufficient responsibility to choose the kind of servants they want to have to carry out their wishes and their will in this province.

There is a lot of talk about population figures, and I realize that to some people it may be difficult to have their mind surround any complicated or complex situation. And to some people it's very easy and very simple to refer to a simple figure like the population of Saskatchewan and to assume that

it means more than it actually does in terms of political or economic significance. But I think that any person who wants to really appraise the effect of population growth should analyse the population figures to see in what area, in what segment of our economy population is declining and to see whether or not there is an increase in part, or what part of the economy. One only has to look at the figures, or one only has to divide the figures into rural and urban components in order to get some meaningful appraisal of the effect of the growth in population in Saskatchewan.

If one looks at rural population we will find a very substantial decline in this province as compared with the neighboring provinces. In Saskatchewan our rural population declined from 1941 to 1961 from 601,000 to 398,000, a decline of 33.7 percent. I don't have to explain to the house why that has occurred. Anybody who is familiar with the rural situation of our province, who knows what has been going on on our farms, the mechanization that has taken place, has no difficulty explaining why that reduction has occurred, and I don't think there is any responsible person in Saskatchewan who would like to see our present farm resources farmed by 33.7 percent more people than they are at the present time. This has come about as a healthy result of a progressive and a prosperous province.

In the province of Manitoba there has been a much smaller decline in farm population. Their mode of farming, their farm operations are different from ours. They don't lend themselves quite so readily to massive mechanization with the result that the farm population in Manitoba, has declined only from 408,000 to 376,000 or a decline of only 8 percent.

Alberta has a little different situation. There has been a vast hinterland developed in northwestern Alberta with the result that there is a vast increase in the acreage farmed in that province in that 20-year period and their population has declined also only very slightly, 11 percent. But no one in Saskatchewan would suggest that we ought to try to establish farms in the bush areas of the far north or that we ought to plow up our community pastures and try to establish farm families upon them. It is a plain, simple, healthy, wholesome fact that our agricultural industry is adjusting itself and adapting itself to modern technology.

For Manitoba to maintain its population over that 20-year period, they had to add only 32,000 people to their cities, to their non-agricultural population. For Alberta to maintain its level of population they had to add only 33,000 people to their cities, to their non-agricultural industries. But Saskatchewan to maintain a level and uniform total population had to add 203,000 people, 32,000 in Manitoba, 33,000 in Alberta, 203,000 in Saskatchewan. And for that reason we have had to enjoy much more conspicuous success in the development of secondary and non-agricultural industry in order to merely hold

February 22, 1963

our own with respect to population. And I don't think that the hon. members opposite are fooling themselves by this silly nonsense that they go through, this rigmarole about Saskatchewan's population in relation to the other provinces. They certainly aren't fooling very many people among their intelligent listeners.

Liberal spokesmen, Mr. Speaker, have attacked the administration of social welfare in this province. Well, I can remember the financial critic of the Liberal party the first year I sat in this house saying that this government had extended itself, had over-extended itself in provision for social welfare benefits. I remember him shaking his finger at the government and saying, the time will come when you will find it isn't possible to maintain the social welfare structure that has been erected in this province under a CCF government. Now, what was thought then to have been excessive costs of social welfare are now harked back to by members opposite as being stingy and niggardly for social aid. It seems that the only time Liberals can be progressive is when they are looking at a decade back rather than looking to the future.

Mr. Speaker, they evidently think, they assume apparently that the day-to-day administration of social aid is under the control of the Department of Social Welfare. They decry the fact that a number of meetings were held in Saskatchewan at which this subject was discussed. Apparently this subject was discussed in the presence of their constituents, and apparently their constituents are capable of understanding very well what the true situation is in this province. But apparently this little morsel of thought hasn't percolated into the minds of hon. members opposite yet. They still seem to think that the Department of Social Welfare is responsible for the day-to-day administration of aid.

In the same breath, of course, they see nothing inconsistent about complaining and criticizing the city of Regina for the way in which it administers social aid. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how these people think and I don't know what passes for thought in their mental processes but surely you can't in one breath blame the provincial government for the manner in which it administers social aid and at the same time say that they know this is true because of a scandal that existed in the city of Regina social welfare office. The city of Regina welfare office is, of course, under the control of the city of Regina, not under the control of the provincial government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that they are wiser than they would admit. They know perfectly well that this is a ruse and nothing more than an effort to try to confuse others. The Leader of the Opposition pursued this thing in his speech the other day by saying and I quote the Leader of the Opposition "that there is evidence that social aid on an ever-increasing scale

is being given to chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, people who are too lazy to work and people who are frequently not citizens of Saskatchewan”. And then levelling that indictment against this government he proceeded to quote certain statements which he said appeared in the Regina Leader Post as quoting a declaration given by a city welfare official by the name of Mr. Krisko. I quote again from the Leader of the Opposition:

Mr. Krisko, a social aid worker, said he was instructed by the mayor to offer monetary aid to an applicant. He conducted the usual investigation as to the eligibility of the applicant and determined the person was a self-employed business man conducting a landscape business in the city. He further determined that the applicant was the owner of tractors, trucks, cultivator, a front-end loader and a Cadillac car.

Having left the impression, Mr. Speaker, that this person received social aid, the Leader Post — the Leader of the Opposition then — excuse me for confusing those two terms but they come very close together — the Leader of the Opposition then grandiloquently poses the question — “Do you think this man is entitled to receive social aid?”

If the hon. gentleman had been willing to be frank and fair with this house he would have had to say that he had no evidence whatever that this gentleman did receive social aid. There is nothing in the Leader Post story to suggest that this gentleman was awarded social aid by the city welfare department. Or indeed, Mr. Speaker, if one really wants to be conscientious about this and looks up the actual declaration which Mr. Krisko made and which Alderman Young has, and I am sure all he has got to do is just ask Alderman Young for it some day when he sees him, he will see that Mr. Krisko never at any time suggested that this gentleman got social aid.

The Leader of the Opposition tried to leave this innuendo in this house, and one of the other members — I think it was the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) picked it up and repeated it. Why, he said, there are people getting social aid who drive Cadillac cars — apparently on the basis of the insinuation made by the Leader of the Opposition, which the Leader of the Opposition knew or ought to have known had no foundation in fact.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert): — Would you mind . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

February 22, 1963

Mr. Stuart: — Would the member permit a question? Is he making the statement that the gentleman in question did not receive social aid?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am saying this to my hon. friend that neither the Leader Post nor Mr. Krisko's statement said that he did receive social aid, and this is the information on which the Leader of the Opposition attempted or purported to lead this house to believe that aid was given. Now if the Leader of the Opposition or if the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Stuart) has got any private or confidential information which Alderman Young has, then all I can say is that Alderman Young wasn't frank with me when he asked me to launch an investigation into this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he made some other references to people getting social aid and he tried to leave the impression that there were other cases involved in this Regina matter. Well, as a matter of fact I checked the documents and not one of the cases which he described fits the allegations made by any of the welfare officers in Regina and I can only assume that the Leader of the Opposition either willingly or accidentally left that misleading impression with the house. However, Mr. Speaker, since the Leader of the Opposition did try to leave the impression that the mayor of Regina had done something illegal or that he had unlawfully or improperly interfered with the actions of the city of Regina social welfare department, I think I should place on the record of this house some of the principal facts which were contained in the documents submitted to me by Alderman Young's committee. I would not have thought this worthwhile dealing with except that the hon. Leader of the Opposition sought to inject it into the proceedings of this house for partisan advantage.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the material disclosed that there were 2461 social aid recipients in Regina on October 31, 1962. Each welfare officer in his declaration recited lists of file numbers in respect to which he alleged that the mayor had made representation. In about a dozen cases particulars of the conversations between the mayor and the welfare officer were related in the declaration. But in respect to the other files which were cited, which were listed in the declaration only the vaguest references were made. Although Mr. Krisko, one of the welfare officers, referred to 44 files where he says the mayor questioned his decision, he gives particulars with respect to only five and he refers to only two of those five where he says that he bowed to the mayor's request that aid be granted. Out of this total of 2461 cases it appeared from the material that was filed with me by Alderman Young that the mayor had made representations with respect to 66, and in only eight of these 66 cases did the welfare officers claim that they had changed their minds and had decided to award aid. It was, therefore, perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker,

from the facts that the mayor had seen and made representations on behalf of less than 3 percent of the welfare case load of the city of Regina in his capacity as mayor. And out of this number, the 66 cases, there were only eight reversals of the previous decision made by the welfare officer. I suggest that doesn't seem like an unduly high proportion; if I am right in 56 decisions that I make out of 64, I'll think that I'm hitting a pretty good score. If the Leader of the Opposition is right in eight out of 66 he will be hitting a good score for him.

There is nothing unusual, Mr. Speaker, about a person having made an application for aid, having it declined, a few weeks or a month later going to see the mayor, the mayor sending him over to the welfare officer, the welfare officer looking at his case again and deciding in eight of these 66 cases to put the man on aid, where he had declined aid earlier. In each of these eight cases, however, Mr. Speaker, in each of these eight instances, the new decision was made by the welfare officers or the director of the Regina welfare department, as is required under the social aid act and the regulations under the act. Indeed, the director and the Regina social welfare department acknowledges in his declaration that it was laid down in the social welfare agreement that he and only he could take responsibility and only he had the sole authority to decide which cases in the final analysis should receive aid.

There was, therefore, in the allegation, Mr. Speaker, no suggestions that the mayor or anyone else had illegally or improperly usurped the legal rights of the director of welfare or acted unlawfully in his place. No suggestion of that. Nothing was alleged but an insinuation, an innuendo which apparently deceived the Leader of the Opposition and, when he read it, deceived one or two of his group over there. It is one thing to say that representations were made or that instructions were given that a man should be put on social aid, but when the welfare officer didn't do it, no harm is being done. Nothing unusual about that.

Thirdly, is the fact that the officials of the Regina welfare department are civic officials, they are employees of the city of Regina, they are paid by the city of Regina and hired by the city of Regina. Now someone has a legal duty and responsibility to oversee the manner in which these employees perform their duties to the public. No one in the provincial government has got the right to oversee the way in which these people perform their duties, to see whether they treat the public with proper respect and proper consideration for their rights. Only the city has this duty. And ultimately this duty falls on the mayor and aldermen of the city. In this case, in the absence of any clear-cut procedure by the city council, then the duty clearly fell upon the mayor as Chief Executive of the city of Regina to supervise the conduct of the city staff. These are substantially the fact, Mr. Speaker; they disclose no illegality or impropriety, or irregularity.

February 22, 1963

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Just Liberal politics.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose it's lost on most members of this house, that this whole thing occurred the day after the mayor of Regina was re-elected with a surprising majority and a majority that floored some of our Liberal friends over there. And the Attorney General for the province of Saskatchewan must always be on its guard against spending the taxpayer's money, going through the motions of an investigation where no wrongdoing is even alleged, only insinuated and suggested. The use, Mr. Speaker, to which this unhappy episode has been put by the Leader of the Opposition, and recent political events in the city of Regina casts a light I suggest upon the whole purpose and origin of the affair.

But even supposing, Mr. Speaker, that there had been something wrong with the city's welfare administration, then it would be a reflection on the integrity of local government and not against this administration. Do they really have a high regard for the efficiency of local government?

On the contrary, like all the criticism which the opposition level against the day to day administration of social aid, hon. members don't care who they hurt or how they hurt them; they don't care whether they cast gratuitous and slurring insults upon the administrators of local government, or whether they reflect upon the decency of those who are unfortunate enough to need social assistance. Anything at all in their headlong struggle and climb to the fruits of power, Mr. Speaker.

At another point, in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, he said that while he approved of compulsory property damage and public liability insurance, a Liberal government would place the automobile accident insurance plan on a competitive basis with other insurance companies providing this coverage. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know, that it would be worth many millions of dollars to the insurance industry of Canada, if this plan could be undermined and destroyed. To do what the Leader of the Opposition proposes, would I say, destroy its usefulness and its effectiveness for the people of Saskatchewan. They don't dare come out and flatly say that they would repeal this act, although they opposed it, they fought it tooth and claw in this house, when it was being put through here. They haven't changed their opinion, they would still like to destroy it but they don't dare face this issue head-on so they announce a plan of subversion, which will . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . have the effect of

destroying it by devious means.

One of the virtues of the Automobile Accident Insurance Act is that there are practically no acquisition costs in the ordinary sense. It goes right along with the car registration. There is no cost of printing and distributing the policy of insurance, that is set out clearly in the act. Another advantage is that it doesn't have to bear on its own shoulders the cost of administration, this can be shared with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. It can ride along on the shoulders of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and share in the administrative costs. The result is that the administrative costs of this plan amount to only 18¢ on every dollar of premiums collected. In contrast, the private insurance companies, as the Premier mentioned the other day, referring to Consumers' Union Reports — amounts to slightly over 52 percent compared to 18 percent. Something over 52 percent by the private insurance companies in the United States and Canada.

So, if this plan is to be put on a competitive basis, if it becomes just another insurance company, then its administration cost, its costs of acquisition, ought to be at least as high as the cost of the private insurance industry; if my hon. friends believe that public enterprise is always less efficient than private enterprise, then these costs would be probably higher than the administrative costs of the private insurance industry. And, if that was done we would lose these advantages that I have talked about, but in addition to that, in order to pay out the claim benefits, that were paid out last year, this plan would have had to have a premium income last year of \$14 million or \$5½ million more than it actually had. This \$5½ million would be added to the burden carried by the motorists of Saskatchewan in order to implement his "scheme" and I use that word in quotes, advocated by the Leader of the Opposition.

This plan has also built into it, other advantages. Every motorist is covered. Other provinces and states try to pass laws saying that every motorist must carry public liability and property damage insurance, but then in a distressingly large number of cases, when accidents occur, there is no insurance coverage and the individuals, of course, have to suffer. There is another distinctive advantage that would be lost if the pie was to be cut up and divided amongst scores of competing insurance companies. In a two car collision, for example, where either party is insured it becomes a very important question — who was at fault? So much turns on this question, Mr. Speaker, that where both parties are uninsured, or where both parties are insured by different companies, as in other provinces, the trial courts are literally choked with litigation, deciding who was at fault in these two car collisions.

One only needs to read the professional magazines of lawyers coming from any part of North America, to know about the cries of anguish that arise as a result of the years of delay in the choked court dockets of North America, caused by automobile accident litigation. In this province, where the auto accident plan provides basic protection to all motorists, the overwhelming majority of all claims fall within the limits of this coverage. Since the same fund is liable for the claims of both motorists — “A” — in a two car collision, where there is property damage coverage to pay and collision coverage to pay — “B” — or vice-versa, it makes no difference which motorist is at fault, except as to the comparatively minor question of the \$200 deductible.

Often the statutory death benefits, the out-of-work benefits, the disability benefits and other benefits under part II, exceed the amount which could be claimed in a negligent action, so, therefore, there is no need to resort to a court of law to settle whether the victim is going to be compensated or not, and by whom. If my fellow lawyers in this province haven't got enough work to do, the proposal by the Leader of the Opposition would give them a bonanza but at grievous cost to the public of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I just want to say in passing, in fairness to the lawyers, they haven't asked for it. This demand comes from the insurance companies, not the lawyers.

Other benefits, which we have, as a result of having all motorists covered by the same company, is that you can have a claims service centre in the larger cities in the province, which makes it possible to more speedily adjust claims of accident victims, and also makes it possible to protect the insurance fund from padded and spurious claims. These advantages result in a substantial saving to the people of Saskatchewan, to lower premiums and higher benefits. As I have already said to the extent of many millions of dollars a year. But the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to throw away these savings in order to make it possible for the private insurance companies to turn this province into the insurance jungle that it was prior to 1944.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now from the mundane to the more interesting aspects of the speech from the throne debate. The house will recall that there was some discussion originating back in October, 1960, between the provinces and the government of Canada on the subject of working out a formula for the amendment of Canada's Constitution in Canada. Meetings were held in October, 1960, again in November, 1960, January, 1961 and September, 1961. Although this subject has

since been referred to in the speech from the throne in the parliament of Canada, there have been no further meetings between Canada and the provinces for the purposes of discussing this very important subject.

The government of Saskatchewan is still firmly of the view that Canada should have the power to amend the Canadian Constitution. We believe that this formula should be sufficiently flexible, that Canadians will have this power in reality and not just in some formula that gives the illusion of having this power. Saskatchewan believes that along with a formula for amending the Constitution, we need to incorporate in the British North America Act, a Bill of Rights, which would more adequately safeguard the basic rights of all Canadians. And Saskatchewan put that view forward vigorously at the conferences to which I have referred; Saskatchewan is still more firmly of that opinion today.

We believe that there is evidence that the social and economic progress of Canada has been thwarted by the rigidity in the present distribution of powers between the government of Canada the and provinces. This government, like previous governments of Saskatchewan, recognizes and deplors the fact that elected representatives of the people, sitting in parliament and in the legislatures, had to a very large extent been prevented from realizing desirable social and political goals by the rigidities of our present constitution.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there have been substantial changes in the Constitution of Canada and the provinces, by judicial decisions since 1867. First by the Privy Council, and since the appeals to the council were abolished in 1949, latterly by the Supreme Court of Canada. These alterations in the balance which occurs between the powers of the provinces and of Canada, are beyond the means and the powers of the Canadian people to correct. Attorney General Davis, speaking in this house on March 24th, made reference to this problem in the following words: on the 24th of March, 1936, and I quote from Attorney General Davis:

From 1867 to the present time, there has not been an amendment to either of those sections, sections 91 and 92, and for the first time in the history of the development of constitutional government in Canada, it is now proposed to amend one of the subsections of section 92 of the British North America Act. If that proposal goes through in Ottawa, and is enacted by the Imperial Parliament, it will be the first time a change has been made in either of those sections.

He was referring to the proposed change in the Unemployment Insurance provision:

February 22, 1963

Any change in what might have been the intent of the drafters of the constitution in respect to rearrangement of the powers in the parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures has come about (he says) by judicial interpretation of those two distributive sections, and by judicial decision it was handed down from 1867 to the present time.

The decisions which have had the effect of altering and rearranging the powers, as between the federal and the provincial parliaments, have been the result of judicial interpretation, and judicial decisions, and these have largely been the decisions of the Privy Council in the motherland.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, regarding the growth and development of Canada's constitution, is very aptly summed up in the book *Constitutional Issues in Canada, 1900-1931*, by Robert McGregor Dawson, one of the leading authorities on the Canadian constitution. He says, on page 50:

Judicial decision, Constitutional conventions, political customs, unwritten rules and regulations have so changed and modified the British North America Act, that it is doubtful if the Fathers of Confederation would today recognize their offspring.

And then on page 51, he says:

When John A. MacDonald discovered that his outspoken preference for a unitarian kingdom could not be realized, and that federalism alone would satisfy the diverse interests concerned, he bent his energies, with apparent support from his colleagues, to give to the new federation as strong a bias toward a unitarian system as circumstances would allow. In the distribution of legislative powers the avowed aim, as we shall see, was to strengthen the central legislature. The appointment of the provincial Lieutenant-Governor lay with the Governor-In-Council. They were to be the servants of the federal government, to which, in addition, was given an unqualified power to disallow within one year any provincial acts.

What has happened? Well, on page 56, Professor Dawson says:

Canada possesses in law today a scheme of distribution of legislative powers, which is in its essence, diametrically opposed to the conceptions of the Fathers of Confederation and the British government in 1867.

These changes have come about, not because the people of Canada have deliberately amended by legislative process, the constitution of our country, but they have come about as the result of what one might call accidental decisions. Questions which went to the Privy Council, the Supreme Court, not at the behest of either government but on the instigation of private citizens' litigation over their private rights.

It is, therefore, clear, Mr. Speaker, that the two or three relatively minor changes in our constitution, which were made by elected representatives of the people, have been insignificant and insubstantial. But significant and substantial changes have been made, even in the sacred area of the distribution of powers, as between the dominion and the provinces, as a result of these constitutional changes. The consequences of a single judicial decision may in the long run be of more far-reaching and fundamental importance to every citizen of Canada than the small number of statutory amendments that have been possible during the last 90 years.

No truly self-governing nation, we submit, can allow itself to drift aimlessly at sea, without power and without rudder, leaving the development and the growth of our constitution to the chance winds of private litigation. For these, and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, the government of Saskatchewan, believes that it will be the first duty of whatever government is elected at Ottawa on April 8th, to summon representatives of the provinces of Canada, to make a fresh attempt to work out an acceptable formula for the amendment of Canada's constitution by the legislative acts of the Canadian people.

I would like to report now on a couple of items that were in the speech from the throne a year ago.

It was pointed out at that time, that the Mechanics Lien Act, and I quote from the speech from the throne at that time:

was first passed in the province in 1907. My government believes that it is now appropriate to review this act in the face of modern economic conditions. The Hon. Harold F. Thompson has been commissioned to hold hearings on this question and to formulate recommendations.

I am pleased to report that Judge Thompson did hold hearings on this question, received briefs from a number of interested parties, from the construction industry and other industries, and is in the process of writing his report. Since the study originated, partly as a result of impetus that came from the Canadian Bar Association, and particularly the British Columbia branch of the Canadian Bar Association, Judge Thompson journeyed to Victoria, where he met representatives of the Bar and the industry there, and heard submissions from them.

It is his undertaking to be quite specific in the

February 22, 1963

proposals which he will make in his report, and it is the hope of the government that his report will be in our hands early in 1963, so that consideration can be given to formulating a decision at the spring session in 1964.

Another matter was referred to in the speech from the throne, Mr. Speaker, a year ago and I would like to refer to it now. Reference was made at that time to the increase in expropriation of property by all levels of government, coming as a result of, so the speech said, of increased governmental and public activity. The government proposed to review the expropriation procedures during 1962, and to enlist the co-operation of the various professional and community organizations with a view to evolving uniform and fair procedures for determining and protecting the property rights of the individual citizens, when expropriation becomes necessary.

I am pleased to be able to say that consideration has been given to this problem. Work has been done on the draft of a proposed piece of legislation and it is the hope of the government that it will be possible, either at this session or within a short time thereafter, to make public a draft which can later be submitted to municipal and other interested people, with a view to making a final draft of legislation, which might be dealt with at the next session of the legislature. This is a very important subject, which not only the government is interested in, which I believe the farmers, the property owners of all parts of the province, and the local governments have a great deal of interest.

I would like to refer to a paragraph in the current speech from the throne, read on February 14, last. It will be noted that legislation will be introduced, consolidating and amending, the Automobile Accident Insurance Act; extending the benefits it provides. I am pleased to say that this legislation will substantially increase the public liability benefits payable under the Auto Accident Insurance Act. At the present time, the limits for public liability are \$10,000 for any one claim arising out of an accident, and \$20,000 is the limit of liability where there is more than one person claiming as the result of an accident. It is proposed to raise these figures to \$30,000 and indeed beyond that amount, to the extent that the \$5,000 limit for property damage is not required for property damage claims. This means that if there is no property damage claim, one individual claimant may recover as much as \$35,000 in the place of the former limit of \$10,000.

The increase in the size of the awards which are being made by our courts for personal injury cases, makes it necessary that this coverage be extended; if we are to provide for the needs of the citizens of Saskatchewan. This coverage will continue to meet the minimum coverage required in every province of Canada, under their respective financial responsibility clause.

It is sometimes said that the owners of older vehicles don't get as much benefit for their money from the automobile insurance scheme, as do those who own larger and more expensive cars. Well, of course, the owner of an old car pays only \$10.00. This doesn't contribute very much for covering collision insurance, but then he doesn't get any, or very little, benefit for collision insurance. However, the owner of the oldest car on the road, enjoys the same benefits as the owner of the newest car for the property damage and the public liability coverage. Indeed, the owner of an old car may be more accident prone, more likely to become involved in a public liability or a property damage case, than the owner of a new and efficiently functioning car. And so, to this extent the owners of the older vehicles will receive more benefit from this extension of coverage than proportionately is received by the owners of new cars. I am happy to see that develop.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word, about our magistrate's courts, and the forecast of the speech from the throne dealing with that matter. I think I still have time enough if I hurry.

The government of Saskatchewan believes sincerely and very strongly that it is the right of every citizen to receive fair treatment in our courts of law. We have taken many steps to insure that right will be realized. And over the years I have made reference to the fact that this government has made it possible for indigent persons to be able to afford legal counsel for their defence in the criminal courts; and we extended that not long ago to include the magistrate's courts as well as the Court of the Queen's Bench. This program is being borne jointly by the provincial government and by the Law Society of Saskatchewan. This program is a very important one assuring citizens of their rights.

Indeed an incident that occurred just last year, illustrates the value of this service. Last year a person appeared before a magistrate in this province, and unknown to the magistrate, this person was unable to hear and the magistrate said something to the person before him and got an answer back which resulted in this person being sent to jail. The Department heard about it after it was too late to interrupt what was happening and we had to take habeas corpus proceedings; I think this probably was the only case in history where the crown has actually taken habeas corpus proceedings against a process of its own courts, and as a result this man was immediately released when it was shown to the court that an injustice had been inadvertently done.

Ninety-nine percent of the cases which appear in our criminal courts are tried before a magistrate. The government has, therefore, felt obliged to go a great distance in improving the facilities available to these courts. Two years ago, only

February 22, 1963

the magistrates notes, little sketchy notes that he made during the trial, were all that was available for use as a transcript of the evidence in the event that the accused wished to lodge an appeal. We have provided better places for our magistrates to sit, and to conduct their courts. Admittedly we haven't always been able to achieve all we would like but in some communities it is hard to find adequate, suitable facilities.

We have discontinued the use of untrained justices for the hearing of contested matters, except in unusual circumstances, where it contributes to the convenience of the accused person himself. This has made it necessary for us to increase the number of magistrates to 20 full time and 2 part time magistrates as compared with 8 full time and 6 part time magistrates seven years ago. In order to attract capable experienced people to this position we have doubled the salary scale in the past seven years.

We have provided security of tenure for our magistrates under a slightly different formula to that which is available to the judges of superior courts, but in a form which the government believes is every bit as effective and efficacious as that set out in the Judges' Act of Canada.

The government is not happy about having three different levels of criminal court in our province, the Queen's Bench, the District Court, and the Magistrates Court. With very few exceptions every criminal offence can be tried in any one of these three courts. This makes trials and criminal procedures here unnecessarily complicated and cumbersome.

Furthermore, constituted as they are at three different levels, the magistrates court is by definition the lowest of the three tiers. Therefore it must appear to the public as slightly anomalous to say the least that practically all the convictions are made by the magistrates court. You have the court with the least status and prestige accounting for the overwhelming majority of the prison sentences in the province.

In 1956 the government made strong representations to the government at Ottawa for amendments in the criminal code which would have made it a routine part of the district court judges duty to hear criminal cases, except where the accused might elect to be tried by a Queen's Bench judge with a jury. At that time we have 18 district court judges in 17 judicial centres of the province. Many of them were complaining because they had insufficient work to do. This request was denied by the government at Ottawa even as recently as 1961. It has continued to meet with indifference from them.

As you will note from examining the table of criminal cases which I will lay on the table at the conclusion of my remarks, the 13 district court judges presently holding office in Saskatchewan in 1961-62 held only 141 criminal trials and trials for offences under provincial statutes as compared with 56,464 cases tried by the provincial magistrates. I am, of course excluding civil proceedings and surrogate court matters which, of course, constitute the bulk of the district court judges duties. Any comparison should also take into account the fact that these 141 cases coming before the district court judges were almost all contested whereas 90 percent of the 56,000 cases coming before the magistrates were on a plea of guilty and were disposed of in a few minutes. But I cite these figures only to show that the great bulk of prisoners in our jails and penitentiaries were sent there by provincial magistrates. That is still true today. We have the situation where the superior and overwhelming dignity of the superior trial courts, with robed judges with their red sashes, sitting on a high dais on an impressively and handsomely carved bench, are mainly trying divorce actions and foreclosure actions and the like, while the really important matters touching on the liberty of the citizen are often being tried by a man in a — or at least were a few years ago, being tried by a man in a business suit sitting beside a broken down desk in an old unheated warehouse or an abandoned country store.

Somehow I feel that when the Fathers of Confederation drew up the blueprint of our judicial system, when they gave to the provinces the duty of passing legislation to provide for the existence of a court, but reserved to the government of Canada the prerogative of appointing the judges and reserved to the parliament of Canada the duty of prescribing the rules of procedure and setting out the substantive law.

They didn't envisage that practically everyone charged with crime would be tried by someone who is not a judge.

Subsequent history has shown that the criminal code gradually extended the area within local justices and magistrates could act. This was to alleviate the disadvantage of having to wait for the criminal assizes two or three times a year and to make it possible for the accused person to be tried at a place that might be nearer to his home. And, of course, there was always included the safeguard that the accused must consent before being tried by a local justice.

But the government contends that conditions have changed greatly since 1867. Distances are not as onerous as they were then. The 18 judicial centres could play a substantial role in the administration of justice. These communities, if they each had a district court judge resident at the centre, and the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench periodically visiting the judicial centre, could serve as the focus to attract and maintain a nucleus of legal and judicial services there. Succeeding Liberal and

Conservative governments have turned a deaf ear on these urgings. The district court it seems, instead of being allowed to develop was to continue to wither away. And, as a result of this lack of utilization, Saskatchewan felt bound to reduce the number of district court judges by about 30 percent.

If it was not for the necessity of travelling a good deal to get from one place to another of 18 judicial centres, with all the consequent waste of time which this entailed, an even smaller number of district court judges could handle the work, the judicial work at those 18 judicial centres. Therefore, under protest and with reluctance, Saskatchewan was faced with the necessity of trying to raise the status and dignity of the magistrate court. We now, therefore, will propose to the house that we give them a salary and a pension, roughly equivalent to what is enjoyed by district court judges, to set out the terms of their salary and their pension in the Act itself and so call them judges of the magistrates court.

The layman might wonder why this is important. Well, Mr. Speaker, we not only want our magistrates courts to feel independent of the government, I am confident they feel that way already, but we want it to manifestly appear to the public and in particular to the person being tried that judges of that court are not amenable to the government or the Attorney General for the way in which they discharge their judicial duties.

I am sorry to say that this is not well understood at the present time. I never get letters from residents in the province complaining to me about how the judges conduct their courts but I sometimes do get letters from citizens who have been convicted in magistrates court, advising me to check up on the magistrate; his public relations are bad, his image leaves something to be desired. After all, he had just convicted a very good, upright, honest citizen! I will not be satisfied, however, with the image of the magistrates courts until it is perfectly clear to all reasonable citizens that the judges of the magistrates courts are independently exercising the duties imposed upon them by law.

Before I sit down I would like to lay on the table two schedules, summarizing the volume of judicial work done in the various judicial centres in the province — the three calendar years 1959, 1960 and 1961 are covered. This brings the report forward to the one which I tabled last year and does give you some idea of the volume of work being done in every judicial centre in the province as well as particulars on the distribution of the work of the criminal courts and also gives you an indication of which sections of the various statutes are the most popular, if you like to call it that. So if I lay that on the table it will be distributed to all members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by saying that I believe that the speech from the throne read in this house on the 14th of February discloses unmistakably the fact

that this government is determined to proceed with the progressive programs which it has followed in the last 18 or 19 years. This government doesn't intend to be deterred down any blind alleys to go chasing after any red herrings pulled by my friends opposite. This government will continue to render, judging by the speech from throne, the honest, conscientious, faithful service that it has given in the past 18 years.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the member one question? Did I understand you to say that 96 percent of all cases disposed of by the magistrates was on a plea of guilty.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I said over 90.

Table "A"

**Summary of Judicial Activity for each Judicial Centre
for the years 1959, 1960 and 1961**

	Writs			All Trials			Miscellaneous Applications			S.C. Application for Probate or Admin.		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
Arcola	141	208	25	8	9	5	49	52	16	78	75	66
Assiniboia	122	105	76	3	3	4	52	54	77	87	67	70
Battleford	442	453	780	25	36	71	138	359	495	73	215	338
Estevan	277	276	182	19	23	10	409	476	273	104	105	124
Gravelbourg	88	77	75	21	10	4	99	88	103	63	75	63
Humboldt	140	190	102	33	28	22	157	153	94	149	131	156
Kerrobert	175	155	168	6	5	4	65	54	67	51	42	125
Kindersley	18	7		3	2		34	34		81	75	
Melfort	405	283	358	35	30	32	217	271	257	213	199	220
Melville	301	326	304	9	19	13	100	78	133	72	85	59
Moose Jaw	657	540	542	70	54	62	840	1152	544	309	274	300
Moosomin	88	53	59	3	6	4	53	47	22	128	139	109
Prince												
Albert	1125	1279	893	85	85	65	670	678	481	201	206	195
Regina	2744	2876	2515	210	172	247	288	353	329	732	707	791
Saskatoon	3065	3280	2564	190	254	262	1192	1281	705	617	727	747
Shaunavon	68	35	39	13	7		160	103	83	88	70	70
Swift												
Current	1089	2113	909	33	51	31	169	164	217	289	301	248
Weyburn	193	154	31	11	11	9	101	121	36	88	89	72
Wilkie	85	140		1	5		138	117		79	54	
Wynyard	35	63	95	1	1	18	111	96	95	85	77	86
Yorkton	375	534	419	52	47	55	67	116	145	229	219	247
	11633	13147	10136	831	858	918	5109	5847	4172	4016	3932	4086

TABLE "B"

**Relative Volume of Judicial Work in Principal
Judicial Centres as a Percentage of the Total
for the Province**

	Writs Issued			Trials Held			S.C. Applications for Probate or Admin.		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
Saskatoon	26.3	24.95	25.30	22.9	29.60	28.54	15.3	18.49	18.28
Regina	23.5	21.88	24.91	25.2	20.05	26.91	18.3	17.98	19.36
Prince Albert	9.7	9.73	8.71	10.3	9.91	7.08	5.0	5.24	4.78
Swift Current	9.4	16.07	8.97	4.0	5.94	3.37	7.2	7.66	6.07
Moose Jaw	5.9	4.11	5.35	8.4	6.29	6.75	7.7	6.97	7.34
Battleford	3.8	3.45	7.69	3.0	4.20	7.73	6.8	5.47	8.28
Yorkton	3.2	4.05	4.13	6.2	5.48	5.99	5.7	5.57	6.04
Melfort	3.6	2.15	3.53	4.2	3.50	3.48	5.3	5.06	5.39
Weyburn	1.6	1.17	.31	1.3	1.28	.98	2.2	2.26	1.76
Melville	2.6	2.48	3.00	1.1	2.21	1.42	1.8	2.16	1.44
Estevan	2.3	2.10	1.79	2.3	2.68	1.09	2.6	2.67	3.03
Humboldt	1.2	1.45	1.01	4.0	3.26	2.40	3.7	3.32	3.82
Gravelbourg	.8	.59	.74	2.5	1.17	.44	1.5	1.91	1.54
Wilkie	.7	1.06		.1	.58		1.9	1.37	
Moosomin	.8	.40	.58	.4	.70	.44	3.2	3.54	2.67
Arcola	1.2	1.58	.25	1.0	1.05	.54	1.9	1.91	1.62
Kerrobert	1.5	1.18	1.66	.7	.58	.44	1.3	1.07	3.06
Wynyard	.3	.48	.94	.1	.12	1.96	2.1	1.96	2.10
Assiniboia	1.0	.80	.75	.4	.35	.44	2.2	1.70	1.71
Shaunavon	.5	.27	.38	1.5	.82		2.2	1.78	1.71
Kindersley	.1	.05		.4	.23		2.1	1.91	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

CRIMINAL STATISTICS
for the period April 1, 1961 to March 31, 1962

Offences Under	J.P.'s Cases Conv.		Magistrates Cases Conv.		D.C. Judges Cases Conv.		Q.B. Judges Cases Conv.	
Sec. 221 CCC	7	7	303	275	1	1		
Sec. 222 CCC	3	3	89	86	3	2	3	2
Sec. 223 CCC	42	42	965	921	11	7		
All other CCC cases	402	392	8251	7768	103	72	53	31
Other Federal Offences	238	238	1537	1516	2	1		
Total Federal Offences	692	682	11145	10566	120	83	56	33
Liquor Act	667	663	5277	5127	2	1		
Liquor Licensing Act	34	34	350	341				
Vehicles Act (speeding)	2120	2118	6738	6658	2	1		
Vehicles Act (all other)	2460	2452	18550	18104	11	6		
Highways & Trans. Act	351	346	855	839				
Education & Hospitalization Tax Act			131	131				
Saskatchewan Hospitalization Tax Act	5	5	239	239				
Fuel Petroleum Products Act	344	343	1089	1082	1	1		
Stray Animals Act	5	5	8	8				
Recovery of Wages Act			36	34				
Game Act	66	66	474	443				
Securities Act			1	1				
All other Prov. Statutes	84	83	631	522	4	1	1	1
Total Prov. Offences	6136	6115	34379	33529	20	10	1	1
Municipal Bylaws	2530	2530	10930	10735	1			
Grand Total	9358	9327	56454	54830	141	93	57	34

February 22, 1963

Mr. R. Perkins (Nipawin): — Because I would like to add my voice to those who have supported the budget I would ask for an opportunity to say something in the next sitting. I would therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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