

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
16th Day

Thursday, March 7, 1963

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

On the orders of the day

SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I thought the members would like to have some information in regard to the current issues of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds. We now have the returns for the first two days of the sale, insofar as they have arrived in the Treasury Department. Undoubtedly there would be more after these came in.

For the first two days, Monday and Tuesday up until 5 o'clock on Tuesday, the sales were \$1,668,500. This is a larger amount for the first two days of sale compared with the series one in 1961, by over \$200,000 and a smaller amount than the first two days of series 2 when \$2,400,000 was sold in the first two days. I would consider this quite satisfactory for the first two days.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Cooper (Regina): — Before the orders of the day, I would like to call the attention of the members to the fine group of students in the west gallery, they are from grade 7 in Davin school, with their teacher, Mr. Wayne King. I am sure you would all like to join with me in welcoming them and hoping that they will enjoy very much their visit to the legislature.

Mr. Dahlman (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to draw the attention of the members to a fine group of young gentlemen, they are the Columbian Squires, from Cardinal Villeneuve's circle, Assiniboia. They are here to visit the legislature, some of them have been here for the first time, they are also accompanied by Mr. Blase, Mr. LeTillion, Mr. Peyon, and Mr. Turgeon. I hope their stay here will be pleasant and informative.

March 7, 1963

Mr. K.F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Today, I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of the member from Bengough, in welcoming the Columbian Squires to the legislature this afternoon, and I hope they will enjoy the proceedings, I was only wishing they could have been here on a different day.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the member from Bengough, in welcoming the Columbian Squires to the legislature this afternoon, and I hope they will enjoy the proceedings. As many of you probably know Cardinal Villeneuve was at one time the Bishop of Gravelbourg, which is within the diocese of Gravelbourg, and I am sure their stay here today will be most enlightening, even though they don't hear, probably, both sides of the story. Thank you.

BUDGET DEBATE

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

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — As I was delivering my remarks yesterday I was attempting to frame them in three general areas. One was to advise somewhat to the misuse of fact by the opposition, and my only concern here is, that I firmly believe that a democratic system can only work effectively if it is given accurate information and if, of course, the people within that democracy are prepared to use that information within the business of making a decision. And when inaccurate, or half-truth is given to the general electorate, I think this is not only grossly unfair but I think it is really a betrayal of trust in the high office to which hon. members have been elected. I think it is a betrayal of the democratic system itself.

I have pointed out that such statements as the role of the Liberal party in maintaining the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which I thought was so far from the truth and so well known, that I could scarcely credit my ears when I heard the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) make such a sweeping statement, not only are their legislative and historical facts incorrect, but also the amount of money is incorrect, in fact the hon. member apparently hadn't taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the facts.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to remind the hon. minister that the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, has not spoken on this debate.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — What I was referring to, Mr. Speaker, was the technique of the opposition, and I was referring to that particular statement, and I was referring to other statements that had been made.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — On a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of privilege.

Mr. Foley: — The hon. member has stated that there have been untruthful statements made by this side of the house. I believe that he should either state what they are, or . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Foley: — . . . or not be allowed to do so.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — I'll be glad to do so . . .

Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — What about what Mr. Kramer said yesterday . . .

Mr. Speaker: — On a point of privilege, it must pertain to privilege of the house and not to allegation of the facts.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — I will turn directly to that point, Mr. Speaker. I have here some statements made by the hon. member for Turtleford, (Mr. Foley) made at other times and I am referring now to a statement credited to him, as it appears in the Prince Albert Daily Herald, dated Friday, November 9, 1962. The headline on this particular newspaper statement is:

Steuart names the acts he would eliminate.

I will deal with that in a minute, but turning to the hon. member for Turtleford, I note here that, and I would like to quote what Mr. Foley said:

A friend of the farmer, they say. The hon. Mr. Turnbull, presently Minister of Education, and in private life before politics, he was the president of the Farmers' Union. He fought

March 7, 1963

hard for the tax free purple gas for the farmer, and for the elimination of the \$3.00 per acre mineral tax, then after he was elected as a MLA and made Minister of Co-operatives, when the Liberal opposition introduced resolutions on behalf of the farmers, which were made as authored by Mr. Turnbull, he stood up and released a violent attack against the Liberals, and then he had the nerve to vote against us, this shows how shallow their principles are.

I have never seen this retracted and I hear some of the hon. members saying . . .

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Correct, correct.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Well, let's see all the errors that are in this quotation credited to the hon. member for Turtleford. In the first place I have never been the president of the Farmers' Union, in the second place, there is no such tax as a \$3.00 per acre mineral tax. In the third place, when I perused the index of minutes and proceedings I find that there was no such debate and I find that neither he nor I ever spoke on it. Now, if this isn't straying from the truth, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what it is.

And turn to the purple gas, yes I will be quite happy to do that.

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Pretty weak argument for president of Farmers' Union.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — When I was an officer of the Farmers' Union, Mr. Speaker, the Farmers' Union had no such policy, as being in favor, and if you want to check the records, and see what time I came out of office, it was November, 1959. At that point in time the policy of the Farmers' Union was not in opposition to purple gas. I retired at that point in time and in that December convention the policy was changed.

Point Two. The hon. member says I stood up and unleashed a violent attack against them, and if he will consult with the records again, he will find that neither he nor I spoke on the debate. How could I release a violent attack?

And thirdly. If the hon. member will consider the policy of the Farmers' Union, he will now find that they have changed their position, and they are back again to

endorsing purple gas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Oh, yes they are. And if you will consider the resolutions that were passed you will find this to be true.

Mr. Foley: — I was not hitherto . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Except for these few errors, I suggest that the hon. member for Turtleford, (Mr. Foley) was strictly within the bounds of truth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Foley: — On a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Mr. Foley: — I was not hitherto familiar with . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is not a point of order. Will the hon. member take his seat. You can't enter a debate on a point of order. Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member has been tagged off base, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — So are you, boy, you're off on third . . .

Premier Lloyd: — Fouled out . . .

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Another hon. member who has employed similar tactics, apparently, the newly elected member for Prince Albert, and he is quoted as saying that one of the first things he will do when the Liberals form the government is to remove an Act — and these are his words from the same press release —

That they call the Natural Products Act, passed in 1953, which is something one would have to go behind the iron curtain to find.

Well, now, there is no such act as a Natural Products Act. There is a Natural Products Marketing Act, and I was much interested in seeing just how far you would have to go

March 7, 1963

to find out whether there are other similar acts in Canada, and I have here a list of some twenty individual products marketing acts, ranging all the way from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island, covering various agriculture commodities, such as fruit, all the way to potatoes, and if the hon. member had even been casually aware of the current news, he would realize that there has been a continuous battle going on for some time in Ontario, over the commodity of hogs.

So, once again, Mr. Speaker, you can see that the story was correct, except for one or two deviations from the facts. I sometimes think that the “new look” of the Liberal party, as they are attempting to define it, might be best summed up by saying that if you combined the two new back benchers of the party and added it up you would have something that would say, that you have got about 150 pounds of misinformation and about three hundred pounds of misguided effort.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — I’m not really too concerned when I hear the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) criticize the budget. He did point out one thing that I must take issue with, and that is he stated as I recall his words

That surely the government can’t criticize the Liberal party for such things as wars and depressions.

Now I don’t believe that this side of the house has ever said and I don’t think we could ever possibly bring ourselves to believe in such an irrational statement, but what we are saying is that the kind of thinking that goes behind the philosophy of the people that find and gravitate into the Liberal party, is the kind of thinking that results in wars and depressions.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Ah, Nuts!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — And to illustrate this, I have something that I am sure our hon. members are reasonably familiar with, and that is a report from the Royal Commission on Dominion and Provincial Relations, which is sometimes known as a Rowell-Sirois Commission, which is a wonderful summary of conditions that existed at that time and it illustrates the kind of thinking that was going on in Canada at the time when the whole of the economy was literally ground to a standstill. And I refer specifically to the question of whether or not the government of Canada ought to issue dominion notes. Up until this time, the hon. members will recall that anybody who considered the question of finance generally considered it within the context of the gold standard. And people at that time generally talked

about the amount of currency that was in circulation and the amount of credit the banks would issue in terms of the total amount of gold. This was the touch-stone. And any proposition to increase currency by one means or another, or by the amount of money in circulation, that veered away from the concept at that time was thought of as being highly irrational and irresponsible.

Now, then the point I want to make is, somewhere during this period of time, the concept of financing governments changed somewhat. Gold, of course, became less practical in these terms, although it is still used, of course, between nations in respect of balance of payments. And during the years of depression, in fact until November 1932, the government endeavored to expand bank cash by the issue of \$35 million and \$52.5 million respectively in dominion notes. The first issue wasn't particularly successful, because of the method in which it was used, but the second issue was particularly successful because it was used in respect of bank reserves and those of you that are familiar with bank processes and I'm sure all members are, realize that then they could use the multiplier effects that banks have at their disposal to increase the amount of notes that they issue and thus increase the amount of currency in effect. Now, what government was it that made this step? It wasn't the Liberal government at all. Once again it happened to be the Tories, and if you happen to go back into Hansard and read the record, it is an interesting thing to see the blistering attacks that were levelled upon a group of five people that were called the "ginger group", who were consistently saying it is irrational and illogical to only gear the amount of currency, especially in the times of depression, to the amount of gold. Let us get into the business of issuing treasury bills; let us get into the business of using the Bank of Canada in a slightly different way, and they were criticized severely by the government of the day as being irresponsible, and proposing ideas contrary to the rules of sound finance, but in 1932, the rules were changed and once again not by the Liberals.

I am suggesting in all this, Mr. Speaker, to go to my point, that it is the kind of thinking behind the economic policies of the day, as determined by governments of the day that had a profound effect on the extent to which Canada stayed in economic stagnation and to the development by which this particular action led to, as a first number of steps, that finally led out of the depression. If it hadn't been for the war, of course, I daresay prices wouldn't have come along as well as they did. And I often think of the kind of thinking that was going on at that time. I recall, for instance, Mr. Speaker, my mother giving a couple of fellows, who were riding the rods, a couple of turkeys, because these fellows having no money were looking for something to eat and

March 7, 1963

she happened to be in town the same day, had these turkeys and found they were practically worthless in the market, she gave these two turkeys to these two fellows and said "Here you are fellows, they are worth 50¢ apiece, you have them." They in turn said "Where can we take them so we can have them cooked?" and it so happened that the MP of the day was in town, back from the session, and she suggested that they might go to this person and he had exactly the same kind of a hard shelled private enterprise, private individualistic philosophy, do you know what he said "Let those two bums eat that turkey raw". He wouldn't even cook it for them, and you know where those two lads got those turkeys cooked? They went down to the Chinese cafe in that town and the cook there was a fellow that fed those two lads.

I can recall another type of thinking at that time, this was during the period of relief, and in the town was a very solid Liberal. The relief came into the town, did he distribute that relief. Not a bit, because he said "If I deliver this relief to these people how then are the merchants going to sell their goods and pay their taxes? That is exactly correct.

Mr. Danielson: — Tell us another story . . .

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — That is exactly correct. And what happened to a goodly portion of these goods, they stayed in the basement of the town hall and went rotten, rather than have them distributed to the people of that day, so that they could properly feed themselves.

Mr. Danielson: — Nonsense. Prove it, prove it.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — It is this kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, that dragged our nation farther and farther into the depression, the kind of thinking that is called stable thinking, the kind of thinking that is called neither to the left nor to the right, and we are familiar with this type of thing.

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members of the opposition who find it very difficult to listen to these tales, even though it burns their ears a bit, it is exactly true, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: — It is not true.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — It is exactly true, Mr. Speaker, and I'm telling it to these people because I'm suggesting to them, and let us all take a lesson from this. Times are changing; the economic principles by which nations are governed are changing; we are moving not in one spot, as our Liberal friends would have us believe we may stay, but as we must go ahead in new concepts between government,

between corporate enterprise, between co-operative enterprise and wherever the public sector is operating is private enterprise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Yesterday, I indicated to the house where I thought the best hope of a new look was coming from and it is from the type of thinking that is going on in Europe, not on this side of the water. And I made a brief remark to the European Common Market area. I'm not sure whether the nations of western Europe are going to be able to bring the idea to fruition, but already many lessons have been learned, and I am suggesting to the house, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of forward look that is in our budget, with the proposals that are there, move in the direction in which I believe our society must move if we are going to keep in step with the communistic nations of the world, which pose a threat to all freedom loving people.

I was also speaking in particular about the education system, because here is one of the great keys to whether our nation can survive or whether it will disappear. The revolution that must take place within the educational system, must be such that there is a greater amount of local responsibility, greater amount of flexibility on the part of the teacher, greater amount of capital invested in the whole question, and I was talking about the uses of new devices, uses designed to give greater assistance to the teacher, and I was talking something about curriculum.

Our greatest problem is that we are unable to clearly define how the nation will be ten or fifteen years from now. There is some discussion that we ought not to be talking about the mechanical age, or even the space age, but what we ought to be talking about is the computer age; the electronic age. And hon. members will know that the government has installed the computer system and as I understand, the computer systems, and I only have a very sketchy knowledge of it, I understand there are two main areas, one is called the digital type of computer which works in straight tabulation and compilation, the other is the type of computer which is even more interesting. It is the emologue type of computer. The type of computer which can report data, observe the data as it is being recorded, even taking visual direction in the case of, let us say, a guided missile, feed this new data into the computer system itself and make corrections. And you can see the possibility here in terms of design, engineering design, in terms of use within the industrial complex, pointing to new eras of production that are almost breathtaking. You can visualize and we have seen some machines which operate on a purely automatic process, in banks, turning out hundreds of cylinder blocks, for instance, all to a very close tolerance, all fed by one master machine.

March 7, 1963

This leads us into a question of not only the training of labor, but the displacement of labor, and one of the great questions that is facing modern nations today, is the question of technological displacement of labor. I'm not suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that our whole economic system is going to move into the one plane of using computer systems, and I don't want to leave the impression that everybody is in step as we move in this direction, at all times there is going to be a vertical line, you might also say, with certain areas of our economy having the greatest amount of capital resources, and productive assets, who can use these devices the best, all the way down through to the individual craftsman who might be doing something entirely on his own.

And scattered between these two ends of the spectrum there will be pockets of people who will have been displaced by processes and techniques, who are caught in the business and are unemployed and have little hope or no possibility of getting back into the system. Now, then, this leads to the question, either society has the proper problem of regulating the amount of technological advance that an industry takes at any one time, and relates it to the life-span of the workers that are involved in it, or else, the nation must allow freedom of research, freedom of each individual organization to use any technological device it may wish to and then the nation will have to catch the people that are displaced by it. There is no middle ground, it is either one proposition or the other.

I suspect that we will attempt to attack the problem from both sides. At present, we are in vigorous and serious consultation with corporate groups in Saskatchewan and in business groups so that we, the education people in Saskatchewan, and I am not now speaking of myself personally, I'm speaking now of teaching groups, department, trustees, so that the education group in Saskatchewan has a clearer idea of how business and industry wants people to be trained. This will lead to a new form of co-operation between the school system and the business community. I don't think that there will be a displacement of the school board, fundamentally the school board must always be in control of the system, but the opinions and the desires of business and industry must be inter-related closely with the actual course content given in the school system, particularly in respect of vocation and technical training.

This leads, of course, into a new concept of teacher training. At present the teacher supply in Saskatchewan is very good, we are doing reasonably well in the elementary area, by and large.

By and large I think the elementary schools of Saskatchewan are doing a good job in comparison with other schools of Canada. It is in the high school area that we are vulnerable. And we will need extra teachers, even this year, if we are to

relieve ourselves from the possibility of having a teacher shortage.

Any statistics that I quote will be on the basis of a ten year concept because I think it is unfair to go past that point. Ten years ago this month we had 575 teachers training in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, and 250 at the University of Saskatchewan in the College of Education — a total of 825. This year, at the same point in time we have 2,085 made up of 1020 enrolled in Teachers' Colleges in Regina and Saskatoon, and 1065 in the College of Education. I think this is a commendable increase.

The reason I think that more people are going into the educational system as teachers is partly related to greater security, to a greater increase in status in teaching as a profession, and I believe that the teaching profession ought to be the highest profession, better salaries, better facilities that have been offered by schools, modern schools, school units, and of course security of tenure, and a better pension scheme at the end of their teaching years.

The question of classrooms and the question of capital building is one that seems to go on with us and I had once thought that we were pretty well past the point of the major school building program. And this is not true when you look at the question in terms of the total dollars. In terms of buildings scattered throughout the province it may be that some areas will not build as many schools in the next few years as they have in the last ten, but in terms of the total amount of capital that will have to be laid out for universities, for high schools, for technical training, for the training of teachers in particular, the amount is a staggering one.

It would be a rash person to calculate the total amount but to give you an idea, the scale of building that would be required to handle two to three thousand teachers is a large building which will require capital investment of between two and three millions of dollars. With the better schools, with better teachers, with a more challenging curriculum, we find that we have a greater percentage of our teachers in classrooms that have a grade 12 and more years of professional training past grade 12 than any other province in Canada. And I think this is a good record.

In the year 1958 the percentage of Saskatchewan teachers with two or more years of training in education beyond grade 12 stood at 42.2 in 1963 it stands at 56.8.

The question of teacher training of course leads us into the problem we have been trying to deal with as to the method of training of teachers. There have been discussions going on in Saskatchewan over a number of years as to whether or not the university ought to be occupying a

March 7, 1963

particular role, a larger role; whether the department ought to be expanding or changing its field of operations. I don't have anything to offer to the house at this time excepting to let them know that we are continuing to have discussions with the university, the teachers' college, the S.T.F., the trustees' association and some members of the department in order that whatever teaching training plans are evolved, they meet the requirements of the various sectors of the education communities.

I would like to talk a bit about northern education, particularly in respect to the special classes that we give for the Metis and Indian students. And I am the first one to acknowledge in this house that we are not doing as much as we should. But I think we are doing a fairly good job and I was happy to see that we had decided on a particular training course in Saskatchewan for these students where upgrading courses were given, where the students were of high calibre and performed equally as well as their white brothers and sisters, and we now have instituted scholarships at teachers' college particularly for Metis students. Last year we didn't get the announcement as fully as we should have and as early as we should have apparently because we had a lack of applications but we were able to pick one well-qualified student who is now taking the training in Regina and who did qualify for a scholarship. We hope to see this type of program continued and expanded, because the training and the education of our Metis and Indian population is an important one that deserves special consideration. My opinion is that the people that are of the same racial extraction will do a better job of teaching than the rest of us.

The question of vocational and technical training is one that is dealt with in a number of ways in this house and while our budget and estimates for this year are not as large as all of us would like to see, yet in terms of the total effort of what Saskatchewan is doing, I believe we have a creditable effort. The total amount of money that will be spent up until July 15, 1962, the total amount of projects — if you add the total amount of money spent and the total amount of projects that have been approved up until July 15, 1962, you find that Saskatchewan is spending \$10,279,000 on capital and equipment. We do recover some from the federal government, of course, we recover \$6 million, leaving Saskatchewan a total of \$4 million to spend. I think this is a substantial amount of money; I think Saskatchewan people are generally interested in the program; I think we have to give close consideration as to how we can improve and extend this program so that it will fit well into our composite high school system.

A while ago, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing the question of a relationship between business and the school system. This last year the department has introduced a new technical training program designed to fit in with our primary

industry and largest single industry in Saskatchewan, the industry of agriculture.

This program known as vocational agriculture at the high school level has been carefully worked out over the past number of years by five separate areas of the province and have now consolidated the findings and have come up with a unified plan. We have appointed a director of the program, Mr. Harold Tanger, and by invitation of the school districts have been busy, since his appointment visiting various points in Saskatchewan. Some 18 individual school units have invited Mr. Tanger to give them the program as it exists and I am happy to say that we will be adding about five or six more units to the ones that have already established the program.

This program started by way of the work that has been done by the Department of Agriculture and I would refer hon. members here to the Farm management clubs. I have two copies here of their annual report and members will notice that there are 75 individual clubs scattered across Saskatchewan where they conduct business analysis on their own farming operations. They get expert advice to the best of our ability to supply it, from farm management specialists within the Department of Agriculture, and it became apparent that one of the things that was needed is a better grounding at the high school level. Now the concept of this program, Mr. Chairman, is to have the school conduct classes that are related to the actual farm experience that the young man is having on his farm. It requires every young student who is enrolled in the class to have absolute full control over the productive enterprise which he must have to enrol in the course. The young man is entirely responsible for all the inputs that go into the enterprise; if he needs to borrow his father's tractor, he will have to calculate out the rental and rent it from the father; if he has to raise capital we have made arrangements with the banks so that they will extend these young men bank credit the same way that their fathers now get bank credit. If the father happens to use a credit union, we have an arrangement so that these young men can go to a credit union and get this necessary farm credit. The size of the productive enterprise doesn't necessarily have to be large. We are suggesting it ought to be at least worth \$100 in the case of a small flock of chickens or a couple of hogs, or something of this nature. The young man must keep track of every input that goes into that enterprise. He is given classes on the principles of proper husbandry, the latest scientific information that is available to him is brought to him; the classes are intensive, and have been scaled for credits so that they apply in respect of university entrance.

The relationship, of course, is a different one in terms of school activity than that which Saskatchewan has seen up until now. It means that the adult has an interest in the school; the pupil is learning something that is going

March 7, 1963

to be directly applicable to the home farm and the teacher is in a new related position between the classroom and the actual on-farm experience.

This is a Saskatchewan first, Mr. Speaker. It took some work to have the federal government agree that this program ought to qualify for the same level of grants as other programs. I think all members can be justifiably proud of the leadership that is shown and the way in which the farming community is willing to endorse the program and give it a try.

I would like to say something about the question of school finance. I realize that with the amount of time that is left it would be difficult to go into all the ramifications of school finance. I would like to compare first of all the amount of school grant that is now given in three main areas in the province, in 1962, as compared with 1950. I have three particular areas, the first area is an area of relatively low assessment, low productivity in comparison with other areas that have higher assessment and high productivity.

I note here that in 1950, for instance, the actual mill rate of Meadow Lake rural was 24 mills. The actual assessment was \$4 million. The urban was \$1.3 million and the grant received in 1950 was \$287,000, which was a mill rate equivalent of 53 mills. That is to say Meadow Lake would have had to levy a mill rate of 53 mills to raise this amount of money. In 1962, as we have moved forward on the principle of equalization — giving a larger share of the grant money to those areas who can least afford to raise it, I note that Meadow Lake had earned a grant of \$609,000, which is equivalent in terms of their assessment which has still remained at \$4 million — it has gone up slightly to \$4.4 million and the urban has gone up slightly at \$1.8 million — and the grant, therefore, of \$609,000 is a grant in mill equivalent of 96 mills and I think this is a credit to the government in recognizing the principle of equalization.

Another area, which is a highly assessed area, which wasn't in the unit as a unit at that time is the area of Eston-Elrose. It did come into the unit some time later. It has an assessment of \$24 million as compared with \$4 million rural, an urban of \$3 million as compared to \$1 million and in 1963, its total grant is \$281,000 a mill equivalent of 10 mills. Now this gives you a graphic picture of how we attempt to distribute the monies across Saskatchewan so that those areas that have the richest and best opportunity of producing revenue earn the least amount of grant and those that are unfortunate enough to be in a rather poor area can earn larger amounts of grant. The concept, of course, is to provide a basic package of education to every child in the province, no matter where that child may live.

I have some other facts here but I will not quote them at this time.

We propose to change the grant structure this year so that we can increase the total grant money by \$2.3 million, bringing it up to a new high of \$34 million in total, and we propose to do this in two ways. One is to waive the grant formula so that those districts that hire the best qualified teachers will earn a slightly higher percentage of grant. In other words, we give weight to the idea that we want to continually improve academic competence. And, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are changing it slightly so that we can continue along the road of equalization, and those areas that were higher last year, such as Meadow Lake, will even get more this year, and Eston-Elrose unfortunately, because of its situation, will not share percentagewise in the same rate of grant. I have these figures tabled with the press, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the fact that my time has expired I beg leave of the house that I not read the rest of the figures and I hope this will meet with their approval.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, because the budget allows a forward look in education, because it is aggressive, because it offers a new concept in the relation between government and industry in the community, because it offers latitude and flexibility, I offer it my wholehearted support, and I support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this budget debate, I want first of all to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the presentation of his first budget to this assembly.

The hon. member for Kelsey, (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) is a neighbor of mine in that his constituency is adjacent to my riding of Melfort-Tisdale. I have known the veteran member for many years and I appreciate the many fine qualities which have resulted in his election to this house on six occasions. In the 19 years since the CCF's were elected in Saskatchewan the member for Kelsey has served with distinction as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister of Natural and Mineral Resources, as well as Minister of Mineral Resources. His experience in these portfolios and on numerous boards, particularly that of the treasury board, have served him well in carrying on the responsibility he now has as provincial Treasurer.

His Budget Speech is revealing of the man himself. And while one cannot say of the Provincial Treasurer, as was once said of an English politician that "his bleeding heart runs away with his blooming head" yet it is a mark of the member for Kelsey that his budget is, as he has expressed it so aptly himself, "A budget not of cold dollars only but

March 7, 1963

also of friendship, warmth and light”.

Another quotation from his budget, revealing not only the man but also the party which he represents, Mr. Speaker, is, and I quote:

It is a budget that represents the pioneer spirit of Saskatchewan; it is a budget that provides for new horizons in economic development of our province; it provides new opportunities for our young people, help for the unfortunate, care for the sick, comfort for the aged, and increased opportunities for good living for all.

On behalf of the many constituents of Melfort-Tisdale who were once constituents of the hon. member, and also on behalf of the constituents of Kelsey to all of whom the Provincial Treasurer is Brock., I would say congratulations and thanks for a quarter of a century of work and service in the interests of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The Provincial Treasurer on Friday last, Mr. Speaker, painted a picture of a province making substantial progress on all fronts. It was pointed out that records were achieved in almost all branches of our economy, when compared with past performances in the province; that the 1962 total net value of commodity output was the highest level ever reached in Saskatchewan; that the total of all income received by Saskatchewan residents in 1962 was the highest level we have yet achieved; that last year’s wages and salaries were the highest on record, and almost twice the total amount paid out only ten years ago; that the net value of agricultural production was over three times that reached in the 1961 drought year; and that the economic growth was reflected in increases in the manufacturing industry, and in capital investment; and, of the greatest importance of all for our economy, was the fact that the mineral industry also achieved new records. These are important milestones in Saskatchewan’s progress, Mr. Speaker.

The spectacular developments that have taken place in Saskatchewan which are so apparent, Mr. Speaker, to those who wish to see, are the result of a planned effort by the government which was elected in 1944 to replace a Liberal government which because it spent its time sitting on its hands had lost the confidence of the people.

The financial critic for the opposition, Mr. Speaker, spoke on Monday last of the new direction now being taken by this government to foster further growth in our economy. He stated it was too bad this changed attitude was not adopted

15 years ago. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. gentleman opposite that Premier T.C. Douglas, following the election of the CCF in 1944 stated publicly that there was room in Saskatchewan for public, for private and for co-operative enterprise. 18 years ago private enterprise was invited to come into the province. Co-operative enterprise was encouraged. Public enterprise was expanded to take up the slack, occasioned by the former Liberal government's do-nothing attitude.

The Provincial Treasurer announced in his budget the setting up of the economic development council or corporation, Mr. Speaker, to assist in the establishment of new industries in the province. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not a new direction, or a changed attitude. It is merely a change of emphasis in what we have been doing since 1944. This economic development corporation will make loans to new industries in the province. We have had for many years an industrial development fund for this purpose, Mr. Speaker. This economic development corporation will assist technical research, leading to the development of new manufacturing projects. For some time now we have had a Department of Industry and Information which sponsored this type of research, and before that other governmental departments and agencies performed the same function. That the economic development corporation will only be an extension of what we have been doing was made clear by the Provincial Treasurer when he said in his address and I quote:

Over the time we have, I think, built up a program of economic development in Saskatchewan; a consolidation and extension of what we have done in a new economic development act, should provide a strong stimulant to the further development of the economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have been so concerned with shouting stagnation that they have not recognized what has been happening in this province since 1944.

As a result of our planned effort much has been accomplished by this government in achieving an economic climate so necessary to attract industry. One of the first essentials of a favorable economic climate was the development of facilities for generating electricity to be used by industry. Mr. Speaker, the Steel mill on the outskirts of Regina would not have located here in 1944 unless they had built their own power plant. The Interprovincial Steel Company's plant has a maximum power need equal to that of a city the size of Moose Jaw. Power to handle new industry of this magnitude did not exist in Saskatchewan in 1944, and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals weren't interested in providing this necessary incentive.

The Liberal opposition today thinks Saskatchewan should be back in that same position of a lack of electrical energy, as member after member on their side, time and again,

March 7, 1963

have objected to the expenditure of funds to provide the boundary plant dam at Estevan, the Queen Elizabeth station at Saskatoon, and the two hydro developments now taking place on the Saskatchewan River. And, Mr. Speaker, just as power is essential for industry so are adequate roads.

The Liberal government of the thirties and forties, in office both in Regina and Ottawa at the same time, were lacking in foresight and in planning so that Saskatchewan went without adequate power facilities and put up with mud roads.

But these and other lacks in our economy, Mr. Speaker, have been tackled by this government and outstanding progress has taken place in the comparatively short period of 18 years. The Saskatchewan Economic Review of March, 1962, sets out in graphic form the development which has occurred in our economy from 1944 to 1961. As a result of these measures. The figures for the net value of commodity production are given — a table for each of these 18 years. I have brought the table up to date by using the figures for 1962 given in the statistics on page 34 of the Provincial Treasurer's address.

First, Mr. Speaker, the value of all commodity production in Saskatchewan increased from \$528 million in 1946 to \$1,186 million in 1962. In 15 years the net value of all commodity production in the province has more than doubled, Mr. Speaker. Not a bad record for a province which has been experiencing so-called stagnation.

The table divides the total commodity production into two parts — agriculture and non-agriculture. The non-agricultural commodity production in 1946, Mr. Speaker, is given as \$110 million; the figure for 1962 is \$571 million, more than five times as great. What a picture of stagnation, according to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

The increases in the various sectors of our economy other than agriculture are given as follows: mining was valued in 1946 at \$22 million, in 1962 \$180 million — more than eight times as high; electric power production was valued at \$6 million in 1946, in 1962 \$40 million — an increase of almost seven times; manufactures increased from \$38 million in 1946 to \$140 million in 1962 — almost four times as great; construction was valued at \$37 million in 1946, in 1962 \$205 million — five and one-half times as great. And in spite of this progress, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition spends his time going up and down Saskatchewan and across Canada informing all who will listen that there is nothing but stagnation in Saskatchewan. A most remarkable contribution by this gentleman to our province's development, Mr. Speaker.

The table shows that the non-agricultural segment of our economy advanced steadily from a low of \$110 million in 1946 to a high of \$571 million in 1962.

However, the agricultural sector influenced as it is by the weather fell and rose. In 1952 the net value of agriculture production recorded the high for the 15 year period of \$810 million, while the low was \$181 million recorded in 1961.

Our agricultural sector was hit hard in 1961, Mr. Speaker, but what a calamity would have befallen our province had we had experienced nothing but stagnation as the opposition have claimed. If no progress had been made, if the non-agricultural sector of the economy was still at \$110 million, as it was in 1946, the total net value of commodity production for 1961 would have been only \$291 million and not the \$723 million it actually was.

Mr. Speaker, the economy of the province was able to withstand the poor crop of 1961 because of the progress made in Saskatchewan's economy over the past 18 years. A diversified economy, better able to withstand crop failure is what this government has been aiming for since 1944. These statistics prove this is what has been achieved. Since the Leader of the Opposition has been shouting stagnation on every possible occasion, I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to note that the opposition's financial critic did not once in his address mention stagnation. This in itself was most remarkable. Is it that at long last the truth is beginning to sink in? I don't blame the members for not repeating the charge after listening to the speech of the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

However, instead of shouting stagnation, the financial critic last Monday offered to co-operate with the government in inducing industry to come into the province. Are we now going to get aid and assistance in our development program from the opposition in place of the obstruction which we have experienced in the past? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the remarks of the member from Moosomin last Monday. For the attitude of the opposition seemingly has not changed. There was the same derogatory criticism regarding the population of Saskatchewan coming from the members opposite. Speaker after speaker, in this debate, referred to the population loss in Saskatchewan and called this government to blame. Mr. Speaker, I have heard before of the opposition being mixed up and confused as to what is happening in Saskatchewan. This time is no exception.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that under the CCF the growth in population in Saskatchewan has been less than the natural increase. The figures prove this, Mr. Speaker. Our population has, however, increased on an overall basis each year in the last ten years, but this increase has been less, admittedly, than the natural increase. The opposition claim that this low increase is a result of this government's policy. How absurd can one become, Mr. Speaker. The opposition know that one reason for the slow growth in our population was the increase in size of farms and the mechanization of those farms, with fewer people living in rural areas. Was it this government's

March 7, 1963

fault, Mr. Speaker, that farms increased in size? There isn't I dare say, a farmer in this house who isn't farming more land today that he was in 1946. Just as farm machinery became larger and more expensive, so farmers were forced to buy more land to obtain an economic unit.

However there was a serious population loss in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, which the opposition members up to now in this session have forgotten conveniently to mention. The opposition has the same access to the same facts as I have and they know that Saskatchewan's population fell from 1936 to 1941 by the large figure of 35,555 people, and that from 1941 to 1946 there was a further loss of more than 63,000.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mostly in the Army.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years from 1936 to 1946, Saskatchewan lost 100,000, besides, Mr. Speaker, besides our natural increase. A loss, the actual loss plus the loss of natural increase, a loss approaching a quarter of a million people. And yet we hear nothing of this from the other side, Mr. Speaker.

A Liberal government was in power for all but the last two years of that period. And the Liberal party must take the blame for this huge loss of one quarter of a million of Saskatchewan citizens. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of it is that all this loss might have been prevented. Industry by-passed Saskatchewan in the late thirties and early forties, because Saskatchewan lacked adequate facilities to attract manufacturing industries here. Because the Liberal government of the day was not farsighted enough to see the benefits of having a Boundary Dam power plant or Queen Elizabeth station, industry established elsewhere and our population to the extent of approximately 250,000 people went elsewhere to look for work. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite do not like to talk about the thirties but would rather talk about the great Liberal party of 50 years ago. It might be of interest to members of the house, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the experience populationwise of Manitoba and Alberta in the same period. There was the same depression in these provinces as in Saskatchewan. The thirties were just as dirty and just as hungry there as in Saskatchewan.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — No, they weren't.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — How did these two provinces fare populationwise, from 1931 to 1946?

Did they each lose a quarter of a million of their citizens? Mr. Speaker, here are the figures. Manitoba's population in 1936 was 711,000; it went up to 729,000 in 1941; fell by 3,000 in 1946 to 726,000; a loss of 3,000 in the five year period. Again from 1936 of about 15,000. There is no doubt that they lost a total population here because of the natural increase, but at least they held their own, Mr. Speaker. Alberta, population in 1936 was 772,000; in Alberta in 1941 went up to 796,000; and in 1945 went up to 803,000 people; an increase of well over 36,000 people in the 10 year period. Again, they lost on a total basis because they didn't keep up their natural increase but in both of these provinces, Manitoba and Alberta, the speed was entirely different than in Saskatchewan where we had a loss approaching 250,000 people here in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the actual loss was 100,000, counting the loss of natural increase Saskatchewan's loss was 250,000 people.

We hear nothing about this from the people on the other side, they don't tell us why it happened in Saskatchewan and not in Alberta and Manitoba. The big reason of course was that there was a Liberal party in power here in Saskatchewan a government that did nothing to improve the economic climate of this province. A government that did nothing but sit on its hands waiting for something to happen. A government that didn't realize the importance of providing sufficient power and adequate roads, so necessary to attract industry into the province.

Upon taking office, Mr. Speaker, this government took steps to improve our economic climate, to provide facilities necessary for industry. That we are making progress can be seen by the fact that we have stemmed the loss of population and as a result, Saskatchewan's population is increasing. From 1951 to 1956 the population of Saskatchewan increased by 48,800; from 1956 to 1961 it has increased by 44,000. Today we have recovered the ground we lost in the ten years from 1936 to 1946, as a result of a Liberal do-nothing government.

Today, as our economy becomes increasingly diversified, our urban population is increasing rapidly which surely is apparent to everyone. Everyone knows, even the Liberals opposite, that Regina has increased in size from 73,000 in 1951, ten years ago, to 111,000 in 1961, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 54 percent. Saskatoon increased from 53,000 in 1951 to 92,000 in 1961, an increase of 73 percent. Prince Albert, too, increased, Mr. Speaker, though one wouldn't know it from listening to the speeches of the new member from Prince Albert, (Mr. Steuart), but Prince Albert did increase from 17,000 in 1951 to 23,000 in 1961, an increase of 37 percent. Yet to listen to the speakers on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, we would think we had a loss right across Saskatchewan; we would think we were in the middle of a period of stagnation here.

March 7, 1963

And yet, for the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley's) benefit, Mr. Speaker, I would tell him that Weyburn increased in population from 7,000 to 9,000 in the same ten year period. We haven't heard a thing about that in this house, Mr. Speaker. The member for Souris-Estevan, (Mr. MacDougall), Mr. Speaker, is really in trouble when it comes to talking about stagnation. How can he tell the people of Estevan that Saskatchewan is experiencing stagnation when the city of Estevan's population increased from 4,000 to 7,000 in ten years, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 93 percent from 1951 to 1961. Surely this isn't stagnation.

And even the member for Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald), doesn't seem to realize that the town of Moosomin increased about 60 percent in population from 1951 to 1961. And, Mr. Speaker, I could tell the hon. member for Moosomin that the towns in northeastern Saskatchewan are doing quite well with Melfort, for which he expressed some concern last Monday, showing an increase from 3,000 to 4,200 from 1951 to 1961.

Members of Melfort's board of trade, inform me that Melfort, currently the largest town in Saskatchewan is going to be the province's next city in the very near future. I would like to be present, Mr. Speaker, when and if the member for Moosomin tells the members of the Melfort board of trade that Melfort is suffering from stagnation. Their reaction would not be very pleasant I can assure him.

And other urban centres in opposition member's seats, Mr. Speaker, have been increasing, too, in the same period, which fact has been missed entirely by the members opposite. Kamsack from 2,100 to 3,300, an increase of 60 percent; Maple Creek from 1,600 to 2,300; Unity from 1,200 to 1,800; and Humboldt from 2,400 to 3,200; all in that same ten year period 1951 to 1961 when the province of Saskatchewan has been supposed to be suffering from stagnation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the people of our urban centres must be sick and tired of hearing this talk about stagnation and population loss from opposition members.

Along with this increase in population in urban centres, a spectacular diversification of our economy has taken place, as pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer in his budget address. This growth is pointed up not only by the statistics I have quoted but also by those showing the cheques cashed in clearing centres in the cities of our province. In 1946, the value of cheques cashed in the clearing centre of Regina was \$977 million; in 1961, 15 years later, the value of cheques cashed was \$4,854 million, almost five times as great, Mr. Speaker.

In Saskatoon, the value of cheques cashed in 1944 was \$349 million, in 1961 this was \$1,185 million, an increase of three and one-half times. This is the kind of stagnation which is appreciated by cities, even though it is not appreciated by the people on the opposite side of the house.

It is about time, I should inform the member for Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald), it is about time that the opposition started to help in our industrial program. We appreciate the offer which he made of helping to induce industry to come into Saskatchewan. However, the member for Moosomin's offer to aid in inducing industry to come into Saskatchewan will be believed, Mr. Speaker, only when the Leader of the Opposition ceases his sabotaging tactics in all parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in moving now to speak of my department, I am merely shifting to another facet of our province's growth which refutes statements by opposition members as to lack of progress in Saskatchewan. For, Mr. Speaker, the improvements in our roads, both provincial highways and municipal grids and main market roads are such as to be readily seen and appreciated. Everybody in the province has experienced this betterment.

Those of us who have recollections of 1940 roads under the Liberals accept the change that has come about as part of our everyday life. However, for those who have returned to Saskatchewan after absences of a few years, the transformation has been little short of miraculous.

My predecessor, Mr. J.T. Douglas, tells of an inspection trip he and his deputy took in northeastern Saskatchewan early in the CCF term of office. As they were nearing their destination for the night they were flagged down, so he informed me, by a stranded motorist who told him that his car had broken down under the strain of negotiating the highway. He had a sick woman in the car and requested to be taken to the hospital. Mr. Douglas agreed. The sick woman and the other passengers were transferred to Mr. Douglas' car and the driver of the stranded car and he were left in the darkness awaiting return of Mr. Douglas' car. In the conversation that followed it came out that the Good Samaritan was from Regina, that he was a cabinet minister, and that his name was Douglas. He was asked if he was the Premier and when he indicated not, the other person said, "Good, it was the other so and so I wanted to talk to". I was assured by Mr. Douglas that a very thorough discussion was had that night on the state of Saskatchewan's highways at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I announced a program entailing blacktopping of 503 miles of provincial highway last session. I said at that time that this would seem a miracle to anyone who had experienced Saskatchewan's highways 20 years ago. If Mr. Douglas, that spring night several years ago, had attempted to tell the stranded motorist what our highways would be like now in 1963, he would have been branded a visionary of the first degree. And yet, Mr. Speaker, today I am announcing a program not of 503 miles of bituminous surfacing, but one entailing well over 740 miles of black-top here in the province.

We propose, during this year, to work on 140 miles

March 7, 1963

of pavement, 597 miles of oil treatment on our highways, and 10 miles on access roads to provincial parks. Of this mileage 26 miles of pavement and 42.8 miles of oil treatment are completion of mileage from projects commenced last year. The remaining mileage is made up of projects to be commenced this year. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure now to list the projects which we have in our program for 1963.

The details —

No. 1 highway, Webb to Gull Lake, seal coating.

No. 1 highway, Ernfold to Herbert, bituminous resurfacing

No. 2 highway, Buffalo Pound Lake Causeway, completion of grading and oil treatment. Young to junction no. 14 highway, bituminous resurfacing.

No. 3 highway, Manitoba boundary to Erwood, completion of grading and gravelling, Hudson Bay west, 6 miles oil treatment. Shell River-Shellbrook, grading and bituminous surfacing.

No. 4 highway, Kyle to Elrose, grading and bituminous surfacing. This will be a two year program, Mr. Speaker. We will start this year and finish the bituminous surfacing next year. North junction no. 7 highway, also on no. 4 to south of Biggar, oil treatment. Cando — south of the Battle river, oil treatment. South Saskatchewan river to no. 5 highway, completion of bituminous surfacing. No. 26 highway to Cochin, grading and gravelling. Cochin to Glaslyn, oil treatment, Glaslyn north, 18 miles grading and gravelling. From 18 miles north of Glaslyn to Meadow Lake, oil treatment.

No. 5 highway, junction no. 9 highway to Invermay, oil treatment. Watson to Humboldt completion of grading, bituminous surfacing. No. 4 highway to Bresaylor, completion of bituminous surfacing.

No. 6 highway — Raymore to Dafoe — again a late start on this, Mr. Speaker, with this being a two year program for Raymore to Dafoe, grading and bituminous surfacing. Dafoe to Watson, shoulder seal coating. North of Gronlid to no. 55 highway, grading.

No. 7 highway — Kindersley to Alsask, bituminous surfacing.

No. 9 highway — no. 13 highway to Carlyle, oil treatment. Whitewood to Stockholm, oil treatment. Stockholm to junction no. 15 highway, grading and gravelling. Preeceville to Endeavour, completion of grading and gravelling. Hudson Bay south six miles, oil treatment.

No. 10 highway — Fort Qu'Appelle to junction no. 35 grading and bituminous surfacing.

No. 11 highway — Bladworth to Kenaston, bituminous resurfacing. Dundurn to Saskatoon, completion of bituminous surfacing.

No. 13 highway — Manitoba boundary to Carlyle, oil treatment. West junction no. 36 highway to Assiniboia, oil treatment.

No. 14 highway — Manitoba boundary to Marchwell, grading and gravelling. No. 6 highway to Lanigan, oil treatment. No. 2 highway to Clavet, oil treatment.

No. 15 highway — junction no. 11 to Broderick, oil treatment.

No. 17 highway — junction no. 14 highway to junction no. 40, grading and gravelling.

No. 18 highway — Manitoba boundary to Oxbow, bituminous surfacing. Glen Ewen to Oxbow, grading.

No. 21 highway — junction no. 13 to Cypress Park, grading and gravelling.

No. 22 highway — Yarbo Corner to Stockholm, oil treatment. Junction no. 47 highway to Lemberg, grading and gravelling.

No. 23 highway — junction no. 3 to Carrot River, completion of grading, gravelling.

No. 31 highway — Salvador to junction no. 14, grading and gravelling.

No. 32 highway — Success to Shackleton, oil treatment.

No. 33 highway — Regina east eight-tenths of a mile, grading and bituminous surfacing.

No. 35 highway — Lipton to Leross, oil treatment, Elfros to Wadena, completion of grading, gravelling. Wadena north, grading. Wadena to no. 49 highway, oil treatment. Tisdale to Nipawin — and again, Mr. Speaker, this is a two year program, grading and bituminous surfacing. Between Denare Beach and Creighton, grading and gravelling, and again a late start on this project for completion in 1964.

No. 36 highway — Willowbunch to junction no. 13 highway, grading and gravelling.

No. 37 highway — Climax to south of Shaunavon, oil treatment.

No. 39 highway — North Portal to Estevan, completion of bituminous surfacing.

March 7, 1963

No. 40 highway — junction no. 3 to Krydor, oil treatment. Krydor to Hafford, completion of grading and gravelling.

No. 42 highway — junction no. 2 highway to Central Butte, oil treatment.

No. 47 highway — Qu'Appelle River to Melville, grading and gravelling.

No. 49 highway — Pelly to Hvas, grading and gravelling, Kelvington to junction no. 35, oil treatment.

No. 55 highway — White Fox to Meath Park, oil treatment. Meadow Lake east and west, nine miles in total, oil treatment.

No. 58 highway — LaFleche to Gravelbourg, grading and gravelling.

This, Mr. Speaker, involves a program of grading of 316 miles, oiling 597 on highway mileage and 10 on provincial park access roads, and 140 miles bituminous surfacing, gravelling 387 miles and a seal coat on no. 1 highway of 14 miles.

The further part of our program here, regarding the construction of access roads to provincial parks, picnic sites and camp sites, will have two main, major items including the road from No. 2 highway to Buffalo Pound Provincial park and the completion of grading and gravelling no. 26 highway to the Meadow Lake provincial park.

Our bridge program — we will complete the bridges on no. 2 highway over Buffalo Pound lake, the concrete overpass at Saskatoon on no. 11 highway, and the bridge on Battle river at Battleford, on no. 40 highway.

The new bridge projects this year will be — no. 3 highway, construction of bridge over Red Deer River near Erwood. No. 10 highway, construction of precast bridge at Fort Qu'Appelle. No. 13 highway, construction of a precast concrete bridge near Frys. On no. 35 highway, there will be three bridges to be constructed in conjunction with the improvement to no. 35 highway from Tisdale to Nipawin. On no. 58 highway, construction of bridge over the Wood river near Gravelbourg.

Mr. Speaker, when our 1963 program is completed we will have on our highways some 3,820 miles of dust-free highways. This means we will have 45 percent of our highway mileage dust-free.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, might call this stagnation. I think, however, the people of the province will have a different name for it. Today, one can

travel across Saskatchewan on black-top on our no. 1 highway. The main routes between our cities are black-topped. By the end of 1963, we will have a variety of east-west dust-free routes across the centre of the province — routes through Yorkton and Saskatoon, connecting Manitoba with Alberta. One will be able to motor from Saskatoon to Alsask on the Alberta border on black-top the end of this year's program. We will have three black-top connections with Alberta, namely no. 1, no. 5, which we have now, we will add to this no. 7 highway, a black-top connection with Alberta.

On the east side of the province, we presently have three black-top connections with Manitoba, namely highways 1, 10, and 57. This year's program will add two more dust-free connections with Manitoba, highways no. 13 and 18. We now have three black-top connections with our neighbor to the south, highways no. 39, 47 and 6. While another black-top connection will not be added to the south, Mr. Speaker, we will extend oil south on no. 37 highway as far as Climax. Oil will be extended east on no. 13 highway from Assiniboia to Verwood, which brings black-top closer to East Poplar on the Montana border.

The main part of our black-topping program will be concentrated in the part of Saskatchewan north of no. 1 highway. The greater part of this work will be on north and south roads. These will serve not only our own people, but will serve tourists on no. 1 highway to our northern recreational areas and to provincial parks in both the north and south parts of the province. We presently have no. 2 highway black-topped from Pickthall, south of Assiniboia, north through Moose Jaw, Watrous, Prince Albert as far as Prince Albert national park.

No. 4 highway, the only north-south highway on the west side of the province, will receive the greatest amount of attention this year. On no. 4 highway, we will oil 119 miles, 52.5 miles will be graded and 27.1 miles will be paved or prepared for paving in 1964. Presently, Mr. Speaker, one is able to travel north on no. 6 highway from Regway on the U.S. border to Regina to Melfort on pavement and oil. We will improve this route by paving from Dafoe to Raymore. With the oiling of no. 55 highway from Meath Park to White Fox, one will be able to travel on blacktop from Nipawin and from Prince Albert to Smeaton on no. 55 highway, from where you enter the famous Hanson Lake road which leads to some of Saskatchewan's best fishing lakes. Improvements on no. 9 highway, the east side of the province, will consist of 32.5 miles of oiling and 27.2 miles of grade. No. 35 highway will have 39.5 miles of oil this year, and grading will commence on 38.9 miles, with paving of 36 miles to be done in 1964.

Other important oiling will take place on highways 3, 9, 15, 22, 32, 40 and 55 as I announced just now. No. 10 highway will be relocated, reconstructed on a new location through Fort Qu'Appelle to intersect no. 35 highway south of the Qu'Appelle valley. Currently we are buying the right-of-way

March 7, 1963

from no. 35 to Balgonie, with the intention of extending this highway sometime in the future. Other improvements will be undertaken on access roads to major provincial parks, namely Buffalo Lake and Meadow Lake. I should announce too, that the Department of Highways will in 1963 take into the highway system the Ostoquen road and the Buffalo Narrows road, both in the forest areas of the north, and also the Squaw Rapids road in the southern part of the province.

All in all, this 1963 program, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most exciting programs planned by the department for the improvement of our highway system. It is a program which, including maintenance and administration will cost the people of Saskatchewan in total about \$23 million dollars, of which \$13 million will be for our capital program. This is a program made possible, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that this government saw fit to increase gasoline tax from 7¢ in 1944 to 14¢ as now. I would inform the Liberal members opposite that this is a popular program which we are presenting to the people of Saskatchewan today — that the people of Saskatchewan do not object to paying taxes when they can see the tangible benefits of doing so.

The program I have announced today, Mr. Speaker, is one aimed primarily at extending the benefits of dust-free highways across the province. This will accommodate our own motorists, whether they travel for business or pleasure, and in paying particular attention to north and south highways we hope to give an impetus to our rising tourist industry. In 1962 tourists from outside the province spent in Saskatchewan a sum estimated at \$25 million dollars and this, Mr. Speaker, is only the beginning of our tourist industry. More tourists will come to Saskatchewan as knowledge of our fabulous fishing grounds in the north spread and as our highways are improved.

Already highway based industries providing a livelihood for many of our citizens, as we can see by the number of our service stations and motels along the main travelled routes. The Lake Hanson road, which has important recreational areas, will be connected this year with no. 6 highway, north from Gronlid. A ferry crossing of the Saskatchewan river will afford direct contact from no. 6 highway with this northern road which promises to be one of the heaviest travelled road in the north connecting as it does with Flin Flon and Creighton.

Tourism in the southern part of the province is being encouraged by the large number of provincial parks established by this government. The South Saskatchewan Reservoir and the Tobin Lake, the new reservoir formed by the Squaw Rapids Dam, should both have great recreational attraction. The Qu'Appelle valley is being drawn to the attention of tourists on no. 1 highway, Mr. Speaker, by the erection of billboard type signs. I have a picture of the sign which we intend to put up on these two locations on no. 1. I will leave it in the Chamber and members can pass it around and see the beautiful sign which

we are erecting at Indian Head and at Qu'Appelle. The sign says "The beautiful scenic Qu'Appelle valley route, 45 miles via highways 35, 10 and 56. Scenic drive, historic sites, Echo Valley provincial park, setting of the legend of Qu'Appelle"; and sets out the route from either of these points, north to the Qu'Appelle valley and through the valley and then down to no. 1 highway. We anticipate that there will be a large number of tourists travelling on this route, who if it weren't for these signs, wouldn't know that 18 or 20 miles north, is one of the most beautiful scenic drives and beautiful valleys in Canada.

And, Mr. Speaker, we anticipate too, that this billboard will be quite successful, there will be a great many requests for future billboards, because I can see the time when we will have no. 1 highway from Manitoba border across to the Alberta border with billboards indicating that south there is Kenosee Lake, south there is Cypress Hills, north there is the Lake Hanson road, north there is the Meadow Lake park, and north there is Waskesiu park.

We certainly hope we don't get too many of these signs up on the highway, Mr. Speaker, so that the views along our highways are spoiled but we will continue to draw to the attention of the tourists on no. 1 and other highways that we have these areas in Saskatchewan which are worthy of a visit by them.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I will support the budget.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I think it would be quite in order to congratulate all those who have participated in the debate, although I am not quite in agreement with everything that was said. I was very disappointed this afternoon to hear the Minister of Education with such hogwash, in my opinion, the type of hogwash that came out, especially from the Minister of Education.

It seems to me that when the Minister of Education gets up to speak he should give a good report of his department and after all should set an example for our young people. I am sure that my colleagues and I would not condone the type of goings-on that he mentioned, that have gone on in the past, and I am sure, as much as members on their side of the house, Mr. Speaker, would not condone the reeve of a municipality, because he is a CCFer, we would not condone him because he uses threats to try and get elected as a reeve of a municipality, in threatening to cut off social aid. These are things we find in every walk of life, some people will abuse their position and I am sure that both parties on this side of the house and the other side of the house as well, will not condone these actions.

March 7, 1963

You know, Mr. Speaker, early in my political life, I discovered that there were no subjects whatever in which the government and I could reach an agreement on. Well, consequently, I never tried.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — That's right, you can't go to the trouble.

Mr. Coderre: — Often I brought forth some constructive criticism, but like it says in the proverbs of the Bible, that the seed has fallen on barren ground, and so barren a ground it is, Sir.

I will offer aid at all times. At any time that suggestions have been given, in offering aid for the industries of this province, these suggestions have been rejected. Any time that I can help constructively I shall do so and I am sure every one of the opposition will.

The hon. Minister for Melfort, Mr. Willis, mentioned a few moments ago, about the mining value. I don't believe I need deal with that very thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, because when the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) suggested the other day, that if we take into consideration the constant value of the dollar, we find that we have an altogether different picture. And then he went on to the question of the population growth of the province. He did admit that the population growth was not as high as the average of the country. But then he went on to try and destroy the arguments that the hon. member for Moosomin used the other day in showing conclusively that we haven't had our fair share of growth increase. He goes on to say that the city of Regina's population has increased, the city of Moose Jaw's population has increased, and so on and so forth, but then he doesn't mention that this has been caused primarily by an exodus off the farms into the urban areas. This is the reason that these cities have grown. It is a rather weak argument to say that the population is growing in some spots, but it is growing sparingly in others.

And then just as he mentioned that, the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) said "We had a population of 9,200 people in Estevan. Of course the Minister mentioned 8,500, but he failed to mention that the reason of that drop of 700 is the fact that we have lost many of our oil exploration and industry in these parts of the province. That is the reason, Sir.

Let's bring out the whole facts. The hon. member for Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) the other day did congratulate the government on its apparent outward change of attitude, insofar as the promotion of industry is concerned, and I say it is an outward change, Mr. Speaker. Now, I don't share his views

altogether, you know there is an old saying that goes something like this “You can’t teach an old horse new tricks” and I believe what we have across the way, Sir, is a type of a government that is really an old horse and they can’t come out with new tricks.

Have not socialists, Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial been violently anti-capitalist? Since their inception, I could quote you the CCF hand-book here that they have used so often. Statement after statement has been made to that effect, of where they stand insofar as free enterprise is concerned. But this was a noble thing on the part of the hon. treasurer, saying that we are going to promote industries and everything else. Then on the other hand, you find another minister of the crown that says a different story. The Hon. Mr. Walker has said that the government is determined to follow the path it has followed. Now, I wonder what that means, Mr. Speaker. You have what the Treasurer says, “Now this is the Utopia we are going to build for industry” and then you have another minister, a responsible minister of the crown, who says, “We are going to follow the path we have in the past followed”.

What does this mean? Does this mean to say that you will always follow the same footsteps, that you advocated in 1933 and onwards?

I think that we are entitled, Mr. Speaker, to an explanation of this unique statement by the hon. minister, he says “We are determined to follow the path we have followed”. Now, the path that they have followed in the past, Mr. Speaker, is marked by statements that have been made by responsible members of the government, at their conventions, “profit and ownership have to go”; “It may be that force may prove inevitable, we are not concerned with capitalistic institutions, as soon as we can wreck them”; are these some of the roads or paths of the past? Another “we do not believe in the so called rights of private property, nor shall we recognize either, precedence or practice in connection therewith” Is this the path that you propose to follow? You have one minister who makes statements like this, and then you have another minister who outwardly says “This is what we are going to do.”

Something unique about this government, Mr. Speaker, is that time and again when they get up to speak, they always seem to live in the past. They always compare with the past. You know, whenever you find an old person and converse with him, they reminisce into the past. This sort of indicates old age. They seem to lack the foresight to look into the future. These boys, Mr. Speaker, have nothing further to contribute to this province, they are spent. They have spent all the vigor they ever have had.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — That wasn’t much.

Mr. Coderre: — They spent the future income of our children, and our children’s

March 7, 1963

children. The government has even lost faith in itself. It is indicated by their budget. You have shown your inability to achieve what you originally planned to do in your budget. You budgeted last year for a deficit. And then you wind up with a whopping surplus. Now, you take everything into consideration and end up with a whopping surplus in excess of \$20 million dollars when you predicted a deficit. Well, in terms of the people of this province, what does this \$20 million mean? It means over-taxation. Over-taxation that every child in this province could be clothed and shod with the very best of clothes for a whole year. That is what you have extracted from the taxpayers of this province. You call it more abundant living. More abundant living for the squanderings of your administration.

Since 1960, Mr. Speaker, the socialist government have provided us with a tremendous increase in taxes . . .

Premier Lloyd: — Nonsense . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Deceiving . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Check yourself. The total new taxes since June, 1960, has reached the staggering figure of \$34.5 million a year, and then with this year's over-taxation of roughly \$20 million that means that you have extracted from the people of this province an excess of \$54 million in excess taxation. What I can't understand, Mr. Speaker, and neither was the Hon. Treasurer able to explain, is why it is that in 1962-63 that the budget is for a deficit. What happens? Your revenues exceed your estimates by about \$16.7 million. That is fine, but then your debt increases from \$517 million to \$560 million, and then in your 1963 budget you go ahead and budget for another \$3.5 million deficit. Why? Despite this windfall caused by over-taxation, and by this huge increase in gross debt and this deficit. These are questions, Mr. Speaker, that have not been answered by the government. They are responsible and they are holding the purse strings of this province, and we haven't heard a word or a good reason why.

It is worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, in this budget speech that time and again, the hon. minister tried to alibi why he was extracting these excess taxes, these levies as shown in the surplus. Then when we find that the hon. treasurer is using this type of tactics, I think it is further proof of a government's inability, with all its boards, its commissions, its group of advisers, to forecast expenditures and revenues.

What faith, Mr. Speaker, can anyone have in a government that is unable to perform its duties within a reasonable margin of error. Everyone will admit that we need to expand our utilities. We can have increased public services as well. But these things should be paid for by economizing in thousands

of ways, and by avoiding these useless and extravagant expenditures and not by mounting the debt of this province and incurring extra deficits. Much more could be said on that, Mr. Speaker, and much more will be said. But I have a few things that I would like to draw the attention of the government to, and it applies to my constituency as well as other areas of the province. We have a large corporation in this province, a big monopolistic corporation, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And I have to say a few words on their policies, as it applies to the farmers.

They are constantly driving the farmers into more difficult positions. For example we have a farmer who resides on a half-section of land, and when the power came into that particular area this farmer was not in a position financially or economically, to put the power in. Well as time goes on, this farmer has been able to save sufficient money to purchase a quarter or half section of land. Now, this farmer is wise enough to invest in a situation where it will put him on a more economical basis. It so happens in these cases, where the land that he has purchased has a power pole on it. He makes an application to the S.P.C. to ask to have this pole moved from the land that he has purchased, on to the land where his residence is, and what happens?

It appears that the corporation is in trouble financially, because in the moving of this pole from one section or parcel of land to another, they want to charge him what is known as the area coverage fee, which is usually \$500 or \$550. Now the cost of moving this pole from one part of the land to another would be roughly \$150, could be a few dollars, more or less. Why the extra exorbitant charge on a farmer because he wants to move the power from one place to another? Oh, some people have got away with it. Friends of the government, Mr. Speaker, have got away with just the cost of moving, but if you are not a friend of the government, you are going to pay the full area fee.

What does this mean? Does it mean that the corporation, Mr. Speaker, is in some sort of difficulty, that they must extract from the small farmer, the small man, this extra \$150? It has happened, because our agriculture economy has to move or to change their farm unit, does it mean that they have to have this extra amount of money extracted? It is some squeeze that they are putting on the farmers. Just driving another coffin nail into the farmer's economy. I would ask the government, Mr. Speaker, to explain why they extract this unjust charge. As I said before, and I will say again, it appears that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is in trouble somewhere.

And I would like to show you some other ways how the government manipulates, or changes, charges which should be carried by the corporation, is paid by other departments of the government. Now it is common practice, Mr. Speaker,

March 7, 1963

when the Department of Highways surveys a road in a particular spot in the country, where they have to move trees or homes, that this is chargeable to the Department of Highways capital account. The same applies if a person gets water rights, rights to build a dam on a certain water-way, and there is the effect of people surrounding, this again is chargeable to the person who does perform that work.

Now this is a common practice and it is established in all government agencies. Well, the other day we were in public accounts, and we find that on page 369, there was an amount of three hundred and five thousand dollars that was spent in 1961-62, for clearing the trees in what is known as the Squaw Rapids basin areas. And, of course, I understand that there was a return tabled the other day that this amount is now in excess of \$500 thousand. Who pays for that? The Department of Natural Resources. Reason given, the Department of Natural Resources wanted to have this basin cleared of trees. Now, if it is required for the Department of Highways to charge certain type of work against the capital cost of their highway to remove trees, buildings, or anything else, this should also be so for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and that should be charged against the capital cost of the Squaw Rapids Dam in clearing this Squaw Rapids basin area.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that another agency of the government, because they just want to clear up this area, that this amount of money should be charged to the department, and charged to the treasury as a whole, and not to the corporation?

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that they are trying to enhance the financial position of the corporations. Because this is money that has to be paid, and I believe should rightfully be paid by the corporation. This is something I would like to have an answer about. We asked in public accounts the other day, I asked this question, the Department of Natural Resources, said they just wanted to have it cleared up, and it is going to be under water.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should the Department of Natural Resources pay for the removal of those trees when that should be charged to the capital costs of the Squaw Rapid Dam? Or is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation management has become so powerful that they are telling the government what they want? Is this a question of one of these organizations, these brains, or these offsprings of the government dictating what should be done? It appears that way.

I would like to mention a few things, Mr. Speaker, as well on the feeling and uneasiness that has been left in the minds of municipal men and the public generally. This government, Mr. Speaker, has also left a feeling of bitterness which has been created between towns and villages within the boundaries of these proposed county areas.

This feeling of bitterness has been caused, and I

think primarily caused, by the fundamental philosophy of the socialist, Mr. Speaker, that of divide and conquer. And they are creating this division amongst municipal men and people in this respect.

This feeling of bitterness and this tough competition for the county seat through the constant brain-washing, Mr. Speaker, has caused a state of resignation in the minds of many of the people of our province to accept whatever comes along without putting up a fight. What's the use sometimes!

I have always been under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that a senior government's prime duty was to create a feeling of well-being in the minds of the people, and not create a feeling of distrust amongst themselves.

We, the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, can find solace in the fact that many of our municipal men, who are our community leaders, have stood up, Mr. Speaker, to their dictatorial powers and methods of brain-washing. The government has been remiss in that job, in that duty of creating the feeling of trust and desire amongst the municipal government.

Their thinking is, Mr. Speaker, that if they say something loud enough and long enough it may come true. This is somewhat the method used in the advertising media. Their determined effort, Mr. Speaker, to enforce upon the people the county system is arising to about that point; they have established commissions, royal commissions, municipal conferences — and everyone remembers this municipal conference we had here in Regina that minister after minister was just attempting to brain-wash the municipal men.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — . . . the socialists.

Mr. Coderre: — It probably could be. And then their continuing committee which has made an attempt to foster this county idea. There were no two sides of the story trying to be brought up — they were trying to bring their story over all the time. Then your municipal advisory committee, all these have been constantly directed in, it has created a feeling in the public that it has mistrust in your administration. It has, the feeling is that there is maybe some merit and may not be. It has created this division. These constant measures, methods used in brainwashing, Mr. Speaker, have got to come to an end.

It is said, time and time again, that the people are more qualified to decide what they want for themselves than a bunch of planners who some of them have had no idea of what the problems are. I for one, Mr. Speaker, will not rest until such time as a complete vote for all the people concerned both in and out of the boundaries of a proposed county have had a

March 7, 1963

chance to vote on that question.

Oh, you may laugh, you would just like to try to push your thoughts on everyone. This is what Khrushchev tries to do time and time again. This is what you are constantly trying to do. Do you not think that the people of this province know what they want? They have asked time and again for a complete vote on this question . . .

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — They told what they didn't want . . .

Mr. Coderre: — . . . the granting of a vote to people within a boundary was a concession that was granted, a concession — imagine — when it should be a right. A concession that was granted by the government because of the pressure of the S.A.R.M. and the opposition on this side of the house.

Why should anyone in this province, Mr. Speaker, ask for a concession to a government when it is a right?

Now they have established commission upon commission to recommend these boundaries; they've made intensive studies on it; it has cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars; and now some unknown authority somewhere in the government is coming out with new boundaries which the people have not had a chance to thoroughly peruse and look through. Whoever is redefining those boundaries, whether it is the Department of Education or whether it is the Department of Municipal Affairs, or somebody else, they are coming out with the most radical ideas that I have ever heard or seen from any administration. Every commission, Mr. Speaker, that they have set up to study these problems, and a biased study, possibly, have recommended that within the boundaries of each county would be a large shopping area. It would be built around the local union hospital. Now this, to me, is a noble suggestion. But what do they do? I can name you several cases that they split counties, or proposed counties, right in half and where there isn't a shopping area within the boundaries of these areas. Who in the Sam Hill, Mr. Speaker, is making up these maps. As I have said, time and again, Mr. Speaker, this government has appointed boards and commission to give them an idea of what should go on and then they don't pay attention to it.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Coderre: — Yes?

Hon. Mr. Wood: — What map is the hon. member referring to — one that has been put out by the municipal advisory commission or some other map?

Mr. Coderre: — I don't know what maps, where they come from.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — I do. They come from some . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I'll name you a case in point and then you can applaud after it. The area up for example where I live used to be within the recommended area and the boundaries of the Moose Jaw school unit. We have been contributing to the Moose Jaw Union Hospital for a period of, I don't know — 10 or 12 years. Now there is a map that comes out from, I don't know where, whether it is your department or not. You said you don't even know where it comes from. You don't know but somebody else does — have you no interdepartmental relations at all? Don't you know what's going on. How in the Sam Hill you can bring a government to the people like this, I don't know. But there is still a map that is being used by the municipal men in the areas of my constituency that divides the Moose Jaw unit in half — it re-establishes what they call a Moose Jaw West county, not a city in the area, not a service centre.

This is what these boys know, Mr. Speaker. And this is the government.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher: — Makes you sick.

Mr. Coderre: — Makes anyone sick. You've lost the trust of the people of Saskatchewan and you haven't got the guts, Mr. Speaker, to go to the people and find out where they stand. I don't know how I could express myself, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. W.R. Thatcher: — You're doing fine.

Mr. Coderre: — . . . but for crying out loud why don't they let the people decide for themselves what to do.

You know, these rules and regulations that come up from these people are absolutely astounding. They've lost track of everything, they don't know where they are going. The other day one of the hon. ministers, I think the Attorney General, tabled in the house some rules and regulations, regarding organized or licensed organizations by the government, such as the Dental College and so on and so forth. I mentioned in the past, Mr. Speaker, if these organizations have to table in the house for legislative perusal their rules and regulations

March 7, 1963

and for final approval, then why should not all the agencies of the government that have rules and regulations also table their regulations so that they would have the approval of the legislature as the elected government body of this province?

I thought I should give a recommendation, as a suggestion to the government. Quite often as I have mentioned in the past, that the government have rules and regulations which are arbitrary and I believe that they should have an opportunity to be perused by this legislature and changed or dealt with accordingly. Now I thought at that particular time there was a good opportunity and a good time to bring that up to the forefront.

You know there are a lot of people that have had visions, Mr. Speaker; this government has had a vision as well.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher: — A lot of nightmares too.

Mr. Coderre: — You know, I don't know where they've got this vision. They've got the great vision of tremendous mineral growth in this province. It was mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) that mineral growth was not what the minister has been crowing about. They come out and say we've made so many thousands of dollars in mineral growth. Let's take for example, just a very casual example that I have taken from the Votes and Proceedings, and take 1943/44 for example — we produced 159,000 ounces of gold. But in 1958 we produced 78,000 ounces — a drop in quantity, probably not in price, and it has declined since. In 1943/44 we produced 2,000,560 ounces of silver. In 1958 we produced only 1,171,000 ounces. And this goes on and on throughout the mineral production of the province.

I figured they would say something about potash. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, there is such a tremendous shortage of potash in the world market, and the good Lord and not the socialists, the good Lord put these deposits in Saskatchewan.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher: — The good Lord and private enterprise developed them . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . in 1944 . . .

Mr. Coderre: — And after all, Mr. Speaker, the need for potash was so great that private enterprise did establish a plant at Esterhazy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Hear! Hear! Private enterprise all the way.

Mr. Coderre: — Yes, that is right, private enterprise. But what has happened,

and why did they establish there? Now I just said a moment ago that the need and the demand for potash was so great that this company was prepared to brave all the perils, all the obstacles that you have put into their way for years. Well, naturally, when they would be speaking to you they might be saying a little different story, because after all they just don't know what to expect from you people. I've mentioned a moment ago . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — What else can they do . . .

Mr. Coderre: — . . . that the treasurer said we will create a good climate, and another minister says, we'll follow the same path we've done since 1933. And I've read you some of those things awhile ago, or were you out of the house?

This is the reason that influenced this potash company, and I don't doubt in the world, what influenced them to come into this province, because of the shortage of potash on the world market. And they were prepared to brave any of the unforeseen obstacles that you may have had and will probably have because what's been in your heart and souls for 14 and 18 years, you can't forget because you always wanted to eradicate them. And should ever the day come when you have that power, God bless free enterprise . . .

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — You should say something about . . .

Mr. Coderre: — You know, I have here a whole book that they call CCF citations, I won't bore this side of the house with it but I think you people should read that and see where you have stood since 1933-34-44 and onward insofar as free enterprise and the private enterprise is concerned. You should be ashamed of yourselves. Not only that, this wonderful little book that we call the CCF Speakers Handbook, you have never repudiated the statements you have made in there. You have had your Winnipeg declaration but you have never repudiated what is in this book. If you are so noble and your intentions are so honorable, so far as free enterprise is concerned, or private enterprise is concerned, why don't you repudiate this little book, what has been written in it?

Mr. Thatcher: — Right now, right now.

Mr. Coderre: — One man on your side, one cabinet minister who has the gumption to say we do not stand by what has been stated in the past. No. The Hon. Attorney General says we'll follow the same path we have followed for a number of years.

March 7, 1963

Mr. Thatcher: — Capitalism must be eradicated.

Mr. Coderre: — This book says “We do not believe in so-called rights of private property.” Plank no. 14 of your book has never been repudiated. “No socialist government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism.”

Mr. Thatcher: — Challenge them right now.

Mr. Coderre: — I’ll challenge anyone in that house to get up as members of the government and say that they repudiate every statement that you have ever made in this book.

Mr. Thatcher: — Just challenge that one.

Mr. Speaker: — You cannot be throwing challenges and then have other members throwing challenges too. We must carry this debate on in an orderly manner.

Mr. Coderre: — You have a candidate who is running in this federal election, a man by the name of Phelps, used to be an NDP, now an NDP candidate, and said in the Saskatchewan Legislature, “The CCF was prepared to confiscate if necessary, if it is necessary I won’t back down one inch.” This is what stands within. Why do you not stand if you are such noble and so far as free enterprise is concerned, why don’t you stand up and be counted? And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, even though there may be some good points in their budget and for many other reasons, I feel that I cannot support the motion.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I’m very pleased to be able to take part in this debate.

I would very much wish to compliment the Provincial Treasurer on bringing down the budget which we are now discussing. I think that this is the kind of a budget of which we can be very proud. It is the budget that would be brought down by a government that is prepared to do things, that has a program and that sees a job to do and is prepared to do something about it. This is the attitude that the people of this province have come to expect from this government and this budget is a continuation of this sort of thing for the people of the province. They can see from it that we are still going to do things for the people of this province and not sit down on our hands and howl about things that should be done that aren’t being done. The detractors of this government are apparently endeavoring to pick holes in this budget but it

seems to me that the things that they are talking about are rather picayune and small, and the fact that they have fallen to this level in endeavoring to criticize the budget shows to any thinking person that the budget itself is good and the light that they are throwing upon it only tends to show it up as being stronger and better, and a really good and sound budget for the people of this province.

I would like to compliment you, Mr. Speaker, also upon the trip that you have made this last year to Nigeria as representative of this province to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I firmly believe that all members of this house will join with me in saying that you undoubtedly represented us well and I am sure that you were a worthy representative of this province in that regard.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — I myself had the privilege a year ago of meeting with some of these people from the various parts of the Commonwealth and I can say from first hand knowledge that this is very good experience. It is something that is very instructive, very educational and to be able to sit down with the members of other governments throughout the Commonwealth, people of many colors and creeds and discuss with them the affairs which we have in common and the affairs which concern us and the affairs which concern them particularly, is really a wonderful opportunity. I am sure that you have been able to make the best of this and to return to us with knowledge of this type.

I am very glad to see that the government is in the future setting up a program whereby university students from our province may be able to go to other countries and to obtain information and experience and first hand knowledge of the way things are done in these countries and bring it back to us. I think that this exchange of ideas between peoples is one of the great things that we must have in our modern age, the means we have of traveling back and forth is so much different than what it was half a century or so ago, I think that it is up to us to make use of it and I think that the days ahead of mankind are greatly dependent upon the free interchanges of ideas and of peoples from the various countries meeting together and becoming acquainted.

You know you can't think quite so harshly of any person with whom you become acquainted. I know myself in my experience last year, not that I had harsh thoughts about these people at any time, but some of my best friends that I became acquainted with there were men from Sarawak and dark men from Jamaica, and other people in the Commonwealth, and we established, so far as I am concerned, a real bond of friendship. I think that the more that we can encourage this sort of exchange of personnel, exchange of ideas with other countries, it is going to be of real benefit to ourselves and undoubtedly a benefit to the people where these people come in contact with and I think this

March 7, 1963

type of thing will be of real benefit to humanity at large in the days ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — This budget that we have before us, as I have said earlier, shows that we are prepared to set about and do something about the problems which we haven't before. Anything that is worth while doing costs effort. We must realize that things that come for free in this world so far as effort is concerned are often times just worth what you pay for them, and if we are going to accomplish things worthwhile it is known that we must pay for them. If we were willing to accept the sort of situation we had back in 1943, it is undoubted that we could come in with a budget with a good deal less money involved. We are not prepared, and the people of this province are not prepared to go back to that sort of thing that was at that time. If we are going to have programs that are worthwhile we have to pay for them. I am sure the people of this province realize this and respect us for the stand that we are taking in regard to this.

We have programs in this province which are not known elsewhere in regard to health, our ambulance, our medical care program and others, and yet it has been conclusively shown that our taxes here are not higher than what they are in other parts of Canada. Now, I would like to say a few things about taxes. I would like to show you that we are not keeping down taxes in the province by robbing the municipalities, and having them pay expenses which we could help them with. But in order to make some comparisons I may have to refer back to the days before 1944. I know that the people opposite do not like to have us do this and I think sometimes we are going back to a time which was far removed from the present, but I have to admit that I have to do that because that is the last time that the people of this province allowed the people opposite to hold office here. So I have to back to quite an antiquated date . . .

An Hon. Member: — Prehistoric . . .

Hon. Mr. Wood: — . . . and I would also like to point out that the situations that existed in those times, to which we don't like to refer were caused by free enterprise systems throughout this country and throughout the world, of which the people opposite are very proud to stand up and say that they are in favor of these things. So I think they must take some responsibility for not only being the government at that time but they also must take some responsibility for the fact of the depression itself because they stand for the sort of thing that has caused these cyclical depressions throughout the ages.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — Back in 1943, looking back through the public accounts I find that the amount given for school grants was \$2,795,000. The average amount spent by the provincial government in grants to the R.M.'s for roads and bridges, taking into consideration the election years and others, between 1940 and 1944, were \$290,000, they average out to this, which taken with the school grants of \$2,795,000, would come to roughly some \$3,100,000 in 1943. I noticed that in that same time, 1943, they took in public revenue from the municipalities the sum of \$3,214,000, in other words the amount that was spent on education and municipal roads and bridges by the provincial government was just about exactly equal to the amount that they extracted from the municipal governments.

In other words, they made no grants whatsoever in regard to these items. You stack this up against the present situation where this public revenue tax has been abolished, and in this present budget I see that they are giving some \$6,630,000 to the rural municipalities in regard to roads and bridges, from the grid road authority, and some \$36,772,000 in school grants alone, being given out by the Department of Education.

In referring back to municipal roads again, to put it in another way, I believe that the percentage that was spent, aside from the fact that they got as much from the municipality as what they paid out, the amount that was actually spent on rural municipal road grants was approximately 1 percent of the budget, and our percentage at this time will be in the neighborhood of 4 percent. So which every way you want to cut this, there is no comparison with the amount of help that is given to rural municipalities and local governments of all kinds, in comparison with what was done in those days.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — And I am not saying anything here about the millions of dollars that are being spent in regard to social aid and health measures that are being given to the municipalities which were not done in those days.

I would like to say also, that this is shown in the taxes that are being collected in the rural municipalities in this province, the effects of this provincial government policy. Members opposite like to talk about taxes, and they talk about how high our taxes are. I want to say that taxes in this province are not higher than they are elsewhere. This goes for municipal taxes as well as others. In reviewing the latest report from the Departments of Municipal Affairs

March 7, 1963

in this province and in neighboring provinces, we find that the urban taxes per capita, in Alberta for the year under review, 1961, were \$99.87; for Manitoba, \$94.47; in Saskatchewan, \$83.27. Now it is admitted that the taxes per capita in the rural municipalities are higher in Saskatchewan than they are in some of the other provinces, but this is understandable, because they have larger acreages in this province. You put this matter on a per acreage basis, and we find that the rural municipality taxes in Manitoba are \$1.10 per acre; in Alberta, \$1.00 per acre; in Saskatchewan, \$66 per acre, 66¢ per acre, pardon me.

Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Sounds more right.

Mr. McFarlane: — \$66.00 sounds closer.

Hon. Mr. Wood: — Just a slip of the tongue.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They'll likely quote you on that.

Hon. Mr. Wood: — Undoubtedly I will be quoted on this one. Mr. Speaker, this was a slip of the tongue, and a slip of the tongue, they say, is no fault of the mind.

I notice in the 1962 Canadian Year Book also, that the per capita municipal and school corporation debt, the latest figures we have in regard to this, from this year book, are \$356.36 per capita in Alberta; \$162.93 in Manitoba; \$158.47 in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan's local government taxes in this regard are lower here than they are in the provinces on either side of us, and this I think helps to round out the taxation picture for this province; that we are not being more highly taxed in this province than what we are elsewhere.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — And speaking of roads, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members of this assembly have noted the Department of Highways map that is put out, it shows thereon a very fine section of provincial highways, red ones showing the gravelled roads, and the black ones showing the paved and oiled roads. And I think it is a very fine picture we have in front of us, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has a highway program and has highways built at the present time, of which we can all be very proud. But I would like you to take a look at this map a little more closely, and you will see the finer red lines drawn in here, which set out the grid roads throughout the province, and you can see that they are becoming a very effective and a very important link in our transportation system. They are now approaching the same number of miles that we have in the provincial highway. The total that we have built of this grid

road system at the present time, is some 8,303 miles; 8,093 have been gravelled and 1,544 have been re-gravelled under a re-gravelling program.

We have one hundred and twenty-five miles of oil access roads built and 15.6 resort miles of resort roads have been built into summer resorts. This last year we have graded 1,196 miles, we have gravelled 1,376.7 miles, and re-gravelled 898 miles. We have assisted in the building of 35.3 miles of oil field access roads in 12 municipalities and 5.9 miles of resort roads in two municipalities. Those taking part in the other ordinary grid program of some 280 municipalities, 11 local improvement districts, 25 towns and villages. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this program which we have developed, this government has developed, in regard to helping the municipalities build roads of this type, paying some 60 percent of the total cost of these roads, has worked out to be a real boon to the people of this province.

The time was when you were glad to get out on a highway, because you got out of the mud when you got on the highway, now we are duplicating this with another system of roads throughout the province which is going to be double the opportunity for people to have good all weather roads.

And besides this, Mr. Speaker, we have thousands of miles of good all weather roads that the municipalities themselves are building without this type of aid, on equalization grants and the taxation revenues from the municipalities.

I think the road picture in Saskatchewan is indeed becoming better and better all the time, and I am glad that this government and this department that I am working with, does have a part in doing this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a little time to discuss some of the other branches of our department.

There is for instance, our assessment branch. This is a branch which doesn't get too much credit in many ways. It is not one that makes grants, and not one that has any big program to carry out that the people can see that it is being built, but it is a very necessary branch. If you are going to have property taxes, and taxation, it is very necessary that we have equity, that all people pay in regard to the property that they hold, and it is our assessment branch's duty to endeavor to have this taxation, have the assessments that are set up through the province, as equitable as they possibly can. They have nothing to do with the setting of the taxes themselves, but they do, Mr. Speaker, endeavor to keep these taxes fair between individuals and the same municipality, between one municipality and another, and between different types of municipalities, rural and urban.

March 7, 1963

In doing this work there are some things that come to light, and it points up our contention that the tax base in this province is improving. I believe that a matter of providing services for the people of the province, is important, and I think that the tax base from which we are able to obtain these monies, is also important, and the assessment branch in some of their figures do show that this tax base is expanding. We have heard a lot said about oil people leaving the province, how that under our terrible socialistic set-up, that oil people are not taking part the way they should, but the assessment branch shows very clearly that in 1961, the assessment in regard to oil wells increased by some 10 percent, they increased by \$2.99 million last year up to a total assessment of some \$21 million in oil well assessment in this province. In this, some 51 municipalities, one local improvement district, one town and one village take part, and this is a real assistance to these municipalities, in financing the services that they are given to the people of their area, and it also tends to show that the oil people are not leaving the province, that 10 percent in ten years, approximately in that neighborhood, that the oil development has been on, and the development is at least as high now as it ever was. Ten percent in the last year comparative with the ten years that have gone past.

I would also like to point out here, in regard to this, that it is my understanding, that the oil that was produced last year, is some three times that which was produced in 1956, and the oil produced last year was up some 16 percent from that which was produced the year before. In comparison with Alberta, the oil that was produced in Alberta last year was up some 14 percent and not from last year but from 1956. In other words from the year 1956, whereas the increase in oil production in Alberta has been about 14 percent, it has been by 300 percent in Saskatchewan, and is up 16 percent last year alone. So I don't think these figures tend to show that oil men are not interested in working in Saskatchewan.

I would also like to point out in regard to assessments, our pipe line assessment now stands at some \$15 million, which is in 73 rural municipalities, 7 villages, two towns and three cities. This also is of assistance to the raising of necessary funds for local services. International Minerals Mine at Esterhazy, in regard to potash, which is a new development, which has just been opened up in this province — here in Esterhazy where they have it fairly well established, before this plant is completed it will amount to between one and two million dollars of assessment, which will help a great deal in providing the necessary services to the people in that area, that help to service this mine.

Another branch I would like to say something about, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to our auditing, accounting and inspections branch, which has continued over the past years to give guidance and assistance to the municipalities. It is our

hope that in the coming year we will be able to increase our staff of municipal advisors, as has been requested by the municipal people, and be able to give them even better service in the days ahead.

Another branch which is of increasing interest is the community planning branch. I think it is becoming increasingly apparent that if you are going to have the type of communities that you and I wish to live in, that we must be prepared to plan these, and again, on the request of the urban municipal association, we are endeavoring to set up regional planning throughout the province. We are making a start on that this year, by having one regional planner appointed, which we will endeavor to make available to the people of Regina and Moose Jaw.

Our winter works program has also a great deal of merit, I think. It is being received with a great deal more co-operation as the years go by, by the municipal people. Back in 1958-59 we had 149 applications under this program and the provincial government assistance given out in that year was \$129 thousand. Mind you in the next year, 1959-60 we had 392 applications, the assistance given by the provincial government was some \$352 thousand. Over twice what it was the year before. In 1960-61 we had 962 applications, and some \$597 thousand was given out by the provincial government. Last year, the records we have, up to January 31, of this year, we had some 1409 applications, and the monies given out by the provincial government as their 25 percent share of the assistance on this was \$873,586. In doing this, Mr. Speaker, we have provided jobs for a good many people. The man days that have been worked in this last year are some 268,533. This is a lot of work, it has meant a great deal to the people of the province, and I think that the municipalities are to be greatly complimented on taking part in this program with the provincial and the federal government, to provide work of this type. This helps to take people off relief rolls, and it is the kind of thing that I like to see going forward, for we are not giving money out to these people, and we are not talking about taking them off relief rolls because they are able-bodied, but we are providing them with opportunities to work and I think that this is the proper approach in regard to these things. Applications this year have come from 171 cities, 308 towns, and 340 villages, 577 rural municipalities. We have seven applications from the northern administration district and six from the L.I.D.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about a new activity that has been added to our department during the last year. It has come to us from the committee on minority groups. This has to do with the Metis establishment at Green Lake, and generally working with minority groups throughout the province. We have called this program one of community development. The main emphasis is on people of Indian ancestry, and their relationship with the local people and the provincial community.

March 7, 1963

It is of rather a broad nature throughout the province, but we are working in a more intensive way in the Green Lake area. As you know, we have had a program there for a good number of years, where we have carried on a program of establishment of the Metis in the area. We have had farm and forest programs, housing and welfare programs, and through these programs and also that of better education for the Metis, the standards of living have been raised I think a good deal, in the Green Lake community. We feel that these are still too low, they are not what we would like them to be, and we feel that there is not sufficient participation among the Metis people in regard to the municipal government, or in regard to the operation of the farm and forestry endeavor that we are carrying forward at Green Lake.

Our endeavor is to set up in this area a co-ordinated approach to the local problems by all the government departments involved, that we may endeavor to shift some of the responsibility for the things that we are trying to do and the programs that we carrying forward, shift the responsibility to the local people as quickly and at a rate which is commensurative with their wishes, to accept this responsibility. We feel that it is right and proper that we don't take the position of doing things for these people, we want them to become involved in it; we want to make it possible and we want to make available the opportunities for them making a livelihood, and we want these people to have something to say. We want them to become directly involved in the operation of these projects that we are endeavoring to put into effect there. We have had preliminary discussions with them in regard to this and these are coming along well. We have set up a farm board at Green Lake, and the local people at Green Lake are participating in a fuller way in regard to policy and management of the Green Lake farm. We have set up organizations with regard to forest industries at Green Lake, and we have now been able to have full employment for these people and, in fact, we are able to find employment for people from outside the area.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — Further than this we have started a new development at Canoe Lake. A new community is being built up there. Earlier these people were scattered all the way throughout the country around this lake, and there were children who had no opportunity of going to school. Education was something they just could not have because the schools were not available in the area. These people have come to Cold Lake, south of Canoe Lake and have started up a community. The Department of Education has built a school there, and homes have been built and a new community has been started. The local people provide the labor building these homes, a real example of the co-operation and skill in working together that these people have in doing this. We are endeavoring to build an economic base in this area, so that these people can have a means of livelihood. Their fishing and

fur trapping is not as good as it used to be, and they are in a very depressed condition. We are endeavoring by opening up forestry operations in the area, to help to provide them with a better livelihood, and these people are taking part in this. They are assuming a greater part of the cost of building their homes, and deductions are being made from their salaries.

Again, we are able to find work for these people in this way. Now this is a program that we have just started, it is one of community development in these two areas. I would not wish, Mr. Speaker, to endeavor to minimize the difficulties. There are a good many difficulties along the road. It requires the very best effort that we are able to put in to it. It requires a good deal of patience and toleration on our part, and it will require investment, but unless we are prepared to do this, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a situation where there is destitution and human degradation, and a different level of living for the Metis people than what there is for white people, and this is the sort of thing that I feel we should do our utmost to endeavor to do away with. I am glad that we are at least making a small start in this area in regard to this.

Our general program throughout the province in regard to the people of Indian ancestry, is of a different nature. It is much more general. We are making grants to the Indian and Metis Friendship Councils, in regard to their work in the cities of Regina, Prince Albert and North Battleford. These are people who are working in this regard voluntarily, and I think they are a group that greatly merit our support, not only as a group but as individuals. They are composed not only of people of Indian ancestry, but also non-white and working together to endeavor to do what they can to deal with the problems of these people in these cities and I think they are doing a great work.

We also make grants toward the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. We have helped them to hold annual conventions, and also doing field work among them. I was able to attend their conference last summer at Qu'Appelle, and I greatly enjoyed this, Mr. Speaker. I was able to speak to them. It was rather an interesting little point there, I had a speech written out for the occasion, but when I went to give it, I decided to leave out certain parts. I didn't stick very closely to my notes, not as closely as I am today, Mr. Speaker. And when I started on this line, I expected that the interpreter would interpret as I went forward, but instead when I sat down, he reached over and took my notes and interpreted from them. Well, as a result the Indian people there who weren't able to understand English got a different speech than the ones who did. They got a lot of jokes and other things, that the other people didn't. So, I really think the interpreter gave the better speech of the two. I may say that I don't know if this occasion was very profitable for the Indian people, but I found it very profitable for myself.

March 7, 1963

and I do think that any person who goes out of their way to become acquainted with the Indian people and their problems, will find it indeed a very rewarding and profitable experience.

This matter of jurisdiction of Indian affairs, has been receiving a good deal of discussion throughout Canada, this whole matter of responsibility in regard to Indians is something that we have reviewed in different ways. The provinces are involved with the federal government in school integration, our hospital services are available on an equal basis in regard to Indians and others, and our grid road authority is building roads to the Indian reservations on a 50-50 basis with the Department of Indian Affairs.

The Indians can now vote, and it is our feeling that they should have equal status in all things in this province. I feel that this would be better achieved if we did have the devolution from the federal jurisdiction to the province of these matters of Indian affairs.

There was, I believe you will recollect, a resolution passed in this legislature back in 1961, asking for this sort of thing and I think it is something which we could still press for. In 1961, also, I noticed that there was a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, in regard to Indian affairs, and that passed a recommendation that Indian affairs should be the subject of the Dominion-Provincial conference, in order that such matters may be transferred to provincial jurisdiction, as may be mutually acceptable to the Indian people, provincial and federal authorities. This was a year and a half ago, Mr. Speaker, but we have not yet had that conference. I think it is very important that we do get on with this matter of turning these things over to the provinces, bearing in mind, of course, that the new responsibilities in regard to the financial aspects must be carried in mind.

I feel that we, in our proposal or decentralization, in regard to Indian matters, are on the right track. We feel that extending services to Indians, the same as other members of the community is right and proper. We are trying to develop a working arrangement with the federal government in regard to Indian people, and are supporting a proposal that we should have a permanent federal-provincial committee to sit on Indian affairs.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I wish to discuss in regard to my department, and with the consent of the assembly, I wish to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that there have been no arrangements made for an evening sitting, consequently it is in order to move adjournment. Members of the legislature will be aware of the fact that we haven't had many evening sittings, and are probably moving to that time in the session when they should be considered and would be desirable, and there will be enough work to keep the legislature going.

I would ask then that some consideration be given to this possibility starting in a regular way next week. It may be desirable and it may be agreeable to move to evening sittings on a fairly regular basis. I would move the house now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:32 p.m.