

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
17th Day

Friday, March 8, 1963

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

On Orders of the Day:

SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to report to the members in regard to the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds. I wish to apologize to the press gallery in that I intended to come to the press gallery this morning in time for the deadline for the newspapers but I forgot about it this morning, but the third day of sales, as we have received at the present time, were over a million dollars, and the total now, for the three days, \$2,748,000, which is almost exactly the same as Series No. 1; Series No. 2 last year was a considerably larger amount at that time. But I would say still that these are going quite satisfactorily.

CORRECTION RE TELEPHONE SERVICE TO LAC LA RONGE

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to correct a statement I made in this house last week when I was asked by the member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) when we expected to provide long distance service to Lac la Ronge. I replied sometime this fall. Actually, we are going to be able to do better than that and provide the service, we think, during the first part of July.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of you, Sir, and the house to a group of students, two groups of students in fact, in the west gallery. There is, firstly, a special interest group of some 39 or 40 students from the Douglas Park school here in Regina under the leadership of their teachers, Mr. Sannus and Mr. McNeill. I think we all know that special interest groups are students who have shown a particular aptitude, and we hope that they will find this afternoon's discussion useful in the course of their studies of British parliamentary procedure. I am sure we would all want to welcome them here.

March 8, 1963

There is another group from Saskatchewan House who are also in the west gallery and we would also want to welcome them and express the hope that they will enjoy this afternoon's proceedings and find them very instructive.

GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY GREETINGS

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the house to mention an event here in Regina. Today is the golden wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. William Zeluski of 4124 Regina Avenue. I am sure we would all want to wish this couple many more happy years together.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to make reference to a remark that was made yesterday by the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) in this debate. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I meant to answer the remark yesterday, but in speaking I became rather carried away with my own exuberance and verbosity and forgot about it.

The hon. member from Gravelbourg spoke of the government and accused them of dictatorial methods and the big lie technique in regard to dealing with municipal reorganization. I was not too sure what he means by the big lie technique, maybe he is more familiar with this than I am and he can explain it to me.

An Hon. Member: — What a hope.

Hon. Mr. Wood: — He must have been in the house last year when the Municipal Unit and County Act was discussed and passed unanimously by this house, and he must have realized that at that time it did make it very clear that there would be no reorganization of municipalities anywhere in the province unless it was requested and voted in by the people of the areas concerned. And I do not see how he can continue to say that the government is being dictatorial and endeavoring to force these things upon the people of the province.

He also asked me who was sending out the maps in regard to these proposed conterminous units in the province. I took it for granted that he knew that the municipal advisory commission was dealing with these matters and that was why I asked him the question that I did. I assumed that he must have been referring to some other maps, but apparently he was not aware that the municipal advisory commission was dealing with these matters and sending out these maps. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have had some delegations of municipal people and others from his constituency, and they seem to have no doubt about these questions. They were quite informed about them. It would appear to me, possibly, that they may have put themselves out to become informed upon these provincial matters more than what the hon. member from Gravelbourg had.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to talk a little more about some of the programs that are administered by this Department of Municipal Affairs. One that has meant a great deal to the people of this province, especially those in the smaller urbans, has been that concerned with municipal water assistance which is handled by our department. We have during the current fiscal year made grants totalling \$539,268 to 22 towns and villages throughout the province. Since its inception in 1960, 56 towns and villages have been given authorized grants totalling \$1,494,873; of this total of 56 installations, 31 were for combined water and sewer system, 16 were for waterworks only and 9 were for sewerage systems only. These grants varied from a low of \$2,048 to a high of \$75,000, with an average of \$26,436. And they say, it is my understanding, that about half of the grants were above this average and about half were below this average.

This program has been giving out grants based upon the amount left of the sum necessary for capital cost of the installation of one of these systems in a town or village, over and above that which can be reasonably financed by the users of the system. This meant, of course, that in some instances some towns will receive a larger grant than others, but even where the grants have not been large, it has been such that along with the assistance that has been given these towns and villages in working with the project which they have in hand, and also by the fact that many of their bonds have been picked up by our Treasury Department in giving them assistance in financing these projects, this has meant enough to these people that they have proceeded in this work which otherwise quite possibly would not have been undertaken.

I think this program of assistance in regard to municipal water and sewerage projects has meant that in a good many of the small urban municipalities in our province, they now have sewer and water systems, something that has been very necessary through the years, something that has meant and will mean a good deal in the future in health, services and also in the convenience and just the plain liveability of these towns. And I think it is a real step in the right direction in bringing better living to the people of this province.

March 8, 1963

And now, Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to speak this afternoon for a few minutes about municipal reorganization. I think that the house will grant me that. Usually I do not follow my notes too closely but this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with a question which I believe is of real importance to all of us and I may find it necessary to follow my notes quite closely, and I trust that you will forgive me in this, Mr. Speaker.

Shortly after the formation of this province, it was divided into a system of rural municipalities, mostly square, nine townships in size. They and the councils elected to administer them have served the people of this province well for half a century. There are many, however, who believe that time, which has seen our means of transportation change from the horse or ox-drawn cart or stone boat to the fast automobile or aeroplane, our prairie trails develop into all-weather grid roads and black-top highways, and has chipped away at the usefulness of these municipalities as we have known them. It is maintained that communities and trading areas have expanded in size and the operation of their public business is hindered rather than helped by the multiplicity of boundaries.

Through the years, other special purpose jurisdictions have been built up; school districts and units, hospital districts, health units, conservation and development areas have superimposed their boundaries over those of the rural municipalities and have taken over sections of local government administration. Coupled with surrender of responsibilities to the provincial government, actual responsibility is hard to establish, and in some respects our rural municipalities have become only tax-collecting agents.

There are many other arguments advances which I will not deal with now. Let me simply say that the advocates of municipal reorganization believe that larger municipal units, drawn around our trading centres, with boundaries conterminous with school units and possibly other jurisdictions, would better serve the people of the province and would greatly strengthen local government. The idea of counties, where the municipal and school functions would be combined under the control of one council, is also advocated by some. These proposals have received wide acceptance elsewhere — in Alberta, large municipal districts have been established for over ten years, and approximately one-half of these have now been converted into counties. The states to the south of us and Ontario have used this principle for many years. In Manitoba, the urban and rural municipal associations have set up a committee recently to study the problem, and this committee has brought in a report strongly recommending sweeping changes in the municipal system along the lines I have just mentioned.

There is, however, another side to this picture. There are those that contend that the rural municipalities we now have have stood the test of time and should not be lightly discarded for something new and untried. It is argued that the smaller municipalities allow the councillor to have a closer contact, with knowledge of the problems in their division. This also allows more of the supervision to be done by the elected representatives, living in the neighborhood, than by salaried personnel based up to 30 or more miles away.

These arguments do have validity and the Saskatchewan government has, ever since discussions started on these matters several years ago, taken the attitude that reorganization would only proceed on a basis of constant consultation with the local government groups and the people concerned. Let me read you a few of the excerpts from statements made by the former Premier Douglas, along these lines. The first I have here, Mr. Speaker, is taken from the record of the proceedings of the provincial local government conference in 1956, when these matters were broached here.

The government itself believes that some kind of basic reorganization, at least in the rural areas, is an essential and inevitable first step in meeting the problems of local government today. I want to make it abundantly clear, however, that the government will not embark upon a program of municipal reorganization unless this program is assured of the co-operation of the local governing body, and has the wide-spread support of the general public.

The next quotation I have, Mr. Speaker, is also concerning former Premier T.C. Douglas, where he had spoken at the S.A.R.M. convention in the spring of 1957, and is quoted in the Star-Phoenix of March 13 of that year.

Premier T.C. Douglas stated emphatically his government has no intention of embarking on any plan of municipal reorganization without the solid backing of local governing bodies, and the wide-spread support of the general public. The government, he said, was prepared to lead but not to dictate. "We will go just as far and just as fast as the local governing body want us to go but we will go no further nor any faster".

My third quotation is taken from vol. 26, page 6, of the legislative Hansard of 1957, quoting Premier T.C. Douglas.

Then, assuming that the government, the legislature and the provincial organization are all in agreement on the proposals, we would then consult with these provincial

March 8, 1963

organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their rate-payers. There is very strong possibility that when these discussions are held, a plebiscite or a vote or something of that sort will be what the provincial organizations recommend. How it will be taken, by what method it will be taken, will be something for them to make suggestions to us about.

A further quotation, Mr. Speaker, from the Leader-Post of March 19, 1958, quoting Premier T.C. Douglas at the 1958 S.A.R.M. convention.

I want to make it clear, without any shadow of a doubt, that the government has no intention of forcing change on you that you don't want, Premier T.C. Douglas told the Rural Municipal delegates in convention in Regina Tuesday. He assured the convention several times that the present rural municipal system or boundaries would remain the same until a proposed change was assured the full support of local government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that these quotations make it very clear the stand that has been taken through the years in regard to municipal reorganization by the government of this province, and I will continue, Sir. On March 4, 1959, quoted in the Star-Phoenix, the Premier, speaking again at the S.A.R.M. convention, says as follows:

The Premier said his government remained convinced that some form of reorganization is essential and desirable if local government is to play its proper role in our society. However, he assured delegates the provincial government would accept the wishes of the rural people. Any decisions finally made will only be on the advice of the local government organization. No arbitrary action will be taken by the government, nor will any pressure be exerted to bring about changes either in structure of boundaries or local government.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — That's what they told the doctors too.

An Hon. Member: — Boy, oh boy . . . dictating then . . .

Hon. Mr. Wood: — From the Star-Phoenix of March 15, 1961, again in regard to the S.A.R.M. convention of that year:

The Premier scored a direct hit with his audience when he announced that the government statement concerning its stand on local government reorganization issued at its initial meeting in 1956 still stands. "We are not trying to ram this down your throats", said Mr. Douglas, "and we have no intention of taking any action without discussing it thoroughly with you". Reiterating the government's stand as expressed at the opening of the 1956 provincial local government conference in Regina, Mr. Douglas read parts of his original statement.

And then in the Western Producer of March 23, 1961, referring to the same convention, again quoting the former Premier:

"My plea is, let's study this report; let's talk about it; let's sit down and read it together; if we do that we will have kept faith with those who have gone before and those who will follow. It is not enough that we leave this province no worse than we found it; we must leave it better so that those who come after can rise up and call us blessed." Mr. Douglas said there was no foundation for daily newspaper suggestions that reorganization was to be forced in Saskatchewan by the provincial government. He read transcripts of statements he made in 1956 and again at the 1960 annual meeting of the S.A.R.M. in which he pledged there would be no precipitous action on any report that the committee had handed down.

I would like to state further, Mr. Speaker, that the present premier, Premier Woodrow Lloyd, has also associated himself with the stand that was taken by Premier Douglas in regard to municipal reorganization. In speaking to the S.A.R.M. convention last year, he said as follows:

May I however repeat to you some of the statements made on behalf of the government by Mr. Douglas over a period of years in connection with this subject. I do this in order to emphasize the consistency with which the government has approached this particular problem.

March 8, 1963

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these excerpts from the different news media, records of the house, and others substantiate very strongly the fact that the government has always stated quite clearly that we would not put ourselves in the position of endeavoring to make the municipalities take something in this regard that they were not entirely in favor with.

I may say again, Sir, that I think we should make it very clear that it has been the policy of this government that reorganization would not be forced upon the people or municipal men of this province. It is true, as some have maintained, that the better way of obtaining the views of the people concerned in such an intricate problem as this was by discussion rather than by a vote, but this did not mean that at any time this government accepted the idea of reorganization without due consultation and obtaining approval of the people concerned. It was certainly in line with the expressed policy of this government that the Municipal Unit and County Act was passed by this house nearly a year ago.

This act made it plain that there would be no reorganized area set up unless requested and voted in by the people of the areas concerned. It was thoroughly discussed in this chamber and passed by this legislature. How some of the members of the opposition had either the ignorance or the audacity to go on saying out in the country and in this house that the government was forcing reorganization down the throats of the people of this province is to me something of great amazement. I used the word "some" advisedly because I do not think that all the members were involved in this, but some were. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if this is the kind of misrepresentation that it takes to win elections, I do not desire to continue as a politician.

The stand taken by this government has been that there is some evidence of the desirability of municipal reorganization uncovered by commissions established in this province to study the problem and by examples shown in other provinces, and that it is incumbent upon us to make these changes available to the people of the province who wish to have them. The arguments against reorganization are such that we believe, and have always maintained, that it should not be forced upon them. The steps that we have taken in implementing this policy were taken with a good measure of support by the S.A.R.M. executive and we have throughout endeavored to keep faith with them. In a written statement presented to the government in July, 1961, the executive of the S.A.R.M. recognized the necessity of setting up a boundary commission. They did request that a direct representative of their association be included on this commission. The government did not feel it advisable to have on this commission direct representatives of any of the organizations involved but felt, rather, that individuals be appointed who were free to work on this commission but who had close associations with the organization, and that the elected

representatives of local government bodies act on the local government council who would be consulted in regard to matters affecting reorganization. This latter group, composed of representatives from the Saskatchewan Association of rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association has been acknowledged by the local government associations and has been of real assistance in drawing up the Municipal Unit and County Act and dealing with related problems. Their advice has been valued and followed in a great many instances, and we wish to thank them for the time and expense which they have given and we will be continuing to consult with them further in regard to these matters.

The municipal advisory commission was expanded to form the required boundary commission. This was comprised of Dean F.C. Cronkite, former dean of law at the University of Saskatchewan, former Saskatoon city alderman and recognized authority on local government matters as chairman, Dr. C.H. Fisher, former president of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and former reeve, Mr. T.W. Garland, past president of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, former member of the local government continuing committee and presently reeve of the Rural Municipality of Riverside, no. 168, and Mr. L.H. Johnston, former reeve, these three people representing the rural municipal interests, Mr. W.N. McGillvray, former past president of the Saskatchewan, also the Canadian, School Trustees Association, and Mr. A.B. Douglas, former president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, and former member of the local government continuing committee, these two men representing the school interests, and Mr. V.W. Van Allen, village overseer, and member of the executive of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, representing the urban interests.

This commission has conscientiously applied itself to this task for the last eighteen months, and endeavored to draw boundaries suitable for both municipal and school purposes. They have held meetings throughout the province with municipal councils, school unit boards, superintendency boards, and other interested groups. They have endeavored to keep in mind the needs of municipal, as well as those of education, institutions. They have received countless delegations and written submissions. They have found it impossible to agree with all the advice that has been given them, but their approach has certainly been democratic to the extreme, and, I know for a fact that they have given careful and thoughtful consideration to the proposals submitted to them, whether they have acted on them or not.

Following the first series of meetings they have drafted their preliminary boundary proposals, which were returned to the rural municipal councillors and school unit board members for their consideration. Further representations were received

March 8, 1963

and in the light of these, revised maps of the proposed areas have been drawn up, sent back for the consideration of the interested organizations and submitted to the Hon. Mr. Turnbull, Minister of Education and myself, as their final recommendations. This has been done area by area throughout the province and now their final submission has been made for the last area of the province and the work has been completed.

It has been made abundantly clear to all that the final maps submitted were not necessarily those that would be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. We have reserved our decision on this and have invited further comments to be sent to Mr. Turnbull and myself. Many people have done this. We appreciate the interest they have shown and the representations they have made will be taken into consideration before any of these local government boundaries are proclaimed.

Such a democratic process has not been carried on without a good deal of discussion, pro and con, throughout the country. If the commission had closeted themselves in with their own ideas, a system of boundaries might have been devised without causing much interest in the country, but this discussion on boundaries has been carried by the commission to the very people of the country who are vitally interested, and truly democratic exchanges of ideas has resulted; there has certainly not been unanimity of opinion expressed in many instances, for some people wished a boundary at one place, others wished it at another, but this is a normal, healthy reaction in a democracy.

Other problems have arisen in regard to the dividing of existing municipalities by the proposed boundaries. I might point out here that the statement from the S.A.R.M. executive of July, 1961, to which I have earlier referred, accepted the splitting of present rural municipalities if the project had been requested and had received a favorable vote of the residents therein. However, let me say in this regard that it is not the intention of the government that these boundary proposals should be as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians. The wishes of the local people should be taken into consideration, in this as in other things, especially in those cases where a municipal unit was being considered with no immediate likelihood of a municipal unit or county being formed abutting it.

The question has been raised that the municipalities amalgamating within proposed conterminous units; I am sure the government is prepared to give consideration to such amalgamation so long as they are in the interests of local government in the area, and not just to the advantage of the municipalities involved.

Let me recapitulate. This government has repeatedly made it very clear that they would not proceed with reorganization of rural municipalities unless it was desired by the people concerned. We have passed the Municipal Unit and County Act that made it plain that neither a municipal unit or a county would be set up unless requested and given a favorable vote by the residents of the area in question. We have set up a qualified boundary commission, which has made a detailed survey of the province, and has now submitted an adequate framework, taken in conjunction with submissions made to Mr. Turnbull and myself, and others which have not yet been made, upon which local governments in this province can be reorganized if so desired by the people concerned.

Our part of the task, that of providing evidence, of wide-spread consultation, of making a possible pattern of reorganization available, seems to be completed. Consequently the government proposes that the future initiative should come from the local government organizations. Unless it is the desire of the convention of the Saskatchewan Association of rural Municipalities that we proceed with the proclamation of boundaries for local government purposes throughout the province, we will proclaim such boundaries only where requested and voted in by the local government in accordance with the Municipal Unit and County Act.

If the S.A.R.M. does not show the desire to proceed with the reorganization of municipalities, this does not mean that local government authorities in the field of education may not wish to take steps to change the boundaries of their own units. If so, the government must proceed to accommodate the wishes of these authorities. Let me make myself clear; it is quite possible that the reorganization of municipalities may or may not be desirable, but to make it perfectly plain that the government is not forcing any such thing upon the people of this province, even in the matter of boundaries, we will proceed no further unless we are requested to do so by those who speak either for the municipal reorganizations or for the local people interested in municipal reorganizations in their own area.

Local government is a very important section of our society; it is true grass roots democracy where local people elect from among themselves representatives to deal with matters that concern their community and for which they have responsibility. This, Mr. Speaker, is much more desirable than having a centralized government dealing with such things from afar. I believe we all have a responsibility to see that our local governments lose none of their present powers, but that their powers be increased as much as it is right and advisable to do so. This authority is not so likely to be lost by encroachment by some other jurisdiction as it is by lack of use and lack of interest. We should see that the framework upon which our local government is built is the best to accommodate

March 8, 1963

such increased responsibility. We should sift for ourselves the best from the old and new, not accepting or rejecting either simply on the basis of its relative age.

I earnestly ask, Mr. Speaker, that the local and provincial governments, and all the people of our province should endeavor to work together; that local government, one of our most desirable institutions be strengthened and not diminished.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising at this time to take part in this debate I want to prove to you and to the people of Saskatchewan and to the members of this legislature most emphatically and conclusively that this NDP government has no program to develop this province. This NDP government has no leadership to get our economy rolling again. This socialism will and is ruining this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — The positive proof, Mr. Speaker, is right here in their own budget figures. You and I know that agriculture is the basic industry in this province. We have the experience of the depressed economic conditions after ten years of drought in the 1930's. We saw what happened after the disaster of the 1961 crop failure when we had a net per capita drop in income of approximately \$300 per man, woman and child, or roughly \$1,000 per family of four. That resulted in the net income of Saskatchewan people being almost the lowest in the whole of Canada.

We know that our natural resources are not being developed to the extent they should be. We realize that because of these conditions adequate employment opportunities do not exist for the young people leaving school in this province, and they do not exist for our young farmers who are being forced from the land.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts I have just mentioned it is indeed a tragedy that we have before us a budget designed to extract, tax, and gouge from the people the largest amount in taxes; once again, nothing offered to help the people raise the money to pay these taxes; once again, no indication of relief from this heavy tax burden in the future. What are the cold, hard facts of this budget, Mr. Speaker?

The first shock, Mr. Speaker, is that over \$27.25 million will be spent this year on social welfare. This is truly an indictment and a tragedy.

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The hon. gentleman is reading from a document. I wonder, would he identify the document and the figure he just quoted.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the Minister of Social Welfare that the document I am reading from is the budget which is before us in this debate. I wish the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare would acquaint himself with the rules of this house.

The first shock, as I said to you, Mr. Minister, is that over \$27.25 million will be spent this year on social welfare. This Mr. Speaker, is truly an indictment and a tragedy. We will be asked to spend about \$4.5 million more for social welfare than for the construction and maintenance programs of our entire highway system in this province this year.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I thank the hon. member for correcting his . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — \$27.25 million for social welfare; only \$22.75 million for our highway system and its maintenance. This is the picture the cabinet ministers refer to when they stand up one by one and say Saskatchewan is rapidly moving ahead. The NDP government has no program to cure this dilemma. They are not building up the agricultural industry, they never were and they never will be a party for the farmer. They have seen fit to allocate only \$11 million for agriculture, our basic industry. Compare only \$11 million allocated to our basic industry to \$27.25 million allocated to social welfare, or about two and one-half times as much for social welfare as for our basic industry. Is this the new economic development program the Provincial Treasurer boasts about?

What are they doing to stimulate mineral and natural resources development to correct this serious situation? Here are the figures — \$1.6 million for mineral resources development; \$4.25 million for natural resources development. A total budget allocation of only \$5.75 million for this development of a second basic industry in this province.

March 8, 1963

Mr. Speaker, they are only spending \$5.75 million as compared to \$27.25 million for social welfare. Almost five times as much as is being spent to develop the natural resources and mineral resources of this province. This is stagnation of the worst kind. Is this guaranteeing a dignified and varied life, according to your vice-president, Mr. David Lewis, as was referred to in the budget by your Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to sit idly by and spend \$10.25 million more for social welfare than for the combined expenditure on our two basic industries, agriculture and resource development. This points up the complete failure of the socialists philosophy to develop our province. This is a condemnation of their Lloydist example of NDPism and its togetherness.

How well we remember the promises of these socialists, years ago, when they said no one would be unemployed. All of our social services would be paid by the development of our natural resources; that never again in this province would anyone who was able to work be unemployed or on social aid. We remember their promises to have everyone on a work and wages program, building roads, highways, houses, mining the minerals and developing the natural resources. How hollow these promises read now.

And then I am going to quote a statement read by the Provincial Treasurer in this budget, accredited to the recent provincial treasurer, Mr. C.M. Fines:

The function of any well-organized society should not be primarily to provide employment (well you are certainly not providing employment) but should be to develop its industries and resources (and you are certainly not doing that.)

These conditions as I have pointed out didn't just happen, Mr. Speaker, they just didn't happen this year, this has been building up ever since they took office in 1944. There is an old saying "that we get too soon old, and too late Schmart". The people of this province have grown "schmart" to this government, but they were beaten to the draw by the former premier, T.C. Douglas, and they were beaten to the draw by the former provincial treasurer, Mr. C.M. Fines, and many of their former cabinet colleagues, who refused to run in the last provincial election. They saw this situation and flew the coop before they got their wings clipped. These were some of the original socialists who promised us this Utopia. It is only fitting that the late premier was properly dealt with by the electorate of this city last summer.

The people of Saskatchewan received a measure of consolation when he gave the assurance in a statement "I will not return". Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no General McArthur, that fellow.

Mr. Speaker, it must be evident to everyone in this province that these socialists have been more intent in building up a political machine to maintain themselves in office rather than give a higher income to the people who must pay the bills.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — As I pointed out in my early remarks, just a year ago our net income was among the lowest in Canada. We in Saskatchewan are being taxed to the breaking point. We are the highest taxed per capita in the nation. This has been our penalty for an experiment in socialism. And this “ism” is creeping more every day; it has infiltrated every organization in this province. There is only one that it has failed to eradicate as yet, and that is our local government. But, Mr. Speaker, the handwriting is surely on the wall; the maps are drawn; and final ratification maybe only weeks away. I refer to the persistent and unceasing determination of this government to go ahead with its massacre of the municipalities program in this province. We are being asked to again vote another \$15,000 in this budget on top of the \$317,000 already spent to date through the municipal advisory commission so the finalized county maps can be handed to the government.

As we all know, this change has met bitter resistance from the majority of the people in the province. Chaos and confusion have been prevalent since the big push was started some two years ago. The situation is no clearer today. Many of our rural people and their municipal officials feel it will be the end of self-government on the grass roots level. They feel it will lead to socialist bureaucracy; they feel it will be the death of our smaller community centres, villages and towns; and they have every justification in trying to save and preserve them now. They see the fallacy of the Premier’s argument when he says loss of railway lines will ruin our smaller centres; yet he is willing to allow the same results by virtue of centralization by a county system. The Premier is surely caught with a leg on each side of the fence. He will have to face the people squarely on this issue, and he cannot put them off by locking the doors and hiding under the table as he did last July.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — The attitude of the government has been one of bureaucracy and dictatorship on the whole issue. They have stood by and let a member of the commission, and I refer to Dean Cronkite, refer to the municipal men and all the representatives of the local governments as political yahoos, because they dared to differ with this government. This proves, beyond a shadow of doubt, that when a county system is set up, direction will come from

March 8, 1963

the top down and not from the bottom up. A political bureaucracy, a bureaucracy controlled by this government will overrule the wishes of the people concerned, and that is the price that the people will pay should this government be elected in the next election.

And then I was interested in the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs who just spoke. He chastised the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) by saying that the member inferred that a vote would not be taken, that a vote of the people concerned would not be taken. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that is true; certainly the Premier knows and so does the minister that when the county act was drawn up, the only people who have a vote on the proposed county are the people who reside within the boundaries of that proposed county. But those municipalities who are going to be wrecked and ruined around the periphery of this proposed county, the people who are going to see their municipality ruined and broken up, those are the people concerned, Mr. Speaker, who are not getting the vote and that is something that the people of this province should know.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — And then what about the school boundaries? Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, and surely the Minister of Municipal Affairs know that the people in the superintendencies of Melville, Indian Head, Regina west, and Rosthern are not going to have a vote on this issue. Legislation was passed here last session putting these people within the boundaries of the proposed counties without the vote concerned, and the Premier can shake his head, and I suggest you go back and read this act and see if that isn't true.

And then the Minister of Municipal Affairs dealt at great length with the platitudes, promises and pledges of the premier, Mr. T.C. Douglas. It took up about ten minutes of the time of the members of this house. Well, I am going to tell the Minister of Municipal Affairs this, if the promises and pledges of the recent premier, Mr. T.C. Douglas, aren't any more sincere in regards to the municipal reorganization than they were to the medicare program, then they are not worth the paper they are written on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — The government, because of this municipal controversy, has the municipal and school officials in a state of uncertainty. The rural municipal and school officials do not know when boundary changes are going to be made. They are uncertain whether to expand or introduce new services and equipment. They do not know when their rate-payers will be put in a different school unit administration. They are justified in these fears, and

they are equally justified in their opposition to the wrecking of their local administration get-up.

The success of the people being able to meet the revenue conditions of this budget depends to a large degree on the political complexion of the next federal government. In order that commitments of this budget may be carried out, it is necessary that a stable, practical, strong, efficient majority government be in power in Ottawa after April 8.

This is necessary to stimulate our national economy and to improve economic conditions in this province. That, of course, will have to be one of the two national parties; the party that appears to be headed for that position at the moment is the Liberal party. In the last Gallup poll, support for the Liberal party has increased in every section of Canada. The NDP was soundly rejected by the people of Saskatchewan in the general elections of 1958 and 1962. They failed to elect a single member; their support as indicated by the recent Gallup poll is declining all across the nation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — The stand taken by the farmers and the municipal men on the county system controversy shows they no longer have any faith in this government.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources): — What document is the hon. member reading?

Mr. McFarlane: — I am quoting from the Gallup poll, Mr. Minister of Natural Resources, because I wanted to get the figures straight. That is why I am reading from the Gallup poll, and I hope you are satisfied now that the NDP is finished as a national party in Canada. The stand taken by the Premier and his cohorts last July resulted in the people showing that they have no confidence in this administration.

It is evident that the majority of the people of this province are now convinced they must unite to stop this erosion of our individual liberties by this Lloydist version of state socialism. The people of this province well realize that each successive budget reveals the cost to them of the price they must pay for the loss of freedom as a bureaucracy takes over. Mr. Speaker, Cuba's swing from socialism to communism, and the events in that country since registers with profound clarity.

The people of this province realize they cannot pass the buck or delegate the fighting for the preservation of individual freedoms to any one group or groups alone, such as

March 8, 1963

the farmers, the local governments or the medical profession. They realize now that this must be done by a united effort on the part of all.

More people would be able to get on their feet sooner if this government would stop pulling the rug out from under them by way of terrific taxation. This budget does exactly that. It represents in millions of dollars the cost of the philosophy of the Lloydist group. Mr. Speaker, it is the enactment of socialization by taxation.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that what I have said you will agree was in order.

The motion before us states that you, "Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair". Mr. Speaker, you appear most comfortable and most attentive in the chair so I will not support the motion; in order that you may hear further evidence from my colleagues on this side of the house that this budget will not solve the serious difficulties confronting the people of this province in the year ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, there is one nice advantage of sitting in your chair until this time in the debate because it gives you the advantage which earlier speakers don't have, that is that you can sit and assess what is going on in the chamber. Before I turn to more of the specific aspects of the budget, I would like to point out what I think is one of the outstanding features of this session. That is that the government members are consistently going back to the thirties, every speaker. They said, we drove the dirty Liberals out of Saskatchewan at the end of the thirties and with them went every evil of the province. They would let us believe that because of this one act alone, they are destined to be crowned in heaven. They would lead us to believe that a special place is reserved for them beside St. Patrick who drove the snakes out of Ireland. Having assured themselves of this distinguished place, it is interesting to note the comments of the different members. The Minister of Mineral Resources was putting up a great plea about the great growth in population. I pointed out to him what his own department of vital statistics had to say.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I have not yet taken part in this debate. I haven't talked yet.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — Can't you take it, Alex?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Now he's mentioning the Minister of Mineral Resources . . .

Mr. Cameron: — The Minister of Agriculture. I was interested in what my seat-mate who just sat down had to say about agriculture, because I picked up the Leader-Post of December 5 and the Minister of Agriculture was addressing the Farmers' Union at Saskatoon and he said, first, I am not happy with our farm agricultural program. I thought, well that is one thing we can all agree on.

Mr. Thatcher: — Nobody else is either.

Mr. Cameron: — Secondly he said, I deplore these press reports that would indicate that the farmers are so rich. He said press reports that would indicate that the net income of farms this year was four times that of last year. He inferred from that that the press were giving a false impression of the farm income. And I wondered where the press had obtained that information. I wasn't like the Minister of Agriculture; I wasn't content to see this headline, I wanted to know what train trust had come up with this great suggestion, and I find if you turn to page 2 of the Saskatchewan Financial and Economic Position, issued by the Treasury Department, you will read this:

The forecast for farm net income in 1962 points to a net return from farming operations of \$500 million, more than four times the farm net income total of \$114 realized in 1961.

That's where the press got their report; from the report issued by a government department, itself.

Coming to press reports, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to deal with press reports about the settlement in the Swift Current Health Region. The press and T.V. announcements I noticed said that the settlement had been reached between the government and the commission in the Swift Current Health Region and the Swift Current Health Region had been granted autonomy, or the right to run their own affairs. It is true the question revolved about autonomy, but I think it is right to point out to this chamber the true situation because many people are questioning in their minds why Swift Current Health Region should be granted autonomy and not MSI or other carriers. I would point out that the negotiations and the battle on behalf of Swift Current was not to get concessions from the government, not to be granted autonomy, but the battle was to retain the autonomy they had enjoyed for 17 years. And I think probably a better heading for the press report would have been "Health Region No. 1 successful in battle to retain their autonomy" and here I would like to pay tribute to the secretary and the chairman and the board members of the health region for the

March 8, 1963

consideration, the dignity and the modesty with which they conducted these negotiations, typical of these people that have set up this plan and operated it successfully for 17 years.

I would point out, too, this plan is all the more remarkable because it is operated by the little fellow, by the reeve and the councillors, of the so-called inefficient villages and municipalities that this government talks about. It is remarkable that the health region board and our doctors, in the negotiations as in everything else, speaks with one voice, a voice emanating from the co-operative effort of the people and the doctors themselves in the field of health. They speak with one voice because they haven't any third partner. Incidentally, I would like to commend the minister here for recognizing that we in Health Region No. 1 have no quarrel with our doctors, they have no quarrel with us. And may I assure him that these relations will remain in Health Region No. 1 so long as we exclude any third force that would divide neighbor against neighbor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I now want to turn a moment to highways because I was amazed at the number of members who stood up in their seats and talked about the number of roads and paved highways, the number of miles that they have in their constituency. And some of them would lead us to believe that they have so many paved roads that a gravelled road is an obsolete thing. . . . He says it's right. I know they actually believe that. I believe it's a fact too, in some of these constituencies.

Mr. Thatcher: — Not Rosthern.

Mr. Cameron: — I made a trip the other day out to the resort at Fort Qu'Appelle, travelled east to Qu'Appelle on the Trans-Canada highway, turned north on 35 — a paved highway — and I went right into Fort Qu'Appelle. I remarked to some of my friends there that they were very fortunate that they have had these good roads for so many years to travel on, and their comment was, Oh, we're tired of this highway; we're trading it in on a brand new super model. They said, Why this year they are going to build us a super highway from Balgonie, cutting straight across to the resort. Well, I said, that is fine, but what do your farmers think about crossing their land and cutting up their farms all the way from Balgonie to Fort Qu'Appelle. He said, Oh, they are hopping mad about it but the people of Regina sure love it because it gets them to the resort for the weekend. I would point out to the Minister of Highways that there are great areas, particularly in south western Saskatchewan where we've been happy for years to travel on gravelled highways. And I am going to suggest to him that I think the time has

arrived, rather than to be tearing up good big highways in order to replace them with some super highway, that you give consideration to putting oil on the gravel roads that are now existing in the province. If the minister is interested in cutting down his losses in the government insurance office, the greatest thing he could do is to get out and to oil these gravelled highways, because I am sure that the accident rate on these gravelled highways, in accordance with the miles travelled, are frightening. I think that is the primary need that we should follow in regard to highway construction at this time.

Someone has remarked that we have a surplus budget. I think the remark of the Provincial Treasurer was that we have a handsome surplus. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out just how handsome that surplus is. Last year, the Provincial Treasurer brought down his budget and he told the people that the bill for government services would cost \$175 million. However, he said, because of the crop failure in 1961, it would be difficult for the farmers and others to pay the amount required so the government proposed to collect \$175 million and to borrow the rest, and the people's share of this bill was to be approximately \$100 million; that is approximately \$100 for every man, woman and child in the province. However, what the government proposed to do and what the government did are two different things. When they reached into the pocket of each one of the taxpayers for his \$100, they found there was an extra \$20 bill left, so they took it too, and then they found that they had a surplus of \$20 million unaccounted for, in the process of balancing their budget. They found that they had short-changed the people of Saskatchewan by \$20 million.

The code of ethics governing such a transaction in business would demand either that the money be refunded or that additional services be given in its place. This, however, Mr. Speaker, is not the code of ethics of the government. Not only did they refuse to refund the money, they attempted to hide the fact that they even had it. They have been scratching Mr. Speaker, like cats on a marble floor to cover up this hot money that they've got, and they found a place to cover it. They hid it under a little piece of paper, and I have that paper here called supplementary estimates.

Now, supplementary estimates, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is to take care of a department that has over-expended the amount the legislature voted them last year. If, for instance, the Department of Highways had been voted \$25 million to conduct their program of highway construction and they found due to an exceptionally heavy snow-storm or icy conditions they had to do more maintenance than they had forecast, and they ran into an over-expenditure of half a million dollars, they would come back in the form of a supplementary estimate and ask the legislature to vote that additional one-half million dollars.

March 8, 1963

That is what supplementary estimates are for. This is a different supplementary estimate. This piece of paper, Mr. Speaker, is a request to the members of this legislature to help the government hide this surplus. This piece of paper is asking us, the members of the legislature, to say to the people of Saskatchewan that the government no longer has this money. They are asking us to say that the money was spent last year. They are asking us to say, for instance, that \$1 million of this money was spent on a veterinary college; they are asking us to say that \$2 million of this was given to the economic development corporation; they are asking us to say that \$1 million was given to the Saskatchewan Public Administration Foundation; that is the way they are attempting to hide this surplus, to ask us to say that it has been already spent. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, there is no veterinary college, there is no economic development corporation . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And there never would be . . .

Mr. Cameron: — There is no Saskatchewan Public Administration Foundation. These are fictitious firms, non-existing firms, and yet you would ask us to vote that we have spent and given to those firms last year these sums that I have enumerated. It is a deliberate attempt to cover up this misdeed of the government, to cover this surplus \$20 million; the government is asking us to resort to this type of thing to cover it up. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if any business firm in this province attempted to create a false picture such as the government is attempting to do in here by juggling their books, they would receive a jail term of up to ten to 15 years.

This document is designed to cover up the proceeds of an organized pickpocketing on a scale that the people have not yet heard of. You can bring in who you wish; Perry Mason himself couldn't get you out of this jam.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We got the . . . here.

Mr. Cameron: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, the honorable thing for the government to have done would first be to admit that they had this surplus money, to admit that they overcharged the people by \$20 million, and then, if they didn't see fit to refund this \$20 million to the people in the form of tax rebates or tax cuts, at least to be forthright and honest enough to show how they are going to spend it. People are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to forgive governments for many faults, but they will never sanction such brazen attempt at juggling the books as is shown in here to hide this surplus.

This, Mr. Speaker, is education week. I was interested particularly in what the Minister of Education had to say in regard to education. I had hoped that after he explained what

he thought was the challenge facing education today, he would have laid before the legislature what he thought was an appropriate program to meet this challenge. He picked at bits and pieces, the need for new subjects in the program, the need for research, the uncertainty of the world these youngsters face and how we might best prepare them to meet it. Then he ended there. He didn't put forth any proposals as to what he suggested we should do. I suggest to the Minister of Education that we must be realistic enough to assess the rightful place of education in our society. Having done this, then we must be bold and courageous enough to take the necessary steps to clothe it with the skills and the finances necessary to the fulfilment of its role in society. If we are to meet this challenge, I think we must first divest ourselves of a lot of this horse and buggy thinking in regard to education.

This challenge, we believe, Mr. Speaker, calls for an attack on two fronts. Firstly, it will demand a completely new concept of financing education, to assure an adequate and fair and equitable distribution of the taxes.

Secondly, it demands the re-assessment of the basic aim of education. This re-assessment necessitates a curriculum revision that will allocate subject matter according to its importance in relationship to its aim in education.

I want to turn first to the approach to financing education. I was greatly interested in the press report that was issued by the Premier. He is always saying that for years he has been unable to understand anything the Liberals have to say in regard to education. I believe he remarked at one place that he had heard better speeches in his dreams than speeches given by the Liberals. To me this is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, because for years the Premier and his government, in my thinking, have been suspended in a state of self-imposed twilight sleep. They have been suspended in this state and they find themselves neither able to prevent nor to direct the things that are about to occur, and suspended in this state, they have been hesitant to embrace a dream and they have not been wide enough awake to face realities.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, it is because of this twilight sleep that the Premier was unable to recall that in 1958 he spoke of and voted in support of a resolution which I moved in this house pertaining to financing education. I want to read that resolution which I proposed at that time:

That this assembly request the provincial government to consider the advisability of the immediate establishment of a foundation program for education in Saskatchewan.

March 8, 1963

Was the Premier talking in his sleep when, in reference to an amendment adding the word “for”, he stated he would support the motion, even without the amendment. Was the Premier not then sufficiently wide awake to realize the import of this resolution? Did he not realize that such a resolution, calling for the setting up of a foundation program, incorporated these features; a recognition that our present tax structure provides neither equity of costs nor equality of opportunity; the establishment of a minimum standard of instruction all across the province; this minimum standard would be available to every child, whether the child lived in an urban centre or whether he lived in the remotest area. And this program too would set a flat mill rate for education all across the province. Such a tax rate would assure each taxpayer, the big and the little, the rich and the poor, paid the same for education per thousand dollars of assessment. It would remove the inequality which we find of rich productive areas, coasting along on a nominal mill rate, and the less productive areas saddled with an unbearable burden to meet their educational costs.

Such a foundation program, Mr. Speaker, was a practical and a constructive approach designed to put our educational system on a sound financial basis. The Liberal party didn't keep this program under wraps to be used as the political plum in the election. We didn't do so because we believe, Mr. Speaker, that education of our children is too vital a thing to use as a political football. What did we do? Because of the immensity of the financial problem plaguing the school and municipal officials, the Liberal party lifted this plank out of its program, laid it before the legislature and asked the members to consider its merits. The merits of this program were so appealing that all members of the house gave it unanimous approval. Did you ever, Mr. Speaker, witness a more golden opportunity for a government to launch a bold and an imaginative undertaking? Here was the most practical and appealing plank in the opposition platform. Here was the plank, not to be stolen, but freely offered, together with unanimous support in implementing it. Political pundits from time to time say an opposition should not offer constructive proposals to the government for fear they would do it. I would only say it is evident that these pundits have not studied the mind of the socialist government.

The opportunity here was so great to do something that the Premier thought this must surely be a dream. That is why the Premier thinks he hears these good Liberal speeches in his dreams. Let me remind you these dreams will yet become a nightmare and they will return to haunt you. They will return to haunt you because this government didn't have the intestinal fortitude to oppose the resolution nor did they have the courage to implement it.

While this government has sat since 1958 doing nothing to recognize even the grave financial problems facing our trustees and large communities, other governments have. This chamber will be interested to know that the government of Alberta has now instituted the identical program that I had the privilege to lay before this legislature five years ago. B.C. has instituted a program incorporating many of those features of the foundation program, together with other innovations. B.C. incorporated a clause exempting the first \$1,000 of assessment on rural property from school tax. They also, by this method I understand, relieved the burden of the rural people by 25 percent of their school tax. They have incorporated a plan which gives to the home owners a home owners' grant towards the cost of the school tax bill. And, in addition, B.C. pays one-half of the approved level of the school district costs as a whole in the form of grants. I was interested to note, according to the B.C. budget of 1962, the province of B.C. paid 75 percent of the school districts' budget as they relate to farm and residential property. The government here has now come forward with a program to ease and to correct this financial problem. And I was amazed when I read it.

The minister was speaking in Saskatoon and he outlined how this government proposed to meet this grave financial problem. They must have believed that great things come in little packages because it is a very, very small news clipping and it was a very, very small package. He stated what he proposed to do. He said, the Department of Education has now worked out a plan to relieve the taxpayer of this burdensome school tax. He said this plan is designed to relieve the burden of property tax needed to meet secondary education costs. What was this plan? He said, we want school boards to stream their high school students into vocational and technical training, tax relief would follow because the federal government would share most of the cost.

That's the major program to meet the financial crisis facing school officials in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish in any way to down-grade the technical and vocational training program and I made my stand clear the other day. It can play a very important role. But surely, Mr. Speaker, this program was not designed for the purposes as indicated by the minister; this vocational program which Ottawa pays 75 percent of the capital cost and 50 percent of the operating cost is a most worthy one. Let it not be said to Saskatchewan's shame that she intends to use it as a dumping ground upon which to unload our responsibilities in regard to education.

Where does the Liberal party stand in regard to financing education? I want to lay before this house today our stand as we see it in the current situation that is facing us.

March 8, 1963

We say that immediately upon assuming office the Liberal government will conduct an exhaustive study of the benefits accruing now to Alberta from the effects of the foundation program; we will look into the program as it is operating now in the province of British Columbia; and in the light of such a study we will incorporate such portions of these programs as are most applicable to our conditions in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — How about the Liberal provinces?

Mr. Cameron: — And we will act with dispatch in laying this before the legislature for action. A program will be designed to remove the inequalities in the tax load, to make available equal educational opportunities to our children whether they live in the urban centres or whether they live in the remotest area of the province. Such a program, we believe, will recognize our belief that education is a social responsibility, it is the responsibility of all, not the obligation of a few.

We realize that finding the money for education is one of the most pressing problems facing municipal and school officials in Saskatchewan today. We must, however, recognize that education will continue to make greater and greater claims upon the taxpayers' dollar. We must recognize too that the cost of education will remain an ever-growing problem. Something of the scope of this problem of financing education can be better realized when we stop to think today that the teachers' salaries this year will exceed \$43 million, that the sum total of school taxes levied both on urban and rural property do not raise sufficient money to meet the teachers' salary bill, let alone anything else. Of all the school taxes collected on property, it is not sufficient to meet the teachers' bill alone.

This, however, Mr. Speaker, I would hastily point out does not justify any conclusion that the teachers are receiving too great a salary. Because we must recognize that we require an ever-increasing number of teachers in order to staff our classrooms. In fact, it is interesting to realize that one percent of our population are school teachers actively engaged in the classroom. Putting the cost of education in Saskatchewan another way, the combined cost of teachers' salaries and the upkeep of schools is greater than the combined cost of both hospital and medical care. That gives you some conception of the enormity of the problem of financing education and I believe that it is nothing short of folly to believe that such expenditures can be supported on the tax base that was devised a hundred years ago.

It is true, the Saskatchewan government must carry a far greater share of the cost of education than it is doing today. We must not only put our own house in order; we must look further afield. The plight of Canada's schools and universities, tied to an outdated financial base, presents a

national problem. We believe it must be solved by national means. We have made a beginning at the university level, the vocational level, wherein the federal government contributes toward our university, vocational and technical training. What we have done in these areas has not been a violation of the British North America Act. If we are to meet the challenge of this uncertain and technical age in which we live, we must be aware that Canada's survival in years ahead is hinged, more than ever before, on the effectiveness of Canadian education; on the effectiveness of education in every province.

And the effectiveness of our education in turn hinges upon the funds allotted to research, to university, to vocational schools, and to elementary and secondary schools. Provincial and municipal resources are no longer enough to meet the necessary demands in financing education.

Because of this, the Saskatchewan Liberal party pledges itself to support, and we will vigorously work toward, federal aid toward education in both the primary and the secondary level.

To those who may feel uneasy about the invasion of provincial rights in education, let me state categorically that a Liberal government will preserve those rights. A Liberal government will not be a party to auctioning off those rights for monetary rewards. Surely no one would claim that Saskatchewan has lost any of her autonomy, or is any less free because Ottawa pays a portion of her autonomy, or is any less free because Ottawa pays a portion of her hospital costs or social aid costs, or because Ottawa contributes to Saskatchewan's portion of the cost of the construction of the Trans-Canada highway. Would anyone claim that the University of Saskatchewan is less academically free because Ottawa makes grants to its operation? We believe, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians have sufficient ingenuity to sit down together and to work out a financial formula for education which will not only preserve the provincial rights in the field of education, but one which will insure the province of sufficient financial resources to carry out their obligations to education as set out in the constitution.

We believe this can be done; we believe it will be done; that is why the Liberal party is pledged to support the principle of federal aid for education both on the primary and secondary levels.

Education, Mr. Speaker, presents not only a financial problem, but likewise we must look at education today in regards to the curriculum and the type of education which we are giving to our children in the classrooms.

Let us look at the Canadian educational picture as we see it today. Should we as Canadians be proud of an educational system when we consider that out of every 100 tots in Grade 2,

March 8, 1963

only 30 will emerge with a Grade 12 diploma, and of these 30 youngsters, 23 will enter such fields perhaps as nursing, technicians, tradesmen; at least they will make a comfortable living and a worthwhile contribution to society. What of the other 70? How are they faring? Forty-five of them will complete one to two years of high school; they will be holding down semi-skilled positions; with good hard work they probably will make ends meet. What about the remaining 25? These 25 will not complete Grade 8; most will be found in the ranks of the unemployed. Little to look back upon and even less to look forward to. And at the other end of the picture, we face an alarming shortage of skilled personnel, in such fields as research, in science, in technical fields and in industry. Can we be proud of an educational system which has neglected to meet the needs of the tops and has left so many stranded at the bottom? Today the ranks of the unemployed are swollen by youths in their early twenties, ill-equipped for the age in which they live; ill-equipped to meet the challenge of the day. They are defeated in life before they have a chance to begin.

Do not such conditions as these warrant the scrutiny of our curricula and a re-assessment of our aims of education? We Liberals believe it does, and we have backed up that belief by a resolution at our convention calling for a revision of the school curriculum and the return to basic essentials of education. What was the Premier's reaction to this resolution — "the Liberals have turned back the clock". The Premier stated that the procedure used for guiding and selecting content in Saskatchewan has been in operation for the past 17 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is precisely why the revision is called for. The content of subject matter in our classrooms has been selected in accordance with the aims of education as set out by the Premier 20 years ago. What were these aims of education 20 years ago, the Premier brought into Saskatchewan when he became the Minister of Education? May we review the old ones? These aims of education, as set out by the Premier, were based upon what was then thought to be a new approach to education. This new approach can be best understood, I think, by the slogans which it was clothed with. One slogan said, "The whole child comes to school, therefore the school is responsible for the whole development of the child". Another slogan said, "Education for social living, education for democracy". These broad aims of education have led to an almost unlimited range of subjects in the classroom, almost any course can be introduced into the curriculum, providing its advocates are able to show it is useful to someone. Now teachers are being called upon to crowd into the curriculum more and more subject matter because someone or some group has been able to convince the powers-that-be that this subject will in some way contribute to the child's development.

We have here before us a brief from the "Voice of Women" petitioning the government to add some more subjects to our curriculum. They said, we believe the curriculum should make place in order that they may teach anthropology and sociology. I notice in a press clipping the other day someone addressed the teachers' convention in Moose Jaw, said that he interviewed departmental officials in a determined effort to get in a program to teach psychiatry in our classrooms.

The pressures the teachers are subjected to, I think, is shown by the examination papers in Grade 12 and Grade 11, asking a child to assess the medical care crisis. That is the result of this philosophy of the whole child comes to the school, therefore the child must bring into the classroom all the pressures and the turmoil in the political controversy surrounding him. Such is the aim, as I see it, of education in Saskatchewan.

The tragedy of it all is that mothers today are complaining of the inability of the child to read. Pressures are building up for a return to the phonetic system of teaching the child to spell and to read. University professors are deploring the fact that freshmen entering university are lacking a basic grounding in English. Now we are busy calling seminars of teachers to devise a special course of remedial reading. Far too great a number of our Grade 11 and Grade 12 students fail, not because of their inability to master the subject matter, but because of their inability to interpret precisely what the question asks.

I believe that Saskatchewan falls behind many of the other provinces in this whole field of education. The other provinces have moved forward. First they set up a royal commission to look into the whole field of education, particularly the curriculum, in order that we may do what the minister suggested must be done, to revise the curriculum in view of the needs of tomorrow.

They did this firstly by way of setting up a royal commission to re-assess and re-define the aim of education and secondly, the setting up of the necessary research facilities to assure continuing study, to keep the curriculum in line with the demands of the age in which we live. They are conscious of the fact that education is not static. They are conscious of the fact that we can't put it into a compartment and keep it there for twenty years, like the minister said we should do, and which he is still prepared to carry on. They do not believe that education merely moved forward in the current of progress; they believe that education should actively provide in large measure the source and the direction of progress. When we consider that the child who attends school for 12 years will spend only one-fifth of his waking hours in the classroom, four-fifths of his time outside the classroom, then we realize how

March 8, 1963

precious little time we have to provide a foundation for this child upon which he may build an understanding of the shifting values and of the confusing events that present day society and the world in which he will live. To the extent to which we have failed to provide this foundation, I believe to that extent we have failed the youth of Saskatchewan.

For this reason, that is why we say as Liberals, we will re-assess and revise the curriculum, not to turn back the clock, to design a curriculum to meet the challenge referred to by the Minister of Education the other day, to train the child to cope with the world in which he finds himself; a world such as we cannot even conceive at present; a world in which skills which we learn today will be outdated tomorrow; that is the challenge of education, and the need to meet this challenge is to give our youth that firm foundation of values upon which he can stand; a foundation which will equip him to measure and to assess the shifting values which he will encounter in his world.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that invariably commissions who have looked into this field of education have come to one conclusion. They have come to the conclusion that the primary and most effectual aim of education today must be the intellectual development of the child. And so they have narrowed these broad aims of education to the one specific and precise aim of education — the intellectual development of the child.

It is interesting that British Columbia's royal commission, looking into this field, had this to say:

The demands of the time make it essential that emphasis be placed on fostering intellectual development as the major function of the school. To do this more attention must be given to the basic subjects of the curriculum.

And they proceeded to spell out what they considered the basic subjects were: reading, spelling, arithmetic, grammar, composition, and something of the history of the great nations of the world. And they went even further and they said:

A high standard of literacy, accuracy and precise knowledge, coupled with habits of application and responsibility, gives those enduring values.

These are values which a disjointed smattering of information cannot give. Such commission were not unmindful of the fact that there are other aspects to the development of the child besides the intellectual development. They realize

that the child must develop physically, morally and socially, and that this development is not unrelated to intellectual development. We must, however, keep in mind that there are other agencies that have a responsibility and must be given an opportunity to play their full role in the child's development. Such agencies as the home, community and the church. Schools were not designed to be foster homes for children. They were designed to promote the intellectual development of the child. If the schools are to be successful in the role assigned to them, the curriculum must be so designed as to place emphasis on the subject matter most effective in carrying out that specific aid. This may entail, as the B.C. commission set out, even the setting out of the subjects, putting in the core of the circle those major subjects which must receive the major portion of time of the day. Secondly, those that are of secondary importance to the child's intellectual development, lesser time allotted to them. Those that have little to do, but not as much, put them in the third circle, and then draw circle beyond which we will admit nothing into the classroom, because it would crowd the time of the curriculum to the degree that we can't proceed in an effective manner of intellectual development.

That is why we believe the study must be first made to define a specific aim of education; to assess the subject matter that will promote and develop that end. And, secondly, to review the role of such other agencies as the school, the home, the community and the church, and give them the opportunity to play the important role that they are intended to play in education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Once this has been done, then we must follow it up by, I believe, a continuing study of the aim of education. Money must be allotted for research in education, such research to cover not only the curricula, but research in population shifts, research in classroom needs, research that would assist the unit boards in their construction program, and to have a continuing research so that we will know the number of students that are entering the primary grade, and each of the grades in the classroom so this can be projected in the future; then we will know what financial resources we will have to have by that particular date. We will co-operate in this research with school boards in order to plan the best way to meet this challenge. Such research, I believe, should look into ways in which larger units and school districts may be granted greater authority than they have today in the selection of subject matter, ways in which teachers can be given a greater flexibility in the supplementals into their text books, and so forth.

I believe this complex age, this fast-moving age in which we live today demands that we do all in our power to best equip the child to face the demands that will be made upon him.

March 8, 1963

This little dribble of a million odd that the Provincial Treasurer has shown in grants to education will help, but it is of no major importance. No, it is not attempting to even make a start to understand and to mend the problems that we face in education in Saskatchewan. Because he has not moved in any direction to put the finances of education on a firm foundation, nor has he done any study of the best methods in the revision of curricula in order that we can obtain the best foundation for the child to stand on to meet these challenges, because of the policy of do-nothing but to drift with the times; for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.L. Stevens (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in the budget debate this afternoon, I must confess I have found it rather difficult to decide when to speak, because each cabinet minister during the last few days has risen in his place and announced big extensions to their programs, or new programs, and this is rather tough competition indeed. In fact, just yesterday, the Minister of Highways rose in his place and announced a terrific new program of highway extension; anything I might have to say after that might be rather anti-climactic.

However, today, after listening to the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) and the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), I find we indeed have struck much calmer waters. As a matter of fact I think they were a little bit swampy in places.

The member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley spent a great deal of his time criticizing social aid expenditures, social welfare expenditures. Now, Mr. Speaker, the main item for social welfare, the main items spent are for pensions to the aged and disabled, the care of the neglected and the needy children, and for geriatric centres for our older people, and for correctional institutions. Now, which one of these does he propose to eliminate? Is this new Liberal policy? Or is this the way they intend to decrease expenditures on those least able to take care of themselves? If so, I think the member from Qu'Appelle should make a public statement of the details of this great new humanitarian policy of the Thatcherites.

Since last Friday when the budget address was delivered in this house, I have listened to a great many addresses made by the members of the opposition. I think it is their duty, of course, to make comments on and to constructively criticize the actions of the government and all its fiscal policies. However, the only commendation I could make for any of their efforts would be exemplified in that old proverb:

The brook would lose its song if it were not for the stones that lie within its path.

We have listened to many hard-headed arguments against this budget; loud sounds have been made in an effort to impede or change its course in providing adequate services and opportunities for all the people of the province, but they will, in the long run, thanks to an intelligent electorate, have little more success than the stones that lie in the bottom of the brook have on the course of the water. The sparkling crystal-clear waters of good government will wend their way to their greater destiny with but little delay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: — Previous budgets in this house, Mr. Speaker, have been described as an act of faith in this province; this one should be regarded as the one that proves that this faith has been justified.

It would have been normally expected that 1961, being a year that was one of the driest in the history of the province, and with our great dependency that we have had on our agriculture, that it would take at least one more year to recover from such a setback before significant gains could again be made in our economic progress. This has not been the case, as the whole budget records financial gains in almost every department. I think the estimates of a \$5 million surplus on last year's budgetary operations indicates that the base in this province for development and growth is a sound one, and that given normal conditions we can most surely count on the continued advancement for business, agriculture and labor in the years ahead.

This budget contains many items that are being employed for the purpose of assisting farmers in their struggle for a reasonable standard of living, comparable to other sectors of the economy. In 1961 it was a most difficult year and, while 1962 was a much more favorable one for most of the province, there are still some areas, like my own, which have not yet returned to the normal yields and incomes that they must have under present conditions in order to prosper.

Agriculture has been, and continues to be, the foundation of the basic industries in Saskatchewan. To those engaged in it, and to those in the super structure who depend upon it, it is the life-blood and the sustaining segment of our entire economy. Without it, or when it is in difficulties, industry and all of its supplementary occupations, will surely suffer as well. The shrinking incomes in the face of continually rising cost, the cost-price squeeze, continue to be the most pressing problem of the farming industry today. It has reached the proportions where it cannot be regarded as a

March 8, 1963

temporary problem, affecting only the small and inefficient farmers, it must be looked on in terms of a nation and all its people, because it is affecting all of them and it is becoming more and more acute.

Large farms have solved a part of our difficulty, but have, at the same time, created problems in our communities almost as bad as those they have solved. A 45 percent increase in the size of the farms in the last two decades has meant the loss of 18,000 farmers in Saskatchewan to the industry, and the effect of this loss has become important elsewhere in the economy. It has already swelled the number of unemployed by untold numbers, it is nibbling away at the prospect of every employed person in Canada as well. If this trend is not soon slowed down or halted, serious further complications in our farm communities may soon occur.

Rail line abandonment, ghost villages, suitcase farmers are but a few of the serious complications that will appear if nothing is done in this regard. This problem is largely a federal one, as our income and the price of the things we purchase are controlled almost exclusively by federal fiscal policy, and as we have yet to see in Ottawa a government who has ever given anything but lip service to this problem, and that only before a federal election, the outlook looks extremely dim for agriculture, unless something constructive is done on April 8, and by that I mean the election of a New Democratic government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: — Our provincial government, as far as any provincial government can do, is doing more to halt this trend than any other in the three prairie province — the trend of larger farms, shrinking rural population and increased urban population.

Our budget in 1963 provides the sum of \$8.5 million for the various programs to assist the industry, which is indeed much larger than our neighboring oil-rich province of Alberta, who last year, out of a budget of \$375 million, spent only \$6.9 million on agriculture. And even our sister province of Manitoba expends far less than this. Last year their budget for agriculture was only \$5.1 million, just a little over half what this government spends for a similar purpose.

Our program for agriculture, of ag. reps., livestock improvement, machinery research, water conservation and development, proper land utilization by the lands branch, family farm improvement, and pasture development, along with many other services, is unequalled on the prairies. In addition, this year we have allocated \$2.6 million for the acquisition of pasture lands and \$1.2 million for their development. This attitude on the part of this government is in direct contrast

to that put forward on so many occasions by the opposition, who have on every opportunity voted against these expenditures and whose policy is probably more closely exemplified by Dean Otto Lang than by any other man.

This fellow is becoming a very well-known figure in Saskatchewan agriculture. I think I should quote again the exact words he said when he was speaking to the Saskatchewan Agriculture Graduates' Association at the University Farm and Home Week. He was speaking about farmers and he said:

Should they be subsidized by non-farmers to bring their economic level to that of non-farmers? Clearly not. The farmers are receiving non-economic benefits to make up the difference.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Thatcherites on your left may disclaim this brain trust of theirs on the platforms of this province but there can be no doubt that were the Liberals in power, this is the man who would be helping to form the farm policy of the government for this province.

The economists, even in the U.S.A., have long since given up this ridiculous argument of no assistance for agriculture, while all the rest of the economy receives subsidies. And to illustrate how far they have abandoned that archaic policy I would like to quote from an item of the Time Magazine, of December 15, 1961. This magazine has a reputation for the reliability of its statistics, and I quote:

Net farm income, said the U.S. Department of Agriculture, will increase over 1960's 12 billion to a total of 12.8 billion, making 1961 the most prosperous year since 1953. But there was another side to the statistics. 4.7 billion of the farmers' income will come from government-support programs, a jump of 600 million over 1960, and the farmers with heavily-subsidized crops seem to think they are better off. Wheat, for example, gets high supports.

Over one-third of their income coming from government sources indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that the importance of agriculture is recognized even in a highly-industrialized country like the United States and shows that compensation is being partially made at least to agriculture for the heavy burden of tariffs, monopolies causing high prices and protectionism given to the rest of the economy. The Liberal policy, as Dean Lang outlined, is give them fresh air.

March 8, 1963

Now, the problem of shrinking farm population due to mechanization and larger farms is familiar in all parts of North America. It is interesting to note the findings of a committee set up by the Manitoba government to study Manitoba's economic future which made its report last Wednesday. A Canadian Press dispatch in the March 6, 1963 edition of the Leader-Post, which of course is a very reliable source, which I have in my hand, shows that their problems in agriculture are very similar to our own, similar to what I have described and the solutions they recommend are exactly what our Department of Agriculture has been doing for years, and is further emphasized by increased spending in that direction this year. In the next 15 years, the report states, 32,000 workers are expected to leave the farms and with this will come the decline of small centres of population in rural areas, and the reason given is this, and I quote:

Many farmers will leave the farm because farm income has not increased at the same pace as income in other lines of endeavor. The net 1960 income in Manitoba for farms was only \$1,480, compared to the prairie average of \$2,100, and its key recommendations were an increase in cattle raising, and increase in specialized crops by large-scale irrigation.

It is interesting to note that while Manitoba is just receiving the report, the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture has been aware of this situation for some years, has acted upon and has taken further steps to alleviate this situation this year, such as the expenditure of nearly \$4 million on pasture improvement and large sums in its participation in the South Saskatchewan River Dam. Whenever we have introduced measures calculated to improve the farmers' position, the Thatcherites have been sharply critical and have used every possible means to delay their enactment.

The Medical Care Act was the most recent example. This plan will be much cheaper for those farmers with a small income and much cheaper for those who have a large farm and are paying a land tax under a municipal scheme, or who were. In addition, coverage is much more extensive than the private plans who had a rate as high as \$130. An additional benefit of the medical care plan has become apparent in the province this year. The vast improvement in the quickening pace of the economy is due in part to the fact that the sums of money that people normally held in reserve to meet possible medical bills have now been made available for other uses. This has stimulated our economy. To prove my point I want to illustrate what has been the experience in England where they have had a similar plan for many years.

John Gunther, a well-known author of international renown who has published many books, mostly in the form of objective reports of other countries — he is certainly not regarded in America as a socialist — reports in his latest book, the 1962 edition of *Inside Europe Today*, as follows, about England:

Nowadays the national health service, despite the ferocious controversies which attended its birth, not only works efficiently but is overwhelmingly popular with the rank and file of citizens. About 65 percent of its cost comes directly from the exchequer. Indeed, the fact that a Briton does not, in the normal course of events, ever have to pay more than a nominal sum for doctor, dentist or medicine, throughout the whole course of his life, from birth to the grave, has played a role in the current boom and the increase in national purchasing power. This is because of the elementary fact that the share of the family budget that formerly went to medical care can now be spent otherwise on anything from breakfast bacon to hi-fi, and the ghastly financial drain caused by severe prolonged illness is not all but eliminated, which is not only a good thing in itself, but releases immense funds for other use.

I think that has proven to be exactly the same result obtained here in Saskatchewan and demonstrated by the fact that the economy has recovered faster than anyone, even the government itself, had supposed it would. Certainly it is not all the reasons for the increase, but I feel certain that it did have a noticeable effect.

In my area, expenditures for the South Saskatchewan River Dam have also had a very beneficial effect on business and on the area in general. And again illustrates what a progressive government can do to employ capital in such a way as to benefit the present generations by way of power development, irrigation and increased park and tourist facilities.

For the Leader of the Opposition to imply, as he did in the special session of 1961, that this project was an unnecessary expenditure will be something that people throughout this province will not soon forget. It was common knowledge that the Liberals in Ottawa would never have built the dam, but for a native of this province and a leader of a political party to be against this type of expenditure, with the federal government paying their share, is almost beyond belief and indicates the type of leadership that would be given in this province if the reins of the government were to fall into his hands.

March 8, 1963

Irrigation farming which holds great promise for agriculture under certain marketing conditions appears at the present time to require changes in our market demands before the great possibilities inherent in such a program can be fully realized. When the outlook for markets for cereal grains appears to be as shaky as it is at present, with a forecast of a surplus position similar to 1960 if the normal crop is harvested this year, and the livestock prices already showing the effects of heavy production, the value of the large production potential in irrigation becomes somewhat diminished. The development of the South Saskatchewan River Development project must therefore be one that is proceeded with by great care and consideration.

And in this regard I want to commend the government for the manner in which the project has been investigated and also on the democratic methods used in ascertaining what type of policy for irrigation would be most suitable to the farmers involved. The central farm irrigation policy committee, composed of two elected farmer representatives from each of the proposed irrigation areas study groups in Broderick, Donavon, Conquest, Tessier and the Feudal area, together with two non-voting delegates from the Department of Agriculture, have studied several possible plans and made several tours of other irrigation areas. They have given serious study to what they call the conversion policy through irrigation and which, to my mind, has a great many points in it to commend it to the government. In this policy, it seems to me that the interests of the farmers in the area, the government and the business community serving the area have been given careful consideration. And when the time comes for an irrigation policy to be laid down, possibly in 1965, this plan should be looked at most carefully.

The budget again makes provision for continued improvements in our expanding highways system, a system that now is a matter of pride for Saskatchewan's citizens rather than the butt for crude jokes from those in the neighboring provinces as it was prior to 1944. And at the present time citizens in my area are reasonably well served by our highway system, with the possible exception of two stretches of road, namely no. 4 highway south of Rosetown to Biggar, and another stretch from Outlook east to Kenaston on no. 15, leading to the black-top between Saskatoon and Regina. At present these are gravelled roads and today's high speed vehicles demand a better quality of highway when the traffic is heavy. I was very pleased to hear the highways minister announce yesterday the oiling of these stretches of road and I am sure that the residents of my area will be most grateful about this announcement. And when these improvements are made it will mean that Rosetown will be served by dust-free highways from four directions. What a contrast this will be from the days of the old Liberal regime when the only road into the town was a dirt trail, jokingly called no. 7 highway, which meandered over hill and dale to Saskatoon and was only open about eight months of the year.

Mr. Speaker, my comments on the budget could cover a great many other areas as the document lists a very wide field of government services, but in closing may I mention one that I feel illustrates more than any other the difference between the party in the government and the party that sits in opposition at your left, and probably illustrates as well why they sit in opposition. They are to my mind just the larger of the two Conservative parties in Saskatchewan. Indeed, Mr. Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba and head of a Conservative government, believes they are much less progressive than his own, and on one occasion in the Manitoba house made this statement, obviously with reference to Saskatchewan's Mr. Thatcher:

There are some Liberals (he said) in the Liberal party that are being dragged kicking and screaming into the second half of the twentieth century.

The area that I think illustrated the great difference between the Thatcherites and ourselves is our attitude about the purpose of business and industry. Our policies are for the people and we believe that business and industry should be for people. When we see 930,000 people in Saskatchewan, we first think of their needs, and move in a direction calculated by us to best serve those needs.

Now, after the introduction of the adequate health plan for all, based on need rather than ability to pay for it, and adequate welfare measures, reasonable educational opportunities, proper labor laws, good hospital services, low cost insurance, programs to provide the amenities of life for farmers, such as electricity, sewer and water systems, and grid roads, we believe the time has come when we have provided for the social needs of the people to sufficient degree that we can now afford to use our financial resources for the purpose of providing incentives to business and industry to expand or to come into the province to further serve the needs of these people. SEDCO and the new industrial advisory council have been formed for that purpose because, Mr. Speaker, they will I am sure accomplish that purpose because with this help business and industry will prosper while performing that function.

How different is the policy of the Thatcherites as put forth by their leader on many an occasion in this house. A ten year tax holiday for big business as he has always advocated indicates their thinking. They have, on every occasion, opposed the social policies I have just mentioned. When this type of policy is in force, as it was in years of formal Liberal regimes, the social needs of the people are never met because they are considered last, and as a consequence, industry never prospers either, because they depend upon a happy and prosperous people for their income.

March 8, 1963

Mr. Speaker, I think this budget is a document to be proud of. I think it is a reflection of what careful planning for many years by a government who knows where they are going and have the courage to do it can do for a province and it is therefore, just one further step on the way towards a happier and a more prosperous Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this budget debate I would like to give the usual congratulations to all the speakers who have spoken before, and particularly to the financial critic.

This afternoon I also enjoyed the catty remarks of the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). He indicated exactly what the government was trying to do in about as picturesque language as possible.

Now, the procedures and the speakers in this budget debate, particularly the cabinet minister, have shaken my faith as to whether democracy is a workable form of government or not. This faith was shaken one time before. It was when I first entered politics and I was travelling around the constituency visiting various people and I got into this one person's home and I indicated I was a Liberal candidate, and he practically hit the roof and went for a pitch fork, and I said, Just what makes you so hostile towards Liberals and liberalism? Well, he said — just exactly the same answer as I would expect from you people as I will tell you later — you are a very young man, aren't you? He said, you don't remember the thirties. I said, Not too clearly. Well, he said, I am going to tell you a little story why I cannot support the Liberals. He said there was a carload of apples came for distribution in his area. I went to one town and they told me I wasn't entitled to apples. I went to another town and they told me again I wasn't entitled to apples in that town, so I went to a third place and they said, I can't give you apples here either. So he said, if you think I am going to vote Liberal after that kind of treatment, you have another thought coming. I'll never vote Liberal as long as I live if I can't get apples.

Now, for an ordinary citizen to say this may be understandable. But from reasonable, or supposedly reasonable, ministers of the crown to come into this house and say that because someone ate a chicken or somebody couldn't dispose of a turkey in the thirties, they have dedicated themselves to destroying the whole way of life prior to them taking office is unforgivable.

Now, I have had to logically draw the conclusion that these turkeys and chickens must have been wry-necked ones because it has warped and twisted the minds of those who are in government ever since. And this is the logical pattern followed by CCF'ers of the past. They came through the thirties with perhaps the same amount of bitterness as most of us had. But, instead of trying to go ahead and rectify these abuses of our way of life that we have enjoyed for many seasons, they dedicated themselves to destroying it. We recognize that there were abuses that could be improved, but we were not dedicated to destroying that way of life.

Now, they are apparently coming into the house at this time and saying, well, we tried it for our first years in office, we found out better, that you can't destroy that old way of life, and now they are coming into the house, trying to maintain and claim that they are now the defenders of private enterprise and they are putting window-dressing into the budget so they can say, look what we are doing for private enterprise, after having dedicated themselves to destroying it. I am glad too that you have had a change of heart. The only regret I have is that when you took office in 1944, instead of going around this big circle to point out to yourselves that what you have dedicated yourselves to doing was wrong, if you had proceeded from where you are today, perhaps Saskatchewan would be in a better position now.

Now this budget sets a lot of firsts. First biggest expenditure, firsts in plans for private enterprise and I think it also sets a first that it is one budget that is dripping with so much political propoganda that I doubt if there is another budget that can compare to it.

And this political propoganda is perhaps the shallowest nature. We find when we look at the budget that the Provincial Treasurer decided it was politically expedient to take credit for a few things. He mentions for example that in 1948, 40 out of every 1,000 newborn babies died; in 1962 this has been reduced to 25 out of every 1,000, etc. etc., leaving the implication, of course, that it is because of something the CCF'ers have done. And they ought to take credit for it. I am glad to hear them clapping. Now I've checked the vital statistics and I wish you would too. And I have found in vital statistics that social diseases have increased. Would you like credit for that too? I have found too that the number of illegitimate births have increased. Would you like credit for that too?

Now, it is utterly ridiculous for the Provincial Treasurer to try and take credit for the decrease in birth death rate as it would be for me to try to blame some of the things that I mentioned on CCF administration. No credit was given to the improvements made in drugs, new techniques and all other advances developed by science. All the CCF credit. This,

March 8, 1963

as I said, is about the shallowest form of political propaganda that I have ever seen incorporated into a budget speech.

Now, he also makes a claim in the budget speech, and he quoted one of his predecessors and this predecessor indicated that freedom is more than the mere absence of restraint, it is the presence of opportunities. This is one statement I would definitely like to challenge. In my work daily, I work with young people who are trying to seek a substantial way of life in Saskatchewan. We have parents coming to the door of the high schools to plead on behalf of some of their children who cannot make the grade at high school and university students, and they are asking us please guide us, what opportunities are there for these young people? What should you give them to do? What should we direct them into taking? Should they become farmers, should they become electricians, what opportunities are there in this province? And we as teachers have to hide our heads and say, I am sorry, we have no list of tremendous opportunities supplied by the Department of Education to these schools. If you want to indicate the opportunities that are available, and show me in black and white, why I can honestly tell a student to become a plumber and that he shall be taken care of ever after if he becomes one, for good living in Saskatchewan, I wish you would indicate that to me. So when you are trying to tell me that there are opportunities of all descriptions, I fail to see these opportunities, particularly for young people.

This budget is creating in the minds of the people of this province an air of fear and apprehension. It calls on the part of the government to expend \$187 million. The public realize that the only source of wealth any government has, be it local, provincial or federal, is from the pockets of the people. And when people look at the resources they have and the families they have to support and provide for and clothing, besides expending \$187 per capita on each man, woman and child in that family, then they are seriously wondering what kind of income they would have to have to support this terrific expenditure. Now, granted, some of your grants are coming from Ottawa, from the federal government, but it doesn't matter, any government must rely on the taxpayers to pay that amount of money. You are the ones who claimed that you were going to do it differently. You said that after attracting these tremendous industries into the province you would be able to lower the taxes and take the huge burdens off the shoulders of the people. And for this reason you are causing a tremendous lot of concern, and a rightful concern. When a person realizes that on \$400 a month you can hardly make ends meet when you are supporting a family of five or six children, it is cause for alarm. Because we know it was not always possible to get jobs of this nature and may not be in the future.

Yesterday some ministers got up and said all the opposition can do is nibble at this and nibble at that in the budget and as a result of our nibbling, all we are doing is proving the brilliance of the budget. Another minister got up and he bragged about the increase in the urban population, cities are growing here, towns are growing all over the place, and somehow again he and other ministers have implied that this is a good thing for Saskatchewan, that this has somehow bolstered the economy of the province and made it a more secure place in which to live. This, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, will be written as the greatest tragedy that has ever befallen this province, because your cities and towns are growing at the expense of the rural people, people moving off the land and into the cities. All you have to do to verify this is to check your municipal reports. The loss in rural population since 1956 is a total of 800,000; since 1956 the growth in cities and towns is 65,000. Therefore, your cities have grown at the expense of the family farmers that have moved off the land and into the cities.

Therefore, if there is unemployment, if there is social aid, the blame can be laid directly at the feet of the Minister of Agriculture, together with his cohorts who have done more to destroy the family farm than any government I know. Now, I intend to prove this point conclusively this afternoon. To do so it will be necessary for me to review some of the things that have happened since the war. To do this I want to deal with cases that I am familiar with, that I have lived with and gone through.

The member from Rosetown (Mr. Stevens) had something to say about the government helping and assisting family farmers, now I will challenge him to show me where. They are also critical of the Liberal government rule in agriculture and pooh-poohing the idea that the Liberals would maintain family farms. I checked the records, Mr. Speaker, and under the Veterans' Land Act alone, after the war, 8,101 farmers were established and settled in Saskatchewan due to the Veterans' Land Act — settled on small holdings, 1,285, and settled on crown lands, 1,605. The total cost of the Veterans' Land Act program has been \$47.5 million veterans' costs for their implements some \$14,024,000, and paid to the Indians \$3,659,000 to establish people on farms.

Now the federal government at that time had the challenging responsibility of providing farms for the veterans who wanted them, of educating the veterans that wanted to go to school. They paid the entire tuition, paid the veteran \$60 a month for as long as he was attending, comparable to his war years, a besides that worried about providing sufficient housing and all other post-war problems. And what did the provincial government do at that time for the veterans who came back? There were some platitudes that apparently the veteran was going to get priority of crown lands. This is one of the greatest hoaxes again.

March 8, 1963

I lived alongside a half section of crown land for two years and six different veterans that I knew applied for that land, and not one had a smell of it. They took the attitude during the war that now that the dogs of war are unleashed, the only concern of the CCF party is the welfare of the party. And they continued that attitude after the war; when the veterans came back after the war they attempted to herd them into some co-op farms. Yet the power to establish and set up family farms, economic units, was directly in the hands of this government. You controlled more grazing leases than there is arable land. There is enough sub-marginal land so that you could provide one section of sub-marginal land for each section that the veterans bought through V.L.A. to provide them with an economic unit.

Now, I indicated to you that in order to prove that you have destroyed the family farmer it is necessary for me . . .

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Would you mind answering a question?

Mr. Klein: — After I'm through. It is necessary to discuss three cases that are typical of what happened to some of these veterans that established on land after the war — cases I am personally familiar with. Case no. 1 — we had a veteran that came back and with the money that he got from the federal government he was able to purchase three-quarter sections of land, besides that three quarter section, he was able to get a lease on a section and a quarter of grazing. His land was by no means above average, if anything it was below average because he collected the PFAA payments for four years that I know of. Now, because he had access to this government lease, he was able to build himself a new home, pay off the debt on the land and build a comfortable nice home and establish his family on that farm, and he will stay and continue to live on that land because he was able to get some grazing land.

Case no. 2 — and this is an interesting one — a second veteran who was able to buy a half section of good land, which was what the federal government allowed him, and he also had a half section of land from his parents, which gave him a section of good land. He struggled on this farm since 1948. Last year he had his farm up for sale, and I said, Why are you selling out? Surely to goodness you should stay, and we hate to see people leaving our community. Finally he said, Maybe I won't have to sell out. You know there is a section of sub-marginal land directly south of me. I can get it for around \$10 or \$12,000. What I would like to do is seed it to grass and wait until I can get some returns off it, and then I would have a unit that I could stay and live in this community as a family farmer forever. And he said, There is so much talk about ARDA, the provincial government seems very anxious to help us out on converting

this sub-marginal land. What assistance can I get to purchase this land, will they buy it for me and let me seed it to grass? And I said, No, I'm sorry, there is some assistance, and he said, What's that? They'll provide you with the grass at cost, to seed it if you buy it. He turned around and he looked at me and he said, Big deal!

Now, because this government, together with the Minister of Agriculture, have had no policy whatsoever to convert sub-marginal land back to pasture, this family farmer had to leave. We have heard a lot of platitudes and talk about how this ought to be done. The minister gets on his high-horse and he says, Seed your poor land to grass. That is necessary for an economic unit. But how far is he prepared to go to assist in purchasing that land to set up an economic unit? But the minister says, Oh, but I'm doing something about providing more pasture. This minister runs around the province looking for some poor unsuspecting marsh to drain, and he goes ahead and drains that marsh, so that Ducks Unlimited have to come after he is through with it, and they have to build a dam to make a marsh so that the ducks won't by-pass Saskatchewan, as everything else is by-passing it.

Now, I can tell the Minister of Agriculture that if he personally got on a tractor with a drill and took some of the grass he is trying to peddle to the farmers, and got on that tractor some morning early and seeded sub-marginal land already broken up, in one week he could make more pastures than he will be draining marshes for ten years, and at lot less expense. This is the reason why people have had to leave their farms.

Case no. 3 — this veteran had a section of land and last year he was in a position to purchase another section of land, and with this second section of land there was a quarter on lease went with it. So he borrowed the money and he was hoping that this lease would go with the land. However, it was only a quarter of a section so when he bought this farm he found out that the lease had to be posted, and the lease was given to another farmer. This after he bought the land. It is true that the other farmer needed that lease, very true, but both of these fellows are living on the edge of thousands of sections of grazing land, and they are not asking for twenty sections or forty sections as was mentioned by the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). He said one bachelor might control from this government as high as four sections of grazing land. And all these veterans are asking, so that they can stay on the farm, and stay on the land, is for enough pasture to pasture 30 or 40 head, so that they can convert their farming operations into economic units.

And because of the niggardly treatment and because of the inequality of the distribution of grazing land, and because

March 8, 1963

of the lack of planning to convert sub-marginal land into grass lands, these farmers are forced to leave their farms. Now when one of these farmers leaves his farm and comes into the city, one of three things happen. You might have the odd one that will sell out to retire in the city; others that sell out and move to the city, either gets a job and displaces someone else from that job, or he can come to the city, work for a year or so, and then if he can't find work, go on unemployment; or three, he can move into the city, sustain himself for a month or so, and then go on social aid. This is the overall effect of the rural people migrating into the city, and as I say, it is going to go down in history as the greatest tragedy that has ever befallen this province, because when we look at countries in the past, we find that the danger sign of decay was when the people moved off the farms and into the city.

Now, if we have a look into the future, this becomes an ever graver problem. The average holdings today in farm areas, particularly in my area, are in the neighborhood of some 40, 50, 60,000 and up, so, temporarily, we are all right. What is going to happen when a man who has a \$60,000 unit disposes of it. Will a family farmer buy it? Or are you going to eliminate one more family from that community when that sale is made? Who is going to buy that holding? You are playing directly into the hands of professional investors or anybody who can afford to pay \$60,000 cash for a unit. Not the type of man that needs it.

I was down in the United States in 1947 combining, and I thought they were in a dreadful predicament because when we went to get a job, on 3,000 acres of seeded land, we found that the land was owned by a banker and a lawyer and a doctor, who never ever saw the land and had it sub-let to a tenant. Is that the position you want agriculture to get into in Saskatchewan? Is that what you want to stabilize your economy? You overlook this agricultural industry, and apparently you are not prepared to do a thing about supporting a family farmer, except a few platitudes and tidbits that you are willing to talk about and yak about all over the province.

Or are you wanting to become Castros? To wait until the abuse in land-holding is so great that these big landholders will be so unpopular that you can socialize them like you did the doctors, or do as Castro did. While I'm talking about Castro, you people are great admirers of this man, you people who are posing as the champions of free enterprise apparently like this fellow Castro. About a year or so ago one of our teachers from Saskatchewan flew the coop . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Speak for yourself.

Mr. Klein: — No, I'm going to speak for you and your party, if you don't mind. One of our teachers flew the coop, and he went down to Cuba.

during the Easter recess, and he didn't return for some ten months. Now, I wondered where this teacher would show up on the scene again, and I thought perhaps somebody may raise Cain with him. But lo and behold, by going through the papers, I find that this teacher becomes a great hero of the NDP and was invited to address an elite group of the NDP. Now, where did this take place? This took place in Saskatoon. This teacher, and his only claim to fame — and I have his book if anyone cares to read it, I have it here “Cuba Libre” or something like that. His claim to fame is that he is pro-Castro, pro-Khrushchev, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, anti-American. That is the claim he has to fame, and what honored position did he get in the NDP? He was asked to address the CCF-NDP business organization. Now I think this must have been an elite group because one of the men at the meeting was none other than our friend, Dr. Mahood. Dr. Ed. Mahood had invited him over, and who is Dr. Ed. Mahood? I think he is a candidate for the NDP in Saskatoon in this next federal election. And what were the circumstances under which this man spoke, as reported in the Star-Phoenix. The reporter who stayed to hear this speaker found the main doors locked when she left, and had to return to the meeting to have the door opened. Ed. Mahood, who managed to find the key, hesitated before opening the door by mentioning that there will be a resolution later.

The event was advertised as a public meeting to hear a speaker on Cuba, however before Mr. Matson spoke, Harry Like, provincial president of the CCF-NDP discussed plans on the forthcoming national meeting to be held next year in Regina. Following his brief business reports, Mr. Link informed the audience that the hat will be passed around for donations towards expenses for the evening, to pay this teacher who had given a nice talk on Cuba. And then it goes on to say what Mr. Matson spoke on; he mentioned these horrible imperialists, these horrible capitalists, as he does in his book, have brought about the destruction of Cuba, and you are the same people who are now trying to cloak yourselves in some cloak of respectability by saying “we are champions of private enterprise”.

By golly, when you fellows start growing beards, I'm taking off for the hills, because I'm not the martyr type at all, and it is quite likely that I am going to expect to see somebody sprouting beards.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Klein: — Now, isn't this a kind of scary thing? Doesn't it scare you at all? It does me. To realize that this Dr. Ed. Mahood associates himself with a man who is pro-Cuba, pro-Castro, and pro-Khrushchev and everything else, is also a teacher at the teachers' college in Saskatoon to influence young minds.

March 8, 1963

I had a little frightening bit of an experience with that man. When I attended the teachers' college in Moose Jaw, Dr. Mahood had set up a little select group that met two or three evenings a week at the normal school. I wasn't a part of this group but I think Lloyd Matson was. One evening he decided he would invite us over to attend a panel discussion on defence. After I listened to the presentation of the panel members I thought I was in a real cell meeting because he had these fellows so brain-washed that one after the other they would pop up on their feet and say that Canada is spending — I forget what it was — 80¢ out of every dollar on defence, and defence against what? Against Russia who only wants peace and to get along with the rest of the world, and here in Canada we are spending 80¢ out of every dollar to defend ourselves against these freedom, peace-loving people. So by the time they got through I was very annoyed and by the time it came to my turn to speak I threw away my notes and took my stand. I said that I happened to go through a war for four years and I had the misfortune of serving on a destroyer that they took out of mothballs and gave us on loan to the Canadian Navy because we hadn't equipped ourselves with the modern war machines. We were lulled into thinking that Hitler didn't want war. Had we been prepared, this war would only have lasted two years, but, unfortunately, there were a few people duped as we have been here at this meeting, who are prepared to sell Canada short and to sell the entire free world short.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Klein: — That is this man that is such a great hero now to the NDP. This man is going to give you the cloak of respectability, this is the man who is going to give the NDP the position where they are going to pose as the champions of free enterprise. You had better do a little renouncing before you do an about face on your policies.

An Hon. Member: — Nonsense.

Mr. Klein: — You check the nonsense if you like.

An Hon. Member: — Was McKenzie King hobnobbing with Tim Buck?

Mr. Klein: — There may be other items of business that you would like to attend to and, therefore, until Monday, Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:26 o'clock p.m.