

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
FIFTH SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
18th Day**

Monday, March 11th, 1963

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

On the Orders of the Day

SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: (Provincial Treasurer) — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I might announce to the house that the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, including the fourth day they were on sale, in round numbers, \$3,461,000, which is behind last year, but I still I think is a fair return on them for the first four days.

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.

Mr. Klein: (Notukeu-Willowbunch) — Mr. Speaker, in getting ready for today's talk, a person usually tries to organize his material to be on the air about the same time, so I'm going to have to ad-lib for about ten minutes or so. You people always catch a person by surprise, so I'll, for the next ten minutes, I'll just further develop some of the things I was saying last Friday. We were having a lot of fun then.

Now, I indicated last Friday that this problem of people leaving rural areas and migrating to the cities is a tragic trend indeed. I failed to mention, however, that this government certainly must have been aware of the move. It was so grave that a royal commission to study agriculture and rural life was set up. It cost them in the neighborhood of a million dollars, to get a full report on it, and they sat idly by and said, Well, there isn't very much we can do about this, it's not in the hands of this provincial government to do anything about the destruction of the family farm.

Now, the reason that it is still a thorny problem became very obvious. In public accounts you have a man in charge of Centre of Community Studies, and we asked him what type

of research he would like to carry on. And he indicated to us that he would like to do another . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would like to draw the member's attention that what takes place in committees cannot be discussed as the committee has not yet reported.

Mr. Klein: — I'm sorry. Anyway it was mentioned that the government would like to undertake another study.

Mr. Danielson:(Arm River) — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That ruling doesn't apply. He is talking about what was done four years ago on the recommendation of that commission. Certainly the member has the right to refer to the history of what took place as long as he doesn't mention what took place in the committee.

Mr. Speaker: — For the hon. members benefit I would like to tell him that the member was referring to what had happened, from statements from the public accounts committee, which is not in order at this time. On previous years, yes, but not what has taken place in this committee.

Mr. Klein: — Anyway, it was suggested that the centre of Community Studies ought to do another research on the migration of people from rural areas into urban centres, and it is probably indicated that in order to do this it might cost us another two or three hundred thousand dollars to find out where these people are going. Why should this be necessary since a complete study has already been made, and what more can we hope for if you undertake a study of that nature?

This Minister of Agriculture very often comes out with press statements, saying that in order to diversify agriculture it is necessary and essential that farmers do seed some of the poorer parts of their farms into grass, so that it will provide some grazing for cattle, and to permit diversified farming. This is a commendable thing to do, but as I indicated there are certain areas in Saskatchewan that have received PFAA benefits, eight out of ten years and if some agreement would have been reached between Ottawa and this government whereby there could have been a policy for purchasing this land, and putting it back to grass, Saskatchewan would not now be suffering from a shortage of pasture as we are now.

Therefore I hope you people will come up with some plans since you are supposed to be the greatest planners on earth, but I haven't seen any new plans forthcoming from this

government for a long time. The only type of plan that ever comes out of this government is a sinister plan, a plan whereby you are going to socialize someone or other, and you are waiting until you find an unsuspecting, unpopular group, and then when you hope the public reaction will not be too great, you pounce on these people and socialize them and say, This is a good policy; this is some of the good work we are doing here in Saskatchewan on behalf of its citizens.

The next alarming thing, of course, is that this budget of \$187 million means that someone is going to have to really get busy to foot this bill.

In Saskatchewan you have turned every effort to trying to take care of all the people; if you are out of work you don't have to worry, you are taken care of. If you can't work, you are taken care of. If you are sick, you are taken care of; if you can't work; if you can't work, you are taken care of; If you are sick, you are taken care of. And so we don't have to feel sorry for anybody but the poor worker that has to foot the bill. Nobody feels sorry for him. He is the one that has to pay the shot and he is hooked every way he turns. The family man that goes down town and has to buy the clothing for his children, and this is no small item, must pay percent on everything he buys to support some of this wonderful business the government is apparently carrying on.

Now, last Friday when I adjourned that debate, I was saying that the greatest tragedy that has befallen this province, in the last few years, is this migration of some 65,000 people from rural areas into urban centres. The overall effect of this migration has been to see the once-thriving communities now boarding up their stores, and you see vacant houses and lots and weeds growing in rural towns that formerly had enjoyed a good substantial way of life. And the merchants, therefore, also suffer and they are finding it more and more difficult to stay in business.

The second major tragedy of this budget, is that you have really relegated agriculture to a secondary role. The story behind this goes back to the time Mr. C.M. Fines stood up in this house and we asked him, Why did you remove the "Wheat Province" from the licence plates, and he said, Well, you know as Minister of Finance, I must not mislead other people, —. of course, Mr. Fines was always very careful not to mislead anybody — and he said We can't mislead the people of this province any longer; Saskatchewan now realizes more income from industry than it does out of its agriculture and, therefore, we have taken off the "Wheat Province" from the licence plates. At the same time they took the "Wheat Province" off, they also took away the funds that were necessary to put agriculture in the stable basis that it ought to be in today.

Now, we know that if Saskatchewan should suffer one or two crop failures, not only would the government suffer, but practically everybody in the city would be unemployed and on the street. Therefore, let's not make the silly mistake of trying to play down the role of agriculture in this province.

Today I want to make one or two urgent pleas on behalf of the areas that I represent. The last two years, we have experienced in our area a real menace and outbreak of cutworms. In 1961 the infestation was extremely serious; we were threatened with the loss of our entire crop. Now, many of the farmers had depleted their cash resources and their credit, to try and control this menace, and it was costing approximately \$2 per acre to control it. After they had expended \$2 per acre to control these cutworms, the entire crop failed due to drought and, therefore, it left many farmers in difficult positions after the year 1961. When the crop year 1962 rolled around, the same infestation broke out, and the farmers were faced with the same difficulty of having to try and scare up enough money to pay \$2 an acre to control these worms. Now, in all fairness, I think that when a menace of this nature reaches disaster proportions the cost of control of this pest ought to be charged to the entire agricultural industry.

I don't see why a few unfortunate farmers should foot the bill to control an infestation, and if they didn't control it the neighboring people would suffer, and the entire wheat industry in Saskatchewan could suffer. So I wired the provincial Minister of Agriculture, as well as the federal Minister of Agriculture, asking them to take on a greater share of the cost of the control of this pest. I received a typical answer from the minister saying, We have duly noted the contents of your wire and we will give it careful and full consideration. It is apparently still receiving careful and full consideration.

Now, at the time when the hoof and mouth disease struck the cattle industry, the federal Department of Agriculture went right to work and accepted the costs of controlling this disease. Therefore a precedent is set, and I urgently request that this government work out some type of program with the federal government to sustain the major cost of controlling this type of infestation that we experience so often.

Now, secondly, in the agriculture area, we appreciate construction of highways. However, when you are constructing highways and looking for right-of-ways through the good agricultural land, I would suggest that the Minister of Highways make every effort to give those people a fair share for the purchase of their land. This hasn't been done in the last year or so. There is some land that is valued very highly. It is as good land as you can find in Saskatchewan, and you are asking the farmers to part with five, six or ten acres of that land for a nominal fee of \$45 per acre. However, when the by-pass

around Regina was built you saw fit to pay as high as \$600 an acre for that land. Yet for the land which is, in one instance, located right on the very edge of a town which has all the modern facilities and could in the future be a centre for an industry in this province, farmers are asked to sell for a very low price. These people who own land surrounding this town have had offers to purchase five, six, and ten acres of land for as high as \$150 an acre, yet the Department of Highways is asking those people to sell them land for \$45 or \$50 an acre, and if they won't sell the only option they have is to go to arbitration. Now, I don't think it is necessary for them to have to do that. I know around our town you can't buy land for \$50 an acre, so why should we try and chisel a poor farmer, once again, for the glory of this government.

I also noted with interest that you are contemplating extending highway no. 58 between Lafleche and Gravelbourg. We are very happy to hear that you are going to undertake construction of this highway. However, I am not too happy when I realize that the proposed route of that highway is going to cut through some of the best land in south-west Saskatchewan, land that might be irrigated in the future. You are proposing to go straight through the middle of the land without regard to the destruction it is going to wreak on some of those farmers and farms that are in that area. Therefore, I would suggest that before you go ahead with that highway you give serious consideration to looking at every possible route between the two centres, and to choose a route that will do the least possible damage to the fewest number of people.

Now, in this debate we have heard the members of the government laughing up their sleeve at some of the things that the former Liberal federal government has done in Canada. Now, I wonder why they do this, because there isn't anybody that runs governments more alike than our friend John Diefenbaker and Tommy Douglas. Both these people have placed politics and the interest of their party ahead of the welfare of either the country or the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — Mr. Prime Minister Diefenbaker, since he took office, decided to go on a real spending spree. He took over the reins of government in Canada, when Canada was in a pretty healthy condition, economically, internationally, and otherwise. Now, just over the week-end I was reading just how much this man did spend, and it indicates in the MacLeans Magazine that the free spenders of the Diefenbaker government won so many decisions that if the Diefenbaker government were to continue to spend money at the average rate of the past six years for one more year, the total expenditures incurred would equal the amount of money spent by Canadian governments between Confederation and 1946, including the cost of two world wars.

This is just a fantastic statement and it is difficult to believe that any man, in the interests of himself and his party, would sacrifice a nation, and destroy this nation just for political gain.

Our friend Tommy Douglas does the same thing. When he decided to harness and mortgage the future of citizens of Saskatchewan just so that he could put a political feather in his cap, and be one of the first to establish a health plan in Canada, he charged to this province a huge debt so that we never know whether we will be able to support it.

And there is only one reason he was so anxious to do this, and that was so that he could go as a federal leader of the NDP. These type of people who put politics ahead of the economy of their country are true politicians. Now, this is where the Liberal party differs basically from the CCF or NDP, or Conservatives. Liberals have the habit of putting the interest of their country ahead of the interests of their party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — And I intend to prove this. These fellows over there have been hee-hawing about what the Liberals visualized back in 1919. They say the Liberals had a health insurance scheme then and never did anything about it. They held up a little handbook and say, This is what the Liberals visualized in 1919. Well, I am not one bit ashamed of the statement that was made in 1919 because when you quote the complete text of what the Hon. William Lyon McKenzie King proposed, we find that this might teach you fellows a lesson, and I hope you learn your lessons well.

What was the complete text of what was proposed back in 1919? This is what McKenzie-King said,

That insofar as may be practical, having regard for Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disability, which would include old age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits, should be instituted by the federal government in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces, and that on matters pertaining to industrial and social legislation, an effort should be made to overcome any questions of jurisdiction between the dominion and the provinces, by effective co-operation between the several governments.

I am not ashamed, as a Liberal, of the vision that that man had in 1919. Which one of these things didn't he do? Are you going to sit there and deny that we do have old-age security pensions? Are you going to deny that we do have blind and disabled persons' allowances; that we have family allowances that he gave us a veterans' charter besides all the rehabilitation he did under the VLA Act; that he is sharing the cost of social aid; that he went into a national housing program; that he is now giving national health grants to Saskatchewan in 1960-61, worth \$2,950,000; that he is giving you hospitalization grants through the vision he had in 1919, which amounts to \$14,453,000, and the taxation agreement between the dominion and the province which again keeps you people well fed here in Saskatchewan.

These are all the things that the Liberal government has done, and you people sit there and scoff and say that there has been a do-nothing Liberal government in office for 22 or 23 years in Ottawa. Now there is more to the story of this health plan than you people would like the people in the province to know. When the dominion provincial conference was called in August, 1945, this is what the federal government of that day proposed. They visualized a plan, and this is what they said an insurance plan should have:

Any plan should have the ultimate aim of providing the highest quality of health care for all Canadians in all parts of Canada. While the scheme should be nation-wide in scope, it should also be adaptable to meet the particular local conditions of the various provinces, and, therefore, should be under provincial jurisdiction. The plan should be flexible enough so that each province in adapting it to local circumstances may make use of provincial health services and facilities already in existence.

Too bad, you fellows didn't take that one out of the book and put it in your plan.

The plan should be capable of being introduced in any province by several stages, if that province so desires, in recognition of the fact that staff, equipment, and administrative experiences may be lacking for carrying out an overall scheme immediately.

This was the proposal made back in 1945, and I imagine you, as a province, were represented there. This is the other proposal that was made to the province. The federal government was to meet three-fifths of this cost by a grant giving aid to the province. The province would meet two-fifths of the cost by a tax of \$12 imposed on each adult in

the population. The per capita cost was estimated at \$21.60 for every man, woman and child in the country, which would cover complete medical and dental services, including specialist services and hospitalization. And if you would have gone ahead with a co-operative attitude at that time and accepted the proposals made, you would today be saving every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan, \$12 per head, or a total of some \$12 million.

But what did you do? You came from that conference and howled and yelled about what the Liberals were doing in Ottawa, and you didn't co-operate one iota in trying to see that this program was carried out.

And it is this attitude of putting politics before the economy of the country that is going to be the scourge of Canadians and you people that put politics ahead of the interests of the people of Saskatchewan is going to be a scourge on the Saskatchewan people for the next several years in the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — This budget is a deceptive budget. It leaves the impression that this government is doing a whole lot of things, which they are not. It is taking credit for everything that the people are paying for and saying it is the government's great masterpiece. It offers no security to the family farmer; it offers no opportunity, in my opinion, for any Saskatchewan people; and it offers nothing in the way of reduced taxes in the future.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will not, and cannot support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: (Athabaska) — I would first of all like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the presentation of his first budget. I was pleased that a man who has served the party for 25 years should get a chance to present a budget while this government is still in power. I wonder whose turn it will be next year?

This juggling of Provincial Treasurers each year is more deadly than the game of Russian roulette. For once you present a budget for this government, increasing the tax burden unnecessarily, as was done this year, your hopes for a future re-election have disappeared and I sincerely hope, that the government opposite do not feel that the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has outlived his usefulness in this house; so are ready to chance him being put out to pasture after the next election.

I would also like to congratulate our own financial critic for the statesman-like approach which he took in his reply to the budget, as well as to congratulate the other members who have participated to date. Now, the members, as well as the public, look forward to the budget debate, during which the cabinet ministers avail themselves of the opportunity to present the work of their departments for the coming year. The stature of a cabinet minister can be determined to a large extent by the mature manner in which he explains the programs of his department.

The lack of maturity was quite evident in the remarks of one of the newer cabinet ministers, when the new Minister of Natural Resources spoke. It would appear in the last shuffling of the cabinet deck that the Premier, in attempting to come up with an ace, found only a joker. It must have been a disappointment for his constituents, as well as the public in general, that this new Minister of Natural Resources thought that maturity was shown by personal attacks on the opposition instead of an outline of the work in his department.

His remarks regarding the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley), the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) and the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) were unparliamentary to say the least, but when he showed utter disrespect for the late Hon. J.G. Gardiner, former Premier of this province, a federal Minister of Agriculture, whose decease was mourned in this very legislature and across the nation just a year ago and whose son was sitting across from him in this house, by making the statement that the late gentleman thought windchargers were sufficient for power because he had so much wind in his own family, even his own colleagues hung their heads in shame and embarrassment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — It is no wonder that a man who shows so little respect for the living and the dead was overlooked for so long as being possible cabinet material. His speech the other day proved his colleague's former appraisal of him.

Now, the people of my constituency are particularly interested in the work of the Department of Natural Resources since the programs of this department affect more of the people in our northern areas than any department of the government. And it was for that reason that they listened with anticipation to hear what the Department of Natural Resources was going to do in the coming year. And as I said, they were sadly disappointed in the minister's remarks the other day. From them it is clear that he is not aware of the problems of our constituency, and of the northern part of this province, so I am going to take some time this afternoon to point out some of the problems that do exist.

Now it appears from the speeches of our minister and from the Provincial Treasurer that the present government is more concerned with the past than it is with the present and the future. And it is this attitude and this approach that has placed Saskatchewan, particularly the northern part, so far behind the northern areas of the other provinces of Canada. They have failed completely in developing our natural and human resources. Rather than hear of how many fish were caught last year and how many trees were planted, people of my constituency are far more concerned with what steps the government is going to take this year, and in the future, to provide more work and wages, to provide better systems of transportation, to provide services that are available to other residents of this province, and to provide a higher standard of living.

The providing of employment is one of the greatest problems in the northern areas today, and unfortunately, the industries that are capable of providing increased employment presently are decreasing in the number of job opportunities that they are providing. Is the government that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, not concerned that the value of forest products has been steadily declining in the last three years, from over \$8 million in 1959 to less than \$7.5 million in 1962? Are they not concerned that the number of employed in forest-based industries have decreased from 3,487 in 1959 to 3,285 in 1962? And what is even more significant, as far as the northern region is concerned, is that in 1959 we had 14 sawmills that employed 328 workers in forest industries, whereas in 1962 we had only eight sawmills and 167 workers employed. But, unfortunately, no mention was made in the budget address, or by any of the subsequent speakers, of any new program designed to increase the production of forest products and to provide more jobs or job opportunities in forest industries.

Oh, I know the minister will say that we are practising conservation. They are too. They are not only conserving the timber to eventually die and rot in the forest, they are also conserving their brain power in coming up with an imaginative program. Now, the Stanford report, which we hear quoted so often by the government opposite, said that the Saskatchewan forests could sustain a cut of 180 million cubic feet per year, the ten year average cut from 1947 to 1956 was only 30 million cubic feet. In 1961-62 it was 21 million and, after adding 80 million cubic feet burned in the worst fire season in history, they are still harvesting only 60 percent of the allowable cut. The year before, in a normal fire season, there was only 25 percent of the cut taken.

The reason why the forest industries are not providing the job opportunities that they are capable of is due to the restrictive policies of this government and their crown corporation, the timber board.

Now, the Stanford report also stated that Saskatchewan forests could maintain at least a half dozen pulp mills of 300 tons a day capacity. How many have we got? We've got the promises, but we haven't any pulp mills. Our neighbouring provinces got them.

Less than a year ago, the Hon. Minister of Industry and Information said that the future of this part of the province lies in the development of its forestry resources. Yet there was nothing in last year's budget and there is nothing in this year's budget to show that the brain trust of this government were any closer to providing more forestry development. In fact, the statistics I have just quoted shows that just the opposite is true.

The minister went on to say that no one ever gave thanks to the fire-fighters of this province. One could say that for a long time, under this government, that is all the fire-fighters got were thanks. And, unfortunately, thanks didn't feed their families. And it wasn't until members from this side of the house condemned and shamed this government into doing so did they increase their wages last year from the mere pittance they were being paid. And even yet they are underpaid, compared to their counterparts in other provinces.

Now I would like to turn for a moment to the northern mineral development. Although the Provincial Treasurer was proud to announce new highs in mineral production for 1962, he neglected to mention that metallic mineral production was down for the fourth consecutive year. And that mineral exploration in the northern part of the province had come almost to a standstill. Gold production had decreased from 87,000 ounces in 1958 to 68,000 ounces in 1962. Silver from 1,300,000 to 826,000. Copper from 77 million pounds in 1958 to 66 million in 1962. And uranium from 5.5 million to less than 4 million pounds in 1962. And the total production had decreased from \$94 million in 1958 to less than \$70 million in 1962. There has been a corresponding drop in the claims registered during the year, from 2,540 in 1958 to 1,301 in 1962. And a week ago, Mr. Speaker, the last diamond drilling company left this province.

Now I want to take this opportunity to commend the government for the decision to build a core storage building in La Ronge, but I want to remind the government that unless something can be done to increase mineral exploration, there will be very few cores to be stored in that new building. Accelerated mining development and the promotion of secondary industries are especially important to the Uranium City area at this time, where the uranium industry at the present time is having many difficulties. The long range outlook for the uranium industry is perhaps more favorable now than it was two or three years ago, but it is most essential that new industries and new exploration be carried out in the meantime to carry them over this difficult immediate future.

Now, I was glad to see that this government is at last prepared to acknowledge a greater role for private enterprise in developing our industrial and natural resources. But I am rather sceptical as to the success in encouraging companies to risk capital in this province. As the Indian says, this government has spoken with a forked tongue for so long that it is difficult to have faith in their promises now. And although the Minister of Highways referred again to a statement of the former Premier, that there was room for public, co-operative and private enterprise in this province, the facts belie that they really believe this. It is certain that private enterprise has not received fair and equal treatment with co-operatives and public enterprise in the northern parts of our province.

In the forestry industry, private enterprise cannot compete with public enterprise as long as the timber board has a monopoly and a stranglehold on the industry. Private enterprise, as I have shown earlier, has left the province. Are public monopolies the kind of fair and equal treatment that this government is boasting about? Retail business outlets, in most cases, are not competing on equal terms with co-operative enterprise. All government departments have been ordered to buy their supplies exclusively from co-operative stores. This means that public money, which include taxes from these very retail businesses, are being used to subsidize their competitors, the co-operatives. Is this fair and equal treatment?

Also, co-op advisors have told fishermen that they must ship their fish on S.G.A. planes or else the filleting plant would not admit the fish. And I suppose that the announcement in this year's budget is another attempt to subsidize S.G.A. when it was announced that to further encourage prospecting and mineral exploration in the north we propose to pay a part of the cost of approved air travel. And I suppose in the case the only approved air travel will be Saskatchewan Government Airways.

I ask again, Mr. Speaker, is this fair and equal treatment conducive to attracting free enterprise to the north?

Finally I would like to say a few words about the commercial fishing industry in northern Saskatchewan. This is an industry in which co-operatives and private enterprise could work well side by side to the mutual benefit of everyone if the government would remove the kiss of death which they have placed on the co-op movement.

In 1961-62, only two-thirds of the commercial fish limit was taken out of the northern lakes, due to the restriction placed on both the local co-ops and private dealers by this government.

Now I haven't time to repeat again the whole sordid story of this government's handling of the fishing industry. I have put that on the records of this house on former occasions.

Enough to say that unless local co-ops are taken out from under government domination and control, both the private and co-operative fishing industry will perish.

I would like to take a few minutes, however, to expose only a few of the tactics that are used by the government officials. At present both private dealers and local co-ops are working under great duress. Lakes are tied up by local co-ops, in many cases just to prevent private fishermen from fishing the lakes. In many cases boats are taken on a certain lake by fishermen who do not fish that particular lake regularly, with the result that fishermen who have fished the lake for many, many years find themselves out of a job. In some cases lakes within a 40 to 60 mile range of a community are tied up by the co-op with only a small percentage of the limit ever being taken out. If private dealers wish to fish, the government says, certainly you may operate outside the 60-mile radius, and with flying costs what they are, this is impossible. Yet this is called fair and equal treatment.

Local co-ops are not free to sell their fish to whom they please. They must sell through the central co-ops so they can get their drop of blood from each pound that is caught and sold.

Last year the fishermen at one lake were unhappy because their co-ops were not operating during freeze-up. The lake had a 40,000 pound limit which they wanted to take. They asked a private dealer if he would buy their fish; he said, yes, as long as your licences are not stamped that your fish must be sold through the co-op. The fishermen replied that their licenses were not stamped. However, before they could get out on the lake, the Department of Natural Resources official called and he took their licences back, stamped them, and said, you will either sell your fish to the co-op fishery or you won't fish at all. Being anxious to fish, and having no choice, they agreed. They received 40 percent less in price and to date only 15,000 of the 40,000 pound limit has been taken.

Co-op officials have stated that any fish sold to private dealers or carried by private dealers will not be admitted at the filleting plant. The central co-op shows little concern for the welfare of the fishermen and it is not giving the leadership and assistance needed.

Last year several fishermen fished a lake for three weeks and took out 1,400 pounds of fish. After paying transportation and other costs, they had \$1.56 to share among them. This was a lake that was uneconomical to fish and the co-op manager should have advised them of this, but they didn't care because they got their commission on the 1,400 pounds of fish. And if there wasn't anything left, that was the fishermen's tough luck.

I could go on telling the means by which the central co-op exploits the fishermen in order to keep themselves on easy street. I didn't mention the second payment cheques, when there are any, are paid during slack seasons so that any amount, no matter how small, will look good to the fishermen. And I didn't mention how the second payment is delivered by chartered planes, costing the fishermen \$600 and \$700 when a few five-cent stamps would do just as well.

Until these co-ops are allowed to operate as true co-ops, subject to the same rules as any other form of private enterprise, and until the Department of Natural Resources realize that they are there to protect the interests of all fishermen, private or co-operative, the fishing industry will not make the contribution which it is capable of making to the economy of northern Saskatchewan.

Now, I was pleased to note that a committee in Manitoba concerned with the economic future recently recommended increased industrial and commercial employment must be provided as part of a program to integrate our Indian people into society. I have suggested for some time that the prime requisite in any program of integration is an economic climate that will provide employment opportunities and higher wage levels that would enable our Indian and Métis friends to improve their own standard of living. I honestly believe that if we can solve the economic problems confronting these people we will have gone a long way in solving the social problem. The integration of the Indian into our school system, vocational training and up-grading classes can all be of great benefit to these people. But education is not an end in itself. All the education in the world has little value if there are no jobs available. Therefore, it is imperative that economic development providing employment opportunities go hand and hand with our educational and social programs. To date this has not been done, with the result that all programs are only partially successful.

The provincial Department of Natural Resources could do much more in their support of vocational training and adult education classes than at present. There is also a need for year-round work and wages program for our Indian and Métis people. It would cost money, but in the long run what you would save in ration and social welfare payments, not to mention the non-monetary rewards of giving these people dignity and initiative, would be well worth the price.

I believe the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he suggested the provinces take over the administration of Indian Affairs, are worthy of serious consideration. Time does not permit me to discuss this question at length, other than to say that dominion and provincial handling of our Indian problems are often lost in red tape and delay. And certainly closer agreement for a change in jurisdiction would be beneficial to all concerned.

I was sorry to notice that the budget did not include mention of greater expenditures to provide roads or air strips for our northern communities that are still isolated for several months of the year during freeze-up and break-up. In fact, the estimates show that \$130,000 less will be spent this year than last year to provide these services. I would like to point out that in one case private enterprise came to the rescue of one community in northern Saskatchewan. In an area where this government said it was too expensive to build an air strip for the year-round benefit of more than 500 residents, a private tourist outfitter came in and built an air strip for his own use which could be used for probably four months of the year, but said that he was pleased that it would be available for 12 months to the people which the provincial government had ignored.

I want to commend the native people of many of these areas on expressing willingness to go out and do hand work in preparing the way for road and air strip development if this government would listen to their pleas and provide the money necessary to complete the job. Extension of roads is still needed in many areas. The Uranium City road is still a dead-end road built by a dead-end government. After spending more than \$2 million, it has been stopped in the middle of nowhere. The only mention that was made of this road occurred in the P.A. by-election when the N.D.P. candidate said that if he was elected the road to Uranium City would be completed. As we all know, he didn't get elected and as a result, the estimates show that this year not one dollar will be spent on the Uranium City road.

I was also disappointed that the Minister of Natural Resources made no mention of the proposed road to Cumberland House, Pelican Narrows, Sandy Bay and Island Falls. Delegations met in January with the minister, requesting an early start on these projects and it was hoped that the department would have seen fit to begin them this year. I am still hoping that this will still be possible although not specifically mentioned in the budget.

Now, I notice that my time is up. I want to say a few words about the tourist industry but I think that can wait for another time.

So, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this government has failed in the past to meet its responsibilities to the residents of the north half of the province, and because it does not appear from this budget that private enterprise and co-operatives will be freed from government oppression and control, and because there isn't anything in this budget to make one believe the government has even the desire, let alone the program, for northern development, I cannot support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: (Pelly) — In rising to take part in this debate, I wish to compliment all previous speakers for the contributions they have made to this debate.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on his election to this house with such a handsome majority. I am certain he will prove himself a decided asset to this assembly. We on this side welcome him as a valued member of the opposition. This decisive victory, following so closely on the medicare crisis of last summer, has, I believe, a special significance. It is possibly the factor responsible for the endeavor of those opposite, and which they are making to try and impress the general public of their change in attitude. They are attempting to indicate great concern for private or free enterprise. This reason is too obvious. I fear their efforts are too little and too late to recoup their apparent loss of public support.

I also wish to welcome to our ranks on this side of the house the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb). Too seldom in public life do we see one, who by virtue of his convictions and principles, has the honesty and courage to place them before personal fortune and position. Such is the hon. member for Milestone. No one can deny that he has made a great sacrifice. His action demands respect and admiration from those of all political persuasions and the public at large.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I believe the hon. member has gained that envious reputation throughout Saskatchewan. I predict his stand will result in overwhelming approval and support from the voters in any area in this province where he chooses to offer himself as a candidate in the next general election.

Mr. Michayluk: (Redberry) — Try Milestone.

Mr. Barrie: — He has no reason to make apologies to anyone, particularly so, Mr. Speaker, to those few who indulge in smear tactics and attempt character assassination directed towards all and sundry who have the courage to refuse to conform to their way of thinking and regimentation. Those persons who belong in this category of personal defilement occupy such a low level of thought and behaviour that they are deemed of little or no importance by men and women of integrity.

The continuous attacks on the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal party by those opposite, Mr. Speaker, indicate very clearly to me that they are concerned, and deeply concerned, about the very real threat he and the Liberal party are to their future role in the political life of this province and this nation.

I must tell them, Mr. Speaker, that we appreciate the valuable publicity they are constantly providing us with by way of their ranting. We would have extreme difficulty in planning and paying for such an advertising campaign.

Turning now to the budget, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the current Provincial Treasurer on his effort in the attempt to sugar-coat and minimize a number of most important items contained in his budget. He placed particular emphasis on the more favorable aspects of our economy and fiscal appropriations.

The Premier, during the most recent cabinet shuffle, made a good choice in the present Provincial Treasurer. No other member in his cabinet is so expert and versatile in performing the twist.

The 1963-64 budget, despite buoyant revenues in the past year, reveals some facts worthy of special mention and consideration. One is the increased gross debt which has increased by approximately \$47 million, up from \$470 million to \$517 million. The increased charges for interest of \$4.5 million, are up to a high of \$27.25 million for the coming year. This high debt-carrying charge will have to be paid for by the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan alone, either by direct taxation or by high rates for the electricity and gas consumed and the telephone services that they will receive.

It is worthy of note in assessing the very large amount which the annual interest bill now amounts to is that it is more than the total estimated outlay required for the hospitalization plan and medical plan services for the coming year. The annual interest bill amounts to over \$3 million more than the combined and estimated expenditures for 1963-64 on agriculture, public works and the development of resources. By comparison with these items, the enormity of what Saskatchewan is paying in interest must be abundantly clear to everyone.

In this budget there is no provision for any relief from the heavy burden being borne by Saskatchewan people at all levels. This is in spite of an apparent and probable surplus of approximately \$20 million for the 1962-63 fiscal year. This surplus proves embarrassing to the government. The Provincial Treasurer states in his budget speech that he expects to announce on March 31 next, or shortly afterwards, a budgetary surplus of approximately \$5 million. However, he has already

buried nearly three times this amount in the 1962-63 supplementary estimates. This is a very unique but unusual and incorrect procedure to say the least. This surplus could have, and should have, resulted in either reduced taxes, reduction of the public debt or reduced borrowings.

I note that in the appropriations for municipal grid roads during the coming year there is negligible change. There is a slight increase in the share of total budgetary expenditures for education which amounts to about one-third of one percent. These last two items — cost of municipal roads and cost of education — are the main reasons for the higher rates of municipal property taxes which is quite a problem in the rural parts of Saskatchewan today. This budget provides little hope that municipal taxes can be kept at the 1962 level in 1963, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of people in the rural areas of the province can look forward to increases in their tax levies on the municipal level, during the coming year.

Despite opinions and arguments to the contrary, agriculture is our basic industry and the backbone of our economy. In my opinion it will continue so in the future. Much more consideration and support is due this sector of our economy than it has received in the past, and is to receive currently. Only a slight increase is provided for in the 1963-64 year in its share of budgetary expenditure. The increase has again been approximately one-third of one percent over 1962.

The government, during 1962, borrowed \$72.5 million and I wish to compliment those responsible for these large borrowings in that the total amount, both principal and interest, is payable in Canadian funds. This is quite a different story to the arrangements made by the former Provincial Treasurer, C.M. Fines, when he negotiated large loans in the United States of America and elsewhere, with interest and principal payable in U.S. funds. On numerous occasions in this assembly, myself and other members of the opposition warned of the danger in having a substantial part of our gross debt payable in other than Canadian funds. Our warnings were ridiculed and ignored. Now, since early in 1962, Saskatchewan has had to pay a penalty for the unwise action of Mr. Fines and the government opposite. With the Canadian dollar at 7.5 percent discount in relation to the American dollar, every dollar of interest and principal payments made on this portion of our gross debt retires \$1.075 of Canadian funds. This premium is costing the people of Saskatchewan a very sizeable sum and will continue to do so as long as we have a devalued dollar. This is one of the penalties that we in Saskatchewan have to pay for having had in office at Ottawa a Diefenbaker government for the last 5 and one-half years. Mismanagement of our national affairs has resulted in a drop in value of our Canadian dollar from a premium position it held for so many years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for the few minutes I have left in this debate, to a matter which is of deep concern to the people in the rural parts of this province. Six and one-half years have elapsed since the 1956 provincial-municipal conference. At that conference larger units of municipal administration were stressed and promoted. The report of the Baker commission on agriculture and rural life was the basis for this promotion. This conference was a one-sided affair, dominated completely by government cabinet ministers. It was convened for one purpose and one purpose only — to indoctrinate those attending with a grandiose centralization scheme for our local governments, namely the counties.

Since 1956 we have had a series of continuing committees, commissions, boards and what have you, all concerned with selling the county system of municipal government. Hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent on these appointed bodies. What have they, and the large expenditure of public funds, produced? Little except suspicion, confusion, doubt and deep concern for the future of local government in the minds of our rural population. None of their problems have been solved but new problems have been created.

Over the past few years the majority of our rural people, particularly elected officials of local governments, have not seen any solution to their problems in the many and varied promotions emanating from these commissions and boards. Despite the intensified campaign conducted on a province-wide basis by members of these commissions and committees, assisted by members of the public service, the same basic problem is, and always has been a financial one. Due to lack of generous sharing by the provincial government with local governments of the high revenues the senior government enjoys, lack of funds to adequately meet the need of municipal services has constantly beset our municipal officials. Land taxes have reached a level in many instances beyond the ability of the taxpayer to pay. Larger units of administration will certainly not solve this problem. It can, however, be solved simply, and could have been solved years ago if the senior government will adopt a different tax-sharing policy with the present constituted local government units. Then, to a very large degree, current difficulties in this field will be overcome. This is the solution desired by a vast majority of rural people. The present County Act and revised boundary proposals are not acceptable in spite of the assurance and promises made by the government and members of the government.

The public lack confidence and are suspicious of the government's intentions in this regard. And no wonder. The record of broken promises and arbitrary action by the government is a lengthy one. Let me refresh the memories of the members present, Mr. Speaker, with just a few of them.

These go back for some years. Some are more recent. I think most people remember the commitment and promise made by T.C. Douglas with regard to education costs, which cost is the cause of the greatest concern in the municipal financing difficulties that our municipal officials are experiencing today, and have for some time. And I quote, from a statement he made some years ago.

The first thing which a CCF government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the provincial government. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the provincial government and it cannot be passed on to any other body.

This is a statement in conjunction with financing education made by the gentleman whom the Minister of Municipal Affairs referred to the other day in his remarks in giving assurances to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

And then I am going to quote another, and this is in connection with some of the taxes that we are paying today and has been increased rather than eliminated. And the same gentleman, the late Premier T.C. Douglas, made a very definite commitment when he said, and I quote:

Education taxes levied on most purchases in Saskatchewan can be eliminated and will be when new sources of revenue are developed.

This statement was made many years ago. Many new sources of revenue have been developed and certainly revenues have increased to a tremendous height, and we have now a five percent sales tax, rather than a two percent sales tax. Was this the keeping of the commitment, or the keeping of a promise?

Then we have another, a third. And this is in connection with a promise he made and a commitment he made some years ago and one that, if it had been carried out or implemented, we wouldn't have had the crisis we had last summer in this province in connection with medicare. And I quote again the statement made by the late Premier, T.C. Douglas:

The CCF stands for free medical services for all. The time has come when we must make all the benefit of science available to all without money and without price.

I leave it to the people of Saskatchewan to judge whether they are receiving medical services without money and without price. Mr. Speaker, I could continue for some time with

a resume of many more such commitments that were made and never fulfilled. Very recently we see the broken promises made with regard to the medical care plan. Again, Mr. Douglas made a commitment which, very shortly after making it, he completely ignored. That was the statement he made in this chamber that any plan adopted will be satisfactory to those receiving the services and to those rendering those services. We know that commitment has never been kept. Our rural people have every reason to be suspicious of and opposed to the proposed municipal boundary changes and all such changes due to what they may imply. The arbitrary powers vested in the Minister of Education with respect to power to declare school unit boundaries, does confirm the suspicion held by many that such powers may eventually be used to bring about re-organization of local government and municipalities. Former Premier Douglas has departed from the scene but those remaining, having concurred in and been parties to these commitments and policies, now share the responsibilities for them and for the record of their actions over the last 19 years.

Our rural people are long-suffering and patient but they will be pushed just so far before they rebel and I want to warn those people sitting on the seats opposite that the end of their patience and submission to interference in local affairs has about arrived.

Mr. Speaker, due to the disregard of sound business principles, prudence and economy in the spending of public funds and the administration of public business, the absence of any provision for relief from the current high taxation and high utility rates in the budget, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: (Saltcoats) — Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate I first wish to join with other members in an expression of regret and sympathy to my colleague, the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) in the recent loss of his brother.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly in this budget debate the path which the government has taken and is continuing to follow towards excessive taxation, increasing debt, waste, extravagance, centralization, bureaucracy, and the destruction of local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer in his 1963 budget address said, and I quote as follows:

Tax revenues in 1962 exceeded the estimates and I wish to place on the record the amounts by which they exceeded the estimates. Education and hospitalization taxes exceeded the 1962 estimates by \$2 million. The gasoline tax exceeded the 1962 estimates by \$2 million. Liquor revenues exceeded the 1962 estimates by \$1 million. The mineral revenues exceeded the 1962 estimates by \$5 million. Revenues from the federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangement exceeded the 1962 estimates by \$2.7 million. Other payments to the province of Saskatchewan from the federal treasury exceeded the 1962 estimates by \$4 million.

Mr. Speaker, according to the statements made by the Provincial Treasurer revenues of 1962 exceeded the estimates for a total of \$16.7 million, an outstanding extravagance and excessive taxation in the province of Saskatchewan.

Increased revenue from excessive taxation led the government to adopt extreme measures to camouflage this massive additional income. No stone was left unturned, no avenue unexplored to spend these extra amounts in order that excessive taxation should not be too noticeable to the general public. We are now presented with supplementary estimates for the fiscal year 1962-63 of \$14,857,385. What a spectacle this presents, Mr. Speaker; the Provincial Treasurer frantically endeavoring to spend the money received from the ill-gotten gains of taxes imposed far in excess of need by placing money in trust accounts, prepaying bills, making grants in advance of need, and etc. What an example of waste and extravagance based on the socialist philosophy of tax and spend, regardless of what hardships are imposed on our people. In the light of these facts and the Provincial Treasurer's figures, quite obviously the recent two percent increase in education and hospitalization tax was unnecessary.

Victimization of our people, particularly of our small border towns, has become rampant because of excessive tax. Mr. Speaker, this government, by their tax-and-spend tactics, has gouged the people without mercy. I went to buy a pair of boots in a boot store last fall, Mr. Speaker, and while I was waiting to be served, here was a man from the country with five children, who wished to buy five pair of boots in order that they could go back to school with new shoes. Well, he had to buy \$50 worth of boots, a little more than that, and the government, with its five percent tax, was going to take more than \$2.50, almost \$3, from that man, and one child left that store without shoes. Is that humanity first? Shame on you, you call yourselves friends of the workers, and you tax the necessities of life unmercifully. Friends of the farmer, and you tax our means of production unmercifully. You pretend to be encouraging industry to establish in our province, and you tax them unmercifully.

Industrial expansion — you are talking about encouraging it. You are doing your very best by excessive methods of taxation to discourage industrial expansion.

And then, Mr. Speaker, on page 26 of the Provincial Treasurer's budget address, he says, and I quote, "The government has decided to appoint a royal commission on taxation." This will be composed of commissioners appointed by the government, paid by the government, and, therefore, the voice of the government. That will be the biggest bucket of whitewash that's ever been produced in this province. Paid for by the people of the province of Saskatchewan to whitewash your own excessive taxation of the people.

I wish to refer now, Mr. Speaker, to the debt structure of the province of Saskatchewan. In the summary of the 1963-64 budget, on page 47, the Saskatchewan provincial debt, as of April 30th, 1944, was shown as being \$218,155,854.12 at that time. The Provincial Treasurer in his budget address last week estimated that our debt would reach in 1963 the sum of \$560 million, an increase, in comparison to 1944, by \$341,844,146. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer, on page 11 of his 1963 budget address said, and I quote "In the calendar year 1962 we borrowed \$72.5 million". Then on page 12 he said, and I quote "at the end of the current year I expect that our gross debt will equal some \$560 million", and on the following page he said, and I quote, "so at April 1, for the first time in many decades the government of Saskatchewan will begin the fiscal year with no net debt". What a play on words. No more or less than office garbolese and socialist gobbledigook.

Interest charges on the estimates of 1963 total \$27,285,990 up over 1962 by \$4,612,280. And then the Provincial Treasurer endeavors to leave the impression that we have no net debt. This debt, built up over 18 years of socialist waste and extravagance, Mr. Speaker can't be whitewashed.

Now I wish to quote an example of socialist extravagance. I have never spoken in this house without drawing attention of the members of the house and the general public to the waste and extravagance that has been perpetrated by this government over 18 years. And here is another example. I wish to quote from the public accounts for the province of Saskatchewan covering the Attorney General's department. Payments made to Mr. N.L. Matthews by the Attorney General's department of the province of Saskatchewan totalled in 1960-61 \$27,548.21; and in 1961-62 they totalled \$15,788.79, for a grand total paid by the Attorney General's department of the province of Saskatchewan, from tax moneys extracted from the people, a total of \$43,327. Now I understand this gentleman is still engaged by the government and it will be interesting to see what his bills amount to next year.

But here are some examples chosen at random of the payments made in the foregoing-mentioned account: Telephone call received — \$12. He was charged for his time while he was receiving the call. Telephone call received — \$6. Telephone call received — \$3. Received a letter and considering same — \$3. I don't know whether he charged for receiving or for considering or whether it was for both, but it was three bucks anyway. Received a telephone call from Dr. Langford, Professor of Geology — \$3. Considering a letter from Mr. Embury to the Attorney General and implications thereof — \$15. Considering a letter and checking material enclosed therein — \$15. Received another letter — another \$15. Items such as this in the account exceed the sum of \$1,400. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is far short of the total he received of \$43,327. Let's take a look and see what some of the rest was paid for.

Despite the fact that this man was supposed to be of outstanding intelligence, and one of the most experienced lawyers in Canada with, no doubt, a wonderful background and education, here are some of the other items shown in the accounts. Engaged in study of law — \$12. Engaged in study of law regarding particulars of indictment — 1.5 hours — \$30 an hour — \$45. Study of law, etc. — \$39. Further study of law — \$69. Now he wasn't the only man that was studying law, for here we have another item: Mr. Sanders engaged in assisting Mr. Matthews in study of law — \$35. I presume he held the book. Study of law in preparation, etc., etc. — \$48. Engaged in the study of law — \$24. Now, somebody else comes into the picture. Our Mrs. Matthews attending the city hall library to study law — \$80. And again, our Mrs. Matthews at Osgoode Hall Law Library engaged in the study of law — \$24. We are really adding to her education as well as his, all at the expense of the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. Conference by our Mrs. Matthews with our Mr. Kennedy regarding New Zealand case which is relevant to our appeal — \$9 — a conference one with the other. Engaged in consideration of law — \$15. And so on, Mr. Speaker, and so forth to a sum well in excess of \$1,000 for studying law.

Mr. Steuart: (Prince Albert) — Did he pass?

Mr. Snedker: — A further item in the accounts as per invoice C14702 under the heading "disbursements" paid to the law society of Saskatchewan re call to the Bar — \$550. We paid his fees for that. A charge to the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. We not only paid for his time when he was studying law, we paid for his time while he was answering telephone calls, reading letters and so forth. We also paid all his travelling expenses to and from Toronto, Saskatoon, Regina, etc. Travelling expenses on this account amounted to in excess of

\$1,600, including the following interesting items. Taxi for Mrs. Matthews to and from home to pack, get suitcases, etc. because of leaving for Regina on short notice — \$4.40.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to educating this man and despite the fact that he was being paid for his services at the rate of \$30 per hour, we also paid for his board and lodging. And here are some of the items picked at random from that part of the account. And when I stop to think of that fellow who couldn't afford boots for the last kid, doesn't it make your blood boil? Here's what we paid. These accounts are just picked at random out of the account that we paid for board and lodging of this man, despite the fact that we are paying him \$30 an hour. I would have thought that at best he could have fed himself. Breakfast and tip — \$1.45. Dinner and tip \$2.85. Dinner and tip — \$3.45 — he was hungrier that time. Dinner and tip — \$3.60 — price is going up. Tip to porter re tickets — \$1. Lunch and tip — \$1.60. Chambermaid — \$1.50. Dinner on the train and tip — \$3.75. Lunch and tip — \$1.30. All paid for by the taxpayers, the people of the province of Saskatchewan who were over-taxed \$16 million just recently. I continue: Chambermaid — \$3. Limousine from Malton airport to home — \$7 — riding in style at the expense of the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. Lunch and tip — \$2.50. Chambermaid, Hotel Saskatchewan — \$1. Dinner at Saskatoon and tip \$2.50. Chambermaid. King George Hotel, Saskatoon — 25¢ — I think we should take that up before the Labor Relations Board. Mr. Speaker, the quarter that he paid that chambermaid wouldn't begin to pay her share of the tax bill she will have to pay to keep this man rolling in style. Hotel rooms in the Saskatchewan Hotel ranging from \$14.50 to \$19 per day, making a grand total for meals and tips, taxis and tips, bellboys and tips, and hotel accounts in excess of \$4,200. All paid for by the people of the province of Saskatchewan through taxation.

The balance of the account, made up mainly of charges for time spent in legal work, including time spent in travelling, at the rate of \$30 per hour, totals in excess of \$26,000.

Thirty dollars per hour, Mr. Speaker, and I have in my hand a copy of a form used by barristers and other persons submitting accounts to the Department of the Attorney General, in which compensation for absence from home is listed as being payable at the rate of \$25 per day. Some difference between the \$25 per day allowed by the Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan to our Saskatchewan lawyers and the \$30 per hour paid in this case to an Ontario barrister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I neither hint, nor do I imply, that there was anything improper or anything of a kick-back nature in these payments. I do say, however, that they are a glaring

example of socialist waste and extravagance. I do not know who advised the Attorney General in this regard but I do consider that if he was advised, he got poor advice.

In addition to the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has recently involved the province of Saskatchewan in a law suit before the Supreme Court of Canada between certain British Columbia labor unions and the province of British Columbia. Now, theoretically, he had the right to do so but I consider that it was most inadvisable, not in the best interests of our people and a further waste of his taxpayers' money. In my opinion, the prime purpose of his intervention was to insure an unceasing flow of union dues for the already over-stepped campaign promises of the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to see in next year's public accounts what this new crusade of the Attorney General will cost the taxpayers of our province.

I've brought these glaring examples of waste to the attention of this house, as just another indication of socialistic extravagance. Much more research of this nature is necessary, in all government departments, and particularly in the government's crown corporations.

What does the government propose to do? I quote from page 27 of the Provincial Treasurer's budget address where he said, and I quote:

Study in the field of public finance, of particular public policies, or of trends in government administration, are greatly needed, and would be likely undertaken by specialists in administration, if monies were available to assist them. To meet this need, hon. members will be asked to vote \$1 million dollars to establish a Saskatchewan Public Administration Foundation. This foundation will be administered by a board of five or seven, including one representative nominated by the University of Saskatchewan, and one by the Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this commission will be no more or less than a glorified patronage-ridden socialist secretariat of propaganda for the purposes of defending or hiding the government's waste, extravagance, centralization, bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, presuming that the commission will be administered by a seven-member board, five of them appointed by the government and two others from non-government bodies, presumably for the purpose of window-dressing, the commission would be completely government controlled, five to two. This is going to be just another whitewash job, paid for by our people who are already groaning under the socialist whiplash of excessive taxation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — I believe the people who should carry out investigations are the persons the people elected for that very purpose, namely the opposition members. I can think of some lines of investigation that I would like to follow in this regard. However, extensive research of this nature demands secretarial assistance to a much greater extent than presently available in order to secure information and to properly tabulate and correlate the information received.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to discussion of the Department of Highways. Estimates for capital construction in the year 1961 were \$15,901,280. As compared to 1961, the 1962 estimates were down by \$2,651,281; as compared to 1961, the 1963 estimates were down by \$2,287,311. As compared to 1961, the 1964 estimates were also down by \$2,195,871. Making a total decrease, Mr. Speaker, for the three year period of \$7,134,463. For three years now, Mr. Speaker, this most important department has been starved for money by the socialistic dictatorship.

This wholesale reduction of necessary expenditures on highway construction is impeding the industrial development of our province, increasing the transportation costs of our agricultural and mining wealth-producing areas, and is placing a time bomb of delayed construction demands in the economy of our province. These statements I have just made are borne out in the 1962 report of the Department of Highways.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the annual report of the Department of Highways, 1962, report of the Deputy Minister on page 7, as follows:

Economic conditions have dictated a relatively lesser emphasis on provincial highway development in recent years. This pause, or coasting, in the face of the growing use of the roads, continued demands in extension and improvements, and the transition in commercial transportation has been possible largely because of dry weather conditions. We are missing opportunities for reductions in transportation costs and we are risking severe difficulties with some of our aging facilities while this shortage of investment capital persists.

And where has the investment capital gone to, Mr. Speaker? Into highflown, highfaluting socialist plans, waste, and extravagance. Mr. Speaker, I quote now from the annual report of the Department of Highways, construction branch, 1962, page 27:

The attitude of the program was influenced to some degree by the construction of multi-lane facilities, and the general decrease in funds allocated to highway construction.

And also from the construction branch the following:

The mileage of work completed reflects the decrease in funds available and the effect of the four-lane developments.

I think I indicated to the house last session what the effects of the four-lane development would be. The rest of the province would be starved for highways, while Regina, this socialist bee-hive, was treated to four-lane highways costing \$166,000 per mile.

I wish to quote from the Leader Post, March 28th, 1961, which I was quoted as saying as follows:

J.E. Snedker said the rural areas of Saskatchewan are becoming more dependent on truck transportation as railroads are closing their branch lines. The CPR in the next 20 years will seek to close 1,129 miles of railroad and the CNR will seek to close 1,237 miles. This would affect 390 towns.

At both the sessions of 1961 and 1962 I warned the government of the impending calamity of railroad abandonment, and urged increased emphasis on construction and maintenance of highways, particularly in outlying areas, in order that our smaller communities should not be completely abandoned to their fate if the railroads left.

My warnings went unheeded, new highways were not built, nor old ones adequately maintained. The Department of Highway estimates were reduced, while money was lavished and squandered on anything else which appeared to have propaganda value. We are now faced by a probable massive railroad line abandonment in our province. The inevitable day of reckoning in highway construction and maintenance, if communities affected are to be served, is almost upon us. Now what is the government doing?

Well, the government is frantically trying to pass resolutions asking for aid from Ottawa. If any assistance can be secured from that quarter, I am all for it. Our first trans-Canada No. 1 was built on a federal-provincial cost-sharing basis, and I certainly think it is high time a second trans-Canada was inaugurated on a financial basis more generous to our province.

A second trans-Canada is of urgent necessity, in order to save our wealth producing agricultural, mining areas, and to encourage further industrial development. At every federal election, socialist supporters, knowing that they could never form a government in Ottawa, have appealed to the public for votes on the grounds that they could do great things for us if they only had the balance of power. Well, for nine months, Mr. Speaker, they have had the balance of power, and despite the fact that the present Prime Minister promised a second trans-Canada highway in the election campaigns of 1957, and again in 1958, the socialists failed dismally to secure the implementation of his commitment to western Canada, or any other evidence of tangible assistance in regard to highways. I hope that the future will produce better results. In the meantime I urge the government to cease squandering money on propaganda frills, unnecessary projects of a grandiose prestige nature, and use the money so saved, for the very essential construction and maintenance of our vitally-important highway system.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the discussion of the maintenance estimates of the Department of Highways. Maintenance estimates in 1961 were \$7,193,720. Maintenance estimates were down in 1962 as compared to 1961 by \$889,090. Again, in 1963 maintenance estimates were down as compared to 1961 by \$1,240,720, and again in 1964 the maintenance estimates were down as compared to 1961 by \$551,020, making a total decrease for the three year period of \$2,680,830. Decreased expenditures on highways maintenance is being reflected in massive deterioration, borne out by reports of highway officials.

Mr. Speaker, I quote now, in part, from the annual report of the Department of Highways, maintenance branch, 1962, page 60 and I quote as follows:

Budget requirements curtailed the major works program to some extent as regards regravelling, resurfacing and other projects involving larger expenditures. The schedule referred to indicates the reduction in mileage of such improvements when compared to last year. The 1961 summer season was generally dry, and no major problems were encountered as a result of the curtailment of a major works program of the branch.

However, traffic problems and the demand for a high standard of maintenance are increasing. If further budget cuts and resulting amendments to planned departmental expenditures become necessary again, I believe the department will have to consider seriously the possible ultimate effect on the standard of maintenance it is possible to provide.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, reduced expenditures on our highways are definitely going to lead to worse conditions, the only thing that bailed the government out over the last four years has been the fact that those years have been dry.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, we should adequately maintain that which we already have. With our vast spaces the economic welfare of our province is completely dependent upon adequate transportation facilities and an extended network of good highways is of vital importance both to agriculture and to industry. If the government is really sincere in their professed desire to attract new industries to our province, then I suggest that no better method could be found than the extension and improvement of our highway system. I draw the attention of all members of this house to the fact that it is performance that counts, not pamphlets.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to quote from the 1962 annual report of Department of Highways, by the administrative services branch, and I quote as follows:

During this past year, some branches of the department were required to make a number of moves to satisfy the space requirements of the government. This branch was located in the building situated at Winnipeg Street and 8th Avenue, in which a construction branch division office was also situated.

At approximately the same time it was also found that other construction branch division offices located in the former Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan building would have to move.

To facilitate these moves, space was provided on the top floor of the government building located at Rose Street & 7th Avenue, and the bridge branch and the operations branch moved from the Fur Marketing building to this building.

The two construction branch division offices then moved into this space, which also accommodated some crews of the surveys branch.

The co-operation of the Department of Public Works in making this rented space as comfortable as possible tended to avert the possibility of an unpleasant staff morale problem. However, for the bridge branch and the operations branch, this proved to be an extremely temporary move, because in the spring of 1962 they again had to vacate to accommodate the Provincial Library, which in turn was being moved to provide for a computer center.

Fortunately, very good rented space was obtained in the International Business Machines building at 2143 Albert Street. In spite of these moves, the space occupied by the department still presents the often repeated problems of over-crowding and dispersion.

The same number of major branches, namely the materials and research branch, bridge branch, operations branch and our warehouse advance office, are situated in various locations throughout the city.

This, Mr. Speaker, this is an example of socialist planning. What a spectacle of confusion: the government playing musical chairs with the branches of one of its most important departments while the pampered and petted propagandists of socialism and the planned economy are housed in glorified prestige buildings complete with every modern frill and facility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I have always considered that the Department of Highways as one of the government's better departments, free of bureaucracy and less tainted by patronage, and I was happy to note that the overall estimates for the department were slightly higher for this year than for last, but I also noted that almost ten percent of the increase, or \$86,556, has been earmarked for "Administration" and that the number of people engaged in administration is to be increased by nine.

I hope that this department is not taking the road toward excess arm chair superintendents and office holders already followed by other departments. It is the men in overalls, the engineers, surveyors and construction workers who actually build our highways and it's the fellows with grease on their hands, not the swivel chair brigade, who maintain them.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let an opportunity such as this pass without drawing the attention of the government and to all members of this house the necessity for adequate provisions being made for grants, for snow removal from our country roads in the winter time. The trend toward centralization of educational facilities demands this. We now have improved school transportation by means of buses, and our people have improved the roads in the country at the expense of our municipalities. Snow removal has now become imperative if our buses are to run in winter. We have been very fortunate this winter for we have had a winter with very little snow, but if we got into one of the real old timers, of the kind which I and other members of this house remember, the problem then would be quite different. Municipal people in my area are now moving towards snow removal, and I consider that government grants to rural municipalities for purposes of winter snow removal are justified; justified by the taxes which are paid on gasoline burnt in vehicles in the winter time; justified by the fact that these roads which stay clear and open are used by all provincial traffic, not just local traffic; and justified in the interests of better education for our children.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the Department of Municipal Affairs, in which department we have, through the years, wasted thousands and thousands of dollars of the public's money. We have set up commissions and committees to force municipal re-organization on a reluctant and embattled public, trying to save their self-government. Commissions drew coterminous boundaries, then they redrew the boundaries, then they defined the boundaries, then they redefined the boundaries. This cost the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan thousands and thousands of dollars, has led to ill-feeling and distrust, and has created confusion confounded.

Most of these commissions were composed of city slickers with no actual relationship to farm or country conditions. I would suggest that the government might have well sought the advice of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities before proceeding with their headlong destruction of our local self-government.

Now, what of the present strategy of socialist bureaucracy. Well, the controversy started now; they got pretty well rocked back on their heels a couple of falls ago, when all the people of the province of Saskatchewan held straw votes and decided that they weren't going to have anything to do with this thing unless they at least got a vote on it.

I want to pay tribute to all the municipal men, the reeves, councillors, members of the hospital boards, the school trustees and the general public of the province of Saskatchewan who took a hand and played their part in the battle to maintain our freedom and our right to government by our own elected representatives at the lower level.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — Now there has been a lull in the battle that the government has been waging on our local self-government. Why? Well, possibly to soften up the public, and to lull the public into a sense of false security. And also to give the socialist bureaucrats, and the NDP political organizers an opportunity to try and get more NDP supporters slipped into key position son rural municipality councils and in rural municipality offices. I am firmly convinced in my own mind that the government has never ceased in their desire to destroy local self-government, and I think we are going to see action in this regard next week, because I am firmly convinced that the socialist agitators and propagandists of the government are going to endeavor to stage a blitzkrieg on the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities convention next week in an all-out endeavor to get the control of it into their sticky socialistic fingers, in order that they may use it for their own nefarious and miserable ends for the destruction of our local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Department of Municipal Affairs has been actually under the control of its minister for many years. Rather, it has in the past been influenced and dominated by the radical socialist elements in the government administration who seek to destroy all local self-government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — I believe that the present minister may be trying to regain control but to really do so he will have to change his colleagues' philosophy of socialist centralization.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the discussion of the Department of Social Welfare. The February 9th, 1963 edition of the Leader Post, reported the following from a meeting of municipal men with the Minister of Social Welfare at Tisdale and I quote:

Some of the delegates of the meeting expressed the viewpoint that rural municipal councillors could better decide who needed social aid in their own divisions and that social aid could be administered better on such a basis.

The Hon. Mr. A.M. Nicholson is quoted as saying in reply:

He doubted that such would be the case, (this is a direct quotation of what he said) and particularly in a year when he was seeking re-election a councillor might be influenced.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Social Welfare made that statement he insulted every elected official of local government in our province and every enfranchised citizen who could have voted at a local election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — This is a monstrous statement for a responsible minister of the crown to make. He should retract and most humbly apologize here and now to all the people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Social Welfare judging our municipal men by himself? Is he using the Department of Social Welfare as a gigantic slush fund? I hate to believe that, but I suggest that he has so implied.

In his budget speech last week the Provincial Treasurer said that we would be asked to vote the sum of \$1 million for the establishment of a veterinary college in Saskatoon. However, he hedged the grant with certain conditions which he said would have to be fulfilled before the matter could be proceeded with, and I quote directly from his statement — the Provincial Treasurer said:

First, the University Senate and Board of Governors would have to decide that they want a veterinary college in the university.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as reported in the Leader Post on March 4, 1963, Mr. McEown, Vice-President of the university in Saskatoon, said:

Statements favoring establishing a veterinary college in western Canada have been issued favorably by both the Senate and Board of Governors of the university.

Also, the chairman of the Board of Governors of the university was recorded as saying that he favored the establishment of a veterinary college in the university of Saskatoon.

So, apparently we have cleared the first hurdle. The second stipulation that the Provincial Treasurer made was — and I quote:

Second, the other western universities should agree that Saskatchewan is the appropriate place for the college, and the participating governments should agree to contribute their fair share towards its operations.

And the third stipulation that the Provincial Treasurer made was as follows, and I quote:

Third, the government of Canada will be expected to confirm its offer to contribute towards the cost of constructing and operating the college.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the veterinary college, it was reported in the Western Producer on March 6th, 1963, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. I.C. Nollet, said, and I quote as follows:

We hope it will come to Saskatchewan. It is hardly likely Alberta will give up such a federally-aided project without some kind of a fight.

From the foregoing statement it would appear that federal aid is assured — the Minister of Agriculture said so — thus fulfilling another of the Provincial Treasurer's conditions.

As to the Minister of Agriculture's statement that Alberta would hardly give up the project without a fight, this is a battle the Minister of Agriculture could have avoided and won before it started had he made a definite statement in favor of Saskatoon immediately after the Premier of Alberta had intimated for the second time that Alberta didn't want a veterinary college in their province. The Minister of Agriculture now has to fight a battle that could have been avoided. I sincerely hope that the Premier will show more interest and render more assistance to his minister than he has done heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, what of the three socialist members from our university city, the city of Saskatoon? What have they said or done to support the establishment of a faculty of veterinary science on our university campus? One would suppose that the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum), a school teacher and former farm housewife, would surely be acquainted with some of the problems of livestock producers and would have given this project her wholehearted support. Unfortunately I have found no indication of any public endeavour or statement by her to secure for our university city this valuable asset. The second member for Saskatoon, the Minister for Social Welfare, has likewise displayed disinterest. Too busy playing politics by smearing and victimizing our reeves and our councillors. Mr. Speaker, so far as the third member for

the city of Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) is concerned,, I do not, nor could one hardly expect any action from the world's one and only example of perambulating rigor mortis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — I sincerely hope that the three government members from Saskatoon will display much more enthusiasm than heretofore in the interests of our great university and our second city, and also in the interests of all the livestock producers of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, one would naturally suppose that the Minister of Education, under whose aegis the University of Saskatchewan falls, would have given the project his whole hearted support, but so far he has failed to make any definite statement. This is hardly surprising when one realizes his inability to understand his own department. For the Minister of Education is the man who admitted that he had never read the report of his own department . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snedker: — . . . despite the fact that on the front page, on the flyleaf of the report of the Department of Education, the following appears:

To His Honour
The Honourable Frank Lindsay Bastedo
Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan,

May it please your Honour

The undersigned has the honour to submit the annual report of the Department of Education for the year 1961-62.

Respectfully submitted,
O.A. Turnbull,
Minister of Education

Mr. Turnbull: (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The hon. member is giving misinformation. This information claimed that I stated that I had not read the report. This is entirely incorrect. What I referred to was the particular table.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! We cannot debate it.

Mr. Turnbull: — No, it is misinformation and I wish to reply with the correct information.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! An allegation of fact is not a point of privilege. That is a point of debate.

Mr. Turnbull: — Mr. Speaker. How then do I correct this information that this gentleman is giving out?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — Read your report, read your report.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order as it seems to me that the hon. member is discussing matters which took place in a committee of this house at this session and I think, if I understand the rules properly, these are not admissible matters for debate.

Mr. Speaker: — If the matter has taken place in a committee at this session, it is not available for debate at this session.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — For my information, how do I reply to and correct this gentleman?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Snedker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I will continue from the point of interruption. Not only did the Minister of Education not understand his own department but neither did he know who the members of the board that direct the Saskatchewan Research Council were, despite the fact that when he opened the book and flipped over the pages his own name is on the top of the list as the chairman of the board. And he didn't know who else was on the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Research Council. He didn't know that Mr. David Cass-Beggs, the manager of the power corporation was there apparently — the manager of the power corporation was there. He didn't even know that President W.T. Spinks, president of the university was on the board.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — This gentleman is still referring to the matter that appeared in the committee and I gave an explanation at this time. It is still out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If the hon. member is referring to what took place in committee he must refrain from that because that cannot be discussed at this time.

Mr. Snedker: — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I shall continue.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to quote from the Leader Post in their issue of August 25, 1962, and I quote:

Dr. S.W. Steinson, for the past year principal of the Saskatchewan Teachers' College in Saskatoon, said that members of the Regina Teachers' College staff, Claude Ellis and Mrs. Maynard Wollard, had been appointed without reference to him. Accused of political patronage were Premier W.S. Lloyd and Minister of Education O.A. Turnbull. Linked with the patronage accusation was the charge that the provincial government was guilty of pushing people around. This kind of business should not be tolerated in education, Dr. Steinson commented.

Dr. Steinson is further reported as saying, and I quote:

Now I feel I must speak up. Recently the attitude of the CCF government has been changing. The climate is different. It is obvious that they are closing ranks. Now you are either for or against them. As a civil servant you dare not object because if you are fired you lose your superannuation benefits and so your future security is jeopardized. The Minister of Education appears very adept at by-passing the civil service commission by demanding orders-in-council verifying his own requests for personnel, Dr. Steinson said.

As a result of these conditions, Dr. Steinson resigned and left our province to take a position with the University of British Columbia and the people of the province of Saskatchewan lost one of North America's most outstanding educators.

And there he sits, Mr. Speaker, the man responsible for this, the Minister of Education, trying to look innocent. Mr. Speaker, if someone would just hand him a carrot he would look for all the world like an overgrown Bugs Bunny caught redhanded in the farmer's cabbage patch.

And the opportunities that he has missed — the opportunities here in the province of Saskatchewan to serve our agriculture, to serve our mining areas. To properly educate our young people, in order that they may take their rightful place in this modern world, we are in crying need of more technical-vocational training institutions. The federal government, under the federal-provincial technical-vocational

agreements was willing to give the province of Saskatchewan 75 percent of the capital cost of construction and a 50 percent on the cost of maintenance of such institutions. This offer expires on April 1 next. One of the greatest needs in the field of education is technical-vocational training. I thought the Minister of Education would have made full use of these agreements but he is evidently more concerned with party patronage and playing politics than with the education of our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to quote from an article appearing in the press dated April 25, 1962, and I quote:

Our education system seems very vague on the subject of democracy. When I went to school we had history, geography and civics. I was fascinated by the history of government and consequently politics from Grade 6 on. My children struggled in frustration with social studies and did not discover history as such until they attended university. I would like to see a subject which could be called 'citizenship'. I'd start with awareness of our surroundings, encouraging tidiness and the desire to improve the physical environment. The course would teach courtesy to others on streets and highways, including traffic rules and regulations. Then to community endeavors. Next would come local government, provincial government, federal government, the United Nations, etc. with more and more in high school the pupils would have debates and discussions so that they would begin to form their own opinions on matters of political significance, instead of at the university level which many never reach.

That quotation is of April 25, and the article written in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth by a Jen Freed from Dubuc. Again, Mr. Speaker, what a damning indictment this is of 18 years of socialist administration in the Department of Education.

Education for our young people to take their rightful places and play their part in a self-governing nation has been woefully, and I believe, deliberately neglected by a socialist government who have endeavored by every means at their disposal to destroy our local self-government.

I wish to quote from part of a speech delivered by Mr. Stefan Hansen at Conference Week for Farmers and Homemakers at the University of Manitoba, March 1960, as reported in the Western Producer of Thursday, March 9, 1961.

Furthermore (he said) as Khrushchev has just begun to fear, too many well-educated citizens can be a real bother to a slave state. This fear impelled him to a decree a few months ago that only those high school graduates who are approved by the Young Communist League will be permitted to proceed to university.

Now, I hope that condition never arises in this country.

I wish now, briefly, Mr. Speaker, to touch on Medical Care Insurance Act. I would be unfaithful to the people of my constituency and of this province, and untrue to the principles and convictions in regard to self-government which I hold most dear if I did not refer to this act.

As hon. members will recall, in the special session of the legislature in which Bill No. 1, The Medical Care Insurance Act was presented, we on this side of the house unanimously supported the principle of complete, comprehensive medical care insurance for our province. It was, however, on the question of implementation and administration that our views diverged from those of the government. The government's plan, as embodied in their legislation, called for administration by a government-appointed commission. We believe that this implied regimentation of both people and profession by a patronage-riddled centralized bureaucracy and proposed the alternative of regional administration of the plan by boards of administration elected by the people in the respective regions.

Mr. Speaker, the government did not accept our proposals. I believed them correct at the time and I am more than ever convinced of their correctness in the light of what has happened since. I am firmly convinced that had medical care insurance for our province been enacted with regional, as opposed to centralized, administration, the ill-feeling and confusion of last summer could have been avoided.

I base this assumption on the solid fact that the Swift Current Health Region which has covered 53,000 people, or one-eighteenth of the population of our province, had for 15 years successfully given complete medical coverage to all its people, including dental care to all children within the region up to the age of 12 years. It was enthusiastically endorsed by the people of Swift Current and by the all the medical practitioners in that area. They had proved it successful but the government sought to destroy it and bring the region within the orbit of its control. I wish to pay tribute to the board of the Swift Current Health Region, to all the people of the region and the medical practitioners therein for the great and successful battle which they have so recently waged against the government in order to retain the autonomy of their

region and control of their own affairs. Their past success in this field has been amply demonstrated. I am sure their future success will be equally outstanding provided they manage to successfully hold the socialist bureaucrats of the government at bay.

I wish to quote from the Leader Post of November 10, 1962. Mr. Walter Erb, former Minister of Health, was reported as saying:

He suggested the Swift Current Health Region medical plan could be used as a model for development of medical care service in the other 11 health regions. Such a plan could be free from the odium of bureaucracy of a centralized plan, and its acceptability to doctors and to the public alike had been demonstrated.

With those words of my colleague I most heartily agree. I firmly believe that regional administration would lend to better health care for our people and, more important still, would lead to an extension of the democratic principle of self-government at the local level.

Hon. Mr. Wood: — Could I ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Snedker: — No. Mr. Speaker, we live in a democracy. That is, we have evolved our civilization to the point in history where we are governed by our own elected representatives. The alternative to this is one and one only — dictatorship, under which type of government the majority of ordinary people do as they are told to do from on high, and if they do not immediately obey, or if they raise so much as a whimper in protest, they are sent to the salt mines or shot. A dictatorship, to continue, can tolerate no opposition or criticism, hence freedom of speech and freedom of the press must be abolished. Which do we want? The choice is ours. Dictatorship is simple. Do as your told, silently. But self-government imposes the obligation of its own success on us, the governed, for we are governed by our own hands.

Mr. Speaker, this is the age of the astronaut and today we stand on the threshold of inter-planetary communication. It is a great age, and the issue before the world is the greatest issue mankind has ever faced. The issue is one and one alone. Shall man be slave or free? Mr. Speaker, the ranks of the socialists are snickering. Shall we be governed by ourselves through our own elected representatives or shall we be ruled by a dictatorship, and if the dictators of old

were terrible, how much more frightful are the dictators of today clutching atomic weapons within their hairy paws. This is the issue; and all others pale into insignificance beside it. For its preservation no sacrifice is too great, for if we lose it no sacrifice will be great enough to regain it.

Self-government, be it provincial, federal or world government, must be based on the most extensive and comprehensive local self-government which gives education, experience, understanding and responsibility to governors and governed alike. The would-be dictators who win the battle for the destruction of local self-government and destroy it in any country have only a few minor skirmishes left to destroy all self-government be it provincial or federal and so secure their dictatorship. But if local self-government be not abolished it will perpetually haunt and eventually destroy the most mighty and powerful of despots. Only the extension of local self-government guarantees the protection and preservation of self-government at all levels. The destruction of local self-government greases the already slippery path to dictatorship.

A centralized government and a proliferating bureaucracy inevitably seeks the destruction of self-government in order to enhance their own power, for bureaucrats are the arch foes of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to preserve our heritage of freedom, this government must be swept from office by the people or most assuredly it will eventually and inevitably destroy the people's right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, because I do not believe that the government is taking adequate steps to prevent waste, extravagance and sky-rocketing debt, and because of the government's determined continuation in the direction of bureaucracy and government centralization, and because I see no indication of the administration ceasing its vendetta against local self-government, I shall not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Strum: (Saskatoon City) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I wish to state at the outset what a source of pride and satisfaction such a budget is to members on this side of the house.

The Provincial Treasurer, while new in this portfolio, is a veteran of many encounters and many budget hassles. In this, his first budget, he has earned his spurs as Provincial Treasurer. To those of us who have valued his wise counsel over the years, this budget marks a particular kind of milestone.

We in this province enjoy the enviable position of leading the way in Canada in many social advances. But, as in our private spending, all new advantages carry a price tag. In provincial affairs, this means taxes. But of all the taxes, federal and provincial, none gives us back such good value as those levied for health services.

By way of a reminder, let us go back and examine the way taxes apply to health insurance costs. As the Premier pointed out when introducing the Medical Care Insurance Act, three provinces now have a five percent sales tax, but only one province has both hospital and medical insurance. How is the tax on personal income distributed? In Saskatchewan 50,000 families have incomes of \$4,500 or less. These families will pay income tax increases of from \$1 to \$12, depending on the number of dependents. For a family of four living on less than a \$3,000 income, the income tax increase will be less than \$1. A family of four paying a \$24 premium will pay an average of \$6 a piece.

Last Friday when I was having my hair done, the girl who did my hair told me that she is expecting her second child and what a privilege it is to pay \$24 to cover the expenses of the confinement. She tells me that her little boy has recently had a long illness that would have crippled her husband for years. She is forced to work to supplement her husband's income. This insurance is the best thing that this province has ever done in any field, because this has delivered the people of the province from the crippling expenses of medical care that can keep you in debt for years and years.

The other day I had the filling station operator fill my car with gas. And he told me that a year ago last fall he and his wife both thought they were in good health, but before spring this hospital insurance plan had paid over \$2,100 for him and his wife for illness that they could not have afforded, could never have paid, without crippling themselves for years and years. And so I say this is the most advanced thing that we have ever done.

In 1959 there were 193,000 taxpayers; over half of these reported incomes of less than \$2,500. These families are below the taxable limit and are not affected by the one percent increase in income tax. Of monies from the hospital and education tax, which now stands at five percent, the two percent increase is shared by health and education. The change from three to five percent works out as follows. One-half of the one percent to education, plus the former two percent education tax, equals two and one-half percent. One and one-half percent to health plus the former one percent of the three percent tax, now balances the cost and each share equally in the five percent tax. And this I think is a very nice judgement of the value of health and education, to think that we share equally in this five sales tax. This gives the yield of \$10.5 million for health and \$3.5 million extra for education.

The one percent increase in corporation tax profits brings the corporation tax rate up to ten percent. Ontario and Quebec are provinces which retain, under our present tax rental agreements, the right to levy their own taxes and they presently levy these at 11 and 12 percent respectively, so that Saskatchewan is still one or two percent lower, depending on which province you compare us to.

The Premier has earned the respect and loyalty, not only of his own party, but that of thinking people in all parties, for working out such a just and equitable approach to financing the cost of health insurance. His long experience in public life and government finance prepared him for the gruelling experience of the last two years. To work out an objective in terms of program and finance, and then to defend that goal, in spite of organized sabotage, not only of just legislation, but of our democratic institutions, and indeed of parliamentary government itself, was a test that our Premier passed with the highest honors.

The pattern of resistance came as no shock to anyone who reads contemporary history on this continent. The causes that produce such legislation in any country are the same. In our province, with its long history of self-help, it followed naturally that we would extend the municipal doctor schemes and union hospitals to cover regional bases and finally we would make the unit province wide. This we have done. This budget carries out the purpose and intent of our philosophy — that is that our economic arrangements shall be a sound base for our forward-looking humanitarian programs, and that for almost 20 years our government has been a pacemaker, if not a peacemaker, for all Canada.

Now I want specially to mention the borrowings for the power corporation. Not that they need to be defended, but to clear up some of the misrepresentations persisted in, year after year, by people who I am sure must know better.

I wish to make a distinction here between capital borrowed for expansion and the creation of new sources of wealth, as are the borrowings of the power corporation, and that of inflowing capital in the form of foreign investment and ownership, which carries no control and may indeed even prevent growth in our province.

Mr. Lesage was not Premier of Quebec for very long before he saw this very clearly. Last fall he fought and won an election on the issue of public ownership of power. What were his arguments in favor of public ownership, rather than private ownership? Well, they are all set out in a very readable book that I think should be required reading in this house called "The Nationalization of Electric Power" by Paul Sauriol. The author points out that the policy of investors

is to take out raw materials, to be processed in other countries, mainly the U.S., and then sell them back to us, the Canadians, as finished goods. And this is happening in a wholesale manner in the Ungava region where the iron ore of Canada is taken out, down the St. Lawrence Seaway which Canadian money built, and processed in the States, and sold back to us in steel products to our disadvantage. I quote from page 18 of this book, and I hope you will all read it:

It so happens that our rich and powerful neighbors have the necessary capital and a huge industrial market which requires our raw materials. This is why American entrepreneurs behave as though Canada were a backward country. Our stage of political and social evolution, and our standard of living, encourage large American companies to open branches in Canada. Their main aim, however, is to obtain raw materials and their investments provide them with a strong hold on our natural wealth. In return for mortgaging our heritage we buy their manufactured goods, importing infinitely more than we export, with the result that we are living well beyond our means. This equilibrium, already precarious, now appears threatened by our uneven balance of payments and by the forming of the European Common Market. The austerity instituted after June 18 indicates that times are changing.

He points out that electricity is a means to an end, and the end being the good of his own province.

Under "Electricity's Preponderant Role" he develops this argument:

In Quebec, as elsewhere in Canada, industry has made gigantic strides forward in the last 20 years, and especially since the end of the war. These advances provide a dazzling testimonial to the industrial future of the province. Our progress is due in part to our immense forest and mineral riches, but even more to our hydro-electric potential which is vast enough to suggest even greater future development. Had we only our other natural resources, minus our water power, we would still be wealthy but we would be condemned to an even longer period as an underdeveloped country where foreign capital would continue to produce and export our raw materials.

On page 21 of this book the objections to continuing under private ownership of power are summarized.

An examination of the privately-owned sector of this industry demonstrates that restricting private enterprise to its present share will not suffice: for electric power to play its fundamental part in the province's economic expansion, especially in achieving industrial decentralization, and developing hitherto unexploited regions, general planning, coordination of services, and equalization of rates are necessary. This is the only way effectively and fairly to correct the discrimination as to quality and cost of service from which some regions suffer. It is the only way to correct the intolerable waste arising from lack of coordination in electricity distribution, and to remedy other anomalies which are unprofitable to the French Canadian community, such as the payment of federal taxes on the corporate income of a monopoly founded on one of our natural resources.

As we all know a provincially-owned corporation pays no corporation tax to the federal government and is able to effect that saving.

Mr. Lesage is also viewed with a friendly eye, even from the investors in New York who have money to lend, and as are our Premier and our Provincial Treasurer, and for the same reason. Small companies find it hard or impossible to borrow for utilities. But under public ownership, with the province's resources behind it, borrowing for development is possible and justifiable. I would like to quote now from Canadian Business, the February issue, 1962, and on this page titled "Report from New York", it discusses that Mr. Lesage will probably be down to get some money to buy out the other utilities. And I quote, on page 23:

Expected to have a good reception in New York when he arrives in the spring is Quebec's Premier Jean Lesage. He will be coming here to raise funds for the takeover and operation of his province's 11 remaining private utility companies. Mr. Lesage seems to be admired here for his fairness in dealing with the parties involved. 'We don't feel Mr. Lesage will have any trouble raising the needed funds', said an executive of a leading firm here which is expected to do some of the business with the Quebec Premier.

I think this is a very good recommendation for his wisdom and his business sense and his forward look in trying to develop the resources of his province.

Now, Mr. Lesage is doing this to protect his province. In this book he points out some of the selfish and short-sighted policies carried on by people whose only interest is profits. And in the Financial Post of November 3rd, 1962, I came across a very, very, interesting argument to support my position and I would stress that this is not the “Commonwealth”, this is hardly a radical publication, it could not be accused of socialism as its motivation, but it says this:

Great issues of growth and trade now beset this nation, but none raises more profound implications for the survival of Canada than the tidal sellout of Canadian companies to foreign owners.

On this and the following three pages is the hard evidence of who controls Canadian industry. They show the astounding depth and degree of the invasion by foreign capital. They document a development of immense historic significance for this country.

Most certainly Canada has gained from foreign investment, and most certainly Canada needs an inflow of foreign capital to help maintain a healthy foreign exchange position. But what about Canadian independence? Where is this country going? Is our political sovereignty a pathetic pretense when economic independence goes?

And he develops the argument that I have been carrying on for the last month: that it is safe to borrow money and pay it back, and this carries no control by a foreign power; that it would be unwise to wait until tax money could develop all of our resources; that you must borrow for development, but that you must be very careful of the way in which you use foreign capital, and you must protect Canadian interests by seeing that it is borrowed capital and not ownership by outside forces.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Strum: — Now, I will go on and I will refer to some more in this Financial Post issue, which I think is very interesting. This writer says:

In 1960 foreign interests controlled nearly 70 percent of the assets of our big manufacturing, petroleum and natural gas and mining enterprises, (those with total investments of \$25 million or more). In 1953 there was 62 percent control. In numbers, some 92 of these enterprises were foreign-controlled, and only 51 of them were Canadian. Many of these, and hundreds of smaller foreign controlled businesses, were set up initially in Canada as new businesses — subsidiary companies or branch plants, creating additional employment for Canadians and boosting construction activity.

But I am still going on quoting this man. This isn't my statement but he backs up my position that I have held for some time.

But many others have come into Canada, or expanded here, by acquiring companies built up over the years by Canadian owners, Canadian management. Some of these Canadian owned firms were profitable, going concerns. Others were "rescued" by their new foreign owners.

And he points out that Canadians were glad to sell out to these people and get out from under and get their money out.

But here is a significant quote:

And here is the trouble with the takeover. The trouble with the takeovers is this. They often entail little new activity in terms of construction and jobs — simply a change in ownership that in this case leaves control, profits and markets in foreign hands.

Since 1950, a new Financial Post study shows, there have been some 240 important takeovers of Canadian-owned companies by foreign investors. A look at this list shows the real impact of foreign control. Statistics on foreign ownership are impressive enough, more than 5,000 companies in Canada are owned abroad but the influence of foreign control is far greater than he figures alone imply.

We in this province are especially proud that we have protected our people in insurance: fire insurance and auto insurance; and health insurance; but this is not true of all Canadian provinces or of Canada as a whole.

In the insurance industry, for example, nine Canadian fire and casualty insurance firms passed to foreign hands. Canadian controlled companies now write only 22.4 percent of fire and casualty premiums in Canada. Only 48 of the 375 companies registered to do fire and casualty insurance business in Canada are controlled by Canadians.

And again I quote from this article:

It's doubtful whether there is any major country in the world, other than Canada, where such a larger proportion of the fire and casualty business is transacted by companies from alien countries (And this is by Mr. K.R. MacGregor, the federal government superintendent of insurance.)

Control of seven life insurance companies has gone abroad since 1955, and the federal government even passed special legislation to give Canadian owners a chance to hang on. This federal legislation save two of our big life insurance companies, but didn't stop the trend completely. Offers by foreign groups were simply too good to pass up.

Now summarizing this article, this writer in the Financial Post of November 3rd says this:

No one denies that foreign investment is productive and has made an enormous contribution to Canada's economic growth, but nevertheless the reality of foreign control exists, and say many observers, presents these dangers.

And here are the dangers that Mr. Lesage saw so clearly in his decision about taking over power.

The U.S. parent companies sometimes preserve export markets and even some domestic markets for themselves. The U.S. companies have 'jumped' Canadian tariff walls to establish branch plant operations here and Canadian manufacturing has suffered from a large number of small firms operating in a limited market. The result is excess capacity, and high per unit cost . . . (and so on).

He goes on to suggest this:

To the extent it is necessary and desirable to import capital from foreign countries, government policies should be such that it favors the purchase by foreigners of debt securities and debentures, rather than equity investments, which imply control.

Now this is exactly what our government has done in developing our key utilities in its borrowings for telephones and power.

In Saskatchewan our gas is considered to be as important as our electrical energy, and as such it necessarily must be part of our plan for consumption and expansion of energy. Contrast this to the national scene where, quoting, from page 24 of the Financial Post, same article:

In the petroleum and natural gas industry, which has shown spectacular growth in the postwar period, U.S. capital is dominant. The industry is 75 percent foreign-controlled (69 percent of that is U.S.), and the figures will be even higher now with Shell investments takeover of Canadian oil companies, the last remaining Canadian owned integrated oil company.

We all know and we have heard it stated by all parties over and over again, that capital borrowed for development of utilities is a self-liquidating loan. Foreign control through equity or ownership, is as Mr. Lesage points out, of limited benefit and even carries the possibility, not of development but even of deliberate retardation of development. For this and many other excellent reasons, Mr. Speaker, which includes forward-looking, dynamic proposals, most of which have been discussed at length by other hon. members, it gives me great pleasure to offer my heartiest congratulations to the minister and support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky:(Cumberland) — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that I am privileged and honored to add my congratulations to those of my colleagues in this assembly to our Provincial Treasurer. I consider our treasurer a very fine gentleman and everybody knows he is a friend of the Saskatchewan people. The budget so certainly indicates.

As a matter of fact, one of the reasons why I became interested in politics, Mr. Speaker, was because of my friendship and association with Mr. Brockelbank, and I did that because I learned from him to be always concerned with the welfare and

the future of the people of this province. I thought it would be a good way to dedicate some of my time and I am trying to do the best I can to be of service to the people.

Now I can say this. The contribution of the hon. minister has made in this budget is appreciated I am sure by all people in Saskatchewan, and I would say at this time that I consider it a tribute to the minister in particular and to the government in general, and it will go down as an historical document for the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, after what this house has heard today, I am sure that anything I could say, Mr. Speaker, would be like an anti climax. Certainly I am not able to entertain the members of this house and the people of this province the way they have been entertained this afternoon, and I certainly don't intend to do so at any time. I wouldn't try. It has often been said that maladjusted people like to use deception, and I consider of course that deception is a cover-up of shortcomings, whether it is in a person or in a political party, and I let Mr. Speaker himself and the members of this house consider whether the deceptions and the fabrications we have heard today are not a cover-up of a political party.

I would also add this to what I have said, that this isn't the first time that hon. members, both in this house and outside this house, have used those kind of tactics, and we are not surprised at all. I only will say this that I am sure that the general public in the province of Saskatchewan, in due course of time, whether it is '64 or '65, will have a lot of time to diagnose this ailment and to decide whether these people deserve to sit even in the opposition at some time in the future.

Mr. Foley:(Turtleford) — Couldn't you try now?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now, one of the hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, referred to the green book this afternoon — I think it was the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), and he submitted certain proposals that were discussed by the conference of provincial premiers, I think, and of ministers with the federal government, I think it was 1945, I think he was correct in quoting the date. And I remember that this green book was brought up in this legislature on a number of occasions. At that time, we pointed out, as a government, that we had agreed that here were certain things that the people of this country, through the governments, could do to say re-establish our people after the last world war, to re-adjust our economy. It is most regrettable that from time to time, particularly when the Liberals are not in power, the hon. members opposite will bring out the 1945 green book, and

expound the kind of things that could have been done. But they will never tell you, Sir, and the people of this province that this was any more than just proposals.

I would like to leave on record that the Liberals have a habit of proposing, but when they have a chance or somebody else wants to go ahead with something well worthwhile, then they sit back there and oppose.

I have heard that on a number of occasions that their purpose in the legislature in the opposition is to oppose. We've even heard, on one occasion, last year, from an hon. member who said, my purpose in this legislature is to sabotage, and I was rather surprised this afternoon when I heard the hon. member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) say that this was a proposal from the federal government. This was no proposal, Sir, this was an agreement of things that could be done, and when this government and other governments of this country wanted to undertake some of those proposals, then they found they were always opposed by the Liberals, and the record since 1945 to 1957 speaks for itself.

As to the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) I always considered him a Liberal but apparently he has joined the Thatcherites according to the speech that I heard this afternoon. For the first time I think — I don't like to say this but certainly there are many things he said that I consider were not facts — I don't like to say his statements were not true, but they were not facts.

He charged that this government did not share the taxes that are collected on the basis of ability to pay. We admit we collect royalties from oil companies and mining companies, from business corporations, and from ordinary people according to their ability to pay. But he didn't explain this policy. It is not their job to explain our philosophy for assessing taxes, but he did complain that we did not distribute these taxes fairly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave it to this house and to the people of this province to decide for themselves whether we distribute taxes fairly or not.

I remember back in 1927 when I was municipal secretary of the R.M. of Garden River, No. 490, years after that, some 13 years I think it was, and I do not recall that we received any assistance whatsoever from the then Liberal government except on two occasions, and these were election years. I remember quite well when we received \$250 to help build a road to Meath Park — and my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) will remember — and a piece of road to Weirdale. \$250 grant over a period of years, and it was in an election year.

Oh yes, I have seen the Liberals handing out little contracts to their favorites, to build up a little bit of road just a week or two before election. But as far as grants

were concerned, that is the kind of money that we received. Now I want to ask the hon. member to be honest with himself, and take a look at the record. We have here the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and I am going to refer him to the municipalities I know something about, and I am sure the hon. member can refer to the municipalities that he lives in as well for comparison.

Let's take a look and see what happened in 1961-62. This same municipality, R.M. No. 490 — well, there are two or three that I have a knowledge of, I live there, R.M. 490, Garden River, had a municipal tax of their own, all they levied was \$53,229, and yet during that same period of time this government gave this municipality grants and contributions in the amount of \$41,195, an amount only \$12,000 less than was levied by the municipality on the taxpayers of that area. Where formerly, under a Liberal administration, these people would have had to pay the full shot, all the money they needed — in this case somewhere over \$100,000 — the taxpayers would have had to pay the whole shot. But here we have a government that, according to the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie), doesn't share provincial taxes, yet we have taken out of the revenue that we collected and have given this municipality \$41,195, as the records show here, as compared to \$53,229.

Now, let's take another municipality, R.M. 491, Buckland, was in the same position at that time. They never got grants from the Liberal government, As a matter of fact the Liberal government collected a public revenue tax of two percent which they used to levy on the people, and this money was sent into Regina by the Secretary-Treasurer. And Buckland levied in this year, 1961, \$45,005 for municipal purposes. They received during the same year from this government \$38,425, yet my hon. friend who sits opposite charged this was not a fair share of the taxes that we collect.

Now take Torch River municipality. It is a little larger municipality just to the east of us. This municipality levied for all municipal purposes \$116,682, and again the story is the same. This government granted, out of the revenues it collected \$101,234 as contributions to this municipality.

Now let me remind my hon. friend opposite that when they were in power, the municipalities has to pay the full shot of social aid whereas today this government, out of the taxes it collects, contributes about 92 cents on the dollar, and yet we allow social welfare administration to rest in the hands of these people. Now these are the kind of things that make me wonder what has happened to my hon. friend from Pelly (Mr. Barrie). I used to consider him a very good Liberal, now I don't think he is any more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard today that there is no prosperity in this province, we've heard it many times. These people are trying to tell the public, the people of the province of Saskatchewan, that this province is going to the dogs. Well, it just so happened that two or three days ago, as a matter of fact Saturday or Sunday, of this past week, I was down to Melfort and they happened to give me a little book as a souvenir from Melfort, and when I look at the second page I find that since 1951 the population in that area has nearly doubled. The gross income of that population in 1961 was \$16.5 million, and it is much higher now. The construction in that same community, it's nearly a city now, has jumped in ten years from \$25,000 up to \$572,000. Now this is the kind of thing that they are trying to describe to us and the people of this province as stagnation. Well, I am sure the people of Melfort, and I am sure the people of Prince Albert are happy — and by the way Prince Albert has just about doubled in the last 10 or 15 years, as my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) knows. He probably has the exact figures; he should know because he was mayor there — Prince Albert's population has doubled and the business people are prospering there, and he dares with others on the other side to come into this house and say this is stagnation. My goodness, I wish we would have much more of this kind of stagnation, as illustrated in this brochure advertising Melfort.

Mr. Speaker, I know we get criticized now because they say we are friends of private enterprise. We have always been friends of private enterprise whenever it is competitive. As a matter of fact, this government has on different occasions and the members on this side of the house have indicated many times, that we believe there is a place for competitive enterprise. That is the way I understand it; some people call it private enterprise. Certainly it can't be called free because nobody anywhere should be allowed to do anything he wants to do, and that is what the word free means. We have always considered that there is a place also for co-operative enterprise and we consider there is a place for public enterprise. And surely in this day and age, when we have technology, when we have progress, that this is about the only way we can go forward. Let us work together and try to help each other to try to build a great country. The only other way or alternative is to have free enterprise, with every business man and every person doing what he wants to do. If you had a situation like that, Mr. Speaker, then you would have to have governments using an iron hand to try to keep the exploiters down so that the people would survive, and I am sure even the hon. members opposite wouldn't like to live under that kind of a system. So let's once and for all decide whether we want to live and co-operate, with co-operatives and private enterprise and with competitive enterprise, and build a great nation and a great country and build for peace.

An Hon. Member: — You said you believed in technology . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — What I am I think is quite evident, and certainly I mind my business, Mr. Speaker, as to what I am. I am speaking for myself and you can easily find out how I think, and I don't have to pin up a badge on what I am but I am a member of the CCF and you will see my badge here, and I am very proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, this just goes to prove how little understanding there is from the members opposite. It is not only a misunderstanding of what they should be doing to build a nation, they don't even understand the meaning of conservation. The other day the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) I think it was, viciously attacked this government for clearing the Squaw Rapids Basin. Now the Squaw Rapids Basin touches upon my constituency and I think I have the right to talk about it. And you will recall, Sir, that the hon. member charged that the power corporation had financial difficulties and therefore the Department of Natural Resources had to clear that basin. Now, if the hon. member knew anything about how governments function and about government responsibility, he would have known that the power corporation is not responsible for playground or parks or for recreation spots. This is something that the Department of Natural Resources in this province has been undertaking for a long time. I think it is the proper department to carry on that kind of work and supervise such projects. And I am very proud that this government has the vision to go ahead and spend whatever money has been spent to clear this basin which was obstructed by trees and rubble of all kinds. They have tried to clear this area so that in the future the people of this province and the many people who I am sure are going to come to this province will be able to enjoy this reservoir of water, not only for fishing but for recreation. I just wanted to point out to the hon. member that I regretted that he didn't know why this was being done and that he wrongly criticized the power corporation for not doing the job and criticized the Department of Natural Resources for doing the job.

Now at this time I notice, Mr. Speaker, it is getting on to 5:30 and I would like to call it 5:30.

The sitting was recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

The sitting was resume at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, before I sat down I think I pointed out the exhibition we witnessed this afternoon in this house and I also pointed out some of the misinformation that had been submitted in this house be referring to the Department of

Municipal Affairs reports insofar as they affected certain municipalities. I also had to answer one of my hon. members opposite as to who I was and it just so happened that during the recess hour some unknown author left a poem on my desk which indicates my feelings very well, and I thought I probably should put this on record how I feel as a citizen of this country. It says:

Our fathers, who have pioneered these prairies,
Have fought for peace, and we must carry on,
To make our province shine above all others,
And always strive to greet a pleasant dawn.
Our province isn't wealthy, never has been,
But we have something worth far more than gold,
We have faith and love, we've pride, co-operation,
We face the future unafraid and bold.

These are my sentiments, Mr. Speaker. I am glad whoever put this down and wish to thank him for this little verse.

Now, as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the hon. members opposite behave like strange creatures at times. For example, on one hand they tell this house that we spend too much money, waste too much money, as the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) did, and then five minutes later he was telling this government that they should spend more money, but of course not by raising any taxes. You will also recall, Sir, that he mentioned the need for snow-plowing in his constituency which costs money.

Another paradox, something difficult to understand is that throughout the days that we have been listening in this session, we hear hon. members opposite say that we should have more businessmen, advising us how to carry on the business of government, and then the hon. member from Saltcoats gets up today and he says that we are wrong in having a businessman to advise us. He referred to the former mayor of Saskatoon, a businessman who sat on one of the committees. Now this kind of thing indicates to me that you just can't win with the opposition, you just can't win.

We have heard all kinds of nonsense, as I have said, and probably the worst kind of nonsense I heard was from the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) today. As usual he was very verbose, but never said anything. He only made attacks upon the services that have helped the people of our north to obtain a better living.

You will recall, Sir, that he attacked the co-operative movement in the north, the co-operative fishermen's organizations and all other co-operatives. He attacked the government at the same time. Now, I don't know just what kind

of an expert the hon. member from Athabaska is but I thought we should put on record something from the Prince Albert Herald of Saturday last week by a gentleman that I think is well known in Canada in the co-operative field, and we can take for granted he knows what he is talking about. This is Professor Raymond from the Laval University, a renowned university which was responsible for quite a bit of the co-operative movement in eastern Canada as you know, Sir. I don't know whether he is a Liberal or not, it doesn't really matter, but Professor Raymond was making a statement while addressing the annual meeting of Northern Co-operative Fisheries Limited, La Ronge, that is in the home town of the hon. member — now, Sir, you remember what the hon. member said about what a wicked organization this was, exploiting the people. It says here that Mr. Raymond told about what is being done in Quebec, and I might as well quote:

He told the group that the province (referring to Quebec) is involved in assisting the financing of 151 large boats built up at a cost of over \$7 billion for Quebec United Fishermen.

And then he went on to say, and I quote again:

Mr. Raymond said he is very impressed with the planning and democratic control of Co-operative Fisheries Limited.

I think that gives the lie to the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) as to where these co-operatives stand in the work they are doing for the people of the north.

I must refer at this time to another nonsensical statement, as I considered it, that came from the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Foley). He is not here in his seat at the moment. His suggestion was that the government should subsidize the insurance premiums of vehicle owners and that the government should take the loss that has been experienced in accidents. Now any reasonable person, of course, will resent such a suggestion for one simple reason that it is not an equitable thing to do. People, I submit, who are responsible for car accidents should pay the higher premiums necessary to carry the losses. I think it would be much more desirable and advisable if the hon. member, who is a school teacher and lives in the rural community, had suggested to this government that we probably should subsidize agriculture, and I could have agreed with him. He might have suggested that we subsidize education more, and activities like that, but of all the ridiculous statements I have heard it is to subsidize those people who are responsible for accidents. This is beyond my comprehension.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have had to discuss some of these things. I always like to bring to the attention of the house some of the projects that I think my constituents need and which the north needs and which the province of Saskatchewan needs. And that is my purpose today, but I had to take a few minutes time out to point out how I feel about some of the remarks that have been made in this house.

There is one thing I would like to say before I go on discussing the problems that should be brought up, and I think I must refer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who made quite an issue about a bill that had been paid by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It was indicated that the cost of diesel fuel was 26 cents a gallon. Now he suggested that the power corporation could have obtained the same diesel for 17 cents a gallon from some private company. The facts I think of the case are that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition didn't look into this subject matter and find out what the actual facts were. Had he done so he would have discovered that . . .

Mr. Guy: — On a point of order. I don't believe the Leader of the Opposition has participated in this debate yet.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It was on another occasion. I didn't say . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Leader of the Opposition hasn't spoken on this debate.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Anyway he was quoted in the Leader Post, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition spoke . . .

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, in which issue of the Leader Post were these statements made?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If it was quoted in the Leader Post as referring to a previous debate in this house in this session then you cannot discuss it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is general knowledge — everyone knows that this statement was made by the hon. members opposite, not only by the leader, and in any event I want to explain to this house the actual situation. This diesel fuel was delivered to Cumberland House, a return trip of over 200 miles — close to that in any event — and the freight charges I think each way were 3 cents a gallon and the price was not 26 cents as has been indicated by our friends the members opposite, but was only 24.8 cents. Had they given the true figures to the press I think the public would have been advised as to what had happened and we wouldn't have had to have this kind of discussion across the province.

I might point out at this time that there is no road to Cumberland House, only a winter trail and there is always the danger of bogging down, which is why they have to charge high freighting rates. It doesn't matter whether it is a co-operative organization or whether it is a private company, you will find that they have to charge freight in order to break even.

By the way, I just found a note here, and in case my hon. friends want to know, they will find these statements I referred to of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in the February 22, Saturday Star-Phoenix.

Mr. Guy: — That was the morning after . . .

Mr. J. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, you haven't heard the last of what I have to say yet. The hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy), for example, expounded the virtues of free enterprise insofar as the fishing industry is concerned and I thought to myself that of all things it is the last thing he should be discussing because, in the first place, we are the only province in Canada that guarantees a minimum price to fishermen. Secondly, we have one of the best marketing agencies in the western world to dispose of our fish. I must remind the hon. member from Athabaska that he apparently is not serving his constituents very well. We don't want the people in Lac la Ronge, or in any other area of Saskatchewan to have to leave their fish rotting as they did three years ago on Manitoba lakes under free enterprise purchases. He knows quite well what happened if he has been reading the press. And I am very happy that we have a government and co-operative organizations that do guarantee the fishermen a good marketing service and minimum prices for their product.

Now, referring back to what some of the hon. members said that we don't return enough of the tax money that is collected from the general public and corporations to the people, may I point out something about schools. Only about three or four weeks ago I was very happy to have the Premier in our community with me, at the opening of the Meath Park School, a \$150,000 structure, and of course the treasury of this province contributed over 50 percent of the cost of that structure, and the rest of course will have to be paid through taxation. I would just like to recall to the hon. members of this house that under former administrations the only kind of grants you ever got for the building of a school was a maximum of \$500 for an initial grant, and if you built any other school it was \$250, but the maximum that I could find was \$500. I have spoken in this house before, telling how this is the government initiated programs to help not only the northern areas such as Athabaska, programs my hon. friend doesn't want to recognize, but in other parts of Saskatchewan as well we have paid the full cost of certain schools in certain areas,

and I know this and I want to put on record once more that my home community of Meath Park had the first school in the province of Saskatchewan that was built by the CCF government 100 percent. And then we had Weirdale school built in the same way; some 22 or more schools in the far north built the same way, and some of them of course would be shared in cost by the federal government. I think we had a composite school at Sturgis and the hon. minister from that area can correct me but I think the composite school was also built there with considerable assistance from the government.

And of these things, I for one am proud. I am not playing politics at all. I think this should have been done, not 15 or 18 years ago but this should have been done by the governments from the time the province first began building schools, in order that our children would have had opportunities. But hon. members, such as the member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy), come in here and say that we are not doing anything for the people in our various communities. Yet these are the kind of things we are doing for progress.

Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the Minister of Education mention that a school would be built in Cumberland House community. This is an isolated community where we have had two schools up to the present time. They are getting old and somewhat dilapidated so I was glad to hear that a new six-room school is under way. I hope that it will be possible to provide more than just public school education in that area. I hope we will have some high school training of youngsters there too.

I was very much encouraged when the Minister of Education was speaking the other day. He talked about the possible changes in the curriculum and the possible changes in educational processes, if I may use those terms. I have always said that there are certain areas of this province that must receive a special kind of consideration and maybe a special kind of curriculum and I think that this is planning in the right direction. I think I can say at this time that there are different values in northern Saskatchewan than there are in the south. I admit that academic training is valuable, but in my opinion, and knowing the people of the north as I do, and I have known them for a long time, I think that they are more interested in practical, technical and other training of that kind. I was very glad to see about four years ago, I think, it is, when this government initiated a program at Saskatoon for vocational training for about 30 or 40 students each year. The hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) I am sure is pleased that we take a few from his area too. It does help them to prepare themselves for a better life out in the world.

At this time I would like to suggest to the government that there is something that could be looked into. I may not be absolutely correct in my argument, but I think youngsters in the north should be given a little more practical education in the younger years, between ages 14 and 18, or 16 and 20. I think these young boys who have to leave the northern community because of the fact that the population has exploded; as we know, there are, as I have mentioned on previous occasions, about 35 per thousand of births in the north as compared to 19 per thousand in the south. You can see what I mean when I say there is a population explosion. Add to this fact that there are not enough resources in that area at the present time to sustain a very much larger population. As a matter of fact, it is over-populated now. I am not talking about people of my age, or middle age, because I don't think we could do very much for these, but for the young people certainly we have a responsibility. I think we should do something the same as I do with my own son on the farm. I have taught him how to operate a tractor; I have taught him to operate machinery; he can take any machine on the farm; he can get a job if necessary and farm jobs are available today. And if I had a girl, I think my girl would know how to sew and cook and do housework and look after babies; in other words be a good domestic. And I think there is quite a demand today for domestics throughout our province and our country.

So why can't we, instead of thinking of putting them through high school and putting them through vocational training, start them out as our children are starting, to learn the basics. Let these boys learn something about agriculture and about machinery, and let the girls learn something about homemaking and domestic science, home economics.

Just when I began to think along that line, Mr. Speaker, it came to my mind that there is a farm at Cumberland House and for sometime the government of this province, the Department of Natural Resources, has been operating this farm as a demonstration farm. There are lovely buildings there, quite a few acres that are broken and they raise some excellent cattle, as the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Natural Resources both know, and I think they have been rather in a dilemma as to what to do. There have been suggestions that we should turn this farm over to two or three people in the Cumberland House community. Now, I could go along with that if things hadn't changed, but since the Squaw Rapids dam has gone up and since the other South Saskatchewan River Dam is being developed, the whole picture is changing. This whole area in the Cumberland flat, in the Carrot River flat, has a tremendous potential for agriculture. I understand that some half a million acres in that area can be brought under the plow, or for grazing and cattle ranching. It seems to me that the

best thing we can do for those people in that part of Saskatchewan — and there are nearly a thousand people at Cumberland and in that area right now, and there will be many more the way they are multiplying — is to get them ready to take up agriculture. Why can't this government, if it can find money for roads, and find money for other purposes, — and they are all good purposes, Mr. Speaker, and I commend the government — why can't we find a few tens of thousands to establish a school of the kind that I envisage, a school in which you can give basic instruction to these young people on how to operate machinery, how to care for cattle and livestock, because this will be their future. They can't go to university because they haven't the background or the money to be able to go to high school and to university. On the other hand, this kind of work is something that will keep them close to the land, something that they would like and something that would give them opportunities for farming. They could develop these areas themselves as farmers, and I surely hope that when the time comes and the area is surveyed for farming purposes, that these people will by traditional right be given the first opportunity to acquire land and get established there.

And what about the girls. Well, the same thing can be said for girls. There is no use keeping them in the north. We know that. The best thing we can do is give them the kind of basic training which would make it possible for them to get jobs in different parts of this province and this country. And I am sure there are all kinds of jobs for domestics. By getting out into the world they will do like other people have done; they will integrate themselves; they will learn something and make some progress in becoming completely integrated into our society.

Mr. Speaker, that I am certain that the federal authorities — there is an election but I don't think that matters too much — I am certain that the federal authorities, if they were approached, would agree that ARDA would pay part of the costs of this kind of a venture. As a matter of fact, I think I discussed it with the Minister of Agriculture about a week ago and he thought that I was right. I cannot be sure but certainly we could approach the federal government and see if they would be prepared to accept their share of costs of a rehabilitation program for agricultural purposes, for agricultural workers.

I would just add one more thing to what I have said on this subject and it is when these young people get their basic training, then they should have the same chance as other farm boys and farm girls have, and that is get a year and if necessary two years of training in a technical or vocational school. In that way they will come off this farm with some

experience and they could be sent to a vocational training school to get a little further education and training. They could be on their way by the time they were 19 or 20. I certainly hope the government will consider very seriously what I have suggested and try and find the money to do what I think is necessary.

I will add one more thing, Mr. Speaker. If this farm, which I am very much interested in — and a lot of people are interested in as a project — if this farm is turned over to two or three people, let me point out to the government that then you will only have two or three people that will get the experience and the benefit from that farm, but you could have an educational institution set up there, not only young people from Cumberland House, but young people from Beauval and other places in the north that are interested in such basic education could be entered into training, and if you had dormitories and teachers you could do something with them.

I have mentioned Mr. Speaker, that ARDA could be of value in establishing young people in the Cumberland House area. And I would like to point out at this time that the way I understand it this program of ARDA could help many of the areas throughout Saskatchewan which are somewhat economically backward. I think the purpose of ARDA is to do four things. One is to have projects for the alternative use of land. Secondly, rural development projects. Thirdly, soil and water conservation projects, and, fourth, research. I do hope that if the minister gets up in debate that he will be so kind as to give us a broader outline of what can be done under ARDA

But I know that in my community a community in the Nipawin constituency, there is already an organization at Choiceland, where they have been studying the needs of that particular area and they are identically the same as the needs of farmers in Meath Park and at Meadow Lake and other places like that. They already have come up with some very valuable ideas. One of these the desire for telephone systems in that area and these people are doing something about it — and of course the government is always ready to help these kinds of associations when they need help. This is just an indication of what can be done. I think a great many things can be done for the development of community pastures, of other services that communities need, and in that way I think that we will be able to retain the family farm and build up Saskatchewan as we envisage it. Both sides of the house I think agree on this point.

One interesting suggestion that has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, since we began discussing ARDA, was from young farmers and farmers that only hold a quarter section of land, and some grazing land. These people tell me this, I have been doing the best that I can under the present economic

circumstances here because of the economy of the whole country here I am flat broke; I am just living on the farm; I can't operate a farm; I have no money; I can't borrow money. You can only borrow money if are big enough to borrow it as you know from the farm credit corporation, and it is probably the same thing with co-op trust; you have got to have property in order to be able to borrow. These people point out that some of them have pastures and have the ability to do something if they could be helped and this is the kind of thing they suggest — Why can't we get a loan, say to get a basic herd of livestock — it could be cattle, it could be hogs. They tell me the loaning agency should be government. To assure a good job then it should be government responsibility to come and supervise the projects and give us help and show us where we are wrong. We don't want to be on social aid, we want to be independent and we want to have our self-respect and we want to have our dignity, and for goodness sake, they tell me, see what you can do about it. And so I am trying to do something about it, Sir. I hope that the government and the Minister of Agriculture and the other ministers, the Minister of Social Welfare and others, will get together and see if there is any value to that suggestion. I think there is. I think that this government should be able to find some money to provide the basic herds of livestock to people that want to get on their feet. This, of course, includes young people that want to farm and it includes those who through no fault of their own, because they are small land owners, find themselves in difficult circumstances today.

Just to give the hon. members a better picture of what is happening across the north, I happen to have gone up to Wolaston and as far as Brochei — sorry if I went in the hon. member from Athabaska's (Mr. Guy) constituency but I thought somebody should look after the needs of the people there so I flew right up — and I talked to people. They are very pleased with the conservation programs of this government but here's the kind of thing they tell me, and I think it is best if I indicate from my notes what has happened.

The conservation programs have made it possible that today, instead of getting say 9,000 beaver in Saskatchewan you can trap 50,000, and if you go through the annual reports you will find the figures for yourself. But what has happened? As we increased the number of fur-bearers and more were caught for some reason or other under this private enterprise system we have, the prices started going down. And here's the kind of thing that happened. Back 10 years ago the price of beaver was \$25.98 average — this was 1947-48; in 1959-60 the price had dropped to \$11.20 average. Now I think the beaver is just as good now as it was ten years ago, but there's what has happened.

An Hon. Member: — Cattle are doing that too, Bill.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You had better blame your free enterprise who control the economy in this country for this kind of a situation where a person has to spend weeks and months trying to get sufficient fur, and then he finds out that the price structure is such that he is robbed of his efforts. The Fur Marketing Service does not buy furs — my hon. friends don't seem to know — the Fur Marketing Service is one of those services that obtains, through the auction sales, the highest possible price for fur for the trapper. And I indicated, I think four or five years ago, where I compared prices, as I recall it, at that time, mink for example that when through the fur marketing was sold for something over \$20.00 at least, I think it was \$27 or \$30, and then private companies who bought mink on an average were only paying \$14 to \$18. And one company paid an average of only \$7.00, and then you people try to throw back at us charging that the Fur Marketing Service is not a good service. You can't get away with that. If you want to debate on what the fur prices and what free enterprise does, and what fur marketing does, I'll welcome you to a debate anytime.

Now, Mr. Speaker, going on we find the same thing has happened with muskrats. It isn't just beaver. Ten years ago, 1947 and 1948, the price of muskrats was \$2.27 average. In 1959-60 the price dropped to 85¢, but I am quite sure that the beautiful ladies who buy muskrat coats pay more for those coats today than they paid ten years ago. And you wonder why this is so. Mink, for example was \$24.50, and now, ten years later \$18.44. Yet there is nothing that this provincial government can do that has not been done. Something that may be looked into by the provincial governments and the federal government maybe could be a floor under, say ordinary furs; the same as there is a floor under wheat. I don't know. Such is the situation and it points out very clearly what has happened to date. Trappers get more fur but get less money for the fur than they used to get. At the same time, in the last ten years, the cost of groceries, the food and everything else, has gone up by 30 percent. So you can imagine what a difficult time these people who are eking a living out of trapping and fishing are having. They are not like school teachers, who get \$4 or \$5 thousand. Some hon. member said it wasn't enough and I agree, but trappers have an average per family in many cases of not more than \$400 and \$500 dollars, and I have some figures to prove that. Some of the better areas, like La Ronge, the earnings are somewhere around \$12 or \$1500. I am just giving you rough figures.

These are the kind of things that concern me very deeply. I know that this government can't do too much, but I would like the people of this province to know what the difficulties are that these people are living under in the trapping and fishing areas.

Therefore, you will understand, Mr. Speaker, what I meant when I said that it will be necessary for the young people to leave those communities, and why we must do something about it. Eventually when these young people leave the school after getting some kind of training and education, then I'm going to appeal to all people in Saskatchewan, to do this to help them.

Don't be prejudiced against these Métis and native people. They are the same kind of people that we are. They are human beings, but they have been under-privileged, and I say this; that any kind of prejudice should be set aside and a helpful hand be held out to try and establish these people in our various communities. We should really over-extend ourselves and help them in every way we can to help themselves lift themselves up by their boot-straps, so to say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to hear about the small amount of \$10,000 that is provided in the budget to continue the housing program that was undertaken by the Department of Natural Resources, and I think the co-operative department, a year ago. This is a worth-while venture. I have spoken on this subject before, and I think that the people themselves attending the trappers' convention passed a resolution urging the government to undertake this kind of project, and I think once the people ask, then it is our responsibility to try and help them. I am very glad that there has been an appropriation for housing.

I must thank the government, and in particular, the Minister of Highways for having undertaken a program in the last two years of oiling most of the roads of the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is a very commendable program, I am very happy to hear, and I have been asked to tell the government and the Minister that the people from Nipawin right on to Prince Albert, are very happy to see that they will have a dust free highway sometime this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — What a difference, Mr. Speaker. What a difference when we had a Liberal administration. My people in the communities of Samburg, Claytonville, and I could name a few other postal districts, pleaded with former governments to build them a stretch of about 10 miles of road and the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) knows the road that I am referring to. It is called the Jack Pine road, past the airstrip. Do you know what they did, how they built up a road?. Liberals used to hire their stooges and they used to fill the racks with

straw and they used to spread straw on this sand along this Jack Pine road, and this is the kind of road that was built for the people of Samburg and Kalyna and the hon. member knows what I am talking about.

Mr. Steuart: (Prince Albert) — I don't know anything about straw . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — This government and the Department of Natural Resources are to be commended that they undertook the venture. It took a long time for me to persuade them and I know it wasn't their responsibility, but they recognized that something should be done and last year they started building a first class grid road into the city of Prince Albert, and I understand that it will be finished this year. And I am sure that the hon. member from Prince Albert will be happy because all his business friends will have more business in Prince Albert, and we will be happy because we will have a shorter route into Prince Albert; and keep off Highway no. 2, and I think maybe the minister will be happy if he is not going to rebuild no. 2, because it will take some of the traffic off it, so we will all be happy.

As I pointed out previously, Mr. Speaker, I was at Melfort on Saturday and Sunday with the Minister of Highways, as well as two of my colleagues, and we met members of the opposition, and we were happy to see them at Melfort, and there is a tremendous interest in the rural area from Melfort north to Snowdon. I hope the minister builds a straight road there.

We all congregated at the lake in my constituency, and I was very happy to welcome the people there, I think there must have been about 600 to 1,000 people up at Big Sandy Lake. I am sure they all didn't get fish, but they were all very happy, it was a lovely day and it indicates this to this government and I'm here to tell the government what the people asked me to say.

They said, we want a road in 1963 between Melfort and Snowdon, and when the minister said, well, we haven't budgeted for it, they said, We don't care whether you have budgeted for it, you can always find the money if you are determined enough, so I'm leaving the message with the government, that here again is a road that is urgently required. Over a thousand people, I would say spoke up for it and I'm bringing the message to the government as I promised to do.

I regret very much that the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) failed — and I tried to lead him in a previous debate — to mention something about a road, that he should have into Island Falls. For some reason or other he failed to ask the government to do something about it.

Mr. Nollet: (Minister of Agriculture) — He never heard about it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well, maybe he never did, but there was a delegation into Prince Albert and we both met. It seems that because he hasn't done his duty, I will do what I think he should have done. And I'm going to ask the government to continue negotiations with the federal government to see that they will permit this government to use the monies for northern roads to build the road to Pelican Narrows and Island Falls in the hon. member from Athabaska's constituency. Now, those people there are just as good as mine, and I think they are entitled to a road, and anything that the government can do to bring it to fruition in the very near future will be appreciated, not only by myself, but certainly by the people there, if not by the hon. member from Athabaska.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now, I can't just leave one road alone, and that is the road to Cumberland House. Cumberland House is a pet project of mine. It is a community of about a thousand people. It is isolated. I know that up to this time we have had difficulty in getting a road, because of flooding and so forth, but I think that these people should be really given priority, and it should be done immediately. There is a lovely lodge there for hunters. Many hunters go into that area in the fall. It has the best wild fowl hunting in western Canada. Tremendous big game hunting there also now that these floods on the Saskatchewan will be controlled and the road is not too difficult to build, I do hope that the minister concerned will see to it that a start is made in the very near future. I think these people are entitled to this road and I hope he will accede to their request.

I would like to see more employment in the north. I know what I say won't solve the employment problem, and I am wondering if it wouldn't be possible for the government to consider some of these ideas in the future. I think it is my job to suggest positive programs to the government. Consider, say a township survey for part of the sedimentary area in Saskatchewan that has not been surveyed to date. When I look at the maps I can see quite an area that isn't surveyed by townships, and I think that probably some of these people in the

northern communities would like to take on work. They would be more than pleased to have the surveys branch of the Department of Natural Resources go up there and hire them out to cut these lines and I think the project would be of some benefit in the future to those people that are going to cut timber, prospect for minerals, or whatever else they may be interested in.

And when talking about surveying, I note the government still has a little section south of Flin Flon, unsurveyed I am told. People say, Why didn't the government survey the rest of Saskatchewan? There is a small section south of Flin Flon that hasn't been surveyed. My trouble too is that when I go fishing on Lake Athapapuscow I don't know whether my licence is good or not because I don't know where the boundary is. So I hope the minister will be able to do something about this and finish that survey, and then the whole province will be completed.

I wasn't going to discuss medical care again. I think we really don't have to, but I would like to point out to the house, particularly the hon. members opposite, that the New Democratic Party, through its leader, Mr. T.C. Douglas, has come out with a definite proposal to assist provinces with the cost of medical care. The New Democratic Party has indicated that when elected, and I'm sure they are going to be . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well, it is about time we had a good government. I don't see the difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives. You were there up until 1957 and did nothing; John did do a little bit, and you won't give him credit for it, so maybe we had better take over and give Canada the kind of people that will give good laws and good legislation.

And this is good legislation, Mr. Speaker. It is no more than fair that the federal government should be interested in the health of its people, just as they should be interested in the education of its people, and I think 60 percent would make it much easier for the province. It would relieve some of the people who are always complaining about taxes; relieve them of some of the taxes. Instead of using 50 percent or 40 percent of the federal budget for defence, maybe Ottawa could spend a little less of the percentage for defence and use some of that money to pay for the cost of medical care and hospitalization. You can see why I am very proud to be associated with the New Democratic Party which has this kind of program, and I hope all members opposite when they have a chance to vote on April 8th will vote for New Democratic candidates.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I must mention in this house that there is one problem that we have in my constituency, and I think it is all around Prince Albert, and that is the problem of out-patient services as far as x-rays are concerned. Now, I am not going to get into the argument for one side or the other, but I would just like to point out what is happening, and this has been brought to my attention by my own people. They say, there is nothing particularly wrong with me, but my doctor says I should have x-rays. But when I want to get x-rays I am refused; they tell me the only way I can do it is to be in the hospital. So they put this person in the hospital and it costs \$25 a day to keep that person from two days to a week there, and you can imagine the cost to the hospital plan. But, if x-rays were provided to that person as an out-patient, we might get away with \$10, or \$15 or \$20. I hope that the Minister of Public Health will be able to find the answer, maybe an understanding. We all hope for a settlement so that not only will these people get x-rays but be able to go back home, instead of lying in the hospital beds. It is to be noted that it will cost the taxpayers much less money than having these people put in as in-patients in the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have really extended myself this time. It is, of course, very clear that I am happy with the budget, and there are a lot of things I suggested the government should do. Maybe they can't do it this time, but I hope they will be able to in the very near future.

I want to point out that the people that I represent are happy with the kind of legislation and the kind of budgeting that we have experienced from this government. I am satisfied we are making good progress, in providing the best possible services and opportunities for our people, and so I can assure you without any hesitation whatsoever I am going to vote for the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: (Saskatoon City) — I, too, would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on presenting his first budget to the chamber. I am sure that the budget, itself, and the forecast, will long be remembered, by everyone in the chamber and everyone in the province.

I appreciate very much his reference to our trip from Steen to Crooked River, almost 25 years ago, and my old Model A car which provided transportation. Hon. members might be interested in knowing, although Steen was only 24 miles from Crooked River, we left 24 hours before the convention, just to make sure that we would be there. My car had been abandoned at

Steen in December 1937, when the Minister of Highways didn't have any snow removal problems whatever. An overnight storm developed and there was nothing to do but leave the car there and so on the 13th of April I travelled from my home in Hudson Bay to Steen by mixed train, about 75 miles — it took about eight hours on a mixed train. The Provincial Treasurer and four of his friends were at the siding to meet me. We had the alternative of making the rest of the trip by train, or driving the car, and since there were a number of people who did want to go to the convention, and no car had been through all winter, we decided that we would try to break trail.

And so as the Provincial Treasurer mentioned, armed with about 30 feet of rope, a shovel and five able-bodied men, we made the 24 miles in four hours. We were very fortunate. For those who are younger, they probably will not remember that having a long rope was a great asset in those days. When you came to a bad hole, you paused to size up the situation, and if it was as bad as it turned out to be, four men got out, and with a long rope got over on the other side, and the Model A would go up nearly any hole. We did manage to get through from Steen to Crooked River in plenty of time for the convention, and later I had the great pleasure of casting my first successful vote for a progressive cause when I voted for the present Provincial Treasurer when he was first elected to this chamber almost 25 years ago.

I should also mention that this road we travelled was the only road that was available for more than 2,000 people who, in the event of an emergency, would have no other road to their nearest hospital or doctor in the town of Tisdale. Here was an area that was settled by veterans of World War 1. There was a mixed train that went down three times a week; by stopping overnight at Crooked River, a junction point, you could get to hospital the following day. I hope that some of the friends of the Provincial Treasurer will take advantage of this 25th anniversary to write something about his very interesting life.

The parliamentary guide will note that he served with the famous Canadian Regiment, Princess Pats, during World War 1. He looks very young, it is hard to realize that he was serving in France so many years ago, and following his discharge from the Army he took a bush homestead in north east of the province, where for \$10 one could get 160 acres of land with the biggest trees you could find anywhere, and so the Provincial Treasurer, more than 40 years ago, went north as a teacher, as a soldier-settler, and as hon. members know, was elected to the legislature in 1938. But there are very few, I think who had had the experience of serving with such a distinguished regiment; who have had the experience of serving with such a distinguished regiment; who have pioneered back 40 miles from the nearest hospital and doctor as a teacher and a homesteader, and eventually has lived to bring down such a very exciting budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I realize that hon. members opposite in criticizing this budget have objected to our comparing conditions as they were when the Liberals were last in office. They have also been very careful to avoid any comparisons with governments in Canada administered by Liberal governments, such as Newfoundland, Quebec and New Brunswick. But I think it would really be fair to compare the twenty year period that the Provincial Treasurer has been a member of the government on this side of the house and the twenty years before he took on ministerial responsibilities. I think this is not an unfair comparison, and so I would like to make some reference to a document which the Provincial Treasurer used quite extensively during his first election campaign; the submission by the government of Saskatchewan, a Liberal government, of course, to the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations, 1937, appointed by a Liberal government at Ottawa.

The foreword was written by the then Premier of the province, Mr. Patterson, and Mr. Davis, the Attorney-General, took the major responsibility for presenting this brief to the federal government. And I would like the hon. members to read carefully again just what was said by the provincial authorities who complained about the unjust treatment that Saskatchewan had throughout so many years.

On page 17, for example, there was a table showing what freight rates have done to us over the years, and the Liberals did a very good job in setting out a table, giving the freight rates on canned goods, from Hamilton, Ontario, to four points in New Brunswick, and then on canned goods from Fort William to four points in Saskatchewan. Now I think it should be said in passing that the railways actually find they can move larger trains at a lower cost on the plains than they can winding around the lakes and the hills in eastern Canada. But leaving that out of consideration, Mr. Davis pointed out that because of these unfavorable freight rates, the citizen in Regina paid a rate of 98 cents a hundred compared with the rate from Hamilton to McAdam of 59 cents.

In other words, the Regina rate was 60 percent higher. In Saskatoon, my city, we would be paying at that time a rate of \$1.11, compared with 61.5 cents for the same distance to Sigas, New Brunswick. We were penalized 80 percent in Moose Jaw; the rate was \$1.04, compared with 61.5 cents; there was a penalty of 69 percent against Moose Jaw, and Swift Current, 928 miles from Fort William, about the same distance that Edmunston, New Brunswick was from Hamilton, had a rate of \$1.14, at Swift Current compared to 59.5 cents to Edmunston, 87 percent higher.

Now the point I want to make is that this was a very legitimate grievance. When the Provincial Treasurer was elected to this legislature, the then government of the day was protesting to the federal government about the unfair freight rates. Now, since that time, freight rates have increased ten percent, 15 percent, 20 percent; these rates have gone up again and again. Each time they have gone up they have added 20 percent to the 61 cent rate, and they have added 20 percent to the \$1.11. So that if a similar study was done now, we would find ourselves in a very difficult position, taking into consideration freight rates.

Another interesting discussion was on tariffs, and it is significant that this presentation was presented by a Liberal government in this province to a Liberal government in Ottawa. They pointed out that there were only two provinces in Canada, which had benefited because of tariffs. These two provinces were Ontario and Quebec, as you might imagine. The province of Quebec had a net gain of \$11.03 per person, and in Ontario \$15.15. All the other provinces had a net loss, but Saskatchewan had the highest loss of all. Our penalty because of tariffs was \$28.16 per year.

On page 252, there is quite an interesting section on "Lack of Manufacturing". We have heard a good deal during this debate and other occasions about stagnation, but hon. members may read what Mr. Davis said nearly 25, over 25 years ago. Taking the 1933 figure, it can be calculated the number of persons employed in manufacturing in Saskatchewan constituted something about one-half of one percent of the population of the province, while almost 5 percent of the population of Canada as a whole; in other words, the ratio for Canada as a whole was about ten times the ratio for Saskatchewan. Coming to the three prairie provinces, Manitoba had about three percent; Alberta one and one-half percent; and ours about one-half percent. So even taking the three prairie provinces, Manitoba had six times as many employed in manufacturing and Alberta had three times.

And then there is a very interesting reference to the roads of today, and the Minister of Highways will be especially interested in this; it said that in 1922 we did set-up a highway system; we prepared a map; and we said that there would be over 7,000 miles of highway, but by 1936 the highway system had 7,806 miles, but listen to this paragraph:

A dirt road, well maintained, is a fairly good road in Saskatchewan, in dry weather, although grades which, of necessity, must be well built up, are very prone to spread and to blow away. In wet weather, particularly in the sections of the province where there is heavy land, the roads become virtually impassable.

And this next sentence, I think, will also be of interest.

The province has not as yet been able to begin the construction of broad concrete highways, such as are seen in virtually every other developed section of the world.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of the Liberal government just the year before the Provincial Treasurer was elected to this chamber, in protesting to the federal government of the day, which happened to be a Liberal government.

On page 297 there is another table that I'll mention in passing. It puts Saskatchewan at the head of this particular list. This is a table dealing with certain facilities — water piped into the kitchen and water piped into the bathroom on Canadian farms. We find that 11.7 percent of Canadian farm homes had water piped into the kitchen, but in Saskatchewan 1.4 percent, and while 4.9 percent of the Canadian farms have water piped in to the bathrooms, 1.2 percent in Saskatchewan.

The reference to education that our school buildings were in very poor shape at the time. It was mentioned that it would take \$300 per school to put these schools in shape; and our libraries were run down too, and it is suggested that we should have a sum of \$30 per room for library facilities. The Premier of the day still apologizing for Saskatchewan highways said that although the network had increased to 8,000 miles, we only had 23.4 miles constructed to standard hard surface.

These last two references should have been from a more recent submission. These were from the submission from Premier Patterson to the special reconstruction committee of the house of commons on Wednesday, April 19, 1944 — 19 years ago.

This reference to the schools and the libraries was made just on the eve of the CCF forming a government, and the Premier was commenting on the very bad condition of our schools. Some mention was made by hon. members regarding the timber operations and again Mr. Patterson said:

If our present rate of consumption of timber continues, our virgin and mature stands of white spruce and fir suitable for saw lumber will be exhausted in 10 years.

And he submitted a table showing that for the ten years before that 45.7 percent of our standing timber had been destroyed by fire.

Approximately one-third of the population has electric service — one-third. Some from major transmission lines and others from local plants where only part-time service is provided. In small urban centres there are 35,000 people who should have service from major transmission lines; and each year members of the opposition have voted against budgets which have made provision for the building of transmission lines, the building of power plants that make it possible for all the people of the province to have the power that should be available.

And Mr. Patterson in his brief said,

About 13,000 of our farmers have a modified electric power service in the form of wind chargers. It is interesting to note that when the power is available from transmission lines from major plants, these present users are the first to avail themselves of these services.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is quite fair for us to have a look at what has been accomplished in the 20 years from the time that the Provincial Treasurer became a minister of the cabinet up until the present, and to compare just what was accomplished in the 20 years prior to 1944 by the Liberal party which had been in office from the time the province was formed, with the exception of a brief period when the Conservatives were here in office from 1949 to 1934.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Provincial Treasurer especially for the very generous consideration given to Saskatchewan's second city, our city of Saskatoon. We are delighted that the university will receive an extra million dollars for the year 1963-64. We realize that the development of the Regina campus is partly responsible for some of the funds but I think it is pretty obvious that the outstanding work which has been done at the University of Saskatchewan's Saskatoon campus for over half a century must be a factor that makes it possible to have increasing funds made available for these excellent services.

Hon. members might be interested in knowing that this year, while the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) is the Provincial Treasurer, we are going to have two really worthwhile achievements. We will own the legislative buildings here and we will own the university buildings in Saskatoon. The original cost of the university buildings and the land, prior to 1944, totalled just over \$4 million. I understand that prior to 1921-22, the government didn't bother segregating the interest payments on capital for public buildings and university buildings so we haven't any information really as to the amount of money paid for interest on the university buildings prior to 1921, but between 1921-22 and 1961-62 I understand we have paid

on these buildings which cost initially over \$4 million, we have paid over \$6,895,000 on debt charges since 1922. Hon. members might be interested in knowing that since the present Provincial Treasurer took on cabinet responsibility the taxpayers of the province have spent over \$28 million on the university buildings and university hospital. And I am sure that every citizen in Saskatchewan must take a good deal of pride in the fact that we have changed from a practice of paying out \$1.50 in interest over a period of years for every dollar that you spend on building. I am sorry that we haven't been able to get an estimate — at least I haven't been able to get an estimate of the amount which might have been paid during the time that the university buildings were first constructed until they started segregating the payments in 1921-22.

I am delighted that the budget has made provision for \$1 million to make possible a veterinary college. The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) is not in his seat, but I am taking the very first opportunity I have had since the budget was brought down to say that as a citizen of Saskatoon and as a citizen of the province I am delighted that this announcement has been made. However I should draw to the attention of the hon. member that the government doesn't build and run veterinary colleges. The Provincial Treasurer was very careful to point out that first the university senate and board of governors would have to decide that they want a veterinary college in the university, and secondly, the other western universities would agree that Saskatchewan is the appropriate place for the college, and the participating governments should agree to contribute their fair share to its operations. But I am certainly delighted that this announcement was made and I understand the authorities at the university have considered that this has been a generous gesture on the part of the government and they are having a careful look at it.

I note with pleasure that the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon is to have a \$300,00 addition, that the Saskatchewan Research Council building is to have an addition running over \$185,000, and that the Technical Institute in Saskatoon will be competed as part of this year's program. I would like to thank my colleagues, the Minister of Education, and the Provincial Treasurer for being able to find funds on a very generous basis for our schools in Saskatoon.

Hon. members might be interested in noting that if we go back a few years to 1952-53, the operating grants to Saskatoon were just under \$200,000; \$21,000 for capital grant, working out to a grant in mills of 4.73. In 1957-58 this amount had increased just over half a million for operating and \$165,000 for capital to \$752,000, grant in mills on the assessment of \$59 million of 12.74. And 1961-62, as our assessment

in Saskatchewan's most rapidly growing city continued to increase, again the grants increased — the operating grant \$1,853,000 and the capital grant almost half a million. This grant in 1961-62 worked out at \$26.94 mills to the citizens of our city, and for 1962-63 again the operating grant over the \$2 million mark and the capital grant \$216,000, a grant in mills of \$23.62, or about 500 percent increase of the grants in 1952-53.

I think any reasonable person, Mr. Speaker, will agree that a government which comes to the assistance of the municipalities in such a concrete way does not deserve the irresponsible criticism that has come from the people across the way.

I would like to thank the Provincial Treasurer for his very sympathetic reference to the work of the Department of Social Welfare in his address when he said:

We say anyone who needs help is entitled to it because he is a human being. He does not have to sign away his future earning power to get it. There are some who still argue that we should force these people to work by cutting them off social aid. Most can't work. Jobs aren't always available. You can't create a job for a breadwinner, nor rehabilitate him, if that is necessary, by starving his family. Families are getting more help now, but only the heartless would say that a family of four, getting weekly income of less than \$300 for food and clothing, is living too well.

The estimates tabled indicate that the Department of Social Welfare will receive \$17,715,000 in the next fiscal year. The hon. member for Wolseley-Qu'Appelle (Mr. McFarlane) gave us an extra \$10 million when he was speaking but I haven't been able to discover just when and where this extra \$10 million will be available, but I suppose another \$10 million is neither here nor there, is not too important with those who have been making so many irresponsible statements from time to time.

My colleagues, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Public Health and the Minister of Highways are able to secure a larger share of the taxpayers' dollar than the Department of Social Welfare. Nevertheless I feel very strongly that ours is one of the most important departments in modern society and requires a great deal of interpretation to have the people generally appreciate some of the problems

.Some of the functions of our department are to give financial assistance to persons in need, and this represents one of our major items in connection with social aid; and to insure the

protection of children; to help clients use the resources of the community and the resources within themselves to cope with the problems they face; to provide physical care, including custody, to certain groups of people; to help local communities provide low cost housing for people in low income brackets, for senior citizens; and to develop emergency welfare services for use in natural or war induced disaster. The objective of the department so far as is possible is to meet the economic needs of our citizen or to see that they are met in such a fashion as to restore or preserve their dignity and usefulness to themselves and to society. To this end, people in need of our services must be encouraged and helped to use their inner resources in addition to those of the community so as to enable them to remain or become self-reliant.

To measure the work of the department is not always easy, for it cannot be set out statistically in such a manner as to give a true and comprehensive picture. Someone who has been to hospital, who has a major surgery, is always willing to tell friends for months, years, about the wonderful experience in the hospital, but it is a different matter with an unmarried mother who has had a very difficult decision to make, or someone who has a breadwinner go to prison, or someone who has been in prison who has had some assistance to try to get started on some better plan for the future. People don't always feel like talking about the past; they want to forget about the past.

We are dealing with thousands of people, people who sometimes feel that there is a stigma attached if they have to take advantage of the services of the Department of Social Welfare.

During the throne speech debate, I referred at a good deal of length to the social aid program of the department and I thought that I had dealt with it so adequately that it wouldn't be necessary to make any further reference, and I do want to thank hon. members opposite for, on the whole, accepting the facts that the decisions as to who are entitled to social aid are made on the municipal level. And if there are criticisms about the judgement being made as to who should or who should not receive social aid, these criticisms must be levelled against municipal officials. However, the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) — and I am sorry he is not in his place — did say something the other day that I must mention. He said there appeared to be two classes of recipients — the city dwellers and the poor country cousins. He said that persons in rural areas had to be almost destitute to get help but in the city persons could make a down payment on a house, a refrigerator, a hi-fi, a deep-freeze, and then go on social aid and have the remaining payments made for them. He said a complete revision of the rules and regulations or an overhaul of the department was needed.

Well, again I would like to ask the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) if he has discussed these problems with His Worship, Mayor Fischter. I am sure this is an unfair attack he has made on the elected members of the city of Yorkton. I wonder if he has discussed them with the reeve of the R.M. of Orkney, or Reeve Sharpe of the R.M. of Wallace, or Mr. Harrison, the reeve of the Calder R.M. The hon. member for Yorkton was at the Canora meeting, as was his colleague the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and I am sure that the member for Melville will recall that some of these specific problems were raised. There was the question of the chap who had bought the late model car and the welfare officer said he would require this young chap to sell the car before he should be eligible for social aid and the reply that I gave was that this was the right decision, that the municipal authorities were doing their duty when they expected that the individual should use his own resources before coming to the neighbors for help. I think it is most unfortunate that the member for Yorkton made this reflection on municipal officials who aren't here to defend themselves; and if there are cases where there are people improperly who have acquired hi-fis, refrigerators and deep-freezes, he should report these details to the mayor of Yorkton who, I am sure, in due course will have an opportunity to defend himself and to ask the member for Yorkton whether this charge was intended to the mayor and the council of Yorkton, or did he have some other municipalities in mind.

Mr. Gardiner:(Melville) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would just allow a question for a moment. I was just wondering if he could tell us when he changed his views about municipal officials being able to do this. You will remember when Grenfell — or Broadview I believe it was — tried this about two years ago, he was told they were told they shouldn't be doing that. When did the department change its mind on this question?

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Chairman, this isn't a question, this is opening up another debate, but the hon. member didn't raise his question at either Regina or in Canora, and certainly this has always been the practice of the department, that the citizen who asks the neighbors to pay for food and clothing should use his own resources before he asks for assistance. We pointed out that a person in receipt of aid cannot contract to purchase a house, and then have the principal payments included in the rent allowance. And again, this is a program that continues to have unfair criticism. At a very large meeting in Saskatoon on Saturday night, when the leader of the New Democratic Party spoke to about 700 in one room and an overflow of about 400, there was someone who came to heckle, who was determined on raising social aid. Finally I was brought into the discussion and the charge was that someone in Saskatoon was paid a fantastic amount every month in social

aid, enough to buy a very high priced house. I said, Will you tell me where this was. Yes, I'll tell you where it was — and by the time I had got my notebook out he had forgotten the street, he had forgotten the number, he had forgotten the name. I said, If what you say is true, why don't you tell Mayor Buckwold, this is one of their responsibilities, and I am sure this charge that you are making against Mayor Buckwold is quite an unfair charge.

And so I am sure that His Worship, the Mayor of Yorkton and the reeves from the municipalities in the Yorkton constituency will want to know whether their member, in speaking in the chamber, is accusing the administration in the city of Yorkton for incompetence and is he saying that people in the rural areas have to be almost destitute before they get help. I might say that I get a great many complaints, but I want to say to the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) that I haven't had any complaints about his having given aid to people because they are voting for him, or withholding aid because people vote against him. I am sure that in the town of Lemberg there are people who vote for the member and against him. If there was someone administering social aid who was giving social aid to his friends and withholding it from those who voted against him, this complaint would come to me, and I want to say that no such complaint has come to me since I became the Minister of Social Welfare.

This will permit me to move on to one of the other departments in public assistance. In May 1962, Saskatchewan recipients of old age assistance, disabled persons' allowance, blind persons' allowance, received an increase of \$10 a month retroactive to February 1, 1962. While this announcement was made initially by the federal government, the \$10 was paid on condition that the province would pay have the amount. Saskatchewan was one of the first provinces to agree to provide this assistance to the maximum amount and retroactive to the earliest possible date. This is in keeping with the policy our province has adopted for years. At the same time, these increases, the federal old age security pension was increased from \$55 to \$65 a month, and like some provinces, Saskatchewan made sure that the recipients benefited by the full increase. This was accomplished primarily by providing an increase in the supplementary allowance scheduled for clothing and an additional sum, a geriatric allowance, to meet special expenses that older people are faced with. This procedure enabled the needy among those recipients who were receiving supplemental allowances and related health benefits to continue so doing.

During the year past, the Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation has given considerable study to the best method of meeting the needs of people who are unable to provide for themselves. The conclusion reached was that a form of assistance to meet actual need was preferable to the means test

approach of a categorical allowance including supplemental allowance. In 1961 the department learned that the federal government was prepared to consider sharing supplemental allowance under the unemployment assistance agreement if such allowances were paid on the basis of need and certain other administrative requirements were carried out. The new supplemental allowance regulations based on a needs test were passed and became effective April 1, 1961.

In the process of the change from a means to a needs test for establishing eligibility for supplemental allowance, it developed that some recipients who had qualified, prior to April 1, 1961, under the means test, failed to qualify under the needs test. The department continued to carry these recipients as a separate supplemental allowance group, not shared by the federal government.

In August, 1962, we approved a new means test that is more liberal than that under which supplemental allowance was originally granted. The department is at present in the process of reviewing all supplemental allowance granted prior to April 1, 1961, on the new means test basis, and some allowances have had to be cancelled. It will be some time before this task is completed. I would stress, however, that no person who would have remained eligible if no change in program had been made will be affected and the persons whose allowances are suspended because of their assets or income have no doubt received an allowance for some time to which they were not entitled, and if and when their incomes or their assets are reduced they of course will be eligible.

The department's 1961-62 annual report indicates a marked increase in our supplemental allowance benefits.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now I would like to say something about our child welfare program. The throne speech indicated that legislation would be introduced during the session which would eliminate residence in child welfare. This will relieve the municipalities of direct contributions to this program. In 1946, under the amendments of The Child Welfare Act, the municipalities were relieved of costs under certain conditions and charges were levied against municipalities only for a comparatively small part of the child welfare services. That was when children were deemed neglected and an order was made by a court ordering the municipality of residence to pay for partial maintenance. The number of municipalities affected was relatively small in the country, yet all the municipalities in the province did have the benefit of the service and no municipality can tell when special problems might arise.

And so we are bringing in legislation which will relieve the municipalities of quite a sizeable amount each year. The S.A.R.M. and S.U.M.A. have made representation that suggested sharing this cost on a per capita basis. We shared

social aid costs, but we have gone one better than they suggested and we are relieving them of their responsibility in this field, and I am sure this will be a very popular decision with both the urban and rural organizations.

Secondly, we will have legislation that will be asking hon. members to support, which I am sure will meet with approvement, when it appears that a child is endangered, either physically or emotionally; the Child Welfare Act gives us authority to remove such a child from his home. The act also requires that the child and his parents will be brought before a judge who will hear evidence and decide on the basis of such evidence whether or not the child is neglected and should be removed from his parents.

These are very serious decisions, which affect the future life not only of the child, possibly the parents too. These courts are, of course, closed courts. We have attempted to give the parents a fair hearing and often council does appear on their behalf. I am sorry that the lawyers on both sides of the house seem to be absent at the moment but I would like to thank them, and would like them to thank the members of the Law Society, because of the very great generosity of the members of the society, because of the very great generosity of the members of the law society throughout the years in providing legal aid. However, we feel that any parents who have not the funds should be provided with counsel if they wish counsel. We have, therefore, prepared legislation, which will be coming forward, which does make provision for the payment of legal fees, making it clear in the legislation that the parents' rights will be protected to the best of our ability.

I believe that Saskatchewan is the first province in Canada where the provincial government has accepted total responsibility for child welfare services, and the first province in Canada which has provided legal services to parents in these circumstances. It is an expression of our continued concern for our children and for their parents.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I found the work of the child welfare branch really very interesting. Last year on one occasion I referred to a letter from Dennis. It was the hope of our workers in one of the regions that this very remarkable family of five kiddies might be adopted and make new parents happy. It was a pretty ambitious undertaking and I'm very sorry that I am not able to tell hon. members that this has been a success story. Hon. members might be interested in the letter from Dennis:

I am four years old, me and my big brothers and sisters need a new Mom and Dad, and we are wondering if you could help us find them. If

you want to read all about us, just turn this page; there are pictures inside too. Was it ever hard for me to sit still for the picture.

I am sorry that this isn't the sort of success story I would like to have told, but the two girls have been placed for adoption. Dennis apparently is very happy in a new home and the two older boys are in another excellent foster home.

But this is one of the great tragedies; these five wonderful children weren't able to, through no fault of theirs, to have the sort of life that all children should have. And it was a worthwhile attempt and I am sure that the kiddies are very comfortably located, but it is a pity that when they were able to give such support to one another, that it wasn't possible to find somewhere in Saskatchewan, people whose life would have been very, very different if they could have had these five kiddies to grow up as a family group. And, again, it is very hard to understand how two parents, at the same time, get off the track to such an extent that these five wonderful kiddies are not given the parental care which they deserve.

At the end of the fiscal year we had 2,476 children for whom we were responsible, and 1,674 of our children are living with foster parents. I would like to thank these foster parents for the care and the guidance that they are providing for their children. I understand that one of our foster parents has been selected as the Canadian foster mother for the year, and in due course, I am sure that this very interesting story will be given publicity across the country.

We have Dales House in Regina and Kilburn Hall in Saskatoon which are receiving centres; there is Embury House for seriously disturbed children; and the Saskatchewan Boys' School for the boys who come in conflict with the law. For some of these there is no easy solution. Too much has happened to some of the children and the skills and resources available are not enough to help them. The government cannot, and does not, carry this responsibility alone. Other agencies, municipal authorities, lawyers, doctors, and whole communities share this responsibility for caring for children with us.

Again, since the Provincial Treasurer became a member of the cabinet in 1944, there has been a tremendous change. The year before he joined the cabinet, there were 1,033 children wards of the minister at that time, and 273 were wards of various children's aid societies. There was a provincial budget for that year of \$171,600 for the child welfare work in the province, and as I said, for 1961-62, we had 2,476 with an expenditure of \$1,458,521.

A word about our geriatric centres and nursing homes. We are presently operating four geriatric centres, three of them are recognized by the federal Dept. of Health and

Welfare, as geriatric hospitals and grants are paid toward the cost of their operation from the federal government and from the provincial Department of Public Health.

The Wolsely geriatric centre doesn't grade as a hospital and is ineligible for these payments.

The Regina centre has 300 beds, 65 are assigned to the federal department of Veterans' Affairs, for D.V.A. guests and 50 beds are reserved for the Physical Restoration Centre.

The Melfort centre has accommodation for 150; Saskatoon centre for 80, and the new geriatric centre which will be opened later this year in Swift Current will have 120 beds. The estimated cost of construction of the Swift Current project is just over \$1.25 million.

As we prepared for Saskatchewan's Golden Jubilee, it was felt that one of the most suitable ways to honor pioneers would be to provide better housing accommodation for senior citizens, so that people might spend their retirement years in the community where their friends and relatives lived.

Since we started working with various communities in 1953, grants totalling over \$3,157,000 have been voted to provide accommodation costing over \$16 million and providing for 4,500 people. With the accommodation at these centres and the accommodation at the geriatric centres and nursing homes, more than 5,000 persons are being accommodated by the middle of this year.

In 1944 there was the one government home at Wolseley, which accommodated 57 persons, six other nursing homes, and the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, providing in total accommodation for 465.

I have visited most of the Canadian provinces, and many of the northern states to the south of us to see what is being done in providing housing for the elderly people in Canada and across the border. The problems we have are not confined to this province, they are problems that are found all over the world. But I don't believe there is any province in Canada that has a better program than we have. As far as I know, Saskatchewan is the only province that is taking advantage of funds made available by the federal government so that three levels of government, the federal, the provincial and the municipalities, are involved in the producing this type of accommodation.

Hon. members will be familiar with the formula: the local sponsoring group provide 8 percent, often the value of the land makes up the major part of this; local people are also responsible for the furnishings and for the management. Provincial government makes an outright grant of 20 percent of

capital cost, plus \$40 per unit, per year, for the self-contained unit, and \$60 per year for the beds in the nursing hostel portion. The federal government loans 72 percent as I said.

Our staff are working at the present time with 20 communities toward development of additional facilities. One of the main strengths of the program is the involvement of the people in the local community, in planning, building and operating of these buildings.

It is our department that represents the provincial government in negotiating with cities in connection with the subsidized rental projects. There are four projects in operation, sponsored by local housing projects: in Moose Jaw — 75 units, Prince Albert — 30, Regina — 109, and Weyburn — 50. The capital costs shared in Moose Jaw, Prince Albert and Weyburn were ten percent by the municipality, 15 percent by the province, and 75 percent. We revised the sharing formula since these cities got started and the sharing formula now is 20 percent by the province, five percent by the municipality, and 75 percent by the federal.

The subsidies are shared by the three levels of government in the same way. A contract has just recently been awarded for the construction of the first low-rental housing in Saskatoon — contract price is \$1,030,531.

Projects are under negotiation for an additional 100 units in Regina, 20 in Weyburn, 20 units for North Battleford, and the estimated costs of the additional 250 units will be approximately \$2,7 million, the provincial share being over half a million.

I must not pass without reference to our correctional institutions. We operate two correctional institutions for men and one for women in Regina. The population in these three institutions has been averaging over 500 per day. The population for the institutions — and the cost of operating them increases as the population increases — and I am sorry to report that all across Canada the penal institutions are very crowded. I saw the warden from Prince Albert penitentiary the other day, and he reported over 700 in the federal penitentiary in Prince Albert. Hon. members might be reminded that if you are serving a very short sentence, you are the responsibility of the municipality; if you are serving up to two years less a day you are the responsibility of the provincial government; over two years, you are the responsibility of the federal government. The federal and the provincial institutions across Canada are all very crowded and we are no exception. Partly because of the crowding, we have completed a new wing for the Regina institution. It contains 33 cells and treatment facilities. The addition accommodates some of the more disturbed inmates who require special treatment and attention. The wing also provides additional office space, group counselling rooms, a hobby room, barbershop and some recreational facilities.

We did not have an official opening of this fine facility but I would like to say again to hon. members, in all seriousness, that I think that as a part of your duty it would be worthwhile, at least once during a four-year term in the legislature. to see one of the institutions to get a better understanding of some of the very difficult problems that do exist in our modern society. Again, I want to explain that these institutions are not available for tourists. Some time ago the director of corrections and I took two carloads, representing the press, radio and T.V., on a tour. We explained to them that they were free to speak to any of the men they wished to see, and the men were free to say anything they want. Later some of the men heard their voices on the radio, and I think it is quite a valuable experience for everyone concerned. So long as those who visit the institutions do go as members of the legislature, who are voting over a million dollars a year, I am sure that the men in the prisons will not resent such a visit.

I would like to mention especially the camps. We are operating a camp in connection with the Regina institution at Kenosee, and anyone who has been down there will be familiar with the tremendous work that has been done there since we established our camp. The men are there the year around, not the same men, but there are usually 12 men with one officer and they are involved in doing creative work. We have been operating two camps in connection with Prince Albert institution, one at Holbein for members of A.A. All of the men there have had serious alcoholic problems, many of them, I think, probably are in prison because of being unable to control this very serious problem in modern society. One of the reporters was particularly interested in an interview with a young chap who had been in the Air Force, who was hoping that as a result of this period with others who were determined to do something about their drinking problems, he probably would never be back again.

I'm happy to announce that the budget does make provision for another camp on the Hanson Lake road, mile 29. The Department of Natural Resources are quite anxious to have us involved in the producing of peeled and unpeeled posts which will be produced there, and from time to time we have supplied personnel for fire-fighting in the north. Again, men from our prisons have had some fine testimonials from people in other departments, who were surprised with the quantity and the quality of their work.

And a word about rehabilitation. About 1947, the department inaugurated a trial program for the rehabilitation of disabled people who are receiving social aid. It has been noted that many people, relatively young people, were receiving social aid because they were handicapped and had no hope of getting work unless they had their handicapping condition reduced and could receive training necessary to enable them to compete for employment.

The program gradually evolved in which disabled persons are provided with a variety of services, designed to fit them for employment. These services range from medical and vocational assessment to academic training, the Departments of Health, Education, and Social Welfare work together on this program and receive tangible help and co-operation from the federal government through the vocational training program of the Department of Labor and the special placements services of the national employment services. Help was also received from the council for crippled children and adults.

In the fiscal year 1961-62, 63 disabled persons were helped through this program and placed in employment. They are expected to earn a total of \$130 thousand in their first year of employment. Without this program they would have been a drain on the public treasury.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at a little greater length than I planned, and again I want to thank the Provincial Treasurer for finding additional funds for our department, and naturally I will be voting for the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meakes:(Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the budget debate, I too with the other members would like to offer my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer, first of all, for his long and faithful service to his constituency. I am sure that all members will agree with me when I say that he has served them well. He has gained the respect of people in public life, all across Canada, including the oil industry in which he has worked for so many years. I think that we all love him for his sincerity, his interest in humanity, his ability, but above all his sense of humor. Certainly, his sense of humor in this house, since I have come into it, has lifted the tedium of many an hour of listening within these four walls.

I want to congratulate him for what I think is a good budget, and we in the cabinet who have worked with him know how hard he has worked in the last three or four months. The budget that he has brought down is a credit to him and I think it is a credit to the government governing this province.

In this debate, members have covered, and well covered, the budget, both pro and con. There are two or three things that I would like to mention. First of all, I would like to look at this budget in relation to my own constituency — the constituency of Touchwood. As you all know, Touchwood constituency is a rural constituency, and the biggest part of the farmers of the Touchwood constituency are mixed farmers, and they raise livestock, and so I think that, to me, one of the first things

that I note in the budget, and it is certainly of interest to my constituents, is the fact that we have set by \$1 million dollars towards the building of a veterinary college.

I'm sorry he is not in his seat, but I was very interested to note the attitude of the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) this afternoon, and I couldn't help but go back in my mind to a year ago when he mentioned in this house and he moved a motion asking that this government should do something about building a veterinary college. I wonder whether he will be able, in conscience, to get up and vote against this budget and, in so doing vote, in essence against the building of a veterinary college.

The livestock industry, Mr. Speaker, in this province, has been growing year by year, until it has reached now close to the neighborhood of two million head of livestock. And I for one believe that within this province there is room for another two million head of cattle, and I believe that this could be started through what appears in this budget in this coming year.

The budget points out that there will be more community pastures, co-operative community pastures, and other pastures built, and I believe we must go on with a program of encouraging farmers to seed down their land to grass, and I think that this is one of the ways that we could stabilize agriculture.

And I would like to ask the members of the opposition, in all seriousness, whether they are going to vote against this budget on the grounds that this is one of the things, two of the things, first the veterinary college and, secondly, added community pastures, whether this is one of the things that they suggest we should be doing without.

Looking at the budget and how it affects Touchwood constituency, I look at education, and once more I see that there is a continuing expanding program. The monies that are to be voted for education are in the neighborhood of \$4 to \$6 million dollars higher than a year ago, I note that there is going to be \$2.5 million voted for technical schools, which I would like to say something more about in a few minutes. I note that grants are increased to \$36.75 million, over \$2 million of an increase, and to me the important part of this sum of money is that it will be voted on an equalization basis, which other members have dealt with, and which the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) mentioned this afternoon.

I note that we are going to vote over \$6.5 million for the university, and I would like to ask the members of the opposition, Is this stagnation?

Sorry, the Minister of Highways, my desk mate is not in his seat. Oh, he is here so he can hear me. I want to thank him, and I want to thank him on behalf of the people of

Touchwood that within his vote there is money allocated for the oiling of highway 35 from Lipton to Leross. This is one more stretch of highway 35 that will be dust-free, and will be getting closer to the time when we will have a second north-south highway from the north to the south which will be dust free.

An Hon. Member:— Could a north-south highway go east and west?

Hon. Mr. Meakes: — I want to suggest to my desk mate, the Minister of Highways, that he should also look at highway 15, and I suggest that in the not too distant future that this too should be made dust-free.

I would like to spend a couple of minutes dealing with the Saskatchewan economy. I note by the budget address that manufacturing rose from \$350 million in Saskatchewan a year ago to \$370 million this year. I note that capital investment, per capita, in Saskatchewan is \$698, yet the average for Canada is only \$628 per capita.

It is noted in the budget address that the mineral resources revenue returns increased. Petroleum gained 20 percent in production in this last year. Esterhazy Investment, the company there invested \$40 million in a plant that will produce \$25 million of potash annually, and I would like to ask the hon. members across the way, Is this stagnation?

I would like to look at the state of agriculture, both in Saskatchewan and in my own constituency. If you think back, you will find in the statistics that in 1944 less than 18 percent of the income from Saskatchewan people came from other than agriculture, but by 1960 over 50 percent of the income of Saskatchewan was from other than agriculture.

I would like to point out to you, Sir, and to members of this house, there has been great technological changes in agriculture in the last 20 years, with automation, insecticides, herbicides, new farming methods, that we have gone into higher production, and certainly I want to suggest that this government has aided in this new era of production. I want also to suggest that the federal government, since the war, has still been using the horse-and-buggy methods in realizing a better economic base for agriculture. Certainly I think that all members will agree that the powers of making great and better changes for agriculture lie within a federal government, what with monetary policies, trade policies and tariff barriers, these are the things that really affect the economy of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a minute or two on what is the vision of the Liberal party, those to your left, in this regard. I could not help wonder what it is. I am now quoting from the Star-Phoenix of January 8, 1963, in which the

federal Liberal organizer, Dean Otto Lang of the University of Saskatchewan, is quoted as saying, speaking to agricultural graduates association meeting, on the myths of the family farm; he said:

A farm, Dean Lang said, is a good place for a family to live because of non-economic factors like independence, fresh air, quite and privacy, and with the intimacy of neighborliness where you know all your neighbors well. The more convinced people were about these non-economic values the greater the number living on the farms would be. Should those living on farms be subsidized by non-farmers to bring economic levels to that of non-farmers? Dean Lang said, Clearly not. He commented, the farmers are receiving non-economic benefits to make up the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my friends across the way, do they agree with their federal organizer, Mr. Lang? Do they agree that there should be no subsidized family farms? That is the first question I would like to ask them, and I hope some of those who may rise in debate before this debate is finished will deal with this.

What independence is he talking about? Independence to work a bit harder? Fresh air! Well, I have spent 45 years on a farm and I'll admit that we get a lot of fresh air, I imagine my hon. friend the Liberal organizer, gets his on a golf course. He talks of quite and privacy. Well, there is many a time. Mr. Speaker, I know both you and I had a lot of quiet and privacy on a farm. These non-economic benefits are to make the difference. Is this the Liberal policy? I hope some of my hon. friends will answer this.

Actually, agriculture has been subsidizing the rest of the country with cheap food every since the war, and I want to suggest the farmers can't live on fresh air. And I would suggest that the Liberal organizer, Mr. Lang, go out — in fact I challenge him to go out and live on a half-section and live on fresh air.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's all you'll get out of the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Meakes: — And I want to say again that I hope my hon. friends across the way will clarify their position. Do they agree with Mr. Lang? Is this all that the Liberal party has to offer? Is this the vision of the Liberal party — fresh air?

Mr. Cameron: — Do you want an answer now?

Hon. Mr. Meakes: — Friends and quietness? Well, I am sure that my hon. friend — I don't think he has spoken, or has he spoken?

Mr. Cameron: — I have spoken, but there are many others that haven't.

Hon. Mr. Meakes: — Oh, I'm sorry, you can't get up to answer it then.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in this session, both in this debate and other debates, about taxes. Now I said this before and I say it again, and I am sure I am speaking with the majority of the people in my constituency when I say that people don't mind paying taxes if they get something for their money. And if they are to have the protection from the worries of illness and doctor bills, they don't mind paying taxes. And if they are going to have the comforts of life, like power and all-weather roads, they don't mind paying taxes. And if they see their children are better educated and they have more security, their children will lead a better life, they don't mind paying taxes. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they don't mind paying taxes if they get more economic freedom. And certainly Mr. Speaker, there are two types of freedom — political and economic. Thank God, we have political freedom in this province, and I hope that the economic freedom will continue to get better, that we get more economic freedom as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, by common consent, Saskatchewan has been known as the co-operative province of Canada. From the pioneer days of this province, farmers recognized the need to improve their position through co-operative effort. This was due to the geographic position and the distance from markets, the need for the farmer to improve his bargaining power in the market place, his fluctuating income due to the variations in production and prices, the need to lower his costs of production in order to compete with producers in other areas which were more favorably located, and the necessity of developing under his own control organizations for greater financial security and to provide for more of the necessities of life.

The need for and the place of the co-operative movement in the life of our province has always been recognized by our people. This has been reflected by government legislation over the last 50 years or more, brought in to give our people, both rural and urban, opportunities to make use of co-operative services as they saw fit. The approach to this has always been non-partisan. Previously in this legislature I referred to the many private co-operative acts sponsored by the dean of this house, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). He has been

a devoted co-operator and his interest shows the favorable attitude towards co-operatives and co-operative legislation which has characterized many members of the legislature through the years. I can only say that I wish his colleagues of this day had the same co-operative spirit and beliefs, instead of one of being ready to pounce on the government if they even as much as imagine that the co-operative movement might be given some small break.

Now, I hoped that there will be no change in the historic policy of giving encouragement to co-operative effort in this province as our people need it, whether they be urban or rural dwellers in the south, or whether they be trappers or fishermen of the north. Co-operatives will continue to play an important place in our economy, along with private enterprise and state enterprise where needed. This, Mr. Speaker, the members to your right have always believed.

The establishment of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development in 1944 recognized the need to maintain as favorable a climate as possible for the development of co-operative enterprise in view of its growing importance to the people of the province. This involved a further extension of the previous policy of giving help to co-operatives and the belief that there was a growing demand for more diversified co-operative services.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the growth of the cooperative movement since 1945. In 1945 there were 876 co-operatives reporting in Saskatchewan; today there are 1,351 co-operatives reporting. Memberships in 1945 were 300,000; today there are 778,000. The total assets of co-operatives in 1945 was \$71 million; in March 1962 it was \$392 million. In 1945 they did a volume of business of over \$200 million. And in 1962, the year ending 1962, they did \$532 million. And if you want to add on to it the Saskatchewan share of interprovincial co-op sales, this total came to \$570 million.

In 1945 the department had a staff of 26. We now have a staff of 56 — a figure which has remained fairly constant for a number of years.

While a good deal of the growth of co-operative business during the 17 year period has stemmed from increasing support by members and the natural growth of the economy, I do contend that an important part of this development has been due to the services provided by our department, especially in the development of new co-operatives.

The policy of this government is to provide legislation for co-operatives as needed from time to time, to give assistance and advice to people who may wish to make use of that legislation, to provide such information as may be needed

to assist co-operatives to operate efficiently and to safeguard the interests of their members. This policy recognizes that co-operatives are voluntary autonomous bodies organized to serve people regardless of difference in race, creed or political beliefs.

In view of the nature of the co-operative development, the movement has never been in politics in this province, is not now, but, Mr. Speaker, if the anti-co-op reactionaries in the Liberal party continue to yelp at the heels of the co-operatives, giving them voice service but biting their heels, the co-operative movement could well be forgiven for not looking on the Liberal party as friends. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my friends across the way take this advice seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to deal with some of the services provided by the department.

Our co-operative associations branch provides inspection and advisory services where needed and as requested to 884 co-operatives, including 323 retail associations, 23 marketing co-operatives, 495 community service associations and 43 of a miscellaneous type.

An analysis of operations is prepared for retail co-formatives and the smaller marketing co-operatives upon request, while our field staff visits community service co-operatives and other co-operatives as often as their time will permit. Our contacts are mainly with boards of directors, giving them information which may assist them in carrying out the policies laid down by the members. In view of the steady growth of community service associations, more information should be given to such organizations.

In view of the growing concentration of retail distribution into fewer and fewer hands — chain stores in 1960 did an estimated 47 percent of the Canadian retail food business — the maintenance of retail co-operatives in the handling of consumer goods and farm supplies becomes ever more important as an alternative method for the agricultural producer and the urban consumer to lower his living or production costs.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, there has been criticism of the government for making available a few oil leases to federated co-operatives. The latest figures which I have indicated that approximately 96 percent of the petroleum refining in Canada is done by companies controlled by foreign stockholders, and four percent under the majority control of Canadian stockholders. Of the refining capacity under Canadian control two and one-quarter percent is through the co-operative refinery in Regina. Now I do not for one moment criticize the part that foreign financial interests have played in developing our petroleum resources. They have done a magnificent job. But surely there is nothing wrong in giving the farmers of this

province, who are our largest users of petroleum products, control over a few oil wells to be utilized through their own refinery in order to maintain the cost of petroleum products to themselves at a reasonable level. Only ten percent of the crude oil requirements of the co-operative refinery comes from wells under their own control.

Our federated co-operatives organization, owned by retail co-formatives in the three prairie provinces, continues to play its part in collaboration with other companies in the field of oil exploration. The consideration given to co-operatives in the granting of oil leases was merely an effort to maintain a better balance between the users of petroleum products and those who manufacture them for sale to the public.

Another step taken recently by our co-operatives was the establishment of the chemical complex at Saskatoon by Interprovincial. This was made possible because of the experience and benefits from co-operative action in other fields — for example, in the refining and distribution of petroleum and the distribution of feeds and insecticides. And I hope to see the day when co-operatives here on the prairies will have their own fertilizer plant, thus exercising a moderating influence on the price of fertilizer.

In 1944 the governments of the three prairie provinces lent some money to Canadian Co-operatives Implements Limited to enable it to purchase a small factory in Winnipeg. Repayments of this loan have been met promptly by C.C.I.L. Its depot system for the distribution of implements and other repair parts has now spread over the whole three prairie provinces and represents a more economical way of distributing farm implements.

It is the policy of our department through the co-operative associations branch to give advice and support where needed or requested to enterprises of this kind which exercise a beneficial competitive effect on price levels. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that our inspection program in the co-operative association branch will be extended this year.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more things I would like to say but I would like to now move adjournment of this debate until tomorrow.

Debate is adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. Mr. Brown moved second reading of Bill No. 16 — **An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very short bill to amend **The Power Corporation Act** and there really are only two amendments. The first one provides for a change in the borrowing limits of the corporation and the other one provides authority to participate in a program of providing assistance for adequate wiring in various communities. This is an extension of the power which the corporation presently has. The act provides authority to undertake various items of promotion of use of electrical energy and natural gas but it didn't specifically provide authority for the corporation to participate in programs of rewiring of premises and this is the reason that this particular amendment is being brought in at this time.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill can be better discussed in committee and I would then like to inform the assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the bill recommends it to the consideration of the assembly, and I would therefore move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Williams moved second reading of Bill No. 23— **An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was requested by the Regina Film Society which has been in existence for the past 25 years, and they merely wanted a definition of film society placed into the act. And then clause 3 provides definitely that film societies approved by the Minister of Education need not require their films to be censored.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 23, **An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act.**

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Davies moved second reading of Bill No. 24 — **An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill involves two main points and I will explain these quite briefly. The first principle involves the person who, in accordance with the sections of **the Public Service Superannuation Act**, has been granted a deferred superannuation allowance. As the situation now stands, if this individual dies before reaching 65 years of age, his widow and his dependants receive only a refund of contributions and the interest on the contributions. It is proposed in this bill that widows' and dependants' allowances would become payable whenever the person with deferred pension rights dies, and the benefits in this respect, Mr. Speaker, would be commensurate with the benefits that are already effective for those pensionable employees whose pensions have not been deferred.

As well, it is proposed by a repeat of section 29 and the amendment of section 64 to remove certain restrictions with respect to the widow of an employee or superannuate.

Now, with the explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading of Bill No. 24 be now given.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 28 — **An Act to amend The School Assessment Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 28, **An Act to amend The School Assessment Act**, has to do largely with the procedure for setting up a committee or a board to deal with inequities between hamlets, villages, rural municipalities and local improvement districts in regard to assessment, school assessments, where there appears to be some inequities in them. Up to this time, in some rare instances it has been hard to establish a committee. Under the wording of the act at the present time they are only able to have the assessors of the communities involved and sometimes this is one and the same person, and he has a little difficulty in bringing in both a minority and a majority report, so this is set up to cure this condition. This is really what we are trying to do in this amendment this year.

We also have a couple of amendments in regard to the assessment of separate schools which I think will make clear that we are endeavoring to make legal what is now being done in regard to these things.

I think this will be much better discussed in committee of the whole and I move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 29 — **An Act to repeal The Arrears of Taxes Act, The Tax Arrears Consolidation Act and The Tax Consolidation and Adjustment Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this bill has to do with the repeal of **The Arrears of Taxes Act, The Tax Arrears Consolidation Act and The Tax Consolidation and Adjustment Act.** As hon. members will know, many years ago it was possible for a person to buy a tax sale certificate and thus obtain possession of land that was being sold for taxes. This procedure, however, was discontinued away back in 1937 and The Tax Enforcement Act, with procedures very much as we have them today, was set up at that time. This procedure of being able to obtain tax sale certificates has not been in force since then. However, there was some land that the tax sale certificate had been purchased in this way. Certain equity in this land was retained by those who had obtained the tax sale certificate and there were these other acts, these Tax Arrears and Consolidation Acts, passed to retain and protect the equity of the people who had purchased these certificates. However, the time has long passed we believe when these were necessary. These have all been dealt with and we no longer have any of these — tax sale certificates — in existence at the present time. It is to clarify our statutes and to clear them up that we are now asking for the repeals of these acts. I would, therefore, move second reading at this time of this bill.

Mr. McCarthy: — Would the minister permit a couple of questions, general questions on it?

Mr. Speaker: — If you ask a question, the debate will be closed.

Mr. McCarthy: — The first question I would like to ask him is, did S.A.R.M. ask for these changes, and the second one is, were they consulted about them?

Hon. Mr. Wood: — Would I be closing the debate?

Mr. Speaker: — No, because I haven't closed the question yet. He just wanted to ask you that question before you sat down.

Hon. Mr. Wood: — This bill, the repeal of these acts, has been requested by the Master of Titles of the province and it has been discussed with the major companies that have dealt with this sort of thing in the past and they all agree that there is none of this in existence. It has not been suggested by the S.A.R.M. but I have discussed it with their secretary and he is quite in agreement that we go forward with this at this time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 27, **An Act to amend The Municipalities Seed Grain and Supply Act.**

He said:

This is **An Act to amend The Municipalities Seed Grain and Supply Act.** As a result of the repeal of the act which we have just dealt with in the bill which we have just given second reading to, there will be numerous cases in the municipal acts where allusions to the acts become obsolete when we repeal The Arrears of Taxes Act, The Tax Arrears Consolidation Act and The Tax Consolidation and Adjustment Act, and it would be improvident to do this if we left all the references to them in the acts as they now exist. And what we are doing here is simply to remove the reference to **The Arrears of Taxes Act** in **The Municipalities Seed Grain and Supply Act.**

I would now ask second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 o'clock p.m.