

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
13th Day**

Monday, February 24, 1964

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

On the Orders of the Day

FISHING DERBY, LAKE HANSON ROAD

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to report to the members of the house that a very fine winter Fishing Derby was held yesterday up Lake Hanson Road at a little lake called Seely Lake, the crowd was phenomenal for this time of the year, there being about 2,000 people in attendance, attracted by the good weather and by the fine fishing and by the appearance of Ted Peck, of Tides and Trails, as well.

I rise at this time to thank, on behalf of the members of the Board of Trade of Melfort, and the Melfort Fish and Game League, those MLAs from Shaunavon, Kelvington, Cumberland and Nipawin, who put in an appearance and enjoyed the day yesterday afternoon. I want also to apologize first of all that the people who were representing the members were not successful in catching any fish, but I did bring a fish back with me, Mr. Speaker, a fish taken from Seely Lake. D.N.R. a few years ago poisoned all the native fish in this little lake and restocked it with trout. This is a sample of a rainbow trout, a two year old trout which I'm sure hasn't reached its maturity. It will, of course, get larger than this. I am sure that when trout have reached maturity some will be bigger than this fish.

Now this fish was caught by Mrs. Pelech, who operates a tourist camp at mile 50 on the Lake Hanson Road. She is also the Secretary of the Hanson Lake Outfitters Association, and she, in catching this fish, insisted that I bring it down to Regina, show it to the members in the legislature to show just what is being done by the Department of Natural Resources in stocking our lakes. She also insisted that I bring it down here as an expression of the appreciation of the Hanson Lake Road Outfitters Association and the public, the motoring public who appreciate the services which are available along the lake.

She asked me to especially present this to the Premier and on behalf of Mrs. Pelech, I today present this to the Premier. I have made arrangements with the cafeteria downstairs to cook this fish for the Premier's dinner tomorrow. I won't give it specifically to the Premier now; he is liable to take it home; his wife is liable to insist that she eat the fish, and to make sure that he tastes the delicacy from Seely Lake, I am going to ask one of the page boys to take it downstairs and give it to the people there who will cook the fish and have it for the Premier's dinner tomorrow.

I must apologize to the rest of the members of the house that I wasn't able to bring back any of the other fish which were caught at the lake yesterday. So if one of the page boys would take this downstairs, please . . .

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I must rise to say thank you for the fish. It looks to me like one I threw back last summer, as a matter of fact, so I am glad to see it again. I just want to say to the members I am not inviting anybody to lunch tomorrow.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put on the records of the house that that is the size of fish we use for bait up in the La Ronge area.

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resume the adjourned debate on the Budget Motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks of the Minister of Highways this afternoon, and I know it was a “fish” story but it reminded me of many of the speeches that we have heard in this legislature in years gone by. I only wish that I had the opportunity of either being with the Minister of Highways or some of our other colleagues, north of Moose Jaw, over the weekend, as I can assure you it would have been much more pleasant for me to have spent the weekend either fishing, or skiing than to have spent it with my head in a lot of books.

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Didn’t you enjoy it?

Mr. McDonald: — Now, I hope that my remarks will be as enjoyable as the Premier’s dinner tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I would like to say that I feel like many other members of this house when they have expressed their regret at the fact that there are several members of this legislature who will not be with us after the next provincial election. Several of these members have served for a considerable period of time and I suggest to you, Sir, have served their constituents in the province well.

The first member I want to refer to is my friend and colleague, the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman). He has sat in this house for some sixteen years, and I can recall his first nominating convention, and at that time Mr. Horsman expressed the opinion that perhaps he was too old to seek election, but he has served his people of Wilkie and the people of the province well and I suggest that it is with regret from all members of the house that he has decided not to contest that constituency in this coming election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — I think the same thing can be said for the retiring member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) who came into this house one year later than Mr. Horsman. You will recall he was elected in the by-election after Mr. Patterson left this chamber to go to the Board of Transport Commissioners. He has served this house well and his constituents well. He, too, thought at the time when he was first nominated that perhaps he was too old to enter into provincial politics. He and Mr. Horsman had both served for many years on the municipal council, both as councillors and reeves, prior to seeking the election to this chamber, and I think that all members will agree with me when I say he, too, has served this house and served the people of Saskatchewan well.

There are two much younger members on our side of the house who have told us that they will not be contesting this election, the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) and the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). Both of these people entered public life when it was my pleasure to have led the Liberal Party and I attended both of their original nominating conventions, and I feel sorry indeed that these two people have found it impossible to let their name go before the electorate again, whenever this next election is called. I think that they are in their prime of life and I sincerely hope that they will be able to continue to make a contribution in the public life of either Saskatchewan or Canada in years to come.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Then there are those people on the other side of the house who have decided that they should not contest this particular election. The first member I want to refer to is the senior member for Regina (Mr. Williams). As most of you know, Charlie Williams was born in my constituency and, of course, that is one of the reasons that he has sown better than average intelligence of those people who sit opposite. As a matter of fact I think he received part of his education in that area of the province. Charlie has made a tremendous contribution, not only to this legislature, but to the city of Regina over the past many years, and he has served in this house for twenty years, and I think that any person who can survive five provincial elections has a lot of personal qualifications that some of the rest of us probably envy. And I know that all members are sorry to see charily not contesting this coming election.

The same can be said for the honourable member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone). He, too, has served 20 years, and if we go back and look at the record, from 1905 to date, you will find that there are few people indeed, who have ever served 20 years in this house. The casualty rate is

rather high, I can recall looking into the records at the time we passed legislation in this house dealing with pensions for members, and if my memory serves me right there were only 13 people who had served in this house who had qualifications sufficient to draw a pension at the time the legislation was passed. This, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the casualty rate is such that most people do not even serve two legislature, let alone five. So my congratulations go to both Mr. Williams and Mr. Stone and I wish them well in whatever activities they may peruse in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — The third member on the government side of the house who will not be seeking re-election is the member for Kelvington (Mr. Peterson). Unfortunately he has been caught in the draft that all of us are subject to from time to time in that he didn't get the nomination in his constituency, and I want to repeat that this is not too unusual either. I can only refer back to the casualty rate that I was talking about a moment ago — that most members who had served in this house had served one term, and I am sorry that he will not be contesting the next provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — I would like to turn now Mr. Speaker, to some of the remarks that I made last Friday before I adjourned the debate, and you may have noticed that before the Provincial Treasurer began to deliver his address on Friday, he was kind enough to give me a copy of the budget speech, and I had it in my possession during that time that the minister was delivery his budget address. I had done some arithmetic that has proven to be not too accurate, because before adjourning the debate on Friday, I made the statement that the Provincial Treasurer had under-estimated Saskatchewan's revenues by some \$20,000,000 over a period of two years. Mr. Speaker, my arithmetic was more than 100 per cent out, because I find after working with the budget speech and other material available, that the Provincial Treasurer didn't under-estimate the revenues of this province by \$20,000,000 in two years, he under-estimated the revenues in those two years by \$45,000,000.

Some Hon. Members: — OH! OH!

Mr. McDonald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot even comprehend how any Provincial Treasurer could under-estimate revenues of \$45,000,000 over a two year period Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that if twenty years ago you had under-estimated the revenues by \$45,000,000, there wouldn't have been any revenues at all, because the first budget that was presented to this house by a Provincial Treasurer representing the present administration, his total budget amounted to \$41.7 million. Mr. Speaker, how do I arrive at this under-estimation of revenues of some \$45,000,000.

If you will turn to the budget address of the year 1963-64, you will find that the budget called for a deficit of \$3.578 million, but the result of the year's operations didn't show a deficit of \$3.578 million, it showed a surplus according to the address delivered by the hon. Provincial Treasurer of \$7,000,000. But this was after provision had been made for the expenditures of \$12.758 in supplementary estimates, and if you will add the deficit, the surplus, and the supplementary estimates together, you will find that there is some \$23,000,000 more revenue than estimates. In one year, not in two, and if we were to turn to the preceding year of 1962-63, again the Provincial Treasurer calls for a deficit of \$2.392 million, the year end results show that rather than being a deficit, again there was a surplus of some \$10,000,000. And again, the total for that particular year, the fiscal year 62-63, we had revenues of some \$22,000,000 over estimates and you add these two sums together, and, Mr. Speaker, I repeat the government had some \$45,000,000 of revenues over the estimated revenues in a period of two years. And again, I want to repeat that I do not believe that this happened by accident. Mr. Speaker, I think it happened by design.

Now I can use a second method of arriving at this \$45,000,000. In the fiscal year 1962-63, estimated revenues according to the Provincial Treasurer's own figures, were \$171.826 million, estimated revenues. Actual revenues were \$195.452 million, or a difference of \$23.636 which is the same figure that I arrived at adding the deficit, the surplus and the supplementary spendings for that particular year. And then if we proceed to the year 1963-64, estimated revenues of \$184.306 million actual revenues of \$206,000,000 the difference being \$21.694 million. Mr. Speaker, again this adds up to \$45.320 million.

But this is the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker. You will recall that the fiscal year 1962-63, followed one of the worst crop failures that the province has had in many, many years, and yet the Provincial Treasurer collected in revenues \$195,000,000, following a poor crop. But in 1963-64, following a good crop, does he estimate the revenues of Saskatchewan to be as high as they were following a poor crop? No – he drops his estimates to \$184,000,000 when his actual was \$195,000,000 the year before. Then he has the audacity to come into this house during this session, Friday last, and attempted to tell this house and to tell the people of Saskatchewan the tremendous part that agriculture was playing in the development of our province, in the difference that good crops made over the poor crops.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer estimates \$11,000,000 less revenue in a good year, than he received in a poor year. How ridiculous can you get? Mr. Speaker, I believe that these estimates were by design. I do not believe that the provincial Treasurer has followed the advice of some very good people in his and other departments that are available to him. And again this year, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer is \$10,000,000 under in his estimates of revenues for this particular year. The problem seems to be that the Provincial Treasurer and his colleagues opposite cannot even estimate in their own minds the over-taxation that has taken place. They have no conception, apparently, of the amount of money the present tax levies will yield. Here is \$45,000,000 of over-taxation in two years, and will be followed by another \$20,000,000 over-taxation this year – \$65,000 in three years of over-taxation.

If it isn't over-taxation then why didn't they produce a budget to spend the money that the taxes brought in to the treasury. They had no conception of what the tax levies were doing to people; they have no conception today, as I indicated to members opposite on Friday last. There are people paying taxes in Saskatchewan today who ought to be using that money to put food in their mouths and their families' mouths, and clothes on their backs. But this government are prepared, apparently, to take \$65,000,000 over a period of three years in excess revenues in taxes alone from the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and I submit to you that there are many of our citizens who haven't this tax paying ability.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the comments of the Provincial Treasurer on the national and international economic trends, and I could agree with most of the comments of the Provincial Treasurer on this particular subject. I think one place that we have all probably been wrong when we have been looking at national and international trends is that many nations in the world, their standard of living has increased much more rapidly than many thought it would. I think that in most of the areas of the world today that have stable government their standard of living is higher today than any one of us in this chamber, probably in Canada, would have given credit to only a few short years ago.

The movement of people from rural to urban centres is not confined, Mr. Speaker, to the North American continent. There is a general movement throughout any part of the world that I know anything about – people moving from the rural centres into urban centres, and this is very, very noticeable, not only in Canada and on this continent, but it is very noticeable throughout Europe and Asia. I think it is having an effect in those parts of the world that it is not having in this area of the world, in that in the far east, rural dwellers, as a rule, are rice eaters, the farmers and the people who live in the rural areas consume great quantities of rice, but once they move into the urban centres it seems that their standard of living has increased somewhat and then they tend to change from rice eaters to wheat eaters, or bread eaters.

Therefore, I believe that we have an ever-expanding market for foodstuffs in Asia and especially wheat, because it seems to me that if their standard of living is going to increase, and I believe that it is, and they are going to continue the movement of people from rural to urban areas, then we can look forward to many millions of people who in the past have been rice eaters turning to wheat as their stable food, and this, of course, will open tremendous markets throughout the heavily populated areas of the world for Canadian wheat.

Japan, I think is a good example of this movement of people, in the change from rice eaters to wheat eaters. In Japan today there is a shortage, believe it or not, of agricultural workers. A country with a population of some 95,000,000 and yet they are unable to get sufficient labour to work on their farms. These people have not moved from the farms into the urban centres to be unemployed, you have virtually full employment

and their wages are much better than they have been in years gone by. Many people credit low wages for cheaper Japanese production than we seem to be able to produce in our country. Mr. Speaker, this is not the chief reason. The chief reason that manufactured products in Japan are lower in price on world markets than our own and the commodities of many of our neighbours, is because of automation. I do not believe there is a nation in the world that is as highly automated as Japan, especially in their manufacturing business.

Automation has not brought about low wages, and it has not brought about unemployment in Japan, and it seems to me there is a lesson for Canadians to learn because of this fact in Japan. Many Canadians are inclined to look upon automation as creating unemployment, I do not believe many of our workers, but in addition we must be prepared to give better training to many of the students that are now in our public and high schools. Provision must be made—it is not necessary for every student attend university—but provision must be made for these people to attend technical schools, trade schools, so that when they go out into the labour force they have some qualifications to make a contribution to society and to make a decent standard of living.

Many people seem to be under the impression that Japan is unable to feed herself, that she must import Canadian wheat. I believed that before I visited that country, but it is not true, Mr. Speaker. Japan on the average produces 13,000,000 tons of rice a year, and if she had no wheat at all in her country, no imports of wheat, she would consume 12,000,000 tons of rice. She has a surplus of foodstuffs of a million tons of rice along each year. There is a ready market in Asia and eastern Europe for rice, for surplus rice. But Japan is still producing her 13,000,000 tons of rice; she is exporting it to some of her neighbouring countries and importing wheat from Canada, because these people who are moving from the rural areas into the urban centres prefer wheat.

The higher their standard of living becomes, the more wheat they want to eat and the less rice. So I think that we have a good example in Japan as to what we could expect as far as developing markets are concerned for Canadian wheat in the East.

I said at the beginning of my remarks, that I doubted if the Provincial Treasurer realized the extent to which good crops of wheat affect the economy of Saskatchewan and the economy of Canada as a whole. I doubt if there are many Canadians who would realize, let alone admit, that wheat as a single commodity, probably pays more, or has more influence on economic conditions in Canada, than any other single commodity. And I do not believe that Canada as a whole can prosper, unless the western wheat growers are prosperous, and I'm not talking about Saskatchewan, I'm talking about Canada. I think it is demonstrated to all of us over the last few years that if the western Canadian wheat farmer is prosperous, then as a general rule, prosperity exists in Canada, but if the western farmer is not prosperous, the economy of Canada as a whole suffers because of it.

Only a small part of the greatly increased farm income, that we are receiving in Saskatchewan today, is being derived from exports of this year's crop. As you, Mr. Speaker, know, there's been very little of this year's crop delivery by farmers, and the only payments that they have received has been the initial payment, but the general prosperity that we are experiencing at the moment is the result of a very good crop in 1962, and all of that crop has disappeared into commercial channels, the farmers have received not only their initial payment, but are now in the process of receiving their final payments, and I think that the prosperity we are experiencing today, is the result of a good crop in 1962, and the prospects of large amounts of income from our 1963 crop which is going to be getting to go to market.

This is reflected, Mr. Speaker, in net farm income of Saskatchewan farmers over the last several years. And I'm only going to refer to net income, because I do not believe that gross income means too much. It's what the farmer has left in his pocket or his net income. When we consider that the net income in 1962 of our farmers some \$503,750,000 compared to \$150,750,000 in the preceding year or the drought year of 1961. This is what has brought prosperity to Saskatchewan and has played a large part in bringing prosperity to Canada as a whole.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — The Provincial Treasurer mentioned in his address that retail sales had for the first time reached a billion dollars in Saskatchewan.

Again I believe that the single commodity that had more to do with this fact than anything else, is wheat, and I hope that not only Saskatchewan people but that the people of Canada will realize that if you are going to have general prosperity in Canada, then your wheat farmers in Western Canada must be prosperous.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — I mentioned a moment ago that practically all of the 1962 crop has been delivered by our farmers to the Canadian Wheat Board and has been sold at what I think pretty good prices, and the final payment that our farmers are now receiving, of course, proves that statement. The crop of 1963, Mr. Speaker, really is two crops in one. This the Provincial Treasurer said. It's not very often in the history of Saskatchewan that we have grown two crops at once. More often we got two crops in three years, or two crops in five years, but 1962, I submit, was an excellent crop, 1963 is two years in one.

This crop is now moving to market, and it looks like there's going to be a considerable market available, and I believe that we will be able to dispose of it. When I say we, I mean the Canadian Wheat Board. We'll be able to dispose of the entire 1963 wheat crop. It looks like exports will run at least 550,000,000 bushels and it looks like the price will be an improvement over the last several years. To date, wheat exports amounted in this crop year to some 112 bushels, or at least 112,000,000 bushels greater than they were for the corresponding period last year. This again, Mr. Speaker, is going to be very influential as far as revenues are concerned to the government of Saskatchewan. Total commercial disappearance of wheat is about 134,000,000 bushels above this time last year. This is not total sales, Mr. Speaker, total commercial disappearance at this date are 134,000,000 bushels over what they were this date a year ago. This is going to make a tremendous difference to Canada, and to Saskatchewan. And this is why I said at the beginning of my remarks that I believe that the Provincial Treasurer has underestimated revenues again this year, by at least \$10,000,000.

You will recall that farm deliveries at the beginning of this crop year last August 1st were lagging somewhat behind the deliveries of a year ago. Some people have found it difficult to understand why. But again, Mr. Speaker, one year ago, or a year ago last August 1st, most of the country elevators had a lot of space because we had almost a crop failure caused by drought in 1961. So there was a lot of space available in terminal elevators and in country elevators throughout the country, and immediately the new crop was harvested, people were able to deliver their grain into this space that had been created because of the crop failure. This was not the case this year, I mentioned a moment ago that in 1962, we had a good crop, farmers had delivered most of it, and at the beginning of this crop year, there was very little space available if any surplus space in either our terminals or our country elevators. But farm deliveries recently have picked up and we are now some 66,000,000 bushels ahead of where we were a year ago, as far as the deliveries are concerned, and I think all hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that it looks now that as soon as the Great Lakes are cleared of ice, the wheat will move out of this country in quantities we never dreamed of in the past, and I want to give full credit for this to the Canadian Wheat Board. In past there have been too many people trying to chisel in on the work and the efforts of the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board was set up . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — . . . by the farmers of western Canada to serve the farmers of western Canada, and I think they should be allowed to run their own business and I think they're doing a pretty good job.

These increased markets, Mr. Speaker, have reflected themselves in increased prices. There again, I think the only reason that prices are going up is because we have a larger world demand, part of it caused by drought in parts of the world, but a lot of it is being caused by the increased standards of living of people in other parts of the world. They've come into a position for the first time in history, where they can afford to buy Canadian wheat or anybody else's wheat. And because of this increased demand, we have increased prices. Recent price of wheat, the high was some \$2.08, I notice its dropped down to \$2.07, but I have every hope that it will go back up a cent or two, or perhaps more, once the Great Lakes are available for shipping.

This is the highest price of wheat in 43 years, but, Mr. Speaker, farmers have got the highest cost they've ever had in 43 years. Right

today we should have the highest wheat prices we've had for 40 years. The farm costs are certainly the highest they've been in the last 40 years. Some of these high costs have been placed on the farmer's back by government, both provincial and federal, and I don't think that this legislature has played its proper part in endeavoring to decrease this ever increasing cost of farm production, and I hope that this house in its wisdom, in this session will attempt to alleviate some of the problems that confront our farmers, take off their shoulders some of the taxes that are being extracted from them today.

I've talked about wheat, and the part that it has played in our economy today but what's the future like, Mr. Speaker? Commitments have been made by the Canadian Wheat Board to deliver some place between 75,000,000 and 100,000,000 bushels a year to Iron Curtain countries over the next two crop years. This is a great source of satisfaction, or must be to western farmers, to think that they are now in a position where they will sell to Iron Curtain countries alone, someplace between 75,000,000 and 100,000,000 bushels per year over the next two crop years. This added with our normal sales, and the prospect of even selling larger quantities of wheat to the Iron Curtain countries, it looks now like the Canadian Wheat Board are going to be able to sell, large crops over at least the next two crop years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that I believe this means far more to the province of Saskatchewan than has been recognized by the government that sits opposite. I think that it means more to the economy of Canada, than most Canadians realize. This is the first time in the history of the Canadian Wheat Board, that we have had commitments for future deliveries to several countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, what would have happened to Canada's international payments had it not been for the part that wheat has played over the last 18 months in balancing Canada's international payments? Surely, Canadians recognize that if it hadn't been for these large crops that we have been able to produce, and able to sell, that there's a good possibility that this country would have been in economic difficulty the like of which we have never seen before in the history of Canada, and the one product that saved us was wheat, and the sale of wheat to the needy countries of the world. And I hope Canadians will pay attention or at least make note of this fact, and I hope that in future, when governments are attempting to see that western farmer receives this fair share of the national income, that thought will be given to the part that was played by the western farmers during this time of an emergency and could have been a crisis.

Members will have noticed that so far I have given the entire credit for these sales of wheat and the price of wheat to the Canadian Wheat Board and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that's where it belongs. But I also believe, Mr. Speaker, and I hope my friends opposite will give me a hand when I make this statement. I also believe that Canada today is fortunate in the gentleman they have as the Minister of Trade and Commerce for Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Now why do I say that? Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? There are two reasons: 1. The sale of wheat to Russia was part of an overall trade program, in which I am sure the minister must have had some dealings but I am not going to ask anyone to give him credit for the wheat sale, but I think we should give credit to him for the policies he has adopted, in endeavouring to broaden Canada's trade with all nations. Mr. Sharp is fortunate in that he had served as deputy minister of trade and commerce for many years before he became the minister and I can imagine that his experience as deputy minister has served him well in preparing him to do that job as minister. I am pleased that he too has adopted a policy of freer trade for Canada, this is something that westerners have supported for generations. Westerners in general, whether they were CCF, Liberal or Conservative or what they were, the majority of people in western Canada have supported freer trade for a good many years. But the majority of people of Canada, whether they were CCF, Liberal or conservative or whatever they were didn't support freer trade and this is the one reason that we have not had a free trade policy in Canada as I believe we should have had and as I believe would have benefited this nation. But I am glad that the present minister is supporting freer trade policies for Canada. It appears to me that he has converted many people in eastern Canada to our way of thinking and I hope that members opposite will wish he and his staff well, when they attended the Kennedy round of talks on freer trade, I am convinced that this will not only help the people of western Canada, but Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canada is going to remain one of the great nations of the world, that Canada must have freer trade policies, much freer than we've had over the last many years.

I want to refer now, Mr. Speaker, to page 6 of the budget debate and I want to quote two or three paragraphs of the Provincial Treasurer. The first quotation is as follows:

The future of our agricultural resources in the long run is equally bright. Increasing world demands for food will place more and more of a premium on world soil resources.

I agree with the Provincial Treasurer. The second quotation is:

The productivity of agriculture has increased more than that of any other sector in the post-war period. I expect this to continue.

I agree with the Provincial Treasurer here. Then the last quote:

Some may say that this is too optimistic a view of the future. I do not believe it is.

I agree here with the Provincial Treasurer. I think not only Canadians, but Saskatchewan citizens, many of them who live in our urban centres have not recognized the part that agriculture has played in Saskatchewan in the past. I believe that we can produce far more in the future and must produce more, if we are going to feed ourselves and to feed hungry people in the world. And I do not believe that the Provincial Treasurer's views are too optimistic; the only criticism I might have is that they're not quite optimistic enough.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to page 11, of the budget address, and on page 11, the Provincial Treasurer makes a very strange statement, and I want to read it to you, he says:

Revenues have risen markedly, along with our rapidly expanding economy. They are expected to reach \$214.8 million next year, up from this year's revised estimated of about \$206,000,000.

And I want you to take note of this, Mr. Speaker;

this is after having the deducted \$5,000,000 tax reduction, which was announced last year.

What \$5,000,000 tax reduction? What \$5,000,000 tax reduction decreased revenues?

Mr. Speaker, let's turn to page 30 of the same address. If the Provincial Treasurer can show me any place in this statement where taxes have been reduced on revenue accounts by \$5,000,000, I'll buy him the biggest Cadillac that General Motors have ever made. Mr. Speaker, the \$5,000,000 that the Provincial Treasurer is talking about has nothing to do with revenues. Nothing. The \$5,000,000 was put in here, Mr. Speaker, as a political gimmick, trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan that he decreased taxes by \$5,000,000.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources): — He did.

Mr. McDonald: — Well you know, I have no doubt that the Minister of Mineral Resources would think this because I wouldn't expect him to know any better.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — But I would expect the Provincial Treasurer to know better, and again I don't think his advisers ever advised him to put this in the budget speech. Mr. Speaker, the \$5,000,000 that he is referring to was a decrease in the premiums or head tax on hospitalization and medical care. Is there any reference in revenue accounts in this budget or any budget that's ever been presented of this particular tax? None whatever; it has nothing to do with revenues.

Let us turn and look at this chart on page 30 and what do we see, Mr. Speaker? Again the government that sits opposite would like to think that they are increasing services to our people, using revenues from the development of our resources to pay for, Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent of the revenues that the Provincial Treasurer referred to, some \$214,000,000 comes from taxation.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Twenty per cent comes from resources development, and if the Provincial Treasurer would take the time to go back and look over the budget speech, for I don't care how far he wants to go back, he'll find that this has been the general pattern. Eighty per cent of the revenues derived from taxation, 20 per cent from the development of our resources. And, Mr. Speaker, this 80 per cent is what I'm concerned about. \$65,000,000 is over taxation in three years, no decrease in taxation.

Now let us refer to some of these taxes and the increase that has taken place over the last few years. Let us look at the Education and Health Tax. In 1960-61, the Education and Health Tax brought in \$21,500,000 in round figures. It is estimated this year that it will bring in not \$21,500,000 but \$44.7 million. Forty-four point seven million from a 5 per cent sales tax and I repeat, a good deal of this 44.7 million being taken from people who can ill-afford to give to this government. What about the gasoline tax? Twenty-five million, or \$25,500,000 in 1961-62, 30.7 in 1964-65, and increase of \$5.3 in three years in the gasoline tax. Motor vehicle licenses \$8,000,000 in 1961-61 and \$9,250,000 in 1964-65. What about this income tax? And this is just a provincial levy, or the increase in the provincial levy, from the national standard all across Canada, what they figure Saskatchewan citizens could pay over and above that, nothing in 1962-62 was in effect, but this year we'll yield 7.7 dollars.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — On a point of privilege, I would like to correct the hon. member. That \$7,000,000 is not by any means just what Saskatchewan levies, but the total allowed to Saskatchewan under the agreement.

Mr. McDonald: — I agree with you, but what I'm pointing out Mr. Provincial Treasurer is that you are collecting above the Canadian average. You said to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — . . . the effect of your policy has been that you said to the people of Saskatchewan you have more tax-paying ability than people of other parts of Canada. This is ridiculous. On the other hand, and I'll refer to it later on in my remarks, the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier are very concerned because of the relationship between the province and the dominion on the tax-sharing agreement, and the reason we have tax-sharing agreements, Mr. Speaker, is because the wealth of Canada is not equally distributed from east to west, north to south, and we are trying to get more out of these tax-sharing agreement. But the Premier and his seatmate, the Provincial Treasurer have said, "Oh you wealthy Saskatchewan, you can pay above the national average." Well, kick in a little bit and don't be so tight.

What about telephone dividends? Or profits? Or extractions? This is one place that I must disagree with my good friend, Charlie Williams, Minister of Telephones. His profits have gone up from something like \$2,000,000 in 1961-62 to something over \$4,000,000 in this fiscal year. Again you've got about the highest telephone rats in the North American continent.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — It costs more money, Mr. Speaker, it costs more money for me to phone from my home town to the neighbouring town than it does to go by bus.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — And it is not a Saskatchewan government bus. I can catch a Greyhound bus and drive from my home town to the neighbouring town for less money than I could to call.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — You know, I don't mind that some of my friends over there like to interfere because I never met an alley cat yet that didn't like to make noises like a lion.

Let's turn to liquor, Mr. Speaker. What's happened with liquor? Thirteen million dollars revenue three years ago, \$16,250,000 in the next fiscal year. In other words, this increased taxation during that period 1961 and '62 to '63, too \$27,000,000 additional money in taxation out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan. In the following year, to ok \$35,000,000 out in additional taxes, this year will take \$42,750,000 additional dollars out of the pockets of the payers. This means that in a period of three years, a total of \$104,750,000 additional; revenue has been derived by taxation, a \$104,750,000 additional taxes, not total. Mr. Speaker, I think it's time that we had a few tax cuts.

Now I want to turn to some of the so-called priorities that apparently the government has adopted in spending all of this money. I don't know whether their interpretation or the word priorities is the same as mine but I wonder just when some of the matters that I am going to discuss will be given any priority by my friends who sit opposite. These are just a few, I wonder when the assistance under the old-age security allowance, the old age assistance, blind persons' allowance, disabled persons' allowance, when are they going to come up under this system of priorities? What consideration have they been given by my friends who sit opposite in the last ten years? You know in opposition the NDP in Ottawa are constantly asking the government of Canada to increase old age pensions. But they are not in opposition here, they are the government. I want to repeat, what assistance have you given to these people who are in receipt of old age security? What allowances are they getting today that they didn't get ten years ago? What about those people who are receiving old age assistance despite the fact we have had \$104,000,000 additional revenue. What considerations have you given to them? Where do they come on your list of priorities? I don't think you even have them on the list.

This government has continued to refuse to make an increase in the provincial contribution to these particular people and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that increased taxation has hurt these people. You have increased the tax load that they must pay, but have you given them any additional revenue to pay it with? None. Complaints are coming in, I don't know whether members opposite ever get any or not, but I certainly do. Complaints are coming to me at this very moment about the attitude this government has taken since the recent \$10 increase to our senior citizens. As you know the government of Canada increased their old age assistance and old age security, blind and disabled allowances by \$10. What has this government done?

They have taken into consideration this \$10 increase and cut down the supplementary allowance.

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare): — That's not right.

Mr. McDonald: — It is so right, and I will give you a list as long as your arm where you have done it.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Tell him . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You have done it twice before. this man holds himself out as the friend of the aged, the disabled, the crippled, the blind and those on social aid. Never in the history of this province have we had a Minister of Social Welfare who had so little regard for any one of these people.

Mr. Speaker, what does the record prove? What happened in 1947? You were the government. What happened in 1947 when the old age pension was increased by \$5. a month; what did these people do? That increase didn't go to the pensioner; this government took it.

Mr. Danielson: — Stole it.

Mr. McDonald: — Stole it, is right. These friends of our senior citizens — did they pass the \$5 on to the pensioners? Not very likely they did, they kept it.

What happened in 1949, Mr. Speaker? The federal government again raised the pension to \$40 a month and the socialists of this province reduced their supplementary allowance so that our pensions did not get the full benefit of the increase. Those provinces that gave the full benefit of the increase, their pensioners got \$50 a month, Saskatchewan pensioners got \$42.50. You not only have done nothing to pass on part of this increased

revenue from ever increasing taxes to our senior citizens but you have taken part of the money away from them that ought to have been theirs because of the increase in the pensions provided by our senior government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — I wonder where our senior citizens come in the list of priorities. I wonder where our blind pensioners come. I wonder where disabled persons come. Surely if we have all of these increased revenues, \$104 in three years, there ought to have been some of it passed on to the disabled, the blind, the old age.

Mr. Nicholson: — There has been, there has been . . .

Mr. McDonald: — There has been. You're a has-been. Mr. Speaker they act like Santa Claus in opposition and like Scrooge in government. Again I ask, where do these people who can do nothing for themselves as far as their income is concerned, where do they come on the list of priorities? When are they going to show up? Is it announced either in the throne speech or in the budget in this house? The Provincial Treasurer wound up his address by asking the opposition to support this budget. I will never support a budget in this house that doesn't make adequate provision for our senior citizens, our blind, and our disabled people.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — I mentioned on Friday last, those people who are partially disabled, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again today that I think it is a disgrace the interpretation of the word disabled. This is federal legislation . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Passed by a Liberal government.

Mr. McDonald: — I don't care who passed it. This is what is wrong with you people, Mr. Minister, you have too much bigotry in your head and not enough common sense. I don't care whether it was the Liberal Party that passed it or whether it was the New Moses, it is bad legislation. The interpretation of a disabled person is a disgrace to Canada. In my opinion, any person who has no earning power, through no fault of his own, ought to be classed as a disabled person, but they are not. They are not, and it is not good enough that if the federal government, whether they be Liberal or Conservative or whatever they are, if they are not prepared to take care of these people then the members of this legislature ought to be prepared to do something about it.

But for you to sit idly by on your hands and your eyes closed, and to see these people with no income, too proud to go on relief or social aid, and what have you done about it? Nothing. Not one single thing. Are they happy? Where do they appear on your list of priorities? They are not even on the list apparently, you have completely ignored these people, unless they are prepared to swallow their dignity and to take relief or social aid. And the stigma, as I mentioned Friday, is the same today on social aid as it was on relief thirty years ago and this isn't good enough. They talk about new horizons. This government is sitting here looking at a sunset instead of a sunrise. I doubt if they know the difference.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Perhaps I shouldn't become so worked up, because I don't think these people are going to be here to spend the budget that we are talking about in any case.

So apparently you don't care about those people who are partially disabled. Apparently they are none of your concern. I suggest they are the concern of every member of this house and there ought to be monies in this budget to do something about it.

I mentioned prepaid drug insurance in this house on Friday last. I'm going to mention it again today. There are many instances in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, where some of our citizens are called upon to pay as much as a \$100 a month for drugs. Now there are few people in Saskatchewan who can afford to pay \$100 a month. There are many instances where drug costs are crippling families, and with the revenues that are available to

Saskatchewan today, this increase of \$65,000,000 is three years, surely part of this could have been used to implement a program to pay at least part of these drug costs. But again this government wants the people on this side of the house, the opposition, to support a budget, the largest in the history of this province but it makes no provision to do anything about this problem, it is not even mentioned. They close their eyes and I suppose they believe it doesn't exist. When will this arrive on the list of priorities?

Again, Mr. Speaker, when are their promises of twenty years ago to pay the total school costs out of provincial funds going to arrive on the list of priorities? When is this going to come up on the priorities — this promise is twenty years old. But here after twenty years there is 26½ per cent of our budget being used for educational purposes, and as far as I can figure out we are paying about 45 per cent of the operating costs. Twenty years after the commitment was made that they would pay the total costs. When will this come up again on your priority? Certainly you are increasing school grants by \$5,000,000 and I don't think there is a citizen in Saskatchewan who is opposed to that. But . . .

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Except you . . .

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Who said that . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — You said you would vote against it . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly I'll vote against it, you promised to pay 100 per cent. Twenty years later you are paying 45 per cent and until you keep your promise I'll continue to vote against it.

What about the percentage of the total revenues of the province being used for educational purposes. They don't compare too well with the rest of Canada. You know it is a strange thing but the gentleman who is now our Premier, used to be Minister of Education and he used to be a school teacher, but we have had more educational reform from the present minister who used to be a farer, than we ever had from the minister that is now in the seat of the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — You know I wonder when these priorities are going to appear. You know the speakers opposite would like us to believe that they have this list of priorities and every time anything is needed it pops out, it is the first thing on the list they take care of.

Mr. Speaker, many of the problems that exist are not even on the list of priorities, apparently. I wonder when this government will consider as a priority some policies that will keep Saskatchewan-born citizens in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Some policies that will keep those venturesome souls that immigrated into our province here as well. When will we have these types of priorities? What is in the budget this year, Mr. Speaker, it see that additions to our populations from natural increase and from immigration are gainfully employed?

Certainly they talk about priorities, and one of the other famous phrases that was coined by the Provincial Treasurer "New Horizons". About the only new horizons we have are high taxes, increased debt. And I want to repeat I think the Provincial Treasurer is like the old hunter that lived up in the mountain to a very old age, and he was sitting out in front of his trapper's shack one night looking at the sunset, and he got so old and confused he thought it was the sunrise. Well, I think that is exactly what has happened to this government. They have sat here so long they don't know the difference between sunset and sunrise. Mr. Speaker, at one time the political party that sit opposite and the government of the day, were active; at one time they were quick-witted; at one time they had abilities; at one time they had foresight but, Mr. Speaker, they are dead as a dodo today.

I can recall many, many people coming to me over the last several years. People who had supported the NDP or the CCF, if you want to call

them that, for fifteen and twenty years. They are saying to me “What has happened to our government; what has happened to their leadership?” Many of these people, Mr. Speaker, have turned against this government. Many of their best followers. Many of those people who made the largest contribution to their political campaigns have turned against them. Why? Because they know that this government are sitting here looking at a sunset and not a sunrise.

Most Canadians are not convinced, as I said on Friday, that the province of Saskatchewan is Utopia. If they were there would be more of them coming to live with us. But what is a good definition of Utopia? Well, I think a good definition of Utopia would be 1964 wages, 1926 dividends, 1932 prices, and 1910 taxes and if anybody thinks that is what exists in Saskatchewan . . .

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. McDonald: —But there is a new definition for a dime in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it is “that part of a dollar that is left after you pay your provincial taxes.”

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Now if this were Utopia, would we have to be concerned about the population growth of our province? If the new horizons that the Provincial Treasurer has talked about were viewed by the average citizen of Saskatchewan, and of Canada, would we have this problem? The problem in most areas of the world today is over-population. I can think of a little island that I met a delegate from at the recent conference in Malaysia. A gentleman from Mauritius. An island that has a total area of 720 square miles, they have a population of 700,000 people. There are few places in the world today where under-population is a problem. But the best example that I can think of is the province of Saskatchewan. Just here a few days ago, the new figures were made available on our population up to January 1, 1964. We have the same pattern that we have had in Saskatchewan and in Canada over the last many years.

Canada's population has increased by 1.8 per cent, the provinces of Newfoundland, that terrible Liberal province, Quebec, another terrible Liberal province, Ontario a terrible Conservative province and Alberta a terrible Social Credit province, they have an increase in population of two per cent. But what did this Saskatchewan of ours do? It had an increase of .6 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Saskatchewan citizen. I think I am the only person in this house whose father and mother were born in what is now Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact some of my grandparents were born here too, and there is no individual in this house more proud of this province than I am. But I am not prepared to stick my head in the sand, like an ostrich, and not complain about many of the things that are happening in our province, and population is one of them. If you were so kind, so generous, providing so many services, so many firsts in Canada, I would think we could keep pace with the rest of Canada, but we haven't been able to do that.

When this government came to power, Saskatchewan was the fourth largest province in Canada as far as population was concerned. The fourth:- you had Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia ahead of us in 1944. Today we are the sixth. Are you satisfied with the result? Do you think that you have accomplished or done a good job? Do you? Well, if you do you are the only people in Saskatchewan that are convinced of it. Here, Mr. Speaker, we have had an increase of 12 per cent in our population, when the Canadian average is 59.9 per cent. Now the Minister of Industry and Information, who as usual isn't in his seat — he will be out making a political speech somewhere — he made on yesterday, and he said “Why if this prosperity continues in Saskatchewan we are going to have to import people.” Well, you are going to have to import them because we haven't been able to get them here any other way.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — We cannot even convince our own families to stay in Saskatchewan. How are you going to import them? Are you going to get some boxcars, load them up and bring them into Saskatchewan? If you do, better put a fence around it or they will escape. Mr. Speaker, this is the one and greatest condemnation of this government. They cannot even

provide a decent standard of living for the people who are born here. They cannot even provide jobs for the people who are born here. The Minister of Agriculture – you know, he likes to too his horn once in a while. I wonder where his family are making their living. I'll ask him that some day when I have him alone.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to federal-provincial relations, and again I have no quarrel with the Provincial Treasurer or the Premier in their attitude and their representations they have made to the dominion-provincial conferences on Saskatchewan's behalf. And I'm not going to spend any more time on that particular matter other than to say that I do agree with them, and I think it would be a poor Saskatchewan citizen indeed no matter what his political faith might be, if he didn't stand up for policies that would bring more revenues from Canada as a whole to our province, and revenues that I think we are entitled to and this idea of bringing the yield of certain tax revenues under consideration and leaving others out is nothing but hokum-pokum as far as I'm concerned, but Mr. Speaker, I only wish that the attitudes that are held by this provincial government with regard to dominion-provincial relations were the same attitudes that they hold in regard to provincial-local government relations.

I think that what is fair in our dealings between Ottawa and the provinces would be fair in our dealings between Saskatchewan and local governments. But this hasn't been the case, Mr. Speaker. I want to read to you a paragraph from the budget speech of 1961, page 25. The present Premier was Provincial Treasurer at that time. This is what is says:

We in the government of Saskatchewan are as anxious that local government have adequate revenues to discharge their responsibilities as we are anxious that the province have adequate revenues to discharge theirs.

That is a good statement and I would support it but why have he and his colleagues never lived up to it. I repeat, we support the provincial government's stand on federal-provincial matters as far as taxation is concerned, but we do not support your stand on provincial-local government relations.

What has the government that sit opposite suggested to our local governments? Have they said, well, we will collect all of the automobile tax, all of the sales tax, all this tax, that tax and the other tax, and hand part o fit back to you? That's what they are advocating that Ottawa do fro Canada, and for the provinces. Have they adopted this same attitude with the governments that they created – local governments? No. Here is what they told local governments they can do – and I wonder what sort of a howl would come up from the present Premier and the Provincial Treasurer if Ottawa told this government to do what this government told the municipalities to do. What did they tell them to do?

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — In a statement by Provincial Treasurer Fines to the provincial-local government conference in December of 1956, he suggested several additional taxes that the municipalities might levy on their residents to solve their own financial problems. The government of Ottawa didn't tell the government of Saskatchewan to go home and put on some of their own taxes. But this is what they told local government. They said this; they suggested to the municipalities that they should put on a frontage tax on land that faced adjacent to provincial highways or improved all-weather roads. What would this outfit have said if the federal government ever told them this? What is the next thing they suggest? A provincial tax on farm machinery fuel, and the proceeds used to improve local roads. They suggested that we should not only have a provincial tax on fuel, but you had a municipal one as well. I suppose it would be 2 cents in this municipality, 3 cents some place else, 8 cents some place else. These are the very tax principles that I thought my friends opposite were opposed to, as far as Canada is concerned, but they are tax principles that they support when they are at home.

The third recommendation was for municipalities to impose within their boundaries an additional levy on some provincial government taxes. Now, they not only want the province to collect taxes from the municipalities, they want the municipalities to have an additional levy. Local license fees on resident motor vehicles. Then you are going to have to buy a provincial license for your automobile and a municipal license as well. A municipal sales tax, Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear such nonsense. We have a 5 per

cent general sales tax in the province, and now they said to the municipalities you put one on as well. Special levies on gasoline! Aren't we taking enough money out of the users of gasoline now with a provincial tax.

Taxes on property now exempt such as charitable and community service institutions, — well, now we are not even going to let the churches get away without paying taxes. They should be taxed. Taxes on privately owned assets in the form of building improvements, machinery, equipment and personal possessions — the municipality now, they suggest should tax you on your building improvements, your farm machinery, equipment and your personal assets. If you have a tie that you are not wearing you pay extra tax on it. This is after \$45,000,000 additional revenues in two years, and increased taxes of \$104.75 million in three years.

They don't have the same respect and attitude for the governments that they created that the government of Canada have had under both Tory and Liberal governments, for the provinces of Canada. I want to repeat that I am not satisfied with the proposals that have been made at the recent dominion-provincial conferences for our provinces, but I am much less satisfied with the proposals that this government has made with regard to local government.

I would suggest . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — . . . Mr. Speaker, that a provincial local government conference should be called at once. Again the government that sits opposite us constantly is asking Ottawa to take them into their confidence so that they can discuss matters that affect all of the dominion of Canada, the premiers and the Prime Minister of Canada. I would suggest that we take local government into our confidence, not to bring them here and subject them to a brain-washing like they got here in 1956, but to bring them here on equal terms with the government of the day, to discuss a new division of responsibilities and a new division of taxes between the province and local government.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has this government said? Again it isn't just the list of taxes they told the municipalities to go home and collect, but they've said that municipalities will receive no additional revenues unless they're prepared to reorganize their boundaries, and I want to read into the record what they have been told:

but unless the basic reorganization step can be anticipated, it seems clear to us, that merely raising the amounts of direct financial aid will not come to grips with the inherent problem. Further financial relief however, should only be made to local government which is soundly organized and effectively administered. We cannot afford to waste the taxpayer's money.

Mr. Speaker, what this government has said to local governments is that they are ineffective and they have wasted the taxpayer's dollar, I don't believe that. I believe if there's any tax dollar for which we're getting value today, more than any other, it is the tax dollar that is being handled by the local government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to the public debt. And I'm afraid I'll have to do all over again, what I have done in this house in the three previous occasions, to try and point out to my friends opposite what they are attempting to do as far as the public debt is concerned. And I could refer to a quotation in the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer on page 7, when he talks about the procedure being used in Saskatchewan which is identical with the government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, this statement is not in accordance with the facts. In order to arrive at the net debt that the Provincial Treasurer arrived at in his budget speech, he definitely did not use the same system that is used by the government of Canada. And I would refer the Provincial Treasurer to House of Commons Debates, Official Report Tuesday, June 13, 1963, page 93, and if he thinks for one moment that he's using the same system that is used by the government of Canada, then I don't know what's wrong. He's blind. He's either blind or he cannot see or he will not see, I don't know which it is. There is no similarity between the procedures used by this Provincial Treasurer

and the procedures used by the government of Canada when calculating the net debt.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer likes to refer at different times to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics when he's talking about gross and net debt. And I refer him, Mr. Speaker, to financial statistics of provincial governments 1962 fiscal year ending March 31, 1963 from the debt direct and indirect page 6. If he will look at the figures that are used by DBS, net funded debt — they don't say net funded assets, as the Provincial Treasurer tried to tell us that we have no net debt, but that we have assets of some \$23,000,000. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics under net funded debt have \$483.473 in the first item, and in the second item \$13.063. Mr. Speaker, there is no recognized authority on this earth that can come up with a juggling of figures and supposedly net assets of \$23,000,000 as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned. And I want to refer the Provincial Treasurer to what his own party said when Premier Bennett in the province of British Columbia attempted to juggle figures, the same as my friend is juggling it, and what did the CCF party say in British Columbia? They said the debt had merely been moved from one column to another by a book-keeping expert. If you'd like an example, . . . here take this over to the Provincial Treasurer . . . and they call it debt reduction hokum, book-keeping gimmick.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the exact same book-keeping gimmick in Saskatchewan as you have in British Columbia, and I'm not going into great detail about this public debt, but, Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Treasurer were to use the same system that is used by the government of Canada, or to use the same system in keeping his books as his predecessor did, for seven years, and if he doesn't believe me, here are the budget debates from 1945 for the first seven years, the then Provincial Treasurer discontinued that system, because he could no longer hide the debt that was being created in Saskatchewan so he set up a new system of keeping books and if the Provincial Treasurer has never looked at them before, I ask him to turn to page 16, of the budget address delivered by the Hon. C.M. Fines in March 15, 1945. Under public debt, what has he got? Bonded debts, so many millions, treasury bills so many millions, he adds them together and subtracts the sinking funds and gets the net debt. If the Provincial Treasurer will do that today or if his junior partner who sits across the aisle had done it when he was Provincial Treasurer, or if the Premier had done it when he was Provincial Treasurer, you would have nothing like a surplus of net assets of \$23,000,000, you would have the net debt in Saskatchewan today of \$509.3 million. There's what you would have. If they followed the same procedure in setting up the net debt that is followed by Ottawa, by Dominion Bureau of Statistics and followed by this government, until the picture became so unbearable, so they juggled the books.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Now it's perfectly true that you can come up with a figure of \$23,000,000. You can do this, and the Provincial Treasurer proved in this budget speech that you can do it, but this means nothing if you want to compare the picture in Saskatchewan today to what it was 10, 15 or 20 years ago. My friends opposite are always wanting to compare conditions in Saskatchewan today to what they were 20 years ago. Why don't you compare your net debts? Because you're afraid to, that's why. You're afraid to tell the people of this province the true picture and the mess that you have created, the financial mess.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to move from this debt picture which I think I have explained to them for the last five years and you can't get anything through somebody's head who doesn't want it to go through and all I ask, is that the Provincial Treasurer, if he persists in doing this, then for goodness sake, in his budget address, let's have a record that he uses, let's have on the page a record using the old procedure of arriving at net debt, and if you do that, then you will have something to compare with the government of Canada, or you can compare with Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to refer to another remark at the close of the budget debate, on page 27, when the Provincial Treasurer talked about citizen rights, and he says Saskatchewan has led Canada in the protection of rights of the individual. We know of a lot of political propaganda, in budgets that had been delivered by the gentlemen who sit opposite, but this is the greatest stretch of the imagination, that has ever emitted from any one on that side of the house. "Saskatchewan has led

Canada in the protection of the rights of the individual.”

What is the policy of the NDP for the protection of the rights of the individual? I want to read it to you, Mr. Speaker, and listen, this will even shock you.

A change is coming, peaceful or not, when we become the government, we will institute socialism immediately. And we'll use the power of the police and the military forces to force those opposed to obey the law. Those who defy the government will be treated as criminals, if capitalism says no, then we know the answer, so did Russia.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Would the hon. member give the authority for that quotation, time and place and so forth. I think I recognize it.

Mr. McDonald: — Yes, I will, I'd be glad to. November 10, 1943, City of Calgary, Harold Winch. Is that all you want?

Well now, Mr. Speaker, this certainly falls in line with the protection of the rights of the individual. Now I want to read a paragraph from another letter to show the protection of the rights of the individual and I'm reading one paragraph out of the letter.

I have debated whether I should include this paragraph from such letters addressed to me from the province of Saskatchewan but I have decided that it is only fair and proper to do so. From the reports reaching the dental students here and the future of the health profession in that province, there appears to be a certain reluctance to go to Saskatchewan to practice, and particularly so, when there seems to be more stability elsewhere. Perhaps this attitude will change in your province, but until there is reasonable assurance that it will, their distance inclination to venture into such uncertain territory, I think this attitude is understandable and there's not much that we could do about it here.

Mr. Speaker, does that indicate that people in other parts consider that Saskatchewan has led Canada. We talk about the Bill of Rights. What rights? What rights has the Bill of Rights bestowed upon the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, that have not always been enjoyed by our citizens? It's British justice that has guaranteed these rights. The Bill of Rights that was passed by this government is a mockery of that British justice. This has meant nothing, and if there is one province in Canada that has tramped on the rights of the individual, it is this province. There are more examples than probably anywhere else in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a budget that in its priority does not take care of many of the pressing problems that confront our province. I cannot support a budget that continues to take excessive amounts of the income of our people in taxation, year after year. I cannot support a budget that has been produced by a Provincial Treasurer who cannot estimate the revenues within \$20,000,000 in any year.

Mr. Speaker, surely after 20 years of experience this government ought to have been able to: first, at least come close in the estimating of provincial revenues; second, at least give some consideration to the tax paying ability of the people of Saskatchewan; and third, give some consideration, if they're going to extract ever increasing amounts of money out of our citizens, of paying back into the hands of those people who are living on a fixed income, some revenue, and some increased income in order for them to pay their taxes. I cannot support a budget, the final budget of this government who have never implemented the promises they made 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker another reason that I will not support this budget is because it is not the manner in which the money will be used. This government will be out on their haunches on the streets where they belong

in a few short months and I hope the government that replaces them will have some respect for our people and will have more ability to handle public funds than has been demonstrated by our friends opposite.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Before the hon. member sits down, could I ask him just for information — he quoted, the House of commons report of Tuesday, June 13, 1963, what pages was it, have I got those figures right.

Mr. McDonald: — Tuesday, June 13, 1963, page 93.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, it's with some enthusiasm that I enter this debate today because of the very fine impression which the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer made on me when he was delivery it a short time go last Friday.

But before going into the main body of my remarks, I would like also to add my tribute to those members who have served in this house for so long and who are about to retire voluntarily from these precincts. I think, however, that I won't be quite as self-confident as the member who has just taken his seat. I won't say that we'll miss him — we'll miss them — after the next election, because of course, I am perfectly prepared to leave the question of who will continue in this house in the hands of the electors of Saskatchewan. I am not prepared to try and prejudge the issue. I do hope, however, that too many members will not be departing from these halls involuntary, after that date.

I enjoyed the talk of the financial critic this afternoon. I always enjoy his talks. I entered this house at the same year he did, and I have watched his career with a good deal of interest. I recall that he has changed his party at least once, and that he has become leader of that party, his party of adoption, and that he is now occupying the rank of financial critic for that party. He is one of my favorite members, Mr. Speaker, at least he is one of my favorite members from that side of the house. I enjoy his presentation because he has a certain boyish exuberance about him and his speeches at least ring with a passionate show of sincerity. I think sometimes it borders on reckless extravagance. At least he shows that he evidently believes the things which he says. I enjoyed his remarks which apparently had some reference to his visit around the world last fall. I couldn't help but feel after hearing him speak on his return that world travel is good for him. Indeed if anybody can think of any way of sending him on another world cruise about now, I would heartily support it.

When he came back, I was quite taken by the support he seemed to express for democratic socialist governments that he saw in operation in the Far East. I thought that it was a little frustrating to those on this side of the house who have been trying to impress him with the virtues of democratic socialism to find that his conversion was so easy, when he got over into Malaysia and Cambodia last fall, I must say I agreed with his views on the future of government in those less privileged parts of the world. I particularly agreed with his conclusion that if we are to enjoy prosperity and expansion, we must have stability of government. Changing governments always creates some tearing effect and some confusion and some uncertainty on the party of the citizens and I support this view wholeheartedly that stability of government is an end worth pursuing even here in Saskatchewan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that his address today really deserved more respect from his colleagues. I was disappointed that he was only able to muster never more than half of his colleagues to hear what should have been the major presentation of the opposition on the subject of the budget for next year. I suppose, however, that like all members, members opposite are spending time corresponding with their constituencies and phoning them and trying to keep their ears to the ground and their nose to the wind, and all these other things that politicians are reputed to do on election years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I noted that one of the first criticisms the financial critic made about our budget was that we were too pessimistic in estimating revenues in the last two years, and I agree that the facts would have supported a more optimistic view than the government took at the beginning of the last fiscal year and the fiscal year immediately before it. I think that perhaps if we make any mistake on this side of the house, it is that we listen too much to the pessimistic forebodings of gloom from

members opposite. I think that we ought to have more confidence and more assurance in the accuracy of our optimistic opinions about the economic prospects of the province. It is quite true that the 1962 wheat crop had a very decided effect on the fiscal year which began on April 1, 1963 and this did have a very substantial affect on inflating the revenues of the province. It is true that the agricultural boom which resulted from this good crop had a secondary effect on commerce and industry generally in Saskatchewan, and our most optimistic expectations were exceeded. I can't help recalling, however, Mr. Speaker, that at the time when we were making these forecasts, hon. members opposite were crying blue ruin, were saying that the government was seeing economic prospects that weren't really there. I can recall that members opposite refused to accept our optimism at face value. And so it is true that tax revenues were higher than we budgeted, and the financial critic may be right when he says that our present view of the economic outlook may be pessimistic. The rate at which this province is booming along, I think defies the observations of economists and statisticians. I think that the true extent of the progress that has been made in this province in recent years will have to wait for posterity to assess. Most of us here are inclined to be more pessimistic than we should be; we're inclined to accept the dire forebodings of gloom and doom that members of the opposition express in this house.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member went onto say something about the sale of wheat. While he didn't exactly say it, he, I think, suffers under the illusion that the Liberal government at Ottawa had something to do with the fortunate sales of wheat in the last year by the Canadian Wheat Board. I am sure that the Liberal government doesn't claim any credit for the crop conditions in China and in Eastern Europe. I don't know that the Liberal government took any particularly strong stand which would likely endear them to the people of these other parts of the world. I think the plain, bare, bald fact was, Mr. Speaker, that we had a lot of good wheat and they wanted it and they knew it was for sale and they came here and offered to buy it. I think that's the plain fact of the matter, the unvarnished truth of the matter, and for the hon. member to try to leave the impression by insinuation that this somehow is to the credit of the Liberal government is to try to claim credit where credit isn't really due.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that there were attempts made before the present Liberal government was elected to office to develop an interest in Canadian wheat by potential purchasers of food. I can recall extensive efforts made by the previous government to send trade missions all around the world, to pay the expenses of Canadian exporters to visit foreign countries, and to try to develop and drum up the market for Canadian products, and I suppose that this affected indirectly the wheat industry and did help the export of wheat.

I can recall that the first ten years that I sat in this house we had a Liberal government at Ottawa, and many, many suggestions were made to that government, which would have or probably would have had the affect of promoting the export of Canadian wheat. And I can recall that that government was vain and arrogant in its response to these suggestions and refused to accept them, refused to benefit from advice offered so freely by the farm organizations, by the CCF, and by this government.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, proposals put forward in this assembly by members of this side of the house, being opposed, being voted against by the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and others. I can recall that they made an attempt more than once to prevent this government from offering advice and suggestions which might have resulted in an increase in the export of wheat. I have here the journals of the sessions of 1955 and 1954, and I just remind the house of a resolution that was put before us, at one of those sessions.

It was moved that this assembly respectfully requests the government of Canada to take immediate steps, (that was the Liberal government of Canada) to free trade channels by removal of all restricted trade policies, such as tariffs, and anti-dumping duties which contribute directly or indirectly to the accumulation of the alarming surplus of agricultural commodities, in order that these commodities may be moved to those areas of the world which urgently need them.

That seems to me to be a perfectly straight-forward, a fair piece of advice, an honest observation by bystanders as to how the glut on the Canadian wheat market could be alleviated. And the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) was the one who seconded the motion by Mr. Lopton:

That this assembly respectfully requests that CCF members of parliament move the above motion in the House of Commons.

A motion, which of course, would kill the decision in this assembly. An amendment which would nullify it, and render nugatory the proposal which was put forward here in this assembly. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) led by Mr. Loptson of Saltcoats, moved this stultifying amendment and the question was resolved against the amendment and the motion was then passed. Hon. members opposite have never shown much enthusiasm about offering suggestions to the federal government which might have helped.

And then there was another resolution which was also moved by Mr. Loptson, this time seconded by Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek) protesting in fact against the offering of advice to the government of Canada on the sale of wheat and it went like this:

That this assembly deplore the action of some organizations and individuals who continuously endeavour to advise the board of the method they should follow in carrying out their selling policy, which invariably would hamper their progress if carried out by them.

I recall that the Liberal government in Ottawa was so conceited and so arrogant and vain, that they rejected all advice from all sources, they said that any advice from you people will just hamper our work, will just get in the way, will just confuse things and this, of course, was typical of the C.D. Howe's and the Liberal moguls who occupied the seats of power in Ottawa at that time, and my friends opposite were willing to bow and scrape to this sort of thing, were willing to serve this sort of interest right here in this assembly.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — When are you coming to the budget, Bob?

Mr. Walker: — And so I think it ill-becomes the financial critic, at this stage, to try to claim some credit for the sale of wheat to Asian and eastern European countries.

The Liberal party inherited a situation which they weren't able to do anything to prevent, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the reduction in the medical care tax has nothing to do with revenues, with the revenue and expenditure account of the province. The financial critic must be using this million dollar brains trust that he was talking about the other day, because he discovered the payment of the medical care tax doesn't go into these ordinary tax revenues of the province but goes into an ear-marked fund to pay for medical care. Our hon. friend knows, or should know, that this fund can only operate out of the proceeds of the tax, plus whatever supplementary amount is paid into it out of general revenues, and he should know, if he doesn't I'll tell him now, and he can make a note of it, he should know that \$5,000,000 less in that fund requires to be made up out of the ordinary revenue account of the province, so that the removal of that \$5,000,000 premium, or tax, does have an affect on the revenues and expenditures of the province. It does mean that we have to provide an expenditure on our ordinary account of the amount which was taken out of the fund by the remission of that tax. My hon. friend may think that there is some magic about this but if he will stop to look into the relationship between the medical care insurance fund and the consolidated fund he will see that the results are linked together.

My hon. friend also tried to make the point that less than 20 per cent of the revenues in this budget were coming from resource development and more than 80 per cent was coming from taxation. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had the amount of resource development in this province that we had 20 years ago, the amount that comes from taxation would be precious little indeed. The fact that we have had resource development in Saskatchewan has reflected itself in increased revenues from taxation, but these revenues whether they come from tax sources or not are the result of the broadening of the economic base of Saskatchewan . . . the development of secondary interests in Saskatchewan. I can think of one case alone where a pipe line was being

built across the province costing some \$30,000,000, that produced a tax revenue of over a million dollars. That certainly was a revenue from resource development, although my friend would call it tax revenue and not resource revenue. I suggest that the rather casual look he has taken at the figures may be misleading him on this score.

Mr. Speaker, I had thought that with all the things that had happened in Saskatchewan in the last 10 or 15 years, that it wouldn't be necessary for a financial critic at this date, and I should tell him that as recently as 15 years ago, financial critics have dropped this old chestnut but my friend has apparently instead of starting at last year and working back to see what other financial critics have said, he started at 1901 and came forward, because he has picked up as many debating points out of very old speeches as out of more recent ones, and for him to revive this old chestnut about the old-age pension just staggered me. This happened before he came into this house and he has been here 16 years.

Well, what is he talking about? Well, he is talking about a little transaction that went like this, Mr. Speaker. When the CCF came into office the Liberal government was paying the senior citizens the munificent sum of \$20 per month. \$20 per month and it couldn't go any higher — there were a great many of them getting \$17.50 and in fact the mean average was somewhere around \$17.00 per month, and this government recognized that even though this was a matter for which the responsibility had been assumed by Ottawa, this government recognized that it just couldn't occupy office and see this kind of penury being foisted on the old people of Saskatchewan by this stingy, miserly outfit that occupied power in Ottawa. So this government, this government was the first government in Canada to institute a supplementary allowance to add to this little stipend that was being given so grudgingly by their friends in Ottawa. And so, Mr. Speaker, this government added, I've forgotten whether it was \$2.50 or \$3.00, to this allowance and this government said it is time the federal government raised the pension to a larger figure, and we'll pay our share of any figure the federal government is willing to agree to. The federal government, I don't know what they did. I think they appointed a royal commission or something, or said they would consider the matter and this government got impatient and we said well, if we really mean what we say about our willingness to pay our share of a larger pension there is no reason why we shouldn't start paying it now, there is no reason why we should withhold it in order to try to starve the old-age pensions into bringing pressure to bear on the federal government. And so this government immediately paid what we called then a supplementary allowance which was our share of a pension 50 per cent larger than then being paid. And then, of course, after some months, nearly a year, the federal government assumed its share of this pension and it relieved the situation for the time being.

But we were paying in their stead, we were paying in their stead for several months, so that the pensioners would be relieved of the financial stress of a \$20 or a \$17 monthly pension. And for hon. members opposite to think that anyone at that time was fooled by that kind of an argument is now to tax the credulity of this house, because at that time it was well-known by the pensioners and by anyone who stopped to look at the thing, Mr. Speaker, that all this government did was to go in and in anticipation of an increase in the federal pension pay some money to these people until such time as the federal government would live up to their responsibility, would discharge their proper duty in the matter.

And so, having forced the federal government or shamed them into increasing the allowance we had served the purpose and then we continued by contributing our share of the increased pensions. Old age pensioners knew this and for my hon. friend to take advantage of the forgetfulness of some people by raising this hoary old chestnut after it has been dead for 18 years, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a fair measure of the mental bankruptcy that affects the opposition.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Ditto.

Mr. Walker: — The hon. member says what have we done for the old people, the blind people, and the dependents and disability pensioners. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have done more than my friend is willing to acknowledge. We have not only launched the first old age supplementary allowance, which has been followed in every province west of Quebec, but has never been followed by any Liberal government, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this province started the idea of supplementary allowances and it was never followed by any Liberal government in Canada. The Liberal government was in office when an old folks' home was established at Wolseley. This government has

introduced a far-reaching program of geriatric centres, some of the finest institutions of their kind in Canada. This government has assisted in the construction of senior citizens' housing with an outright grant. The government of my friends opposite makes a loan at 5½ per cent interest; this government makes a grant to assist in the building of these houses, these housing units.

What about the cost of hospitalization? What about the cost of medicare? These are things which particularly plague senior citizens, and if my hon. friend, the financial critic, doesn't know about these things then he ought to go back to Cambodia and have somebody send him the Commonwealth so he can read it, hear about it. My hon. friend is living in a state of wilful ignorance, I think, about what this government is doing for this group of people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it is really necessary to comment on all the things he said, but he says that this government makes the insane proposal of a municipal sales tax. Well the only province I know of, Mr. Speaker, that has a municipal sales tax is a Liberal province, maybe it is an insane idea. My hon. friend can speak with some authority on this subject, being a Liberal. He says that we refuse to trust local governments. Well, he says that we don't have confidence in the ability of local governments to spend money. Well, I recall, and I haven't taken the trouble to look up figures, but I recall in 1943-44 a Liberal government was giving \$2,750,000 in school grants and that was less than 10 per cent of the provincial budget at that time, Mr. Speaker. Less than 10 per cent.

Mr. McCarthy: — You are wrong.

Mr. Walker: — Oh no, I'm not wrong, my friend better look it up, and what is the situation today, well . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — You are not telling the truth

Mr. Walker: — . . . with a provincial budget of a little over \$200,000,000, around \$40,000,000 which is more than twice the percentage of our budget going for education than what was going under a previous government.

And that government, of course, didn't have a lot of the programs that we have. They didn't have a free cancer program; they didn't have an air ambulance; they didn't have a program of assistance to regional health services; they didn't have a hospitalization plan or medicare plan; they didn't have many of these programs, and yet they were only able to find 10 per cent of their budget for education. Well, Mr. Speaker, now that I stop to think of the argument that my hon. friend used, I really can't think that they are worth replying to — taking seriously.

I would like to say something about this question of provincial debt before I resume my seat. My hon. friend says we are trying to deceive the people of Saskatchewan somehow, when we talk about net debt and when we talk about gross debt and he says that the debt of the province at the end of 1963 was \$575,000,000 and that if we try to use any other figure we are trying to deceive people. Oh, he says it is all right to take off the \$48 or \$49,000,000 cash, or sinking fund, and debentures which we hold but that would end you up with something like \$513,000,000 and he says that is the net debt. Why that is the way it was always figured under a Liberal government, and I guess, Mr. Speaker, that under a Liberal government they weren't able to, they didn't have very much to boast about in the way of investment in a power corporation, they weren't able to boast that they had \$418,000,000 worth of power utility, because they didn't. I think they had something like \$10,000,000 in power utility at that time. They weren't able to boast about owning a telephone system that was worth nearly \$90,000,000. Naturally they didn't take these things into account in figuring out their net debt position, because these items, these assets were of no great significance, until after this government was elected and in the last 15 or 16 years these items have become an important factor in arriving at our balance sheet.

But if my friend said this \$575,000,000 of gross debt is the real debt and that nothing else should be taken into account, well he is willing to take into account the cash investment of \$49,000,000 but he doesn't think we should take into account debentures issued and sold, but not delivered, \$9,000,000 worth of working capital advances, sinking funds of \$6.7 million, loans to crown enterprises such as the government finance office \$8.5 million — he doesn't think we should take that into account, yet I am certain that

if we were to put up our crown corporation for sale we could get not just a half a billion, we could probably get twice that much for them, because they have appreciated in value since they were established. This \$8.5 million would be cheap indeed for these crown corporations, but he doesn't think we should take this \$8.5 million into account. I know he doesn't consider it an asset, he doesn't consider these are valuable resources to the people of Saskatchewan, these crown corporations. And what about the \$6,000,000 that has been invested by the Industrial Development Fund? Oh, he doesn't think you should take that into account either, the capital of \$6,000,000 nor the loans of \$2,500,000. He doesn't want that reckoned in any statement of assets in arriving at the net debt.

He doesn't want to count the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which is an asset worth on book value alone \$418,000,000 or the telephone system which is worth \$87,000,000. He doesn't want to take any of these things into account. He says I defy you to show how you can arrive at a \$23,000,000 surplus of assets over liabilities.

Well it is all there for the benefit of my hon. friend on page 47. All he has to do is remove the blinders from his eyes and recognize that these are assets, these are genuine assets that are shown on the asset side of the ledger. The Liberal Party seems to be grossly confused, Mr. Speaker, about the financial position of the province, at least, if they are not confused they seem to be bent upon trying to get everybody else confused.

They try to put a very primitive kind of argument about net debt and gross debt. When we point out, for example, the gross or total debt of the province amounted to \$575,000,000, we also would like to point out that this is offset by assets which I have already referred to. These self-liquidating assets, power, telephones, crown corporations, account for \$520,000,000 of the \$575,000,000 debt, and this leaves \$55,000,000, Mr. Speaker, commonly referred to and shown in the statement as the dead weight debt.

Well, how is this \$55,000,000 accounted for? What have we got to show for this \$55,000,000? Well, there is \$18,000,000 of it accounted for by the old relief debts of the previous government, which are still outstanding most of which I believe are in the form of treasury bills owing to the government at Ottawa. There is \$34,000,000 still accounted for by highway debts, commenced and first incurred by the Liberal and Conservative governments previous to this government. There is still over a million dollars owing on the public buildings debt. In those days they used to finance their public buildings out of borrowed money and these, together with other miscellaneous items account for \$55,000,000 dead weight debt.

Now offsetting against the \$575,000,000 gross debt, the people of Saskatchewan have these assets. The power corporation, which at the end of December was worth \$421,000,000 – it is worth a good deal more than that – it could be sold for much more than that, indeed, it has assets which have accumulated as a result of the re-investment of surpluses of the corporation – this \$421,000,000 is the advances that have been made out of capital account to the corporation. Many of the assets of the corporation have appreciated considerably in value, since the time that they were built because of increasing costs.

Undoubtedly, the same is true of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones and the smaller crown corporations, but even if you assume that these corporations are only worth the amount that we put into them, and take no account at all of the re-investment of their own profits, then that value of these corporations amounts to \$520,000,000, as I have already indicated.

Then there are certain other assets which I have already itemized, amounting to \$50,000,000, and there is also approximately \$9,000,000 in other investments which brings the assets of the province to \$23,000,000 more than its liabilities or debts.

Mr. Speaker, opposition members seem to think that if we talk about the net debt having been eliminated, that we are somehow trying to gloss over and conceal the fact that there is a gross indebtedness of some \$600,000,000. We are not trying to conceal this fact at all, Mr. Speaker. We are merely trying to assist members opposite to understand the financial position of the province. We are quite proud of the fact that this government has borrowed hundreds of millions of dollars to invest in the development of industry and in the development of our community. As a matter of fact, we are convinced that when you borrow money to invest in a worthwhile utility you don't create a burden on the province, but you, in fact, create an asset, which adds to the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan.

If the financial critic of the Liberal Party wants to look back, Mr. Speaker, and read some of the statements that were made by some of the better provincial treasurers – I would commend him to read the one that was given by the Hon. C.A. Dunning, who was Premier and Provincial Treasurer, and who read the budget on March 13, 1924. He was commenting on this gross public debt problem and he said this, I commend these words to my hon. friends and I quote:

In order to look at the matter fairly, one needs to deduct from that figure, (the figure of the gross debt) that portion of the public debt created for utilities that carry their own public debt charges. The house is familiar with them in general terms, there is the telephones, the elevator systems, the sinking fund and so on. By doing that we find that \$27.249 million of our public debt falls into this class, leaving a net debt which the people of the province are responsible for, in relation to utilities or institutions, on which interest has to be paid, of \$28.907 million, or \$34.88 per capita.

In other words, he took the gross debt, which in those days amount to some \$55,000,000 and he deducted the \$27,000,000 and that represented the investments in the elevator system, the sinking funds and so on, and said the net debt was the rest.

I need not go further in detail in this matter at this time except to say that the policy of the government, as it has been for several years, is to endeavour to keep down as much as possible the increase in the dead weight debt, but to allow a moderate increase in that portion of the debt which is created for the purpose of utilities which carry the debt charges themselves.

This concept was supported, was endorsed by the last Liberal Premier and Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. W.J. Patterson, in his budget speech of February 16, 1938, he said, in discussing the debt, and I quote:

Of the gross public debt, some \$46,750,000 is regarded as self-supporting, and this total comprises telephones, \$12,500,000; power, \$6,750,000; farm loan boards \$16,000,000; drainage districts \$333,333; wheat pool guarantees \$11,000,000 or a total of \$46,000,000.

He says you deduct that from the gross debt if you want to get a realistic picture of the province's debt position, and then he says you also deduct or you add to these deductions of \$46,000,000, adding to this amount the sum of \$12,190 million held in sinking funds, the net public debt stands at \$133,000,000. In other words, he deducted from the gross debt all of these self-supporting projects, enterprises, and arrived at the figure for the net debt.

Now, he said, that while this wasn't done in the balance sheet of the province, that to have any proper understanding of the balance sheet one had to remember to do these things. One had to remember, and he made a note of it and told the house, one had to remember to deduct the value of these assets in order to reach the true financial position of the province. These were very wise words, Mr. Speaker, and since they were uttered by progenitors of my hon. friends opposite, I would think they would pay them some heed, but my hon. friends opposite don't seem to be so much concerned with being objective and frank and fair about these things as they are about trying to create the illusion somehow the province is spending itself into bankruptcy and that unless they call a halt we are liable to sink down into a morass of debt, from which we will be unable to escape.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are only two other provinces in Canada and they aren't Liberal provinces that will be able to show as solid a financial position as Saskatchewan does. Saskatchewan didn't achieve that, however, with any aid or comfort from hon. members opposite. Saskatchewan had to achieve its present financial position by its own courage and resources in spite of the niggling criticisms and attacks made by hon. members opposite.

My hon. friends have continually sold this province short. My hon. friends ought to at last take a lesson from twenty years of defeat.

My hon. friends ought to know that the people of Saskatchewan have faith and courage, that they have hope, and confidence in the future of this province, and for my hon. friends to go around trying to leave the impression that this province is bogging down in a morass of debt which it cannot pay, that the province is stagnating, that everybody who can get out of the province is leaving the province, and leaving because every other part of Canada is a better place to live, is not the way to commend themselves to the people of Saskatchewan. This is not the way to further their cause; this is not the way to achieve any position of responsibility; and this is not the way to look upon the future of Saskatchewan if they hope to have any hand to play in that future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that my hon. friend may have got the first lesson and I've never believed in rushing students too hard, I think that I would like to give my hon. friends time to think over what I said, until tomorrow. I'm sure that if there are any points which I feel I haven't successfully made, I may touch on them again, but I thought that I would try to instruct my hon. friends in the privacy of this chamber today rather than tomorrow on the air, when some of their constituents might be listening and so I hope that tomorrow, I will be able to give more attention to the contents of the budget and that I will be able to say something about the future prospects of Saskatchewan.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Debate adjourned

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Turnbull for second reading of Bill No. 16 – An Act respecting the Education and Training of Teachers:

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — I think this is of vital interest to the house and to the people of this province; the educating and the training of teachers. When I went through the bill to study it, I noticed that the title An Act respecting the Education and Training of Teachers was indeed a very dignified title. It would lead us to believe that this legislature was going to give some importance to the teacher training program, and the importance of teacher training was now to be recognized by the passage of a special bill. I thought this would be a very commendable step, because I believe that if we are to meet the challenge facing our educational institutions today, we must look to the teachers. Teachers must be in the forefront of any leadership in this challenge facing us in this modern age.

I believe that this challenge demands that teachers must first be scholars; they must have a store-house of knowledge, but of equal importance, I believe they must be thoroughly trained in the method and in the mechanics of imparting this knowledge to others. I believe anything less than this is insufficient.

In view of my feelings on the training of teachers, I find this bill most disappointing. This bill does not deal, Mr. Speaker, with the educational training of teachers. This bill merely sets up another advisory board. It would appear that setting up an advisory board is rather a fashionable thing these days, because we've had so many of them set up. We've had an advisory board for the medical care commission; we set up an advisory board for the Minister of Industry and Information, the other evening we set up an advisory board for the Minister of Natural Resources. This bill merely sets up an advisory board for the Minister of Education.

It is evident to me that the minister certainly needs guidance from somewhere, but setting up an advisory board to the Minister of Education surely is not sufficient to deal with the education and training of teachers. The minister, speaking to this bill on second reading, I believe it was, said that his department had been working for 16 years on a program for the educating and training of teachers. After this 16 years of diligent study he has discovered that what he needs is an advisory board to tell the minister how to educate and train teachers because this bill is set up, I want to read it

To recommend to the minister and to the president . . . (I presume the president of the university) and advisory board to recommend a program for the education and training of the teachers.

They have no program for the education and training of teachers, and this bill doesn't spell it out nor set it up, it merely sets up an advisory board who will recommend, not establish, but will recommend to the minister how he may proceed to set up a program for the education and training of teachers. This is in keeping with many other phases of education and training of teachers. Last year, you recall Mr. Speaker, that the minister said he had a wonderful plan for relieving the rate payers of the heavy burden of taxation to support schools. Why he said the plan is very simple. All we have to do is set up vocational training schools, because the federal government pays 75 per cent of the cost of construction, they pay 50 per cent of the cost of operation; therefore, he says, we will divert more and more of our students into vocational schools, Ottawa will pay the shot and the people of Saskatchewan will be relieved of the responsibility. He forgot one important detail, that before he could establish vocational training school, he had to train the teachers with which to operate it, and so today we find in this whole field of vocational training that we've been able to make only the token contribution because we haven't got the trained teachers to move into these schools to train our boys and girls.

The only school we have for vocational training of teachers, the only outlet is through the kindness of the government of Alberta. They have set up a college for vocational training and they have condescended to accept a handful of our teachers each year into their college in order that they may train them for us and return them to us and set up our vocational training schools. This bill does not do anything to alleviate that problem. It doesn't mention anything about setting up a training college for vocational training. Now how does he propose to train the teachers in this important field?

This bill doesn't deal with the education and training of teachers at all. Is it any wonder in the February issue of Saskatchewan Trustee, that they had this to say:

We are now told that we have a special college of education for vocational training, together with a multi-million dollar vocational program.

Then they add this comment:

Perhaps with the bewildering way proposals are being made by the Department of Education, we should petition for a special course in guidance for trustee and teacher.

Yes, they are bewildered. So are the teachers bewildered. On one hand we're told that this bill will set up a special board to draft a program and to advise the minister on the educating and training of teachers. Yet before the composition of the board is even named, before it is set up, before it is ready to set the board up, we find the department strikes out in all directions in this so-called new approach to education. The minister told us the other day of amendments that would raise the age group of leaving school from 15 years of age to 16 years of age. Introducing this amendment, I believe he took the opportunity to reveal the extent to which the department is rushing into what might be called the new revolutionary concept of education in our classrooms. He said he was doing away with what he called the "lock step" system, and he says we're moving into the block step system. Yet, I wish to point out to the minister that while he instituted the so-called revolutionary change in the whole field of education, he neglected once again to provide for the instruction and education of the teachers in how to carry out this program and today the teachers are bewildered, because come September 1964, they're going into their classrooms to instruct and to carry out this so-called revolutionary program, and they haven't the basic knowledge of what is required to do. And so this confusion in the whole field of education, the teachers don't know what it is all about, and they can't find anyone who has sufficient knowledge to interpret what the minister aims to do in this change of lock step system to the block step system.

And so, we have utter confusion in the classroom in the fall, because of the inability in the education and the training of the teachers to institute this so-called revolutionary program. I don't know what this so-called block step system is. All I know is that a pamphlet was sent out to every school, every principal and the pamphlet is called "A plan for the reorganization of instructions in Saskatchewan schools."

A plan for the reorganization of instruction, yet neither in the pamphlet nor in this house, or in any press report that I can read, has the minister answered the question, and if he knows the answer, he hasn't

revealed just how he proposes to train the teachers to carry out this new program in education.

Then too, by press report, by statement of the minister of the house the other day, he would lead us to believe that there is a revolutionary change going on in our teachers colleges. He spoke about the teachers college in some way or other may be tied in with the university, in some associate professors or something or other, with universities, and yet here again, he hasn't spelled out precisely what he intends to do in this field of teacher education.

At present the teachers colleges are operated by the Department of Education. The department sets the standards of admittance; they set the curriculum that is to be taught; they decide who shall and who shall not qualify as a teacher. Now if he is going to hand over the training of our teachers to the university, if the responsibility of teacher training is to be handed over to the university, then I presume it will not be the Department of Education but it will be the university that will set the standards of admittance and the curriculum and will decide who may and who shall not qualify as a teacher.

Anything less than this would have to be some sort of a joint program between the Department of Education and the university. We haven't answered whether he is going to turn the training of teachers over to the university, whether it's going to be the teachers college to continue as it is, or whether it's going to be a combination of the university and the Department of Education in the training of teachers.

These are vital questions which have never yet been answered. Is he going to invade the field of autonomy of the university, that was set up in its early history to be free of any political interference or government control? Is he going to change that principle, and submit the university to government control and government interference? If he is, he should tell the people so.

What is his arrangement for the instruction and the education of teachers? How does he proceed to do this? These are vital questions and it's no wonder that the teachers are confused and the parents are confused and the trustees are confused because they don't know what direction he is striking out next.

Those questions should have been answered in this bill. It isn't sufficient to bring a bill that sets up an advisory board. The way the minister is proceeding, the work will all be done prior to the advisory board even having had an opportunity to study the field of education. It's because of this confusion in the educating and the training of teachers that we've lost some of our outstanding teachers from the colleges last year, teachers who resigned because they couldn't interpret and understand the direction in which the department is going. It's leading to resignations from our university. This question should have been asked and answered and as yet the minister has sat silent and has said nothing.

This bill does nothing to allay these fears; it makes no decision as to the type of institutions that are going to train our teachers' it makes no decision as to the standards of training. He has no answers to the problems facing teachers training. This department continues to hit out in a solution of problems facing education. Strikes first in one direction, then in another direction without co-ordination, without any direction. If they continue to strike out in this pattern without any knowledge of where they are going or what the ultimate outcome is going to be, then I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to be concerned very much whether we have a lock step system or a block step system, because if this utter confusion continues, the next strong hand to take hold of the Department of Education will institute the goose step system. Whereas today we say four legs good and two legs back, tomorrow we will be teaching four legs good, two legs better or whatever the whims of those in charge are at that particular time, and I think, Mr. Speaker, what we need is not a bill setting up an advisory board to the Minister of Education, desperate as that need is, but what we need is a bill that would set up a royal commission to investigate the finances, the curriculum, the training of teachers that would redesign the aims and the purposes in the field of education in order to train these boys and girls to make a living and to make their contribution to the complex society in which we live.

This is but a piece meal effort. It is nothing but a setting up of another advisory board to the minister, and I should think that if this is the purpose of the bill, it should have so been stated – an act to set up an advisory board to the Minister of Education, and don't try to clothe

it with dignity as An Act respecting The Education and Training of Teachers because certainly the house will not be misled by this.

I would like the Minister of Education before he closes this debate, to spell out specifically to this legislature what he intends to do in the field of teacher training. Does he intend to turn it over to the College of Education and let them set the standards and decide who is going to be teachers? Does he intend to keep it under present government and department control of the teachers colleges? Or is it going to be some bargaining agreement between the two? Are we going to have a two year course of teacher training? Are we going to have a four year course of teacher training? Are they going to insist that teachers going into classrooms must have a degree, or are they going to put in the two years of training or three years of training?

These questions have never been answered and this bill doesn't even attempt to answer these questions and unless the minister can lay there before the legislature what specifically he intends to do in this whole field of teacher training, I can't see that this bill is anything but an insignificant way of advising the minister in steps that he's already determined to take.

And for that reason, I am going to reserve my judgment on this bill until we give the minister an opportunity to clarify where we're going in this whole field of teacher training.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I've heard of people who have been dragged kicking and screaming into the reality of the 20th century, but I think this is a new demonstration. When I hear the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) quoting "Animal Farm" and trying to relate this to the question on teacher education and training, I think it a little bit queer, but however, we all say our arguments as best as we can and I guess that was the best one he could come up with at the time.

Regarding some of the questions that he has asked, I think they're fair enough and legitimate enough although I object very much to his attempt to promote "the confusion, the disturbance, unanswered questions and what the minister is going to do, whether he is going to take over the university;" and all these sort of approaches, and I can understand his saying this of course. He is justified in picking these arguments out of the air as he reads the bill because these particular points aren't mentioned in the bill, but if he would take the trouble to look at the section 14, which sketches out the duties of the board, then you will remember what the powers of the university are, in respect to education and I think many of his questions will be answered.

The Minister of Education has no jurisdiction in the university and we accept this as a fact. Therefore, classes will be laid by the university in the same manner which they are now laid on. The senate has the power of accreditation and this of course will remain as it is now. The minister and the department have the responsibilities in respect to certification and bear a responsibility in respect to supply, because education in respect to the public system of education and we will carry out these responsibilities.

Now then, we come to the specific parts of education to which the hon. member referred, and he asks for clarification. When we come to the question of academic training we very simply come to the point of scaling the classes that are being taught within the university, within the very disciplines of colleges in the universities, against the requirements of the teacher in the classroom. And the only people that can do this, it seems to me, are those people that are teachers and superintendents, not ministers of education. When you reckon this fact against the present rate of change, and increasing knowledge and growth of knowledge, in the whole question of teaching and teaching skills, it becomes nigh impossible to be so wise as to write into any bill, exactly how teachers shall be trained, two years from now, five years from now and ten years from now, because the growth of the system must be related to the experience within the classroom and the experience within the classroom must reflect in the courses taught at the university, or otherwise we will lock ourselves into a rigid position it seems to me.

And therefore, under B of 14, we see that the boards shall consider and review in whole or in part, any phase in existing detail of structural program, the education and training of teachers. This can be

referred to the president and the minister and if we find that at that point in time, that the courses that are being offered are not the types of courses that the teaching profession and educators general agree ought to be taught, we find there is provision in section E to allow for special grants to be given for special purposes.

If the hon. member will take the trouble to discuss these points with members of the university, he will immediately discover that we are involved in a very serious discussion with the university and whether we ought to take English 102, which is the standard English class in the first year of Arts, and have this a class in English for people who are going to be teachers, or whether in fact we should redesign a different type of course in English, and we can call it 104 if you like which is not the usual type of course now being given in the standard English course in Art courses and other courses. This type of review and consideration of additional courses will have to be done as we move forward, because the hon. member is quite right when he says that teachers should be trained as scholars and they must have the best possible instruction methodology.

The problem in writing it into a bill is that once you write the method in detail, you lock yourself in and this is a changing era. So we prefer to have this in a flexible position. The public is perfectly safeguarded in respect to the powers of the university, the powers of the department, both of which are clearly understood. In speaking in other debates I will outline programs which will rise out of this bill in respect to internship, in respect the merging of teachers college with the university. There's no argument about where it's going to be; it's going to merge. There's no question about where the buildings that are going to have to be built are going to emerge; they're going to come on the campus of the university. There's no question about where the staff is going to be, they're going to be university staff.

With respect to vocational and technical teachers, here we find that Alberta has a training area, Saskatchewan doesn't and Manitoba does not. I'm not sure about Ontario. At our present rate of growth, it would no more pay us to launch into a training of vocational and technical teachers, than it would for us to set up a dental college. It makes much more sense at this stage to enter into an agreement with Albert as we have done. We are generally saying that we'll train your veterinary surgeons and you train our vocational teachers and until such time as we need more teachers, this makes good sense.

The honourable member is not right when he said we don't know of the need in this respect. He is not right when he said we don't know that there should be a difference in training between, and a very particular training given to these members.

An. Hon. Member: — I guess we didn't come to hear over here.

Mr. Turnbull — Oh, I'm sorry, and so therefore, I think that he is wrong in his conclusion. I think he is really being carried away by his political motivations, trying to create concern and dissension and perhaps not taking sufficient trouble to find out what the facts are. I propose that we ought to continue the arrangement with Alberta until such time as the volume makes it economically feasible for us to consider a separate training program, or (b) until such time as we have the new buildings on the university campus, and there develop the courses required for the training of teachers.

Now I saw that the hon. member quoted an article from the Saskatchewan Trustee, and here he refers to a matter that has been mentioned that does not appear in this bill at all, but which has been discussed by the trustees, and quite properly so. This matter will be considered during the forthcoming year in greater detail, and with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I now move second reading of this bill.

Mr. Cameron: — I wonder if the minister would permit one question? Is the training of teachers to be placed under the joint control of the university and the Department of Education?

Mr. Turnbull — From what I understand you to say now, it is the policy.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, and bill read the second time.

Yeas – 32

Messieurs

Lloyd	Willis	Semchuk
Johnson	Meakes	Perkins
Williams	Thurston	Thiessen
Brown	Wood	Snyder
Blakeney	Davies	Stevens
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Dahlman
Walker	Turnbull	Kluzak
Nollet	Stone	Peterson
Kuziak	Whelan	Gardiner
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Snedker
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	

Nays – 10

Messieurs

McCarthy	McFarlane	Coderre
Barrie	Staveley	Gallagher
McDonald	Boldt	Erb
Cameron		

SECOND READINGS

HON. C.C. WILLIAMS (Minister of Telephones) moved second reading of Bill No. 28 – An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act.

He said:

A similar amendment was passed to this act in 1960 when it became necessary to increase the borrowing limit to \$100,000,000 and which amount will be exceeded sometime this fall. A corporation required to borrow an amount large enough to exceed the present \$100,000,000 limit, it now becomes necessary to pass this amendment so they can increase the amount from \$100,000,000 to \$125,000,000 so I would move that Bill No. 28 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. C.C. Williams moved second reading of Bill No. 29 – An Act to amend the Fire Prevention Act, 1954.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Municipal Affairs will pass an amendment to The Rural Municipality Act whereby the municipality may appoint a fire chief with jurisdiction over any or all areas of the municipality. At the present time the fire commissioner must deal with the secretary treasurer of each rural municipality and now to meet the requirements of the amendment that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be bringing forward in a few days, we will require this amendment. And with that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I would now move second reading of Bill No. 29.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill, it may have some merit but it seems to me that somebody in the department or the minister is completely out of touch with the facts and the situations that do arise in many of these small towns insofar as fire prevention is concerned. In the past you have had the secretary of either the local government that you appoint that acts as the local assistant to the fire commissioner. Now very often in many of these communities, you have a sort of a fire chief, but the fire chief is not in a sense a person who has been appointed as such by the local government, he is usually a sort of man-about-town. He can be a business man, he can be anybody to act as fire chief and mind you, I don't oppose the bill as such, but I think it could be brought in and discussed more in committee. I feel that we are out of touch with these small communities. This may apply in some places. Take for example, the area of Bateman I believe, you are quite aware, has organized a local fire fighting company which works in conjunction with the municipalities. This may be all right in its place but in other places I think it is not quite right.

Mr. Williams: — I can answer that, Mr. Speaker. Each fire chief in the province is considered to be an assistant of the fire commissioner. Now, presuming the Department of Municipal Affairs will go ahead and pass their amendment, which I have every reason to expect that they will, then there would be a conflict in the legislations. The municipality authority to appoint a fire chief, Our Fire Prevention Act would not give us the authority to deal with that newly appointed fire chief, because all we have now is authority to deal with the secretary treasurers. Now perhaps if I read the new words in, Mr. Speaker, it would clear the matter up, now here is the way our act reads right now:

The chief, or acting chief, the chief of the fire department of every city, town, village, in which a fire department is established, and the town clerk of the town and the secretary treasurer of the village where no department exists

Now, the new words following the word “the” on the second last line say:

and the fire chief or where no such person has been appointed, the secretary treasurer

it is just filling in a gap that the Department of Municipal Affairs is going to create.

Motion agreed to and bill red a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.