

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
14th day**

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

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

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTION RE DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to direct a question to the Premier. Has the Premier received an invitation from Prime Minister Pearson to attend the Dominion-Provincial Conference at Ottawa? I think the date is March 31st, if so, will he be in attendance?

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I received a wire from the Prime Minister yesterday indicating that the conference would be held starting March 31st. I had indicated in previous correspondence to the Prime Minister that this was not a very suitable time as far as we were concerned, as likely the legislature would still be in session and this might well apply to other provinces. I thought the conference having been delayed this long, it should have been delayed until later in the year when all the legislatures would have finished. At this moment, Mr. Speaker, it will depend on the number of factors, certainly if I am not in attendance then the hon. Provincial Treasurer will be.

CORRECTION OF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to comment that I just happened to glance at this morning's edition of the Leader Post, and I happened to come across a remark that was attributed to me on page 10, about the middle of the page. You might not notice it unless you are looking for it.

Mr. Walker took particular issue with the opposition claim that the province's debt was \$563,000,000. He said the net debt was about \$55,000,000 with the remainder being self-liquidating.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, my notes say that I said

These self-liquidating purposes account for \$520,000,000 of the \$575,000,000 debt, leaving \$55,000,000 of dead weight debt.

and the point I'm making is, there is a difference between net debt and deadweight debt. If the difference escaped me in the course of my address yesterday, it is because my hon. friends opposite had confused this picture so much that I haven't been able to get straightened out in my own mind.

POTASHVILLE SCHOOL UNIT

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to the attention of the house the fact that there has been a new school unit emerge in the area of Esterhazy, Churchbridge, and Langenburg. This was done by minister's order, after considerable consultation with the Yorkton School Unit Board and local school unit boards. Local citizens there have wanted to call this new unit "Potashville" and so it is to be Potashville, and I wanted to make use of this occasion to publicly thank those citizens for their co-operation in the matter which made this whole thing become possible.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to bring your attention to a large group of school children from Saskatoon, the Haultain school of Saskatoon, along with their teachers, Mr. Anderson and Mrs. Hogg. I am sure all members of the legislature will join with me in saying how delighted we are to have them with us, and hope that their day will be a pleasurable one and also an informative one.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

BUDGE DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the Budget Motion moved by hon. Mr. Brockelbank.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday, following the address of the financial critic, I addressed myself to replying to some of the minor misstatements and misrepresentations that he made in the course of his remarks, and I think that there are, however, some other areas which do need some straightening out.

The financial critic would like to have the people of Saskatchewan and the members of this legislature, believe that the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan is inefficient in his planning of the budget of this province. It is only a year ago since the new Liberal government was elected at Ottawa. There was a government that was to be rich in managerial know-how, a competent and efficient, a business like team. Everyone can remember the debacle that was created early last summer when they presented their budget.

It was announced in the house one day, and it was withdrawn another day, it was substituted a few days later, and finally a week-kneed, illogical, compromise was arrived at which was satisfactory to no one. I think it is conceded on all quarters that that federal budget presented last year in Ottawa did much to undermine the confidence in Canada's economy and to slow down Canadian economic expansion. Who knows but for that bungling our surplus might have been \$4 or \$5,000,000 higher last year.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most conspicuous virtue of recent budgeting in Saskatchewan is the flexibility of our budgeting. Its adaptability to meet changing conditions, changing circumstances. It is sometimes argued that government administrations tend to be rigid and inflexible, that government procedures and government programs tend to freeze into molds which do not lend themselves to changing conditions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the financial critic drew attention yesterday to the large amount of supplementary estimates which are being presented to the house this year for the financial year about to draw to a close.

To fully understand the significance of these supplementary estimates, it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this government imposes upon its various departments a very tight financial rein. It calls on its departments for the most stringent kind of budgeting, indeed, austere budgeting. The Treasury estimates the economic activity, forecasts the economic activity of the province for the ensuing year and it estimates the revenues on that basis somewhat conservatively and I think every member would agree that it is more prudent in budgeting to err on the side of thrift than to err on the

side of extravagance. If it turns out that economic activity is better than was forecast and if it turns out that budget revenues have increased by say five per cent, producing say \$10,000,000 surplus in the Treasury, then the government is in a position to select certain major and worthy projects for inclusion in the supplementary estimates – certain projects which are of real significance to the people of the province – and to undertake them during the course of the year without waiting until the following fiscal year, and thereby use up part or all of this anticipated surplus of revenue. Or, on the other hand, the government is free to decide to use this windfall revenue, this unexpected surplus, to reduce our debt or to increase the assets of the province.

If we assume the economy can just as easily fall short of the forecast level of activity, then if we budget for the maximum amount we will find ourselves suddenly having to curtail expenditures in mid-year, or find ourselves, alternatively, having to borrow money in order to finance ordinary government expenditures. This creates real problems. It is always awkward to have to discontinue capital projects which are in progress or cancel out and abandon contracts which have already been let. This is not only costly but it is painful, to have to contract government services at a time when economic recession seems to increase the demand for government services. It undermines confidence in our financial prudence if we over-estimate our revenues and then find that we have to borrow money in order to provide for an unexpected deficit and when you have to borrow money for ordinary expenditures, this undermines the confidence of the business community in the prudence and in the perspicacity of our provincial administration. And any undermining of confidence of this kind results in increased interest rates, Mr. Speaker. This increased interest rate not only applies to the special loans that were necessary for this purpose – for this deficit financing – but increases the cost of capital monies which have to be borrowed for such self-liquidating purposes as power and telephones as well.

It seems to us, Mr. Speaker, that by adopting a stringent financial frame-work and by keeping ourselves free to adopt major worthwhile projects in the event that the revenues exceed the estimates, we can thereby relate the needs and the resources of the province efficiently and in the most meaningful way. This, I submit, fits the description of a dynamic budget for a thriving province, and so if we have supplementary estimates as a result of our good fortune and our good revenues in the last fiscal year, the real test is how well and how wisely did we select the projects to include in those supplementary estimates.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Now, I ask you to look at them. Well, there is an increase of nearly \$1 in school grants. I think that all hon. members and all citizens would want us if we came into unexpected revenues to use them to assist the educational system of the province, to use them to assist school units and school districts to relieve the tax burden of direct school taxes throughout the province.

In addition to that we will be asked to vote an additional amount of \$134,000 for technical school purposes, the technical school at Moose Jaw. This leadership that we are giving in technical school training is one of the reasons I am sure why Saskatchewan enjoys such a low unemployment rate, why we have the most favorable rate of unemployment of all the provinces of Canada.

We are proposing to set aside \$3,000,000 of this wind-fall surplus to assist in capital construction at the university. This wasn't anticipated. We didn't anticipate these revenues, but we are now able to make this \$3,000,000 available. This will relieve the university of having to borrow \$3,000,000, will relieve the people of Saskatchewan in the future years of having to add to the university grants an amount to cover interest on \$3,000,000 which the university would otherwise have had to borrow to finance their capital program. The people of Saskatchewan will enjoy dividends for 30 years hence because we are able to set aside a supplementary vote of \$3,000,000 for university construction this year.

The student aid fund – well, Mr. Speaker, much has been said about preventing poverty in Saskatchewan. I know of no better way of ensuring young people immunity and security from poverty than to assist them to qualify themselves for work in the middle of the 20th century.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — This \$2,000,000 going into the student aid fund will double the funds which we still have available to assist these young people in getting their education in the universities and in the technical institutes of the province.

Highways — \$1,333,333. Well, anybody who drives over Saskatchewan's highways, whether he be Liberal or Conservative — except for my friends who sit on the other side of the house — applauds this government for its highway program, and I am not going to take the time of the house to defend it here.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Then there were other projects, smaller amounts. For the municipal water assistance program, more than \$750,000 out of our supplementary estimates will go into that purpose — \$750,000 out of the surplus which the hon. Leader of the Opposition says represents over-taxation.

All these things, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends opposite call over-taxation. If these are over-taxation, if this surplus is a result of over-taxation, Mr. Speaker, then my hon. friends opposite must be opposed to these items of expenditure, because these items of expenditure were made possible by reason of the surplus which accrued to the Treasury of the province this year.

Recreation facilities — well, every province in Canada, every jurisdiction in North America is giving much needed attention to this area of public need.

Mr. Speaker yesterday we were treated to a long discourse by the financial critic on the subject of wheat. There is a lot of wheat in Saskatchewan and I couldn't detect anything in what the financial critic said that would help grow more wheat or to sell the wheat that we have got. Yesterday he made an attempt to try to claim some credit for his Party for the success of the Canadian Wheat Board in selling wheat to iron curtain countries. At one point in his address, Mr. Speaker, he went so far as to speak of the vast accumulations of stored wheat and he said this:

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we can sell this wheat, and when I say "we" I mean the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, he is confusing himself and he is confusing the Liberal Party with the Canadian Wheat Board. Everybody remembers that the Canadian Wheat Board was set up, not by a Liberal government, but by a Conservative government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — An attempt was also made by my hon. friend opposite to suggest that to link the present Minister of Trade and Commerce with the successful sale of wheat. Well, Mr. Speaker, his colleagues, his compatriots, his progenitors in Ottawa never make so bold as to utter such a claim. They have never claimed that the federal Liberal government has had anything to do with the sale of this wheat. Mr. Sharp, indeed, is quite frank in saying that it is the work of the Canadian Wheat Board. My hon. friends here try to stoop to try to claim credit for the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan for the sale of wheat by the Canadian Wheat Board. I think it takes too much for granted, I think it presumes too much about the voters of this province.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Attorney-General that if he is going to quote what I said yesterday he has to either quote it all or nothing. I did not try to take credit for the Liberal Party. The Canadian Wheat Board represents the farmers of Canada and nobody else.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, we recall that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce was the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce under the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe. We recall that Mr. Howe and Mr. Sharp adopted the view that prospective importing wheat countries knew that Canada had first quality wheat for sale, that if they wanted it they should come here and pay cash on the barrel head for it. That was the view of Mr. Howe and Mr. Sharp on the subject of selling wheat. Hon. members know that it was the Conservative government at Ottawa that sent trade missions abroad and brought Canada to the attention of the importing nations.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Hon. members of this house remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was to help our export position that the previous government at Ottawa devalued the Canadian dollar, and that this was attacked and maligned by the colleagues of my hon. friends opposite at the time. It was the dollar devaluation, Mr. Speaker, which makes possible the substantial final payment now being distributed on last year's bumper crop.

All hon. members will recall that in the 1950's all farm organizations, all political parties other than the Liberals and indeed this legislature, forwarded suggestions to the federal government which would improve the export position of Canada's wheat. But these suggestions fell on deaf ears. These members of this house will remember and I recalled it to them yesterday, the introduction of a motion by the opposition members of this house protesting against the giving of advice to the wheat board and expressing the view that this Canadian Wheat Board didn't need any advice.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board has done a much better job for the people of the western farms, the producers of Saskatchewan, since some advice was given to them during the last seven or eight years.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — We don't need your advice, that is for sure.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, the budget address of the Provincial Treasurer drew attention to the tremendous increase in agricultural and industrial production and the income derived therefrom. I think all members of the house rejoice in the relative prosperity of agriculture in the last two years. The reference to these facts was not, however, sufficient to inspire any enthusiasm from hon. members opposite when the Provincial Treasurer gave his budget address. We all recognize that bounteous nature cannot solve all problems which plague the agriculture industry. Large numbers of farm people live on sub-marginal and un-productive land. This problem is gradually being corrected by the large scale purchases of land by the Department of Agriculture for community pasture purposes. But the removal of all un-productive and sub-marginal land from agricultural use still will not solve all of the problems. The farm prosperity which we see about us today is not reaching all of the farm people. We have been endeavoring to correct this situation by up-grading the acreage presently being occupied by these farm families. We are trying to increase their production by extensive programs of drainage, irrigation, clearing and breaking and other development programs. The tremendous increase in the community pasture program assists these farmers to diversity and to intensify their operations. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the house will welcome the increase in the general programs of assistance for the agricultural industry, as much this year, indeed, as if there had been no Russian wheat deal at all. In my constituency of Hanley the benefits of the emergency fodder program were keenly appreciated. Last year and the year before the farmers of Hanley constituency, in common with farmers all over the province, will appreciate the erection of a Veterinary College at Saskatoon, and I am sure that the existence of this veterinary college will be reflected in an increased and a more stable farm income for all the people of Saskatchewan.

I'd like to say something about the farm sewer and water program. It is another first for Saskatchewan. In four years it has already helped some 15,000 farmers with their farm sewer and water program and this has doubled the number of farmers who had sewer and water prior to 1960. This program is valued, not so much for the grant paid to help the farmer finance his costs, although that is important, but it is valued even more for the inspiration and leadership which it gave to our farm communities to tackle and to solve the difficult problem of sewer and water on the average farm.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about equality of opportunity, and how this budget contributes to that. The financial critic assailed the budget. He said it contained no measures for the relief of poverty, for help to the under privileged. I have already made some reference to the assistance which the Department of Agriculture gives and proposes to give to improve the economic position of those in the lower income categories in the industry of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, one should ask the financial critic where he has been this last twenty years. This government has brought in a long succession of measures designed to provide a higher standard of services for all the people of the province, including those with very low incomes. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, the kind of rural school system that we had when I was a boy on the farm. When we passed grade eight, unless our parents were prepared to pay tuition fees, together with the cost of boarding us in the nearest town or village, we had to simply stop school at the end of the eighth grade. There are many people in this province who today are without adequate educational standards simply because the cost of financing their education past grade eight was beyond the means of their parents. In almost every part of Saskatchewan today, every youngster passing the eighth grade has the opportunity to continue through grade 12 without fee or without charge, and indeed, assistance is given to the cost of boarding away from home where transportation from the farm door is not provided in most cases. During the past ten years some 20,000 students have been added to the number attending our high schools.

This, I suggest, was a major step in overcoming the effects of poverty in Saskatchewan, and, indeed, of preventing poverty in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Where was the financial critic when the larger school units were being introduced? I can tell him where most of his colleagues in the Liberal party were. They were going around this province bitterly opposing, fighting tooth and nail, against this worthwhile reform.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, in the thirties and the forties, when people of ordinary means in this province could not afford to pay the high cost of automobile insurance. And, of course, it must be remembered that even if they did purchase the kind of automobile insurance payable from private insurance companies, this constituted no protection to their dependents in the event that they were killed in a car accident unless they could prove that someone else was at fault and discover that that person had pub-liability protection. For a few dollars a year added to the cost of every license fee on every automobile in Saskatchewan, protection up to \$10,000 a year was made available to wives with four children, five children, dependent upon them, and lesser amount if the number of dependents were less. This insurance is now provided to every family in Saskatchewan in the event of the breadwinner being killed in an accident. I suggest that this measure goes a long way to relieve poverty and suffering in this province. Where was the financial critic when this measure was being dealt with? Well, I know that his colleagues here in the legislature bitterly opposed that measure, indeed, they called it the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan, and I think they still feel the same way about it, Mr. Speaker, if they would be frank with us.

The hospitalization plan introduced in 1947 lifted a great burden of hospital costs off the sick and placed it on the taxpayers generally. This not only relieved people in the low income groups, but relieved all people of the financial burden of hospital care in return for a very nominal annual premium, but it made hospital care available to many people for the first time. Witness the large increase in the number of people using our hospitals as compared with ten or twenty years ago. Not only that but it made hospitalization available to every one in Saskatchewan without the humiliation of having to lie in a corridor in a hospital waiting for someone to try to get the reeve on the telephone, without the kind of humiliation that they had under Liberalism. Where was my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, when this measure was taken? Here again, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party went about the province and fought with fang and claw against this measure.

I receive letters from people being sued and harassed through the courts of Saskatchewan for medical bills incurred prior to July 1st, 1962. Things are looking up, Mr. Speaker, we are getting more mumbling across there than we have had for several days. Some of the letters that I get would almost make one weep. People say that they would have rather gone without expensive surgery than to have been faced with bills that they couldn't pay. Of course, the doctors as one would expect reassured patients on this score and told them that they had better have the treatment, even if they couldn't afford it. But these bills were not forgotten. In due time, some of these people were being driven to virtual distraction by demands for payments which they could not meet. Today these people for a nominal payment equal to about \$1.00 a month, plus a few pennies on the sales tax, are able to banish from their minds the hazards of crippling medical expense.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — What is even more important, Mr. Speaker, they are able to walk into any doctor's office with their head held high with dignity and self-respect and ask for attention. There is no Liberal means being tested here, Mr. Speaker. I don't need to remind my hon. friend the financial critic where he was when this great measure was receiving the attention of the people of Saskatchewan. He and his colleagues were going about the province, stirring up hatred and dissatisfaction among Her Majesty's citizens and instigating defiance of the laws of the land. Now, the financial critic deplores the fact that the plan does not go so far as to include the provision of drugs. This comes strangely from the hon. member when one recalls that the drug industry, the drug trade in this province with a few notable exceptions, was one of the strongest allies of the Liberal Party in trying to thwart this province's medical care plan in July of 1962. Drug manufacturers and distributors are able to exploit their monopoly situation because of patents and licenses granted under the authority of the laws of Canada. They are able to do this apparently with the connivance of the people of Ottawa whose task it is to prevent combinations and restraint of trade. The Liberal spokesman is undoubtedly justified in regarding with a baleful eye those who assisted him in fomenting and encouraging the anti-medicare crisis in 1962. I think we would all wish that he would direct his attention to the government at Ottawa, who are in a position to take effective measures against exploitation in this field.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — He says, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken no effective measures recently to show our interest in the welfare of the old age pensioners. I won't go back over a lot of old history but the federal government increased the old age security allowance by ten dollars a month, and they did this only under strong pressure from the CCF and the Conservative parties in parliament and throughout the country. Anyone who just goes back and looks over the clippings last fall will see that one pretext after another was exploited by the Liberal Party in Ottawa to try to postpone the introduction of this ten dollar increase.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — It was only when they were driven by the opposition that they finally consented to this ten dollar increase in this allowance.

This province was the first province in Canada to adopt this new scale for the old age assistance group and other groups who come under the jurisdiction of the provincial government. This province made its adjustment in these schedules effective November 1st — made them retroactive to November 1st. This was the first province to do so, and Mr. Speaker, there are still two provinces that haven't done so. I'll give you a guess as to which they are. Quebec and Newfoundland. Two Liberal provinces.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal from the opposition from time to time on the question of taxes. When they are not making quite impossible promises of tax reductions, they are criticizing this government for whatever course it might take on this subject. Last Friday, the opposition spokesman bitterly chastised the government because it made no provisions in

next year's budget for a tax reduction, as the headline put it in the Leader Post, "Failure to Cut Taxes Brings Stinging Rebuke". The innocent observer would think that the opposition were always of the opinion that we should at this session undertake important tax reductions for next year. He says "Hear, Hear". Well, let's see how he has changed his mind since last year on this subject. Speaking in the budget debate a year ago, this same hon. gentleman who just said, "Hear, Hear" said, that the government, and I quote:

No doubt intends to cut taxes immediately before the next provincial election in the hopes that they can buy their way into the hearts of the people of this province.

A year ago, they were condemning us in advance because we might reduce taxes at the 1964 session. Condemning us in advance, Mr. Speaker. It is easy for opposition spokesmen to swing from one side of a question to another, as it seems to serve their party's advantage for the moment. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that that confronted with burgeoning revenues this government did take off approximately \$5,000,000 in taxation since the last session of the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — We took it off where it would do the most good. We didn't take off the income tax, we took it off where every person in Saskatchewan can share in these burgeoning revenues. During this same time, Mr. Speaker, since the last session of the legislature, a Liberal government has imposed from \$10 to \$12,000,000 of net taxes at Ottawa, on the citizens of this province, on the citizens of this province, Mr. Speaker.

It is fashionable for opposition spokesmen to deplore taxes generally. Of course, there are undoubtedly many people in Saskatchewan who contribute more in taxes to support our health care. But the fact remains, that for the overall majority of these people, those with net income of less than \$5,000 per year, their contribution to the three health taxes is much less than they could buy complete health coverage for., privately. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is not just a question of how much it would cost you to get your health services privately. It is not a question of whether we taxpayers make a profit or loss on medical services by buying them collectively through the government. This is not the question at all. All of us, the well-to-do and those on meagre incomes, are daily faced with the hazards of severe and crippling illness. All of us are exposed to the risks of medical bills that we can ill afford to pay. All of us face the hazards of enforced poverty arising out of serious illness. Mr. Speaker, all of us have an interest not only in the well-being of our own families, but in the well-being of our community, of our province, and of our nation.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, there are undoubtedly people who pay school taxes whose families receive no direct benefit from the educational system. Here again, we do not try to measure the cost of educational services against the personal benefits which we and our families enjoy. We recognize that we cannot live in a productive and progressive community, without the benefits of modern education.

Likewise in health, Saskatchewan has decided that the benefits of good health insofar as they can assured by modern medical science, are the birthright of every citizen.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Sometimes it is said that Saskatchewan has the highest taxation in Canada and it was said again by the financial critic when he spoke last Friday. It is repeated again this afternoon. Well, I have a table prepared by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which shows the per capita taxation of all the provinces in Canada. These figures include the proceeds paid to the provinces under the tax rental agreements, and the provincial share of income tax on power utilities. I find that the highest in Canada is British Columbia, with a per capita tax burden of \$142.91, last year. The next highest is Ontario, with \$138.27 per capita, then comes Saskatchewan with \$124.44 followed by Quebec with \$119.14. This places Saskatchewan in third position, and only slightly ahead of the Liberal province of Quebec. In third position. We were in second position, Mr. Speaker, when this government was elected in 1944, and this government has vastly increased

the level of services given by a provincial government and we have at the same time, dropped from second rank to third rank among the taxing provinces of Canada. Mr. Speaker, these figures do not tell the whole story. For our tax money in this province we receive medical services. It is usually estimated that these cost about \$22.00 per capita per year. If this amount were added to the per capita tax burden of the other provinces, it would put British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec substantially ahead of Saskatchewan.

What is perhaps more relevant from this table, Mr. Speaker, is the percentage of citizen's income which goes to pay provincial taxes. On this table I find that the province of Quebec, a Liberal province, ranks first with 8.1 per cent of personal income on the average going to support provincial services. Next comes Prince Edward Island with an average of eight per cent of its citizen's income going to support provincial services. Next comes British Columbia with 7.2 per cent and next comes Newfoundland and Ontario each with 6.9 per cent. Saskatchewan comes sixth with 6.5 per cent of our average personal income going to finance provincial services. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this will end this silly talk about Saskatchewan being the highest tax jurisdiction in Canada or indeed the world as I think my hon. friend said when he was carried away by his own sound and fury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention for a moment to the question of industrial development. Much has been said in this chamber, I'm sorry to say, to undermine and try to discredit the industrial development of our province. I'm not going to take time to review the large number of industrial loans that have been made to small industries locating in the smaller centres of Saskatchewan or review them in detail. Perhaps some idea of the distribution of industrial development throughout the province can be gathered from a leaflet which I happen to have on my desk, reprinted from Trade and Commerce Magazine and it is in reference to the city of Weyburn and I'm sorry that the member from Weyburn isn't here, because evidently he hasn't seen this. It goes on for three closely printed pages to describe industrial progress in the city of Weyburn. It points out that from 1951 to 1961, the population of Weyburn increased from 5,000 to 9,000, an increase of 80 per cent, which by any standard must be regarded as phenomenal. It shows an increase in the retail volume in the same period from 13,000,000 to 30,000,000. It shows an increase in the number of industrial plants from ten to 17. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it would be appropriate for the hon. member for Weyburn to rise in his place in this house and to boast of the great industrial developments that have come to the city of Weyburn since the CCF launched its industrial development campaign.

Mr. Speaker, he could point with pride to the increase in the quality and the kinds of government services made available in his community. He could point out that the capital investment in the Saskatchewan hospital there has more than doubled in the last ten years. He could point out, for instance, that government employees are making an increasing contribution to the economic life of his community and Weyburn is only one example of small communities. I could do the same with respect to Yorkton, Estevan and many others throughout the province.

I think all hon. members of the house were happy to hear the Provincial Treasurer describe the striking advances made this year in the mining industry. All of the belittling comments and the criticisms of Liberal opposition members cannot take away the fact that the value of mineral production in Saskatchewan advanced another \$40,000,000 bringing the total up to \$280,000,000 last year. It is also well known that we are on the threshold of a still greater advance in the year to come.

Perhaps the development of the mining industry depends more than any other area on the confidence which investors have in the integrity of the government and integrity of the people of the province. They must invest vast sums of money before obtaining any return on their investments, and they must wait long years before the capital investment is paid out. This, they have shown a willingness and an eagerness to do in the province of Saskatchewan.

Of course, we could lower royalty rates in Saskatchewan – we could agree to reduce the people's return on the exploitation of the resources which in the final analysis belong to all the people of Saskatchewan – I believe the Liberals have promised to do just that. By demanding a smaller share, we might be able to entice some additional operators into the field, but I suggest that it is not the rate of royalties that attract or deter investment in new mining endeavors, it is the confidence which investors have in the stability and the consistency of government policies.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — It may be that lower rates of royalties would entice some additional operators into the field, but I'm convinced that a government made up of a political party whose policy on important matters veers and changes direction with every change in the political wind would lose more mineral development than it could gain by giving away people's resources for nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, in the old days at the turn of the century mining promoters used to get away with very low royalties indeed in return of a few dollars in someone's political slush fund. Most members will recall that some of the American states in spite of high mineral production received little or no return for the benefit of the people of their states. It may be that those buccaneering days would return if my hon. friends were ever elected to office. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that if it had not been for the doubts and the fears propagated by some gentlemen opposite, we might have had more mineral development at the present rate of royalty. Undoubtedly the province would have benefited if the Liberal Party had fostered and encouraged confidence in the integrity of our province.

The Liberal financial critic and the Liberal spokesmen in general seem sorry to learn about the growth of our industrial economy. They sneer when they hear the figures and they blindly try to pretend that they do not exist. The opposition likes to take manufacturing statistics to prove that our industrial development is not spectacular. They know that employment in manufacturing is drastically curtailed by automation. Of course, they know that manufacturing statistics represent only one segment of the index of industrial development usually used by economists. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics includes mining, manufacturing and electric power production in its concept of industrial prosperity in Saskatchewan. While there has been a considerable growth in manufacturing production it has been the least spectacular of the three elements composing industrial production. While the net value of manufacturing has grown since 1944 by 243 per cent, the net value of mining has grown by 1,183 per cent and electric power has grown by 675 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Even with respect to manufacturing, if we compare Saskatchewan with the neighboring province of Manitoba, we find that from 1944 to last year, the number of people engaged in manufacturing in Manitoba grew from 41,000 to 43,000. In the same period Saskatchewan grew 12,000 to 13,000. It may serve the purposes of the opposition to compare the 13,000 people engaged in manufacturing today to the 43,000 engaged in manufacturing in Manitoba today, but when we remember that at the end of the war, Manitoba had 41,000 to our 12,000, then the effect of the figures, I submit, is to show that even in the manufacturing area, we have held our own with the province of Manitoba under Liberal and Conservative governments.

It is much more realistic and objective to take the net value of non-farm commodity production — we find that from 1944 to 1962 the net value of non-farm commodity production in Alberta rose by 522 per cent, in Saskatchewan by 430 per cent, in British Columbia by 236 per cent and in Manitoba 232 per cent, just half of Saskatchewan's rate, and Ontario 208 per cent, less than half of Saskatchewan's rate. So you have Saskatchewan more than doubling these other provinces, with the exception of British Columbia and Alberta. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is recognized by most sources who are capable of opening their eyes to see. The Financial Post in February's edition this year, and I won't read the whole article, but I would like to commend to the house, one paragraph of this article, they say:

What is mainly helping the government, (government of Saskatchewan) is the success of some of its industrial development programs. Biggest impact is from major industries such as the potash mines at Esterhazy and Belle Plaine, but smaller industries also are growing and the government is adapting to industrial development the ag. rep system used in western agriculture, sending out advisers to work with businessmen in small towns who want help in expanding a business or adapting it to new conditions. To get new investments in large scale business, the government has been wooing investors in Japan, United States and Eastern Canada.

There I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is the commendation of an objective outside source to a government that has been successful.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that I was going to have something to say about this old population argument that my hon. friends use. If my hon. friends are right, the more people you have the better off you are. Then, of course, China and Indian should be the best off nations in the world. I suggest that population argument not be used merely for the purpose of stating what the totals are: this isn't a basketball game that the provinces are engaged in. If population figures have any significance, they should be looked at to determine what they indicate about the economy. What do the population figures of Saskatchewan indicate? They indicated that we have automated our agriculture industry — we have converted it into a mechanized operation. This could have been done, Mr. Speaker, 15 years earlier if we had had a progressive agricultural policy in this country. There were people in Saskatchewan who were farming with modern up-to-date machinery, almost as modern and up-to-date as is common on the farms of Saskatchewan today, as long as 30 years ago. The rest of the people were kept from getting these modern machines by the negligence and inefficiency of Liberal governments during the 1930's. And so this province has had difficulty in recent years, maintaining its population, because two-thirds of our people, when we came into office were engaged in agriculture, and a ten per cent decline in agricultural population had three times as much effect in the provincial total, as a ten per cent decline in agricultural population would have in the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba, where they had less farmers to start with.

In the urban areas, we are able to show that the non-farm production and the non-farm population has increased at a faster rate than that of any other province in Canada, with the exception of the province of Alberta.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Walker: — There is nothing, once the facts are all laid on the table, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing for this government to hang its head in shame for on the population figures.

My hon. friends, however, take the superficial appearance of the figures and act as though it were some kind of a football game, and try to win their arguments that way. The people of Saskatchewan are a little more sophisticated than my hon. friends give them credit for being. The people of Saskatchewan are capable of going a little behind the facts and discovering the reasons, discovering the causes and the effects. My hon. friends won't find any easy victory in this argument.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that a couple of other members in this house are eagerly waiting to catch your eye and I wouldn't want to encroach on any time which they may have planned for this afternoon. So, Mr. Speaker, with these words, I want to say that I will support this budget because I think this is a continuation of 20 years of progress. I think we are now at a watershed in the history of Saskatchewan when we have built for the future and when we have achieved a standard in this province which cannot lead us, which cannot flow any other way, than toward greater prosperity and abundance and security for the people of Saskatchewan.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I think I need not say that I will be supporting the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking in this debate, which will be my last speech in this house as this is my last session in the house, I won't give very much of a political speech. It will be more a goodbye to the many friends that I have made since I have been a member of this legislature. I've seen many changes here since the day, since the year I was first elected, and when I look across this house and around both sides of this house, most of the old fellows that were here in 1948 have gone. There are very few left on either side of the house. I recall in 1948 the Liberals elected 22 members. Out of that 22 there are four of us left over here. We elected one in 1949 too. He is still here and well, he is retiring this year too. So time goes on — things certainly do change. The opinions change too, as well as the people, and as this is my last session here, I don't want to take much of your time. In fact I only have a few minutes and I want to tell the people of this house, members on both sides of the house that I leave here without feeling malice to anyone or hatred, because . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — . . . it is something perhaps, that has always been foreign to my nature. I've disagreed with gentlemen in this house, I will continue to do that, but the fact that I don't agree with them, or they don't agree with me, is no reason for hatred, or anything like that, because if other members here who have different opinions haven't a right to their opinion, then I haven't a right to mine. That is one of our democratic rights, and we don't want to lose it.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — Mr. Speaker, my wife and I celebrated our golden wedding anniversary this year, and when you, when . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — . . . anyone celebrates their golden anniversary they are not kids after that. My reason for going out of public life is principally my age, although not altogether. I have some other private reasons which I don't need to mention here today.

At the opening of the session, as some of you know, my family were all present to see this session of the legislature open. It is the first time any of them had seen the opening of legislature except one of my daughters, who lives here in Saskatchewan. Righter there I might mention the drift in population. We are only an ordinary family of seven. Seven children. Out of this seven, two are still living in Saskatchewan and I want to thank the Premier for his kindness in allowing them to have their seats on the floor of the house when they were here. They got a great deal of pleasure out of that.

There was another reason, of course, why I wanted them to come here. I wanted to show these fellows around Regina, and the members of this legislature, that my wife and I had grown something on that old farm besides wheat over these years.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — Well, regarding this budget, Mr. Speaker, I've seen sixteen budgets. This is the sixteenth I've seen come down in this house and this is by far the largest one. But I do want to congratulate my old friend — he should be an old friend — he comes from my part of the country — the Provincial Treasurer, for the able manner in which he presented the budget, and I want to congratulate our financial critic for the good, able reply that he made that speech, and other members too, who have spoken since. The Attorney General just now, I don't always agree with him, I didn't agree with what he said today, but I can't bear him too much ill-will because you know he came from my part of the country in the east — I don't know how it happened but that is where he came from.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps on this occasion maybe I should say hello to my wife. I am sure that she will be listening. I just want to say "hello honey" I'll see you on the weekend.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — You know, Mr. Speaker, it is probably taking a certain advantage of a woman to speak to her like this when she hasn't got a chance to talk back.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — Now I want to say a word about my constituency that I have represented here for sixteen years. I want to thank the people of that constituency for the whole-hearted support and the friendly support that they have given me over this period of time. They sent me down here as their representative for four consecutive occasions and the trust that they have placed in me, I hope I haven't betrayed that trust. I think we have one of the best constituencies in the province. I think it is as good as the average, I think it is better than average. I believe we contribute as much to the doffers of this government in the way of taxes as the average constituency in this province does. We have one of the best farming areas in the province. Most of our land up there is wheat land, grows wheat, and if we get a little bit of rain we get a crop. We don't need a lot of rain. We have some of the best farmers in Saskatchewan, we have some of the best small towns and some of the best business men. All in all, I am very proud of that constituency in every respect. I am very proud of the people that live there. I am very thankful for the support they have given me over the years.

Now I want to speak of this budget. I have no complaint to make of a big budget. I think that under existing conditions with the big crop we had last year — the crop is the big boost — has enabled you to handle the budget this year. There is such a hazard to farming we don't know what the next year will bring forth, and it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of good business, that in a year like this, it is a time when any business man or any farmer would want to pay his debts and leave a little bit over perhaps for a lean year. This government doesn't seem to do things that way.

Now they boast about the many things they have done. If I stand up here, Mr. Speaker, and say that this government in their twenty years of office never did anything worthwhile, I wouldn't be telling the truth. They have done things that are worthwhile, and surely the people of Saskatchewan would expect that, over about the twenty best years that we have ever had in this province.

They both had great reports this year. The throne speech and the budget, both mentioned the fact — 4,000 miles of dust-free surface roads in the province. Quite an achievement. We have a lot of roads and 4,000 miles is a lot of miles, but I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the people of my constituency will think of that. They say here that there is 4,000 miles of dust-free highway in this province, and we have twenty miles of oil-surfaced in my constituency. That is all. Then I look around me at adjoining constituencies, I look to the east, the Premier's constituency, Biggar, highway 14 that goes through my constituency goes through his too, the roads through Biggar constituency are oil-surfaced until they got up to the junction of highway 51, right in sight of the border of my constituency, and then like the grandfather's clock it stopped short . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — and, of course, high no. 4 goes north and south too through the Biggar constituency, all black surfaced roads. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that his constituency is any more important than mine is. He may be more important, the Premier of this province, sure, but the constituency isn't, and I doubt if the assessment of that whole area is any greater than the assessment of my constituency.

Then I look north and I see my hon. little friend here, the Minister of Agriculture. I take a look at his constituency. No. 5 highway, the full length of his constituency, all black-top or oil, all the full length. Highway 41, the full length of his constituency too, not black-top but I have heard reports, probably right, that it was going to be done this year — right, Toby?

Well, that is only part of the picture, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways when he made his report to this house last year, said that this year they would finish highway 31 from Salvador to Macklin, rebuilt it. Well, they got half of it done. They promised to do the rest next year. Well, in view of the promise they made last year, I'm not too sure that they will do it this year. They did, however, build a road from Macklin north up to my hon. gentleman's constituency again, to Fort Vermillion, a road that was half built by Alberta. Sure I wanted the road built but I didn't want it built at the expense of highway 31. I wanted highway 31 finished, and then that road could be built. Sure it is important, it is important to many of our people, but not at the expense of highway 31.

Now there is another road up there that I want to say something about. I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture and other members of this house, some of them, should agree with me on this, that is the north and south road that starts at the Montana border, mostly built, a good many miles of it is now under the provincial highway system. Many miles of it has been built under the grid road system, that road comes through Shaunavon constituency, Maple Creek, Kerrobert, Kindersley, Wilkie, Cutknife, Turtleford and well into Meadow Lake, up into the north. You know it is pretty nearly completed, then the part that is still under the grid road system with the exception of one or two miles along their opposing municipality which I believe will be completed this year. I am going to say a word about that tax along their opposing municipality. Perhaps the minister will do something about that. I think with a little encouragement and a little more help their opposing municipality would build that section of road; it is just north of Kerrobert. The reason they don't feel they should build it is because the road follows the west boundary of the municipality. They only have one rate payer living on that road, the rest of it is bounded by community pastures and PFAA pastures, and they feel their money would be better spent for their own people if it was spent in some other place. Of course, that shouldn't be allowed to hold the road up. I am sure the minister will give this thing some consideration. That would be a road where the tourists could go, up to the best fishing lakes, some of the best fishing lakes in the north, some of the best hunting grounds in the north. We would want a bridge across the north Saskatchewan river. There isn't a bridge now west of North Battleford, and there should be a bridge somewhere there north of Maidstone. There should be another one on the South Saskatchewan. This road, Mr. Speaker, is just as important a road as highway no. 4 that goes up to the Premier's constituency. Just as important, and it is pretty nearly completed now. I hope you will give that your favourable consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say just a word or two, (my time is almost up, I haven't said anything yet, fifteen minutes goes so fast.)

An Hon. Member: — Go ahead . . . take your time . . .

Mr. Horsman: — I didn't realize, Mr. Speaker, that fifteen minutes would go so quick, but I'm going to say a word about my successor in office. I'm passing out of politics, not passing out of life, I hope, but I am getting out of politics. But just in case some of you fellows over there get any idea that because I am dropping out of politics that you are going to win the constituency of Wilkie, we are going to get that straight right now. This young man that is following me will just walk over it like that. So you don't need to put any special effort in there because not only are you not going to win, you don't need to waste the money.

I am going to say just a word about the NDP amalgamation with labour. The CCF and the labour union. Well, I'm one man and I have said this before, I think, that I certainly have nothing against the labour unions, nothing in the world. I know why they were organized. I know what they have done to the labouring men, I know well, but it seems to me that there is still that great gulf between them and the farm population and I can't see how they are going to get together. I can't see it.

Labour has the one great weapon that the farmers haven't got. They have the strike, and most always just the threat of a strike gets them what they want. We are just common people, the farmers and the labouring men. When I look around this house, everybody looks common to me here; some have higher positions than others but I think we are all common people.

I remember I worked out when there were no labour unions and I know what conditions were like then. They certainly weren't good to say the least, and I don't blame labour for organizing and I think they should stay organized, but their rights, many of them recognized by everyone; the right to bargain for higher wages, better working conditions, shorter hours, the un-denied rights of labour, but their rights ceased when they interfere with the rights of other people and other groups too, they must cease. The average good labouring man, Mr. Speaker, is the salt of the earth. There is no question about that. But when you get a few leaders like Hal banks, Jimmy Hoffa, and people like that, it gives every labour union a bad name and every labouring man a black eye. These are the men an the people that labour must get rid of or they are going to lose the sympathy of the average people. Labour when they started in their unions just wanted one thing, the thing that everyone should have, they wanted their little spot in the sun of their own. They wanted to be able to hold up their heads and walk the world with dignity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will have to bring my few remarks to a close, there are many more things I wanted to say, I didn't' think time could go so fast, but I just wanted to say a few words about my leader here. It may be my last chance. The young dynamic man that he is made a great success of his own business while he was very young. He will be the next Premier of Saskatchewan and I'll even have to cut my remarks short about him.

I only want to say to you fellows over there, after the election is over, you will find yourselves sitting on this side of the house. It will be a change for you. Don't feel too bad about having to relinquish the reins of government that you have held so long. Don't feel too bad about it because you will know in your own hearts that the business of the province will be in good capable hands and will be well looked after.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Horsman: — Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. David G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — Mr. Speaker, I find that it is a most difficult job to follow the hon. member from Wilkie, who said he wasn't going to make a political speech, and then he says we pressed him into it and then proceeded to do an extremely good job. I know that all members of the house join with me in saying how sorry we are to see this member and many other members on both sides of the house who served so well leaving the field of provincial government, the field of provincial politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker as I enter this debate there are some remarks that the Attorney General made that I would like to deal with, just very briefly. He began by talking about, naturally, the budget brought down by the Treasurer in this house, and he didn't attempt at all to explain its errors, but what he said in effect was, the federal government made some mistakes in their budget so this, of course, excuses the NDP in Saskatchewan, for at least three of their unrealistic budgets that have over-taxed our people and slowed down the economic growth of this province. The Attorney General admits that he said they erred a little, they might have taken a little bit more from the people in taxes than they needed to run this administration. A little bit more. Well, our financial critic pointed out that in the last two years they took \$45,000,000, from the people of this province in taxes and charges more than they needed to run the affairs of this province. A little error — I'd hate to see them if they made a major error.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — You know the NDP love to point to Saskatchewan's low unemployment record and we are all very, very happy about this, but I think they should keep in mind, and the people of Saskatchewan should keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that one of the greatest single factors in the fact that we may have a low unemployment rate, is the fact that thousands and thousands of our young people couldn't find jobs here, opportunities here, so they had to leave this province. Now the Attorney General then proceeds to tell us what a utopia they have built in Saskatchewan in the last 20 years. Well, we

can repeat again and again if this is such a tremendously wondrous place in which to live under NDP socialism, where are all the people, where have they gone? Oh, the Attorney General says this is no basketball game, we shouldn't be dealing in just numbers. Well, we agree with the Attorney General, it is not a basketball game, it is a deadly serious matter, deadly serious to those young people who couldn't find their opportunities here. It is a deadly serious thing to those young farmers who couldn't find a chance to go farming in this province, went to the city, or left this province, and it is deadly serious to the families who had to educate their young people and watch them leave this province for other parts of Canada just to earn a living.

Mr. Speaker, if we had the kind of government that we should have had, that would have taken advantage of the opportunities this last 20 years, we would have had people flooding into this province instead of flooding out of it. You know, the Minister of Industry, said the other day that we will soon be bringing in workers to Saskatchewan. Well, I suggest to him to let him first give our own people jobs and opportunities and if he can do this we will see the return of our own people who have been driven out of this province by the NDP and the socialists.

You know the Attorney General and members on the other side of the house like to bleat about the poor people and they love to go back to the thirties, or the bad old days, and they mention about people being sued, what a terrible thing it was to be sued for a doctor bill. Well, I wonder how we have changed. I would like to draw his attention to the hundreds of people that are being dragged into our courts and sued and one of them even put in jail for failing to pay their medical and hospital tax bill in this day and age under their brand of government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — You know the Attorney General talked about our taxes and he quoted DBS figures to show that we were in third place among the provinces in Canada. We were only the third highest, he said "this isn't too bad". We were second under the Liberals. I thought we were the lowest under the Liberals. He then said that these figures don't tell the whole story. They don't tell the whole story, and how right he was. Just let the Attorney General and those people on the other side of the house add our provincial taxes, our municipal taxes, gas bills and our power bills, and he will find what the rest of us know already, that it costs us, the people of Saskatchewan, more to live in this province than the people in any other province in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the budget was a bitter disappointing document. With a buoyant year because of good crops, record wheat sales and high prices, the government of this province was in a position to do so much for the people and they have offered so little. Did they, for example, offer our young farmers a chance to go farming, to borrow money, at low interest rates, so we could build up these family farms they like to talk about? Well, you know the answer, they did not. Did they cut taxes so our people could spend their own money, bring new life to our economy? No, they showed their usual contempt and said "We can spend your money better than you can". Did they cut taxes, Mr. Speaker, give our cities and our towns and our smaller communities and municipalities a chance to cut their taxes or to improve their services, or to build up local development projects in their own communities so we could see the re-birth and bring new life back to our local areas? Mr. Speaker, again you know the answer, they did not. Mr. Speaker, did they cut taxes so we in this province could compete for industrial development, for manufacturing plants with Alberta and Manitoba, or British Columbia? Compete we must, but again, they didn't. In this instance they show an actual unrealistic view, a total misconception of common ordinary economic principles. If we hope to get industries and jobs, job producing manufacturing industry into this province, we must compete with other provinces. We don't compete now and this is just one of the reasons why we haven't had our fair share of this kind of development in the last twenty years.

Mr. Speaker, did they come out in this budget with a tremendous amount of money they are going to spend with some new deal for our people on social aid? Did they come out with a bold new approach, said, "We will

re-educate these people, we will develop some kind of sensible, sound, working wage program so that these people can hold up their heads and take their place back in society in a proper way? No, again they didn't. They just said more of the same hand-outs over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, what did they do in the budget, and what have they suggested? Well, really what they have suggested is that they will continue to over-tax our people once again this year. They will continue to ignore our ever mounting real and actual debt, they will continue to say to the people "we can spend your money better than you can". They had a chance to do so much and they really offered so little.

You know, time after time, when speakers on the government side stand up they love to talk about pointing to the future, "new horizons", "guide posts" and so on, but they continue to point to the past, they want to talk about their record. Well, we in the opposition, Mr. Speaker, are convinced that industrial business, manufacturing, agricultural development, in all parts of this province, is the most important, the number one problem facing the people of this province. Why is it? It is, Mr. Speaker, because we need to create jobs for our young people, opportunities, new tax revenues for our municipalities.

We need to do something about diversifying our agriculture economy, our agricultural industry. We never had a better chance than this year when we had these buoyant economies to take a real and honest step in that direction. Well, let us take a look at this record that the NDP like to boast about.

In the matter of industrial development – first, they have the crown corporations. Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know what happened, we know what a failure most of those were. In those years when great development was taking place right across this nation, our government's eyes were turned inward, they said "We don't need, (in fact, they said) we don't want this outside capital, we will do it ourselves" and they failed and they failed miserably. Then lately they have been pleading with free enterprise saying to free enterprise "We are really not as bad as we said we were, or other people say we are, we have changed our ways, we changed our minds, come in here and help us develop this province." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think even if we give them credit for trying, if we say that they did their best, I think it was a poor best. Maybe they were sincere, but I don't think that being sincere has been enough.

You compare, or any fair minded person, compares our record with Alberta, or Manitoba, or British Columbia, in practically any field of economic development, our record just doesn't stand up. You know, Mr. Speaker, there have been two great periods of economic development in this nation's history, – 1926 – 1929, from 1946 – about 1956. We find the economists both inside and outside of Canada are suggesting that a new wave of development is on its way, it has possibly started now, but in the next four or five, or six years we will see a great new phase of economic development in Canada. Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan missed the boat in that great surge of development from 1945 to 1956. It was the greatest period of industrial boom that this nation has ever seen. We, by and large, didn't get our fair share. We missed the boat – Why? We missed the boat because the NDP socialists have neither the ability or the foresight. They couldn't grasp what was happening, they weren't interested in what was happening until these last few years, and then it was too late. Their efforts to begin with were wrong, and lately they have been too little and too late.

The NDP-CCF socialists, Mr. Speaker, have outlined their usefulness, and they must be replaced.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — What is our answer? Well, first I think that what we intend to do and what we will do, is create an opportunity province. An opportunity province, opportunities for all people and in all parts of the province. Mr. Speaker, what we in the Liberal Party want to do and intend to do, is share the wealth, not over-tax and spread the poverty. How do we intend to do this? Well, I think the first and a major step will be to face the realities of life and when a government finds that they are taking in more money than they need to operate the business of government, then you cut taxes.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — I think then we have to go a step farther and cut royalties, we have to make our power and gas rates competitive with other parts of Canada, especially with other provinces in western Canada. Mr. Speaker, once we've done that, and we will do it, we'll launch the greatest industrial business drive that this nation has ever seen. We'll advertise the tremendous great potential that Saskatchewan has. Our great and largely untapped natural resources. We'll take the story of the new deal that is awaiting investors in the province of Saskatchewan. We will take it across Canada, and we will take it outside of Canada, if necessary, Mr. Speaker. We will get development in this province, we will get people to come in here to produce jobs and opportunities. He said something about Ross Thatcher, well I tell you, we will hold up our leader and the chances of him producing an industrial and economic boom in this country with what they have got over on that side of the house . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Steuart: — I don't think there is a successful businessman on that side of the house, I don't even know if there is a successful man, I can't see one if there is. We put the affairs of this province, the financial affairs in the hands of the Treasurer, and he has shown that he can't do even the elementary arithmetic of deciding our revenues, how much we need to run this province. Our financial critic pointed out that never in the history of this province and I doubt in the history of any province or any government in this country, have we ever over taxed the people, underestimated our revenues as badly as we have seen in the last two years. Mr. Speaker, I would stand the people up on this side of the house and compare them any day in the week and the people we have got running for our party, with their ability to run a businesslike administration, and to go out to other business people, and say "Come into this province". Because, Mr. Speaker, what these people don't seem to realize is this, that before you can get jobs, before you can get opportunities, before you can get tax paying industries and business, you have to get people with money to come here and invest it. They tried it with their socialistic experiments in the crown corporations and I even think they, in their moments of honesty when they have them, will admit that it has failed and failed miserably. So you've turned now, just as we said you should have done 20 years ago — you have said to people with money "Will you come in and invest your money?" You said, "Oh, we've changed, we changed". The sheep, — the wolf is wearing sheep's clothing.

Mr. Speaker, by and large they haven't believed you, they take one look at Saskatchewan and even worse than that, I'm afraid they don't take a look at Saskatchewan and they go to Alberta, they go to Manitoba, they go to B.C., that is where they built their pulp mills, that is where they put their development.

Mr. Speaker, we will develop the kind of government in this province that will bring opportunities. I think this is important. I think it is important to be able to say to our young people, "We want you here in Saskatchewan, you are our greatest natural resource".

It is important not just to say this, but to do something about it. They point to the record of SEDCO and IDO and all the letters of the alphabet to get industry in this province, and they point back to some 75 industries or businesses that they brought in. Well, when you examine, you'll find most of them are very small. They were welcome, but they are not of a major nature.

Mr. Speaker, new opportunities await us. We are on the threshold in this nation of a great new wave of prosperity. I think we in this province can take full advantage of it, with a government that is prepared to partake in the main stream of Canadian economic development. Not a government that is out of step with every other party of Canada, and every state in the Union.

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this budget doesn't show that these people have decided to move in that direction. In this budget, I think these people, the NDP, have proven that once again they have failed far too many people in this province. Again they have shown that they not only have over taxed in the past but intend to continue doing this in the future. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I think the budget, by and large with the tremendous opportunities that were handed to these people has failed. It is a failure and for that reason I cannot support it.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. G. Strum (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the budget debate, I wish first of all to pay tribute to the work of the members who will not be returning to this house in the new legislature. The hon. member for Wilkie, Mr. Horsman, has set an example of integrity and fair dealing that members on both sides of the house could emulate with profit. He will be missed by his party and by government members alike. We wish him health and long life in his retirement.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Strum: — The member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, (Mr. K. Klein) will no doubt find that his work in the classroom has been enriched by his experience in the legislature. We hope that he will find it possible at some later date to again make use of his experience in public life. The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. R. McCarthy) who is an old friend and neighbor of mine, has given many years of his life to public service, first in municipal government and later as a representative in the legislature. While we do not agree in politics, I agree with him in the importance of faithful dedicated public service. I wish him and Mrs. McCarthy many years of happiness and a well earned rest.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Strum: — The member for Humboldt, (Mrs. M. Batten) because of her training and her professional career in law and her experience as a wife and mother, has in the unanimous opinion of this house, I am sure, made an unique and outstanding contribution. I sincerely regret her decision to withdraw from public life. While I understand the burden that is placed on a woman member, I trust that she will again at some future date, be in a position to contribute to the public life of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Strum: — By his completely relaxed and happy manner, the member for Kelvington (C.B. Peterson) indicates that he is going to enjoy his return to farming. We shall miss Mr. Peterson, but are glad to have had him with us for even one session. His integrity, his sense of fair play, and his contribution to the house and to caucus have endeared him to his colleagues. We wish him all the best. The hon. Mr. C.C. Williams, Minister of Labour, member for Regina, will long be remembered by all of us not only for the modern telephone system he has left us but because of his unfailing courtesy, his compassion for those in need, and his genuine affection for people. We regret his decision but admit his right to retirement after 20 years of service to Saskatchewan. My running mate, the hon. member for Saskatoon, has contributed 20 of the best years of his life to this house and has been as well a source of unfailing help and support with two new members of the team. The only thing he hasn't done for me is to teach me how to play a good game of golf. I've got as far as buying the sticks and I might even get time to go to the club someday. We wish Mr. Stone and his wife, many happy and useful years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned

RESOLUTION RE INCOME TAX REGULATIONS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution moved by Mr. Snedker:

That this assembly respectfully requests that the government of Canada amend The Income Tax Regulations to provide that expenses incurred by workers for transportation to and from their places of employment be permitted as deductible expenses for income tax purposes.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with what was said by the senior member from Saskatoon last Thursday, but I feel that the motion made by the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) while it goes in the right direction, does not go far enough. At the present time, business and professional people are entitled to deduct from their taxable income such expenses as they may have incurred in the operation of their business establishments. They are allowed to deduct also living expenses, when required to stay away from home in connection with their business. However, wage earners are not allowed to deduct from their taxable income, amounts spent on tools, or expense for board and lodgings, when they are required to work away from home. This represents something of discrimination against wage earners which cannot be justified. The discrimination I refer to is a subtle one, it is not stated anywhere that in income tax matters some people are treated differently than others. Yet anyone who has filled out an income tax return knows how this works out in practice. If you are in business, you're required to fill out the so-called T-1 general form. This form provided for all sorts of deductions — the value of goods or equipment, for instance, if less than \$100 may be entirely deducted from taxable income. If the cost of the tools or equipment is over \$100, depending on the case, 10 or 20 per cent may be deducted the first year, and so on. However, wage earners and salaried employees are required to use the so-called T-1 short form. This form contains no provision for the deduction of expenses incurred for the replacement of tools or for the purchase of new tools. Neither does it contain provision for the deduction from taxable income, of expenses for board and lodgings in the way many cases which workers are expected to stay away from home if they do not wish to lose their jobs.

We recognize that there may be some technical difficulties in re-drafting the income tax forms, so as to provide for deductions which we are discussing. However, it is important that we recognize the validity of the principle that all men are equal before the law in matters of taxation as in other matters.

Therefore, I propose an amendment to Mr. Snedker's motion as follows: I move, seconded by the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, (Mr. Johnson):

That the words "for board and lodging when required to work away from home and for tools and for tools and equipment required while carrying on their work" be inserted after the word "employment" in the fourth line.

The motion will now read as follows:

That this assembly respectfully requests that the government of Canada amend the Income Tax Regulations to provide that expenses incurred by workers for transportation to and from their places of employment, for board and lodging when required to work away from home and for tools and equipment required while carrying on their work, be permitted as deductible expenses for income tax purposes.

Hon. W.C. Davies (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I would rise to support the amended resolution, because I think it will make a more thorough presentation by this assembly to the government of Canada. In discussing, Mr. Speaker, it should be understood that there are, as has been intimated by the previous speaker, a number of expenditures made by employees in this province and elsewhere in Canada for which they can't claim income tax deductions. Some of these expenses are of a fairly considerable order. The item of transportation to and from the place of employment, is something that affects a great many workers and involves, as has been suggested by the two speakers previous to myself, a relatively heavy spending.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the minister to keep his comments on the amendment. If the amendment is adopted, the motion will become amended but I think you are discussing the main motion and not just the amendment at this time.

Mr. Davies: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought that it covered practically all of the items there, including transportation.

Mr. Speaker: — Just the amendment at this time. If the motion is amended, then it is the motion that is amended that is debatable, but at this time it is just the amendment. That is the question before the house now.

Mr. Davies: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could go on then to discuss it in that narrower form, and as it applies to workers in my own constituency, general interest that it has to this assembly. I would point out, that this amendment would affect, if it passed this assembly, the employees of places like the Saskatchewan Training School and the R.C.A.F. station, four miles south of Moose Jaw, — there are approximately 350 or more civilians working here — as well, of course, it affects the workmen at the Kalium Potash Plant which is 12 ½ miles from Moose Jaw and near Belle Plaine. I suggest that if the amended resolution is passed we will have something go before the federal government that will be in more complete form. It may induce them to depart from the stand that has been taken by the federal governments up to this time, where they have turned down the request of organized labour, the propositions that are urged in the resolution by my friend the Minister of Labour.

I think he has already made it clear that this kind of item, if it appears on another tax paper, that is on the tax paper of a business or professional man, would be a deductible item for income tax purposes. This is not the case where a person receives income by wages or by salary. I would also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the kinds of things that are urged by the Minister of Labour have been asked on successive occasions of the federal government by the Canadian Congress of Labour as well as the Labour Congress. So that from early years to my knowledge, — 1955 to 1956 in the old situation before the merger of the labour congresses — the matters that are requested here, were requested by the labour bodies of this country and since the labour merger they have been successively requested of the federal government by the official labour body of this country.

I would like to sincerely suggest to the member from Saltcoats, (Mr. Snedker) in tune with this amendment that he might request the executive of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan to address a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada, or the head of the Liberal Party in Canada, asking on behalf of his Saskatchewan party prompt action in respect of the principles that we are talking about in both the amendment and the resolution itself.

I may say that I'm advised that this resolution or the parts that are dealt with in the amendment have been urged upon the federal government, the present federal government, last year and previous Liberal governments prior to 1957. At no time was this proposition as urged here, acceded to. So it seems to me that a further urging by the party of the members that sit opposite me, might have some effect as well. In the meantime the approval of the proposition by the Legislature will, I think, perhaps do something to convince the present federal authorities that the reforms that are urged are long over due.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, therefore, that the resolution would be vastly improved as amended by the Minister of Labour and be more consistent with the need if it were fortified as he has urged it to be fortified. I would therefore support the amendment.

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this particular motion until . . .

Mr. Speaker: — One moment, I think that the hon. members know I allowed the last speaker . . .

Mr. Gallagher: — I can speak on the amendment, can't I, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — You can speak on the amendment, but I want to try to keep these debates to the amendments.

Mr. Gallagher: — Will I have the right to speak on the amendment motion if I speak on the motion . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You can speak on the amendment, strictly on the amendment. You will then have the right to speak on the motion as amended.

Mr. Gallagher: — Very well, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the motion until the amendment was put before the house. I'm only going to make a few comments on this, Mr. Speaker. Although I haven't got the amendment in front of me here, I'm inclined to agree with much of what it contains, I believe, as regards tools that are used by labourers. I think that any farmer or any garageman in all fairness would expect that a plumber or an electrician or any other labourer by virtue of the fact that his farmer or businessman is allowed to take exemption for the money that he invests in tools or machinery, would in all fairness be ready to give the same consideration to the working people. With regards to the other part of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I think the minister said something about board and lodging, was it not, I haven't got the amendment, to an extent I agree with him but I think that there are some, there might be something that could be said against this too. I think that there are some trades or some shops that provide their help, their hired labourer with this benefit. I think that many plumbing shops and electric shops around this province and around the country pay for board and lodging when their workers are away from home and in that case I think we would have something rather complicated, but otherwise I can support this amendment. I might say something on this later, Mr. Speaker, when I speak on the amended motion.

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to speak on the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — You have the right to speak on the amendment, providing you keep yourself strictly to the amendment.

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I do wish to say a few brief words in connection with the amendment that has been moved to the motion which I moved in the house a few days ago. I think all will realize that it is necessary to do a little research on the suggestions that have been made in the amendment, and in order to do the necessary research, in order to see what the labour organizations, the Canadian Labour Congress and the various other labour organizations think in this regard, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm not too sure on the procedure, I'd just like to consult with the book for a minute to see if the member who moved the motion originally, whether he has the right to adjourn the debate on it. Yes, I believe that the request to adjourn the debate, realizing that it is the amendment on which the debate is being adjourned would be in order.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. O.A. Turnbull for second reading of Bill no. 16 – An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I did want to make a few comments on this particular piece of legislation.

As I understand it the amendment which was placed before the house the other day, deals specifically with an age clause, in which the age for compulsory school attendance is to be raised from its present level of 15 years to the level of 16 years. But as far as I can see, nothing is said in the amendment with regard to any possible changes in academic requirements. The way the act reads now a student must attend school in Saskatchewan until he reaches the age of 15 years or until he passes his grade eight. I'm sorry the minister is not here at the moment. Will we accomplish the improvement of educational standards in the province by merely proposing an increase in age, without saying something at the same time about proposed increases in the academic requirements or the academic standard which we hope young people would reach?

Now, little if anything has been changed in this respect for many years in the province and at the same time as we have been moving ahead technically, we have been making great advances in the world of science, not only in Canada, but throughout the world. There is increasing emphasis on the preparation of young people for a changing world, and for that reason I believe that a new look at this particular matter at this time is well merited. But again as I said a few moments ago, I question whether simply changing the age for attendance at school is the complete answer. Now at the same time we have heard a good deal lately about streaming, not only in public school, but in high school as well, where we are getting away from the old age-grade concept, and we are putting more emphasis on student ability and directing students into areas of study where they are best suited.

It would seem to me that if this amendment is going to do some of the things that I have mentioned, and some of the things which the minister mentioned when he introduced the bill on second reading, that some attention should be paid to the academic side of school as well, and I would appreciate some comment being made by some of my other colleagues in the teaching profession on both sides of the house with regard to this matter. It little suffices to keep young people in school for one year longer unless we urge them to go higher in their academic education than is presently being done. I would urge the minister to take this matter under consideration and when the bill comes into the house for third reading, I would be certainly interested in something being added in the amendment with regard to increased academic requirements – possibly, first year high school under the new Divisional System.

I think that is all I have to say on the subject at this time.

Mr. David Boldt (Rosthern): — Before the minister closes the debate, we have students in school today that regardless how long they would stay, attend school, they would never even finish grade eight. Maybe some won't even finish grade five, and are we asked not to force these students to stay in the school classroom until the age of 16, or are the provisions going to be made that these students could be released from school.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to warn the members that the minister is about to close the debate, and if they wish to speak they should do so now.

Mr. Turnbull: — Mr. Speaker, I have two comments in respect to the questions and observations put forward by the hon. member for Turtleford, which I think were quite in order. If I may address myself to this particular point now, there are a number of amendments that have to be considered together to get the picture that the hon. member from Turtleford was developing. He is quite right, in my opinion, in suggesting that content, particularly academic content, must be considered as well as the extension of the compulsory school period. I do think, however, that this is not the act where these matters will appear, I think that they more logically appear in the amendment which we will be bringing in under The School Act, where we change the graded system into the divisional system, and at the same time we propose to leave it optional so that we don't compel school boards to take a step until they are ready to do so. I think we can reassure the hon. member that these matters are being considered and they will rise not in this amendment but in other amendments.

In respect to the hon. member for Rosthern, the answer to his query is yes, students will be required to spend the next year in the school in the same manner in which they now observe the compulsory school attendance. We know that there are students who are having difficulty in school and for these particular students there is perhaps the most difficult job of all to be done: that of designing imaginative type classes that will be useful to them. This amendment does not attempt to deal with the point raised by the hon. member for Rosthern, which as I understand it, is the point of the particular group of students that do not now fit into the field of studies offered by the curriculum and amendments that we will be introducing this year will not deal specifically with that point. We will attempt to deal with it in other ways as educational policy evolves but the straight answer to the member's question is that these people will be required to observe the compulsory school attendance after the amendment the same way in which they do now.

Where students can no longer get any benefit from the school system I think we will use our same provisions that we use now, and my mutual agreement they simply fall out of the system. That is, when upon advice of the teachers in consultation with the parents it seems advisable that there is no useful purpose served by having them in the school system.

I would now move the bill be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. Meakes for second reading of Bill no. 9, An Act to amend The Family Farm Credit Act, 1959.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Family Farm Credit Act, when it was passed some three or four years ago, as I understand it, was to provide long term farm credit for young farmers. The Liberal opposition at the time, pointed out that there were a number of reasons why it could not be effective. In the first place because it applied only to farmers 40 years and under. In the second place because interest rates were too high. In the third place because the borrowing requirements were too stringent.

This act has been in effect almost four years . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to advise the Leader of the Opposition that the principle of the bill which this is purporting to amend is not before the house for debate, it is just the principle of the amended bill that is before us.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, that is what I was talking about. What I wanted to point out to you, Sir, and to the Minister of Agriculture, is that there is not much use of this legislature passing this particular bill unless its provisions are made more effective. Because in the last four years, that is has been in effect, only 420 loans were made to young farmers. Far fewer loans than were made in Alberta or in Manitoba. Now, we discussed last night before you called me out of order, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the private lending institutions have left Saskatchewan as far as long term loans are concerned. This bill today that is now before us is the government's answer to long term farm credit in Saskatchewan. I want to say at this point that this act has been the most ineffective piece of legislation probably ever put on the statute books by the NDP. It just isn't accomplishing the task that it was originally intended to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! If the house will bear with me while I try to give a little guidance on this point. I must call the hon. member's attention that he is debating the principle of the act which this purports to amend and not the bill before the house. This substitutes the word six for the word five, it is not the principle of the main act.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, if I understand the rules of the house, once you open a bill up for debate, the whole bill is open. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. Speaker: — Not the principle of the bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — We are on second reading, the whole principle of the bill is open once . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! The principle of The Family Farm Credit Act was debated on second reading when the act was originally introduced and has been adopted in principle by a previous legislature. This bill purports the amend that. The principle of the bill which is before us now is open for debate. The only way the act itself could be amended would be by members bringing in amendments to the act itself when the bill is before the committee.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been in this house and another house for a long time. It was always my understanding that when a bill was brought into the house, you could bring in suggestions as to any part of that bill. If you are going to make a ruling otherwise with respect to this, I must appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! What I am saying is that the principle of the main act is not debatable. I am not saying that you can't, when in committee, bring in amendments to the main act, but the principle of the act has been accepted by this legislature on a previous occasion and cannot be debated now.

Mr. Thatcher: — All right, Mr. Speaker, what I was going to say is that as far as this particular act is concerned, there have been only a handful of farmers in Saskatchewan who have been able to avail themselves . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! Once again I must point out that you are getting outside the scope of this bill no. 9 which is before us . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Let's have a ruling then, Mr. Speaker. With deference I would like to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — The ruling of the chair has been appealed. My ruling is that the discussion on second reading is limited to the principle of the bill which is before us, the amending bill.

Those in favor of upholding the speaker's ruling will say aye. Those opposed will say no.

I declare the speaker's ruling upheld.

Mr. Thatcher: — Will you record the vote, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Call in the members. The question before the house is an appeal from the speaker's ruling on the scope of the debate on bill no. 9, which was moved for second reading by hon. Meakes.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Members are coming in and you were on your feet. Members should stay out under those circumstances. Two of them came in.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I think all members are aware of the fact that after the bell has quit ringing the doors are closed, they cannot enter.

ORDER! That is the rule of the house and I hope members will cooperate with me in trying to adhere to the rules of the house.

Now the debate on bill no. 9 was adjourned by the Leader of the Opposition. In picking up the debate today, he has attempted to discuss the principle of The Family Farm Credit Act, which I ruled was decided on by a previous legislature, which on a previous occasion had adopted the principle of The Family Farm Credit Act. Bill no. 9 is a bill purporting to amend The Family Farm Credit Act, and the debate must stay to the principle of the amending bill. My ruling has been appealed and a recorded vote has been asked for, so I would ask those in favor of upholding the Speaker's ruling that the debate must stay strictly to bill no. 9 as it is on our desk, please rise.

Yeas – 29

Messieurs

Lloyd	Kuziak	Thurston
Thibault	Stevens	Johnson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Davies	Michayluk
Dahlman	Brown	Strum (Mrs.)
Nicholson	Semchuk	Kluzak
Brockelbank	Kramer	Turnbull
Perkins	Peterson	Walker
Willis	Stone	Thiessen
Broten	Nollet	Meakes
Whelan	Snyder	

Nays – 17

Messieurs

Thatcher	Danielson	Guy
MacDougall	Erb	Klein
McFarlane	Boldt	Snedker
Steuart	McCarthy	Staveley
Horsman	Gallagher	Williams
McDonald	Foley	

Mr. Speaker: — I declare the ruling of the Speaker sustained.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — For my information, is there any stage during the procedure of this bill, through the committee and on third reading when there is any opportunity to discuss this legislation, including some of the principles? I would like to reply to some of the things the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said. I would like to know what my opportunity will be.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! That is not for me to say, that is up to the house to decide for themselves what they want to bring in. I can only rule on what the house brings before me. Is the hon. member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher) finished with his debate on the subject? I interrupted him at the time.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, Mr. Speaker, I had hardly begun, but since you ruled me out of order I guess I can't say very much more.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was wondering why I was not permitted to vote while I was in the house when the bell rang, it started to ring and you went to your seat when the bell stopped.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that it is quite clear that when a division takes place members must be in their seats and the doors closed, and if the doors are closed no other members can enter, and the Sergeant-At-Arms checks with the members on either side and the whip of the party on each side and that is usually the procedure and I think that is commonly understood.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment opens up section 25 and if this is defeated then the act is of no value to the people or to the government, and if I am permitted to ask a few questions before the minister closes the debate, I would like to ask him this question – Who are the councillors advising the borrowers as to the manner in which monies lent are to be used, and as to the operations of his farm as per section 20 of this bill? Am I in order?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I haven't got a copy of the . . .

Mr. Boldt: — The question is: Who are the three appointed persons who may sit with the board of directors, or the investment committee of the company, when consideration is being given to operators of the company under the Act?

Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order, this is quite out of order, this has nothing to do with the bill that is before us, I think the member if he manages it properly can get and create a situation where he can ask these questions in the committee, but certainly not on this at this stage, because they have nothing to do with the bill that is before us, they concern the operations of the act.

Mr. Speaker: — This bill is only substituting the word six for the word five in the first line, the word six crosses out the word five. It is just subsection 25 of the act. It is an amendment to section 25 but it does not open up all the principles. This is just a principle on this one point here.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Could I say a word on that one point? The principle that is opened up, the only principle that is before the house at this time, is whether or not this house is in favor of extending the time when a subsidy may be paid on account of the operations of this act by one year, and the question is whether or not we are in favor of changing those figures and extending the time, not whether the act is good or not, but whether this house is in favor of giving the authority for paying this money for another year. That is the question before us.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Is it not possible that the information that the member is seeking could be given to him once the bill was introduced . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — In the estimates is the right place . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! Getting the information at that time can be done and done properly, but hits isn't the time.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — I have sat here a long time and I find that in the years gone by when you brought in the bills amending many acts in this legislature or any other legislature, the rule was you opened up the whole act, and if this member wants to speak on that he has the right to do it.

An. Hon. Member: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Danielson: — That is the rule, Mr. Speaker, and this group you have got here, including yourself, manufactures the rules as you go along.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! The member is definitely out of order. It has been moved by Mr. Meakes that bill no. 9 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Walker for second reading of Bill no. 18, An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Evidence Act.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this proposed legislation with the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and she is prepared to let the house proceed with the bill no. 18. But I believe that when she adjourned the debate a few days ago, there were one or two questions that she had posed to the Attorney General and I wonder if he would have the answer to those questions. Is that not right, Mr. Attorney General?

February 25, 1964

Mr. Walker: — Would you like to stand it for another day on behalf of the hon. lady because I haven't turned my mind to the questions as yet?

Mr. Speaker: — I think the house will agree to let it stand in the hon. lady's name, she may be here. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Item to stand.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:04 P.M.