

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
20th Day**

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Ed Whelan (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and on behalf of all hon. members I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to the Assembly 30 grade 6, 7 and 8 students from St. Mary's School. They are in the Speaker's gallery at your right, to the right of the clock; this group of young people are the elected representatives of a junior boys and girls parliament. Their principal, Gerald Small, is with them and he encourages this activity. Two people who stay at our home are with the group, they are my daughters Gaile and Sheila and I'm sure all members applaud the group's interest in the function of democratic government and extend sincere wishes that their stay here will be pleasant and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call your attention to a group of students from Athabaska School, I believe they are in the Speaker's gallery with their teachers. I also would like to say a word of welcome to them and I'm sure we all hope you enjoy your afternoon here.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I likewise have the honour of informing the house of a group of grade 12 students from Marion High School in the west end of the Speaker's gallery who are here this afternoon accompanied by their principal, Reverend Mother Roberta, and I'm sure each and every one of us would want to wish them a pleasant and profitable afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. A. T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I at this time want to point out that the west gallery is taken over by students from the Saskatoon area. In the front two rows we have the King George School with their teacher, Mr. Lockerby and in the back we have some 60 students from the St. James School with their teacher, Mr. Paslowski and Mr. Rolfe. I am sure the members will join with me in saying how delighted we are to have them with us, we hope their trip to the capital city will be a delightful and an informative one.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

QUESTION RE TABLING OF LETTER BY HON. A.M. NICHOLSON

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask whether the hon. Minister of Social Welfare has tabled the letter he promised to table today.

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order, before tabling this, and it might well continue to interfere with the time of the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I wonder if this could wait until later.

Mrs. Batten: — I don't know how this could be a point of order. This was a firm undertaking by hon. minister that he would table this. He gave us his word yesterday that he would do so.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to citation 278 of Beauchesne's third edition, page 111.

It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the house if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to private letters, or memorandum. On the 18th of May, 1865, the Attorney General on being asked . . .

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't like to interrupt the hon. member but I'm not speaking on a point of order in that respect. No, I'm merely reminding the hon. member that he gave us his word yesterday this wasn't a question of a point of order. I raised a point of order, but this was not argued at all. He didn't dispute it. He just gave us his word as a member of this legislature that he would table this letter today. We relied on that and there was no dispute on the point of order at all.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I must draw the house's attention to the rules of parliamentary government which I prefer not to break. If I might continue:

On the 18th of May, 1865, the Attorney General on being asked by Mr. Ferrard, if he would lay upon the table a written statement and a letter to which he had referred on the previous day in asking a question relative to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, replied that he had made a statement to the house upon his own responsibility and that the documents he had referred to, being private, he could not lay them on the table. Lord Robert Cecil contended that the papers having been cited, should be produced. The Speaker declared that this rule applied to public documents only, and May's citation 329, is also given.

As I explained this was a letter to the Provincial Treasurer, from which I was quoting and Beauchesne and May make it clear, quite clear, that the member, the Minister of Social Welfare would be violating the rules of long established years if this private letter was to be tabled.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, if I may just reply to that, on the point of order, I don't want to get on the radio time but on the point of order, I asked, if you will remember, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. minister to give us the name and address of the person who he said wrote the letter and he said it was written by a bank manager and didn't identify him in any other way. Instead of arguing the point of order, to which he might have been entitled, he simply said that he would produce and table this letter today. We relied on this word as a gentleman, as a minister of the crown, as a member of this legislature, that he would keep his word when he said he would table it. We didn't argue the point, we didn't make any speeches about it, there are quite a few things that could be said about this type of communication, without giving the name of the man who is reputed to have written a very congratulatory letter. But nothing was said because we relied on his word. If the gentleman doesn't want to keep his word I am quite prepared to let it stand on its merits, Mr. Speaker. That is his responsibility.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I did offer to show the hon. member the letter but a citizen of Saskatchewan who writes a letter to the Provincial Treasurer . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! This cannot be debated. I would pray the indulgence of the house. I have several citations I would like to read on this one myself at this time, but we don't be able to do it in the five minutes.

While I appreciate this is a point of order that has been raised, and a point of order is supposed to take precedence and be settled, I wonder if it would meet with the house that we defer my ruling on this and

we bring in a ruling at a later time.

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, you will recall last evening before I adjourned the debate, I was making some few observations on the budget and I should like to continue doing so today. However, before going into the budget itself, I think I should make an observation or two, regarding my own constituency of Maple Creek.

I was pleased in the announcement of the minister in charge of power that the towns along the Empress line would receive installation of gas services this year. The minister, however, will pardon me for smiling while he was speaking because while he stated that he would not keep the house in suspense any longer, we in the Maple Creek district already know that news six days before. The reasons that we knew it was that the Leader News gave a big headline to it "Natural Gas this Year". I want to report the source of the information. Mr. Bill Rollick of Burstall, CCF candidate for Maple Creek constituency was notified earlier this week of the provincial government's plan to extend natural gas services to Mendham, Leader, Prelate and Sceptre.

He said the installation will take place this summer. Mr. Rollick said further details will be announced in the provincial legislature today, Thursday, February 27. Mr. Rollick notified the mayors and the over-seers of the villages concerned. He just beat the gun by six days. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you had better look into your security operations. I can understand the CCF candidate being anxious to release this information but I would tell him that if he wanted news that was current on that particular day, he should have announced the policy of the Minister of Highways in regards to highways, particularly in regard to Highway No. 32.

We have been down from time to time over the past three years, asking for some oiling on 32 highway in the constituency of Maple Creek. The minister assured us that a highway 32 association, composed of the boards of trades of the towns along the line, prominent citizens as well, that he would continue oiling a portion of No. 32 highway each year whether it be 15 or 20 or 30 miles and he would continue such a program until he reached the end of the highway at Leader. We were content with that announcement and we saw the highway coming a bit closer each year. We were happy last fall when it reached the end of the Minister of Municipal Affairs' constituency and was knocking at the door of the Maple Creek constituency.

Thus I must express my extreme disappointment the minister saw first to go back on that commitment and to say to the people of Maple Creek constituency, I have changed my mind now that I have reached your border and there will be no further oiling of the No. 32 highway this year.

That is the news that was current and I'm sure this CCF candidate must have had that news, but, Mr. Speaker, he chose to keep that under wraps, and I checked just last evening and he is still keeping it under wraps. I revealed it today.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Cameron: — Referring now to the budget. The budget speech speaks of the prosperous and of the affluent society our citizens are now enjoying. Last evening the Minister of Social Welfare began to show how the citizens under his charge were enjoying this affluent society. But before doing so he took the occasion to flay Ottawa for what he termed its failures in the field of pensions, of supplementary allowances, for the blind and the disabled. Having done this he then proceeded to paint a glowing picture of how Saskatchewan was the outstanding province in Canada, first in the field of the care of the indigent, the sick and the handicapped and the aged.

This, of course, was to show that it was done in the spirit of the policy enunciated in the budget. I want to quote just one sentence from the budget that enunciated that policy, because I think it is important — and I'm quoting now:

We have always tried to ensure that in the search for the general good, we do no individual wrong.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, before they proceed to sweep the doorstep of their neighbour, they be sure their own is clean.

Just a few days ago you notice the minister from Notokeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) rose in his place, speaking on behalf of the teachers of this province.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Not a minister yet.

Mr. Cameron: — The member rather, was a teacher himself telling us the good points of those teachers who were retired on pension some 15 to 20 years ago, and he pointed out that these teachers under a pension set up by this government carried on by this government, are receiving in many instances \$800, \$900 and as low as \$720 per year.

Likewise, now I want to bring to your attention that it is not only the teachers of the province. This government pays lip service to the civil servants but here again under the civil service pension, we find members retired 15 years ago living on a pension of \$30 per month, plus \$55 per month cost of living bonus for a total of \$85. Many others are receiving pensions of \$100 to \$120. This, Mr. Speaker, does not even pay the rent on their apartment. Here are people, Mr. Speaker, after giving the best years of their life in dedicated service to the province, living on less than a subsistence allowance. This so-called great affluent society is not available to them. These people who have dedicated their lives to the growth and development of the province surely are deserving of something greater than this. Is it not time, Mr. Speaker, that we held out our hands to them, and assisted them to reach a plateau in which they may enjoy some of the sunshine and the warmth of this so-called affluent society?

I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments to the subject of education. Having been, of course, a teacher and a trustee, and a municipal official, I have always been interested in the field of education, and I was interested in the remarks of the Minister of Education yesterday. I think his remarks can be summarized briefly as this: He spoke of the establishment of the divisional system of education, university training for teachers, or teacher university training of our teachers, and he spoke of some time in the future, setting up 10 regional vocational training schools in the province.

Many of these things, Mr. Speaker, have merit but they do not come to grips with the problems. There are many and various problems facing education in the province today. One of the problems is the problem of rising costs. You will recall in 1952, the cost on the local taxpayer for the operating of the schools was \$21,000,000, by 1962 that had risen to \$43,000,000, more than doubled.

During the period 1952-62, we had to go back to the ratepayers and ask them to raise each year \$2,000,000 more than the year before. I would point out as I did last year that this \$43,000,000, which was raised in taxes last year on the local level, was not even sufficient to pay the salaries of the teachers. That is not to say it is because of the high salaries that the teachers are receiving, but it is because we require so many teachers to staff our classrooms. It is an interesting observation to note that one per cent of our population in this province are school teachers actively engaged in the class room.

Projecting the cost into the future, good authorities have estimated that by 1972 we will have to go back to the same tax base in order to raise the staggering sum of \$51,000,000. Grants obtained on their present structure by 1972 will have to rise to the sum of \$68,000,000. This increase of \$5,000,000 announced in the budget is not because of the generosity of this government, it is because they require the \$5,000,000 to keep grant basis on the present ratio. They felt it would be too embarrassing to do less.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as long ago as 1958, I was speaking in this legislature about the problems of education and I outlined to the house at that time a plan which I thought would put the financial house in order. The government refused to accept it.

Other provinces have acted in this regard and I am pleased to repeat again that the province of Alberta has instituted the exact plan that I enunciated in the house in 1958. B.C. has adopted a different plan. We are still on a tax base devised a hundred years ago.

But I want to reassure the house here that the first thing a new Liberal government would do is to assess the operation of the Alberta plan, of the B.C. plan, and would incorporate the best features suited to Saskatchewan into Saskatchewan's plan this, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what we intend to do.

The British North America Act placed education as a responsibility of the province. Provinces accepted that responsibility but in turn they delegated some of their authority and responsibility to the local communities. Saskatchewan established the principle that local authorities should be responsible for the administration of education but in order that local authorities may be responsible and responsive as well, they said that they should carry part of the tax burden and part of the financial load. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party endorses that principle.

We cannot agree with those that say that they would take over complete cost and complete operations of the schools on the provincial level. To do so would increase still further the bureaucracy and the centralization that we have today. To say that the local community must continue to bear the major portion of the cost of education, Mr. Speaker, is to fly in the face of reality. The challenge of this age demands that we recognize education first as a social responsibility, as a responsibility of all, not as the burden of the few.

If Saskatchewan is to play her rightful role and prepare our youngsters to meet the challenge of this age in which we live, we must, I think, pause to re-examine our goals. We must first reassess, redefine, the aims of education in keeping with this complex society. We must realize, I think that education is not static, it cannot be put into a compartment and kept there. Education, Mr. Speaker, is not merely to move forward with the current progress, education provides in large measure the current and the direction of progress.

The minister has begun to move in this direction. It is evident from his speech that the minister is in motion, but while his actions indicated that he is in motion, I'm afraid they do not indicate any purpose or direction of those motions. Sitting on a hot griddle causes the body to go into motion but it doesn't define the direction very well.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Cameron: — The change from the so-called lock step system to the block-step system, without having first instructed the teachers as to how to institute this program, does not show much purpose or direction. Putting the training of teachers under the university without having made someone responsible to maintain the supply of teachers in the class rooms, is certainly not showing much direction of purpose. While I am speaking of the direction of purpose, I believe that if we are to tackle the problem of education we must aim our sights in a definite purpose.

First, we if we are called upon to form a government, we will acknowledge that the local authorities are not asking to be relieved of all responsibility in the field of education. We will, however heed their demands, to be relieved of the excessive financial burden which is not rightly theirs. To do less than this would be less than justice demands.

Secondly, we would put the government relationships with the local authorities, not based on the concept that they are creature and children of the province. They will not longer be used as a dumping ground upon which the government may abrogate its responsibilities. The relationship between government and local authorities will be based upon the concept that we are partners in this enterprise.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we will assess the financial resources available both on the local level and on the provincial level and then we will proceed to allocate the burden of costs of education in proportion to the resources.

We do not believe that parents want to abrogate their responsibilities in the field of education. We believe that parents ask only that they be allotted an equitable, fair and just share of the cost.

Fourth, we would attempt to assure equity of taxation between the individual tax payers, by the establishment of an equitable assessment of property values. These assessment values will reflect insofar as it is practical the protective capacity of the province. When the equitable assessment has been established then I say to you that the tax rate upon this equitable assessment will be in the form of a relatively uniform level of taxes throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that first we must put the financial house in order, and then having our financial house in order, we will then sit down with local authorities in the spirit of partners together we will chart our course, and again justice to our young students demands nothing less. Should we have done this, then we have taken the first all important step in assuring our youngsters of the opportunity to equip themselves to meet the challenge of the age in which they must live.

Mr. Speaker, can we be proud as Canadians of an education system which places so many at the bottom and so few at the top? Can we be proud of an educational system when we witness the ranks of the unemployed being swollen up by youth — youth defeated in life before they have a chance to begin?

Mr. Speaker, this is the challenge facing Saskatchewan and the challenge today is indeed an urgent one. If we talk about the issue of the coming election, I say to the government, that the real issue of the coming election is the problems of education.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Cameron: — This is a challenge facing Saskatchewan and I was most amazed both in the throne debate and in the budget debate that not one except the Minister of Education rose to speak one sentence on behalf of education. That is the issue in the coming election. Surely, if we are to meet this challenge, it demands that we have the courage to break new grounds. It demands that we have the courage and the vision to find a new approach, and if we fail in this, we fail our most precious resource of all, the resource of our community and the resource of youth, Mr. Speaker, the challenge is so great and so precious, that we can no longer hide our heads in the sand. This is indeed the issue facing Saskatchewan.

Now then, having established the issue, I said last year and I want to repeat it here, that we are to devise a curriculum to meet the demands that will be made upon our young people in the age in which they will live, then we must have the courage to reassess the curriculum and we must have the courage to redefine the aims of education. While our sister provinces have set up royal commissions to give extensive study to this, our government has done nothing, and it's a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, when you read the reports of these royal commissions, whether they be in Alberta or British Columbia, they come to similar conclusions, that we must redefine the aims of education, and that the aim of education must be the intellectual development of the child. If we are to attain this intellectual development of the child, then we must look at the subjects taught in the classroom. Those subjects which are of a greatest importance in the intellectual development of the child shall be given first priority. Those of lesser importance, shall be given second and third, and much of the dribble that teachers are compelled to teach today that has no bearing on the intellectual development of the child, should be removed from the curriculum.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Cameron: — We have had 20 years of a philosophy of education which says "The whole child goes to school", and thus we must subject that whole child to all the pressures and the turmoils of our society, and that's why we found questions on the examination paper pertaining to the medical care and its quarrels.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is an out-dated theory instituted 20 years ago and we are still 20 years behind the times in the field of education. Surely, the whole child must develop, they must develop mentally and physically and spiritually, but the school was never meant to be and to replace the place of the parent in the education of the child.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Cameron: — We will call upon the other resources in the community to assist us in the full development of the child. We will call upon the parent and the churches in the field of spiritual development and we will leave that field of education to them. Education will dedicate itself to the intellectual development of the child, because surely, if they are to meet the demands that they will be forced to face in the future, then we must do nothing less. That is why I cannot agree that the Minister of Education is moving in the right direction in the field of education.

I asked the other day and I asked him again today for answers to the many questions left unanswered in the whole field of teacher training. He still has not answered those questions and those questions are still a vital concern to parents. As to the standard of qualification and the supply of teachers on the elementary level, we asked him who is going to be responsible for this supply. The elementary level of education that was set up in this province was a public system of education under the responsibility and the control of public authorities. Now if the minister wishes to abrogate his right and responsibility in this field to someone else, he's free to do so. It will relieve him of many of his burdens and responsibilities, but it hardly charts a course in the direction which we should go.

Therefore, I think the first responsibility of the minister at the first opportunity is to rise and assure the people, first as to who is going to be responsible for maintaining the supply of teachers in our schools, who is going to be responsible for the revision of the curriculum and the standards of education which our teachers are going to receive. Who will be responsible to the parent in this most vital field of education?

That, Mr. Speaker, will have to be answered. I want to say again that education today is the most pressing problem facing Saskatchewan. It is the greatest challenge that this province faces, and to ignore it, is to fail our youth, to whom we owe so much, and that in my opinion is the bias and the most important and the key issue in the coming election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I want to first take the opportunity of congratulating the Provincial Treasurer on the over-all excellent planning of a budget, as well as the very able delivery. I am very pleased that it is again a typical peoples economic blueprint for the furthering of greater opportunity, for our young people in the continuing and the improving of the economic stability of the province and the general well-being of the middle age groups as well as assuring a happy and dignified retirement of our aging population.

Past budgets, Mr. Speaker, of this government have been so planned and expanded year by year to help attain this better life for all of our people. This year's expanding budget again assures that in the next year and the following years, we will reach new records of improved living for all our people. In this address, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal particularly with the rapid development of our mineral resource industry, which my department has been and is directing and encouraging.

However, before I go into the major topic, I want to reply to some of the exaggeration, some of the inaccuracy and untruths expounded by the financial critic and some of the other opposition speakers participating in this debate. The financial critic and his cohorts, may I say, unable to effectively criticize the sound and expanding budget which is making for a very stable and steadily expanding economy are again trying, by repeating exaggerations and falsehoods, to belittle the accomplishments of the government and the accomplishment of this budget.

I want to say this for the opposition, that they're very good at misquoting, misinterpreting, misleading, twisting figures and facts to suit themselves, then they repeat, repeat and again repeat, with the hopes that people would believe those repeated falsehoods.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I want to remind the opposition that the people of Saskatchewan are a lot more intelligent than what they have given them credit for. They have, over the past 20 years, proven this by repudiating the Liberals on four different occasions. I want to say that they are now again trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan of three old moldy untruthful shortcomings of this government in this debate. One of them has been, they say, lack of employment opportunities, particularly for the young people of

March 4, 1964

Saskatchewan. Yes, and I am going to repeat this saying that I have said in this house again: If you want to judge a person or political party correctly, you must judge it by its actions, you must judge it by its past or present records and not by glib statements.

I know that the opposition promises that they will, if elected, provide thousands of new jobs for the young people of the province, but, Mr. Speaker, they do not tell us how they are going to do it, and may I point out that they do have a record in this province, a very dismal record of the past. Many people of the province cannot forget the opportunities that young people had under a previous Liberal government, when all that they could do was act as nurse-maids to cattle on the farm, at \$5.00 per month.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — But, Mr. Speaker, bygones are bygones. I'm going to forget about that dismal age prior to 1944. Let's compare Saskatchewan today with the Liberal provinces of Canada today.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — This is one thing that they evade all the time. Let's take, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment situation today throughout the whole of the Dominion of Canada. I see that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports on the percentage of people unemployed in every province of the Dominion of Canada, and it reports that Saskatchewan of all provinces, has less than one per cent of its labour force unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, the lowest in Canada. Now if you want to compare it to some of the Liberal provinces of Canada, do you know where they are? They've got the highest unemployed percentage in the Dominion of Canada, 6.7 per cent in Liberal Newfoundland and in Liberal New Brunswick. You know Liberal Quebec, the third province, is a little better, it has 5.2 per cent of its people unemployed.

You know I was wondering why it is that when the Liberals compare Saskatchewan to some of the other provinces of Canada, they never compare it to a Liberal province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — The Liberal critic berated this administration for the opportunity of employment particularly for university students, students graduating from technical schools and so on. I am going to read into the records of the house from a report in the Star Phoenix of February 25th. This is reported by a W.G. Feeder of the Saskatchewan University Campus Employment office and here is what he had to say, in fact its headlines in the Star Phoenix . . .

Job Prospects Bright, Varsity Grads are in demand

and I am going to quote:

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — You don't believe the Star Phoenix. You call it a Liberal press.

Mr. Kuziak: —

Graduating students at the university here, especially the engineers face a sellers market. W.G. Feeder of the Campus University Office said today that most of the engineers and the majority of graduating commerce students have already lined up good jobs, he said it was early in the season for such healthy situation. Mr. Feeder said, electrical chemical engineers where in the greatest demand, but all branches of engineering were affected by Canada's expanding economy. The picture for summer employment of under-graduates was satisfactory, despite a survey made in Eastern Canada last year which stated that

the long term prospect for undergraduates' employment was likely to deteriorate. Mr. Feeder said things look good for undergraduates on the local Saskatchewan scene, and least for the coming summer. Undergraduates, he stated, might even find employment a little easier to locate than last year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this statement by an independent unbiased report belies the statements made by the opposition in this particular debate. I want to say that it completely belies the statement made by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on this particular subject in this debate.

The second untruthful idea that they are trying to get over to the public is the falsehood of taxes in Saskatchewan. You know, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan they blame the CCF for the high taxes, in Alberta, they blame the Social Credit and I am going to read into the records of the house again, on a Mr. William Dicky, Liberal member for Calgary Glenmore, speaking in the legislative assembly of Alberta the other day. Listen to this one, I quote:

The Social Credit government has lost sight of what property taxes are for. Increasing taxation for such things as education was like a black spider web choking the owners real property.

In Alberta, the Liberals blame the Social Credits; in Manitoba, they blame the Conservatives for the high taxes. Mr. Speaker, again I'm going to repeat a statement that I have made in this house on a number of occasions, and that is that all municipal taxes, all provincial taxes, all federal taxes have been rising in the Dominion of Canada in every province in Canada since 1946, 1946 when a federal Liberal government in Ottawa lifted price controls and allowed commodities of goods to double and triple and to quadruple.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, any one with any common sense knows that if commodities are skyrocketing, taxes are bound to skyrocket. In fact, I'm going to tell you the Liberal propaganda reminds me of the thief, you know who rushes into a business place, he ramsacks the till, he rushes out on the street and as the police are converging on him, he stands and points to a blind alley and yells "Thief, Thief, Thief". The Liberal Party in Ottawa in 1946 lifted price control, so that commodities and goods could skyrocket, could double and triple, which causes the doubling and tripling of all taxes. They did it, Mr. Speaker, and now they point the finger at the CCF, they point a finger at the Social Credits, they point the finger at the Conservatives, and they scream taxes, taxes, taxes. What nonsense.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, I had to laugh at the gymnastics of the financial critic. He, too, screamed taxes, taxes, taxes, we should have a reduction in taxes. And of course, somebody from this side of the house reminded him that we had only made a \$5,000,000 tax reduction in connection with the hospital and medicare premium or taxes. And of course, he spent 15 minutes of his talk, trying to convince this house that that wasn't a reduction in tax, oh no, that was a reduction in the hospitalization and medicare premiums.

You know when you reduce anything, it's not taxes but I am going to remind the financial critic — he's not in his seat — that in 1961 there was an increase in the hospital premium and at that time, speaking in the same kind of a debate and I am going to quote his exact words, he stated:

Now, what, taxes were increased between June and February 9th, first of all, we had an increase in the hospitalization tax.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when there is an increase, it is a tax, and when there is a decrease, oh no, that's not a tax. Mr. Speaker, I am actually hoping that the financial critic will go out into the country and will try to convince the heads of households throughout the province that a reduction from \$72.00 to a \$52.00 premium wasn't a reduction at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am wanting to point out that this is the only government that has actually reduced taxes in the last year or so.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — The financial critic again and his cohorts in this debate have screamed overtaxation. They point to the surplus in our budget and they say, “What is it but excessive taxation” and try to imply and make the people of Saskatchewan believe that tax rates have actually been increasing. This, Mr. Speaker, is not true. This surplus may I point out, has been generated by the prosperous economy within the province, by the rapid development of the mineral resource industry in Saskatchewan. I want to point out that in both years a substantial part of that surplus has come out of the revenues of mineral resources development in the province.

Further, going on on high taxes, the opposition in this debate have screamed that Saskatchewan’s gasoline tax of 14 cents is too high. But they don’t admit that all other Liberal provinces of Canada are higher than 14 cents. In fact two of the Liberal provinces of Canada have the highest gasoline tax in all of Canada of 18 cents and 19 cents.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — The Liberal opposition screams automobile licenses are high but they don’t admit that Saskatchewan has the lowest automobile license of all of Canada. They don’t tell you that two of the Liberal provinces of Canada have the highest automobile licenses in Canada, which are actually, Mr. Speaker, more than twice as high as Saskatchewan. You know I had to laugh the other day when the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) got up and what did he call taxation? Extortion. What was the other term. Well, I am going to tell him that if there is tax extortion in Saskatchewan, what about some of these Liberal provinces of the Dominion of Canada?

Another major tax that they scream out on is the 5 per cent sales tax. Of course, they don’t admit that 1½ per cent of that 5 per cent goes to pay medicare costs of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. But they don’t admit that a Liberal province, the province of Quebec, has the highest sales tax in all of the Dominion of Canada . . . 6 per cent, and doesn’t pay any medicare costs for its people. They don’t admit that Liberal New Brunswick has a 4 per cent sales tax, that the province of Newfoundland a Liberal province has a 5 per cent sales tax and doesn’t contribute anything to the medical care costs of the people of that province.

Yes, the opposition during this debate too screamed high power bills. But they don’t admit that in 1944 the power rates under the previous Liberal government was more than twice as high as the power rates are today.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — You know the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) last night made me laugh, he was critical of the power corporation making a \$5,500,000 surplus. It was terrible he said. Why, he says, that when we Liberals were in power, they operated the power corporation so that it would only break even. In fact, the truth is they lost money. Mr. Speaker, the power corporation under the Liberal administration lost money every year and their power rates were more than twice as high as ours. Now, over the past 20 years we have reduced the power rates from a maximum of 15 cents to 8 cents and the minimum rate was 4 cents and it is now 1 cent. But on the average we reduced it by more than one half, and the power corporation today produces \$5,500,000 of net profit and they cry about it.

Mr. Speaker, that was absolutely self-condemnation of the efficiency of the previous Liberal government that they charged power rates twice as high as they are today, and they lost money.

Last night too, the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) talked about the provincial parks, and he pointed out how in the old Liberal days you were able to drive out to a provincial park at Katepwa and you could pitch a tent right at the edge of the water. Well he was right, the very few that came out to the very few provincial parks, they did have room to pitch a tent almost anywhere. I remember those days when there was a cloud in the sky you didn’t dare to move out to any provincial parks . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — . . . because you would get stuck in the Liberal mud, but Mr. Speaker, today we have doubled the number of provincial parks since 1944. We have tripled the carrying capacity of accommodating people coming in and

enjoying the parks in these 14 parks, and Mr. Speaker, with the rural municipalities and the municipalities of this province we have provided 30 other regional parks throughout the province, so that that little man that he talked about, the farmer and the little man, could get out and spend the Sunday and they are coming out and I'm going to tell you there is no room even to pitch a tent because it is over-crowded. And, Mr. Speaker, over-crowded why? Because there is stagnation or economic boom?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I stated I am going to speak on the most rapidly developing mineral resource industry in Canada. And it is the mineral resource industry of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, this is the industry that has contributed most over the past twenty years in diversifying the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan. This is the industry that I believe has contributed most to the booming and prosperous Saskatchewan economy we are enjoying now, which has helped greatly to make 1963 the most prosperous year in the history of the province.

Yes, I know that the opposition speakers talk about the bumper crop and the Russian wheat sale has produced this prosperous period. But I want to repeat again it has contributed very, very little yet to the 1963 economy, it will contribute to the 1964 economy greatly, and I am going to tell you it is going to be a good year. In order, Mr. Speaker, to appreciate the rapid growth of our mineral resource industry and to dispel again some of the falsehoods to belittle and underscore this industry by the opposition, I am going to give you some historical background on the development and production of mineral resources within the province of Saskatchewan.

Mining operations, Mr. Speaker, commenced in Saskatchewan, or what was known as Saskatchewan, back in 1886. Coal was then produced in the south. From 1886 to 1905, and I'm taking 1905 because this is the birth of the province, over a span of 19 years, we produced the first \$1,000,000 of mineral wealth. Over this 19 year period we were producing mineral wealth at the rate of \$50,000 a year. Not very much.

The next period I am going to take is a 25 year period 1905 to 1930 and again I am taking a 1930 because this is the time that mineral resources were transferred from federal administration to provincial administration. In the 25 years under what one may call free enterprise federal governments we produced \$26,000,000 worth of mineral wealth or an average of \$1,000,000 a year. Sort of peanuts, that was, but it is not bad.

The next period I am going to take is 1930 to 1944, a fourteen year period and, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that four years of this fourteen were war years when we required every ounce of mineral production when we pressed the production of minerals to the very limit. The Liberal provincial government produced during this fourteen year period an accumulated total of \$143,000,000 of mineral wealth, or an average of \$10,000,000 a year, and I am going to say this, this is just small potatoes.

If there ever was stagnation, this was it. During this particular period in mineral wealth production in Saskatchewan it came mainly from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company at Flin Flon, Manitoba, from coal and sodium in the southern part of Saskatchewan and from gold in the Beaver Lodge area on the shores of Lake Athabaska. These were the best years of Liberal private enterprise mineral resource development.

The next period I want to take is another 14 year period. This 14 year period is 1944-1958. Some speakers from the government side of the house in this particular debate mentioned 1944 as a new era, Mr. Speaker, and I want to particularly say that this was a new era as far as mineral resource development is concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — In 1945, Mr. Speaker, we struck heavy crude that was discovered in the Lloydminster area, later came medium crude oil in the west and the south west of the province, natural gas in the west part of the province. Mr. Speaker, this rapidly expanding mineral industry did not come about by accident. This was planned and directed, may I say, by a very able Minister of Mineral Resources, who is now so ably directing the finances of the province. And here, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the 1952 program for progress. This CCF platform stated,

an expanding economy guaranteed by the continuing development of gas, oil and mineral resources, and by steadily improving agricultural production will enable a CCF government during its next term of office to provide the following

March 4, 1964

and then it enumerated ten different planks that we would provide if it got elected.

I want to point out again that card stated that we guaranteed the rapid development of gas, oil and mineral resources, I want to say that we had the Liberals then in opposition, and do you know the Liberals under the previous leader, Walter Tucker, they guaranteed by scaring and assuring the people of Saskatchewan that if a CCF government was elected there would be no development of gas, oil, or mineral resources in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you, you know from this past history the people of Saskatchewan believed the CCF, they re-elected the government in 1952, they repudiated the Liberals and their false, scaring tactics. I want to say that immediately after we were re-elected, my predecessor and colleague, the hon. Mr. Brockelbank, reorganized his department, the Department of Natural Resources and Industrial Development into two departments. He created a new Department of Mineral Resources. This department highlighted and encouraged the rapid expansion of all mineral exploration and development particularly oil and gas.

I would like to point out that the administration of petroleum and natural gas was established as a separate and a very important branch of the department. The budget of the Department of Mineral Resources in order to assist and encourage mineral development, was doubled that year. I want to report that exploration development and production of mineral resources increased very rapidly.

In 1952-53 came the discovery of the medium gravity oil in the south west; in 1953 came the discovery of light gravity oil in the south east. Hundreds of miles of pipe lines followed, gas processing plants came in; uranium at Uranium City came in; the world's most fantastic potash belt was discovered; iron was discovered at Choiceland and I want to admit not yet developed. Helium was discovered in the south west and is developed and we are producing helium.

Mr. Speaker, by 1958, that is why I took the period 1944-1958, we reached the first accumulative billion dollars of mineral wealth production. Actually, Mr. Speaker, to produce the first billion dollars of mineral wealth, it took the province from 1886 to 1958, or 73 years. Mr. Speaker, our mineral wealth production has increased so rapidly in the last few years that our second billion dollars of mineral wealth came in May of 1963, in less than five years. In five years, 1958 to 1963, we produced the second billion dollars of mineral wealth and the Liberals still nauseatingly call it stagnation.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I predict, Mr. Speaker, we will produce the third billion dollars of mineral wealth within the next three years. We will be averaging \$333,000,000 of mineral wealth over the next three years.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to remind you, a few minutes ago I stated that provincial Liberals produced a \$143,000,000 of mineral wealth in 14 years, we are now producing twice as much in one year. I will make another statement without any fear of contradiction. Within the next three years . . .

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question?

An Hon. Member: — Shut up . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — No, I'm speaking, you had your chance . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . mineral wealth . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, within the next three years we will be producing in one year twice as much mineral wealth as what was produced by the private enterprise governments in all the past history of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — What do you mean "we"?

Mr. Kuziak: — We, and our companies in Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Where are all their head offices?

Mr. Kuziak: — The oil and gas industry of Saskatchewan, Canada and even America.

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about the gas . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, some day when the story of this mineral resource is written, I'm going to tell you it is going to thrill and gladden the hearts of generations of Saskatchewanites yet unborn, but it has been totally missed and unappreciated by a group of Liberal Thatcherites, blinded by their lust of political power, that is all it is.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, 1963 has been an excellent oil and gas well drilling year, including wild-cat well drilling. In 1963 over a thousand wells were drilled. This is 400 more wells than were drilled in 1962. We have, as at the end of March 31, 1964, 5,311 oil wells, 235 gas wells or a total of over 5,500 wells. Only last year, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was screaming that we were driving oil companies out of Saskatchewan. May I read now from "Oil in Canada" a petroleum magazine, dated August 15, 1963, with headlines and I'm going to quote it:

Saskatchewan Sparks 18% July Rise

Saskatchewan's oil-well completions for the first seven months were up 32 per cent.

British Columbia had a decline or drop of 42 per cent.

Mark that down Ross.

Alberta had a moderate increase of 7½ per cent.

This magazine states and I quote again:

Wild-cat drilling has been setting a blistering pace in 1963. Saskatchewan has been responsible for two-thirds of the increase with a gain of 42 completions out of the 62 across the whole of western Canada.

There is the oil magazine.

Mr. Speaker, if oil companies were driven out of any province, it certainly wasn't Saskatchewan. The charge of driving oil companies out of Saskatchewan is the usual kind of fabricated falsehood carried on by the Liberals to belittle the province's accomplishments.

I want to read another one. The Leader Post of February 28, 1964. That is only a few days ago reported on the hustings, given by a Liberal MLA, the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and I say shame. He is reported to have stated, he is reported in the Leader Post to have stated at this meeting "that Saskatchewan could have developed its oil industry ahead of Alberta had it not been for a socialistic government". Mr. Speaker, how ignorant could the MLA or the Leader of the Opposition be or was this a deliberate falsehood? Surely they know that Alberta discovered its oil in Turner Valley back in 1917. Mr. Speaker, Alberta was producing oil and gas for twenty-seven years before the CCF took over Saskatchewan in 1944. During this twenty seven years, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was administered by a Liberal government, except for four years by a Conservative government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member could have been more truthful if he had made this statement: Saskatchewan could have developed its oil industry ahead of Alberta had it not been for a useless Liberal government of that day.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that the CCF did not have a chance until 1944. In fact, I want to point out that the moment the CCF took over the province in 1944, oil was discovered in 1945, a year later, and we started to produce oil. This same Leader Post article says that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) is supposed to have stated

a prime plank in the old CCF platform was to socialize the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, I hold every platform of the CCF prior to every one of the elections that we campaigned in, and I'm going to read, Mr. Speaker, into the records of this house, in 1952, the 52 plank was the first time that we mentioned development of mineral resources. And plank 3 stated continued development of Saskatchewan's oil and mineral resources. If you look at the 1956 platform it again states plank 6 says continue the rapid development of oil, mineral and forest resources.

Mr. Speaker, no place did it say we will socialize the oil industry, that is a deliberate falsehood. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that in 1963 we attained the record production of 72 million barrels of oil. Producing at the rate of an average of 200,000 barrels every day.

I want to now say a few words on potash production. Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that when potash was discovered and announced by the hon. T.C. Douglas, a howl of ridicule went up from the Liberal benchers. I remember the time. Their mining expert, the previous Liberal member for Saltcoats made an elaborate speech in this house belittling the potash possibilities and ended by assuring the people of Saskatchewan that no potash would ever be developed under a CCF government and that it was only election propaganda.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how have we fared in the development of potash? In 1963 we saw International Minerals, largest potash mine in the world, produce and market over 1,000,000 tons of potash. This mine, built at a cost of \$40,000,000 is now busily sinking another shaft at a cost of another \$10,000,000. This is what they call stagnation. Kalium Chemicals Limited at Belle Plaine, another potash corporation is completing a \$50,000,000 potash mine and will be in production by the end of this year, some more stagnation, Mr. Speaker. Potash Company of Canada is reactivating their mine and plant at Saskatoon at a cost of \$7,500,000 and will be in production this year. This is another \$40,000,000 potash mine, some more stagnation. Elwinso Potash Company of Germany and France have announced a \$40,000,000 potash mine to be built near Lanigan, Saskatchewan, commencing to build this year. Mr. Speaker, some more stagnation on the way is coming.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that in the next ten years we will be producing and exporting 10,000,000 tons of potash annually. This will be equivalent, in freight haulage, to 340,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. Mr. Speaker, what a bonanza this is going to be to the railways of the Dominion of Canada.

Canada's first helium industry was completed and went into production in November of 1963, in fact, shipments of helium gas have already gone forward to Australia and Algeria. Mr. Speaker, the total value of mineral wealth production in the fiscal year 1963-64 will exceed a record \$280,000,000. An increase of 17 per cent in mineral wealth production over 1962.

I note that the national mineral wealth increase is estimated by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to be only 4.6 per cent, not 17 per cent as in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the D.B.S. forecast shows that the province of Alberta has actually dropped in mineral wealth production by four per cent over 1962. If this had happened in Saskatchewan would you ever have heard it from the opposition? This, I'm telling you, in Canada's greatest private enterprise province in mineral wealth production last year dropped by four per cent.

In 1944, Mr. Speaker, we were the sixth greatest mineral producing province in Canada, now we are fourth, with only Ontario and Alberta and Quebec producing more mineral wealth. In Liberal Quebec, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics forecasts a 2.5 per cent increase in mineral wealth over 1962 instead of the 17 per cent that we have had in the province.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, in the budget debate, I proved by quoting the D.B.S. figures that since 1944 to 1960 our net value of mineral production has been rising faster than any province in Canada, including oil rich Alberta. In 1963 our increase is shown over that of 1962 as again greater than Alberta. Therefore, we are holding and gaining in this

particular lead.

Mr. Speaker, let us now look at direct revenues from the government. Direct revenues in the form of royalties, fees, mineral land sales to the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — You mean taxes.

Mr. Kuziak: — Well yes, they are taxes. They are payments for the resources that the people have rented out.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — These revenues will also hit a new record for 1963-64 and I estimate it will be in the order of \$28,000,000. Mineral wealth revenues added, may I repeat again, considerably to the 1962 surplus and will again add considerably to the 1963 surplus.

Mr. Speaker, what does this rapid increase in mineral resource production and increased revenues to the government mean to the average man in the province of Saskatchewan? Well, I am going to tell you what it means, it has already meant, to some extent, increased revenues to the Provincial Treasurer, from mineral resource development and has helped to reduce \$5,000,000 of hospital and medicare taxes for the people of Saskatchewan, \$20 reduction for every family Saskatchewan, a \$10 reduction for every single person in the province. Increased mineral revenues have meant increased grants to schools, to universities and technical schools.

I want to point out that in this particular budget, I see that the estimates have been increased for the purpose of education by the tune of \$7,000,000 and then we have paid out supplementary payments of over \$6,000,000, there is actually an increase of \$13,000,000 for education.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — And then the opposition tries to belittle it. Mineral resource revenues have meant more grants to local governments. They are going to mean in the coming year, Mr. Minister of Highways, more dust-free highways, more and better agricultural programs, increased recreational developments, yes, for the little people out in the rural areas, and the villages of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Increased mineral resource development has meant more oil wells, more pipelines, more gas processing plants, more potash plants, which means more jobs for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

This last summer, Mr. Speaker, the cabinet as well as the Leader of the Opposition was invited to Kalium Chemicals Potash Plant at Belle Plaine. And I want to report that I was there, my fellow colleagues were there, the Leader of the Opposition was absent. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, he was afraid of feeling ridiculous, looking and visiting a \$50,000,000 industry. I want to say that had he been there, he could have talked with the manager, he could have found out that some 900 men were at that very moment employed, would not have been employed if it wasn't for this particular development, and it certainly isn't stagnation. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that this winter our unemployed figure is the lowest in Canada, and as I stated a while ago, our unemployed people is actually less than one per cent of the labour force. The Liberal provinces all are about five per cent, Manitoba is 3.3. per cent, even oil rich Alberta is 2.3, has twice as many in percentage wise.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you will agree with me that this record growth of mineral resource industry is creating for every person in Saskatchewan a better and a more abundant living, Mr. Speaker, now I want to take time out to reply to the Liberal party's ways and means of encouraging new mining industry.

Listen to this, Ross, you need to. The Liberal leader of the hustings and the opposition speakers in this debate have stated that a Liberal government will introduce tax concessions to the new mines locating in the province and if necessary, give them grand tax holidays. A Liberal

speaker at another time had suggested five years to ten years tax holiday if necessary. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some facts to him. That the federal government now grants new mines a three year income-tax-free holiday. Even they, Mr. Speaker, don't go beyond three years. We in Saskatchewan, I suppose he doesn't know that, offer the new mines on base metals and metallics, a tax-free holiday. We offered them three years too, or until net profits exceed \$2,000,000, whichever occurs first.

Mr. Speaker, how stupid can he be. If you go beyond the three year limited of a tax-free holiday, you're only going to forego the revenue and the dominion government picks it up in income tax so all you do is throw away the revenues of the province and give it to someone else, have you ever thought of that?

One other thing that I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition in this house, that we share in the risks of any new mining venture of this kind and I'll tell you how we share this risk. For the royalties payable even after the royalty-free period is over, the three year period is over, we only take a percentage of the net profit of the company after allowing certain depreciation write-offs. The percentage of net profit, Mr. Speaker, is 12½ per cent, if the company makes no net profit, they don't pay any royalties or tax whatsoever to the provincial government. If they make a profit, we collect 1/8th of that particular profit and I say that this is not hard on the company.

We also have other incentives, incentive plans and assistances to the mining industry of Saskatchewan, and particularly the north. One of them is the Prospectors Assistance Plan. The second one is serial geophysical surveys which we spend money on taking them and then hand over the information to the companies that may require it. The third one is we pay part of the exploration and development flying in the northern part of Saskatchewan; the fourth is we pay for ground geological surveys and then supply this information to the mining companies that are looking for minerals in the north; and the fifth is we have a roads-to-resources program by opening up new roads into potential mineralized areas. Here again I'm going to re-emphasize the northern road. When I went down to see the federal Liberal government in 1957, they wouldn't contribute a nickel. It was the Conservative government who went along with us in the building of these roads.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now emphasize that our tax holiday of three years or net profit of \$2,000,000 plus the incentives for base metals and metallic mines is comparable and better than most of the province of the Dominion of Canada. To go any further, Mr. Speaker, in tax-free holidays would be an absolutely unwarranted give away that the mining companies I don't believe want themselves. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the companies in this day and age realize that if they're going to live with and operate in harmony and have good relationships with the people where they are developing and mining they must be prepared to pay and they are prepared to pay a fair tax and fair fees for the resources that they take out of that province or the country.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that a five or ten year tax-free holiday would be an absolutely irresponsible throwing away of provincial revenues. More than half of which would go to the federal government in income tax and the balance to excess profits of a mining company.

Now I want to say something about incentives and the royalties paid by the potash companies of Saskatchewan. Potash mining comes under the sub-surface mineral regulations. These companies actually come in to proven or semi-proven mineral resources area. Their royalty, Mr. Speaker, is based on a formula that takes in the potassium content of the potash ore. This again is based on the royalty that is paid in the States of New Mexico and Utah in the United States that have been producing potash for years and years, and I want to point out that our royalty is actually a little lower than the royalties of those states. I want to report that the companies are very happy with the royalties they are paying.

Now, I want to say something about oil. Saskatchewan is second to Alberta in oil production. Our Saskatchewan oil royalties including road allowance tax is less than Alberta's on the average; it is a little higher than Manitoba's on the average. It is fair, it is reasonable. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that our permit and lease rentals are also actually less than Alberta. The Leader of the Opposition on the hustings, and some of this cohorts I know in this house have charged this government with imposing discriminating taxes and restrictions on exploration and

development of oil. I want to repeat that this is absolute nonsense, it is untrue, it is false, it is a fabrication of their own imagination.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I know the leader uses these phrases very loosely, and never gives any examples of these discriminating taxes or restrictions. I want to emphasize again that there is absolutely no discriminating taxes as well as no restrictions on explorations or development of the oil resources of this province. In fact . . .

Some Hon. Members: — OH! OH!

Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, well I blew that all to pieces in my argument, where were you? That's an absolute falsehood for driving oil companies out. In fact, Mr. Speaker, last year the oil companies left British Columbia and Alberta to come into Saskatchewan. They were driven out of the other provinces in to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in my previous remarks in this debate, I quoted Oil in Canada, and I'm going to tell you maybe I should take time off to read it. Here's one from Oil in Canada, the bible of the oil industry of Canada:

Saskatchewan heading for big year of Wild Cat

Yes, I believe I've got another one over here:

Saskatchewan boom oil output to 228,000 barrels in September

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to read this one, since they've asked about driving companies out, it says in this article:

That all of Canada's production is headed for two per cent under national oil targets at about 785

Well, ours is somewhere around 10 per cent. I want to again state, I have in the past too, that there could not be any restrictions on exploration and development because we have had even in the past 10 years a terrific increase.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I want to say that I think this again is a well-planned expanding budget which is going to further improvise opportunities for even a better life for all our citizens and a budget that plans even greater industrial development of the province.

I will wholeheartedly support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Thatcher: — I rise on a point of privilege. I waited until the minister was off the radio, but I should like now to raise this point of privilege. Repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, he has accused the opposition of lies, untruths and falsehoods. Specifically, he accused the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) of a deliberate falsehood when he said it had been the NDP program to socialize the oil industry. I have a quotation here from their 1946 convention, which says . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege because he accused the member of falsehood, and I can prove that it was the truth . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — The hon. member cannot rise on a point of privilege for some other member. That other member must do it for himself and furthermore, I want to . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of order, I have the floor. I was here first, Mr. Speaker, I have the floor, Sir.

March 4, 1964

Mr. Brockelbank: — He can't . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I'm on my feet and I would like to present my point of privilege Sir. Well, I had the floor, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: — Let the hon. member state his point of privilege.

Mr. Thatcher: — My point of privilege is this. The hon. minister when he was speaking accused the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) of a deliberate falsehood when he said that the NDP program was . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He is trying to do precisely what has been pointed out, that he can not do, namely claim a point of privilege on behalf of another member.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! This is not a point of privilege to begin with. Order. This is an allegation of facts, which is not a point of privilege, and I wish the hon. member peruse Beauchesne to find out what a point of privilege is. A point of privilege is when it pertains to a member on his right to speak as a member. This is an allegation of facts. If the hon. member feels that the statement is twisted, he has a right, as the Minister of Agriculture did yesterday, to rise at the end of the speech, and make a correction.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, can a minister accuse another hon. member of being a liar? That's what he did, and we can prove otherwise. He's the one . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Kuziak: — I have proof to show what I read . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — This is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! We cannot permit this type of a debate, this is not a debate. There is no point of privilege.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, he was calling me a liar, because I have the proof right here and if you want to table it, I'll table it. And I insist that he withdraw that. Do you want me to read it? At the CCF convention . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! The hon. member cannot enter the debate again this way, I think you're well aware of the rules and . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — I'm not going to stand for him calling me a liar . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I never heard him call you a liar . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — Well that fellow over there did, he was sitting in your chair.

Mr. Kuziak: — On a point of order, I did not call him a liar. I brought in proof to show . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! Will the hon. member proceed. Does the hon. member conclude his speech . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, just a minute, I'm not satisfied. He accused me of a falsehood and he's got to withdraw it, because I didn't utter a false-

hood. Either he does, or I'm going to stand here all afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! I was in the chair when the hon. minister was reading those cards. What he said was the official promises of the party which he represents and I heard him referring to other statements, and I feel that it is not a point of privilege, it is a point of debate.

Mr. MacDougall: — Well, are you going to let him get away with calling me a liar? In so many words, he called me a liar, Mr. Speaker, I demand . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! The minister has denied making that accusation. The minister denies that he did any such thing.

Mr. Kuziak: — I want to say again, I didn't call anybody a liar. I did not.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Kuziak: — I repudiated his statement but it was the actual opposite of the facts and I gave the facts, the CCF platform itself . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the best budget yet.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Berezowsky: — May I commence by saying that much of what could have been said, has been said, and anything that I might say at this time I consider is an anti-climax. Certainly, the minister who just sat down made the situation very clear to all members and all those who listened in, whether this budget deserved the kind of support it should have or not. Now, we have heard from the opposition, all kinds of charges, of high taxes, compulsion, mal-administration and I want to add a few words today it show that these charges are entirely unfounded and should not have been mentioned at any time.

It is like giving a blind man a telescope. It doesn't matter how big the telescope may be, if he's blind. He still won't be able to see so we are trying in this debate to discover if they can hear a little better than they can see. We've been told during this debate about people needing jobs and the unemployment in Saskatchewan. I would like to point out a province that has often been brought up in this house, it's the province of Manitoba and here I have the Winnipeg Free Press of February 19, on the first page we have the heading:

Manufacturing Jobs Plummet

that means, "go down" and I'll quote, this is by Roger Newman:

Manitoba has lost between 8,000 and 10,000 manufacturing jobs due to automation and the transfer of local plants to other provinces, Industry Minister Gurnay Evans told the provincial legislature, Tuesday. Mr. Evans, in a defence of the department's record, said a massive drop in manufacturing employment took place from 1953 to 1961 with a downhill movement starting at the end of Post War Boom in the early 50's.

Now we've been led to believe or we were told that it only happens in Saskatchewan that people have left jobs and went elsewhere. Here's a province whose manufacturing is centered in the city of Winnipeg and yet in that one area alone, 8,000 to 10,000 people have left their jobs because the jobs are not there, because manufacturing has moved elsewhere, and as has been pointed out in this debate, this is a condition that has happened not only in western Canada but has happened in other parts of the United States as well.

We've heard a lot about taxes. Our budget points to the fact that our taxes have not been increased but as a matter of fact, our taxes have decreased by \$5,000,000 whereas if we look at the reports from Manitoba, from another legislature, we find it says "No new taxes now, says Roblin but the door opened for increases later in 1964." I don't know if they're going to have an election there or not. But that is what has happened in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I have taken Manitoba as a reference is that for the simple reason, the number of people that live in Manitoba are practically the same as the number of people in Saskatchewan. A population of 956,000 while in Saskatchewan it is a little less. When we study the budget of the Manitoba government brought in just the other day, we see it is practically identical with the budget here. Theirs is \$219,000,000, while ours is \$214,000,000. I think the comparisons that I will make are very proper and will indicate some of the things that have not yet been brought up in this legislature. Before I do that, I must refer to what has been said in this house by the hon. members opposite – a lot of political talk. They've been telling the people of this province and this legislature that they're going to get elected in the forthcoming election and I'm of course the last one to wish them bad luck, but I just came back from the north the other day, and I happened to meet with some native people there and they tell me that such a thing couldn't possibly happen, and when I asked why they said: Rabbits haven't come back into the north yet, and I said, what do you mean? They said, well, Mr. Berezowsky, years ago when the Liberals were in power, the rabbits were very numerous as a matter of fact, that is the time we had tough times and the only way we could live was to get snared rabbits but we didn't have money enough to buy snares to catch rabbits. But for over 20 years, the rabbit population hasn't been here; we've had better times and we're sure the Liberals cannot possibly get back, because the rabbits haven't come back.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I reassure hon. members that not only rabbits, the ptarmigan aren't back, and I remember the times when the Liberals were in power, we used to knock the ptarmigans over the head for the simple reason we didn't have enough money to buy shells, and we used to have an odd pancake to go along with the ptarmigans, pancakes from relief flour.

Mrs. Batten: — Who hasn't come back, Bill?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that the arguments that we've heard from the opposition have been completely impotent. They have been in my opinion illogical, they've been untruthful in many cases, and I'll prove that today, particularly when they refer to high taxes. Now as I said a little while ago, I would like to compare Saskatchewan to Manitoba, because of the same size of budget and about the same number of people in this province. All we've got to do is to look at the Free Press of February 20th and here's what we find. Here's the same number of people the same kind of budget. Manitoba is a little higher because they got a gift of \$6,000,000 from the dominion government as a depressed area while we didn't get it because we're considered better off.

Here's what happens. People who pay income taxes in Saskatchewan only pay \$19,280,000, but Mr. Speaker, if you lived in Manitoba, you'll find that according to their budget, the people of Manitoba are paying \$25,488,000. Quite a difference between provinces which have similar budgets and a similar population.

Mrs. Batten: — They make more money . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I'm talking about the taxes they pay, it doesn't matter whether they make more money or not. According to the records, it's been proven – people made considerably more money in this province as income than the people of Manitoba and I don't want to go into that. I'm sorry the hon. member hasn't been doing her homework.

However, let's take a look at corporation income tax. It's the corporations that hon. members opposite have been crying about, and they say we're over-taxing them. The ones that Liberals would give a tax-free holiday to – what have they paid in Saskatchewan in the past year? They paid \$11,800,000 and what about Manitoba \$18,291,000. So who is paying high taxes? But, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the budget less the \$6,000,000 that Ottawa gave as a gift to Manitoba, the budgets are identical. Yet, what do you find in Saskatchewan? We find as the minister has pointed out that our royalties and lease fees amount to \$34,282,360. What about

Manitoba? The great Manitoba with all this development that they have there a miserly \$4,917,000. Mr. Speaker, there is where the benefit accrues to the people of Saskatchewan. We have a saving there of \$30,000,000 that the ordinary tax payers who pay income tax or the corporations or companies or such as you together save \$30,000,000. It is because we have development in this province which brings us this kind of revenue. These millions in royalties don't hurt any company and I agree with the minister who spoke previously that these companies are glad to pay their fair share of taxes. They get their exemptions, but we do get \$30,000,000 that helps the people of Saskatchewan to carry on the kind of projects, the kind of services that we have and that we are proud of. I think that if any member went to Manitoba and honestly compared Saskatchewan with Manitoba, he would have to admit that this is a much better province here because of the roads and the services and many other things that we have, that Manitoba hasn't.

It has been said in this house, Mr. Speaker, that our motor licenses are higher in Saskatchewan than in Manitoba. And it's true, in Saskatchewan we collect \$9,265,000 in motor license and in Manitoba, according to their budget, it is \$8,700,000. But in Saskatchewan there are a greater number of vehicles. Again, may I refer the hon. members to the minister who reported that the lowest license fees in Canada are payable in Saskatchewan. The only reason for the higher amount of license revenue in Saskatchewan is because we have more amenities. We have more amenities, we have more money, we're better off and we have more vehicles in this province and as a result we have to pay more for licenses.

Members opposite talk about hospital and education tax. Really I don't need to go into that because it has been argued by a great number of speakers that it is a very small amount that we pay for health services and hospital services here. In other provinces, as you know, they have property taxes to pay for these services. This actually isn't a provincial tax. In Saskatchewan we do collect the taxes and pay it back in services provided, providing people with health and medicine.

I think one of the reasons why hon. members always talk about high taxes is that it hurts them, because their plutocrat friends are not the kind of friends that I choose. The people that I know, the trappers, and the fishermen, the farmers do not make too much money. Occasionally they do pay a little bit of income tax. Occasionally they do pay some sales tax but the people that the hon. friends opposite refer to are, and I say, in higher tax categories and they are the ones that are squawking.

Why? Because under our policy, under this government's policy we do believe in the Christian adage that the strong should help the weak and the rich should help the poor. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, that if I were making \$50,000 a year, and if I bought a brand new Cadillac every year I would have to pay considerable taxes. Actually, according to my own beliefs, I would be glad to pay taxes to help somebody who can't afford to do so, but my hon. friends take objection all the time against this equalization plan of imposing taxes on that basis for people to pay according to their ability, and I would point out to them, that not all Liberals feel the way they do because Mr. Pearson and his government, the Liberal government at Ottawa, has given Manitoba, because it is a depressed area, some \$6,000,000 more than given to Saskatchewan.

Let us be consistent about these things. We have heard from Liberals that this is a terrible province to live in. People are having a tough time here. May I refer again to the paper here, something that is very interesting. It is that the Leader of the Opposition in Manitoba was given a raise in salary from \$2,500 to \$6,000 last year, Sir, and up to the present time the Manitoba government hasn't paid him his salary. I don't know whether they haven't got the money to pay him, or what, but I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in this province, we treat the Leader of the Opposition much better. When you add everything he gets, including his office expenses, instead of \$6,000 that has been voted in Manitoba, he gets \$28,000 and I'm proud of it. The only thing I'm not proud of is that hon. members, who are provided with an office, and have a research staff, come into this house, ignorant of facts. The only thing they find to criticize is a scale that the government bought for \$150 and this allegedly a waste of money.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this, I want to see this province go ahead. I want to see the right kind of government in this province, I do not want to be as Barry Goldwater is, though some of my hon. friends opposite apparently agree with some of his philosophy. I think that we must wage war against poverty, give people more purchasing power, build economic democracy and freedom, so that all of us can have a good life in this province. And I think it is imperative, as I have said before, that this purchasing power and taxes that we must collect provide the urgent

services that we need which must be distributed or collected on an equalization basis. If we do just that we will not only follow our moral philosophy but we will be building for the people of this province to bring them up to a greater height . . .

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — You are a true liberal.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I quite agree, maybe I am a true liberal, and I have a true liberal philosophy, but the trouble with the hon. members opposite is that for the past twenty years they have been playing marbles. That is what they have been doing, playing marbles and never seeing what is happening all about them.

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have never played marbles.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — You played jacks.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well, the hon. member doesn't know what she has missed. It is a great game if you want to pass the time away doing nothing.

I would like to point out to the hon. members opposite that when they start crying about the taxes that the corporations have to pay, that these corporations are doing very well. I was up at my community of Creighton just the other day, and I was advised that last year the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting made over \$17,000,000. After paying corporation taxes, income taxes and paying royalties to the province, they still had \$17,000,000 left and that is after paying labour and everything else. This is clear money which they were able to pay to their shareholders, whether they were in Canada or in the United States. As a matter of fact, most of them are in the United States and of course, we have the problem of getting this money back. So we have to produce more wheat, produce more wealth. However, be that as it may, let us take a look at a few of these companies. Here it is in the Readers Industrial Manual, companies that are in Canada. Some say they are not making enough and cannot afford to pay the taxes they do pay, but just take a look at some of these figures: Steel Company of Canada, net profit — 1961 — \$27,378,000. (I'm going to use even figures Sir). In 1962 it went up \$30,299,000 yet we are told this poor company can't pay the royalties or the taxes that governments ask them to pay by my hon. friends opposite. Bethlehem Steel Company net income after taxes, \$122,357,000 in 1961. They had an accumulated surplus in 1962 of over a billion dollars. Standard Oil, New Jersey, operating profits, 1961, \$1,074,397, 1962 — \$1,130,908 — net profit after taxes and interest charges in 1961 \$758,000,000 and in 1962 \$840,000,000. And yet these people cry and cry that taxes are too heavy, that we have to reduce the taxes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my income hasn't gone up in that proportion; the income of the working people and the farmers and the school teachers and others has not gone up in that proportion, and I think that when we are prepared to pay our share of taxes, surely these people must be just as willing to pay their share of taxes. No one takes millions away from them; we only ask them to pay a small percentage of profits in Saskatchewan as we know, it is one per cent corporation income tax.

Imperial Oil Limited made a net profit of only \$67,382,000 in 1961. This went up to \$68,432,000 last year so they just made one million more in 1962. I don't know what the figures are for 1963, but the experience of Imperial Oil, and I have read their financial statements has been much better than this. They ran into trouble this particular year. It has usually been about \$6,000,000, \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 more each year yet, my hon. friends opposite weep and cry and criticize this government because we have the courage to collect our fair share of rent, our fair share of taxes from these corporations that we have here in Saskatchewan.

I do remember the time, Sir, and I have said this before in this house that the Flin Flon, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operating under a Liberal government, for a period of some twenty years paid a measly \$600 and some thousand altogether. This government collects each year from a million to two million dollars a year.

And let us not forget that when we ask these companies to pay their fair share, then we obtain money to provide services, provide more grants to education, to build better highways and to provide amenities for the people of this province, and I cannot understand hon. members if they call themselves Liberals, that they are following the philosophy that I said belongs to Barry Goldwater and not to Liberals anywhere.

I have another company here, well this is a little larger company, General Electric Company of the United States, and you know the story about General Electric. It not only made profits but they also have a monopoly; they set prices and even governments can't do much about it. Their net earnings in 1961 were only \$242,000,000. In 1962 profits didn't go up very much, only \$23,000,000, jumping to \$265,000,000 in 1962. These poor companies who plead to have their taxes cut.

The other day the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) – he is not in his seat right now – called upon the Premier to declare an election. I began to wonder why he is so anxious for an election at this time, certainly it doesn't look very good for Liberals anywhere, as I have told you, even the Indians don't think you will get elected.

Then I saw the right-hand man of the Leader of the Opposition, and he is away over to the right, as a matter of fact much farther than the Leader of the Opposition. I refer to the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and I remember reading a press report after he returned from Ottawa, in which he said "Oh, we didn't go to Ottawa to get money for an election campaign, we had other business" and I notice in today's paper, that Ottawa is giving practically nothing to Saskatchewan.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Take it as read . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I'm wondering if the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) didn't do the same thing they always do – tried to keep industry out. Maybe this time they said to these people in Ottawa, make it tough for Saskatchewan because this is an election year. Anyway when the hon. member reported to the people of this province that they didn't go to Ottawa to get money, immediately I had a vision, I had a vision Liberals had a big pork barrel filled with money by somebody else than the Liberal Party . . .

Mrs. Batten: — This is not a vision . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . and here around this pork barrel were a lot of little piglets with long snouts trying to get into the pork barrel for the campaign as they have done in the past.

Mrs. Batten: — That is not a vision, that is a hallucination.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well you can call it a hallucination if you like but I've seen these things happen. Money was acquired by political parties and the Liberal Party wasn't very saintly. This money was used to buy liquor up in La Ronge and in other places and that is how you have been getting your votes. I was surprised at the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) yesterday speaking as he did – I hope he is converted – I hope that the Liberal Party will never do what they have done in the past – bribing people for votes, and handing out liquor to get votes. I've seen it.

I will honour the party and the leader there and the candidates there if they will do what the hon. member from Melville said yesterday: Let us go out into the Indian reserves; let us treat these people as human beings; let us bring them up and let us not bring the white man's vices we have to those reserves. I'm asking you to do that. If that is Liberal policy I welcome it; we will do the same, but I do not know if we can trust all the Liberals, because I remember the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) speaking the other day and he referred – and I talk about his untruths – I don't say that he said a deliberate lie – I say he couldn't have been in his constituency because he didn't know what he was talking about. He referred to a situation at Sandy Bay (and I have been in Sandy Bay a number of occasions because the hon. member didn't go there to look after his people, and what did I find, they had a co-operative there providing power) and what did he say in this house? He said it is the Saskatchewan Power Corporation exploiting the people of that area. He received a reply from the Minister of Co-operatives which should have put him straight.

Now this is the kind of nonsense that we get from some hon. members and it is pretty hard for people anywhere to trust them when they don't know what they are talking about.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — When did you become an authority?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I don't profess to be an authority like my friend from Turtleford who gets up (like two or three others) and talks for an hour and tells us nothing. In my simple way I am trying to give you some facts that I hope will sink down and will do some good to your party and for the rest of the people of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) charged how tough the fishermen had it from their own co-operative association in the north. I happened to be up this fall in Molanosa, and I want to put this on record, Mr. Speaker, it has been said there that these fishermen get next to nothing. Now I'm not going to argue that such a thing could not happen, there might be reasons for such an experience but I want to present some facts to this house to indicate generally what does happen. First of all, let's remember this. This co-operative organization belongs to the fishermen, the co-operative organization does not buy fish; the co-operative organization has men who try to find the best market and they obtain best prices for fish and after the cost of transportation and a few administration costs are paid, the remaining money belongs to the fisherman.

I wish to thank the Minister of Natural Resources and the government for the policy providing a minimum price and I think it is the only province that has that kind of policy. Well, let's take a look at what happened in Malonosa, and this is a report and I can file it if the hon. member so desires. I am not going to read 1961 or 1962, I'll quote you the 1963 prices. Jumbos in the spring of 1963 brought the fisherman a net amount of 44 cents a lb., large white-fish 33 cents a lb., medium white-fish 30½ cents, pickerel 27 cents a lb., jackfish 6 cents a lb., and I challenge any member in this house to go and show me where at that particular time, any private purchaser paid that much to any fisherman. Then you have the spring of 1963 again — jumbos 37 cents, large whites 27 cents, mediums 20½ cents, pickerel 18½ cents. You remember, Mr. Speaker, at that time there was a scare in Wisconsin. Fish in the United States had botulism and the people in the United States were scared to buy fish and the market started to drop, and I think the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) used the lowest figures he could find to try to prove a case which he couldn't prove. However, you will notice that the prices have dropped about 6 cents or 6 cents a lb. during that time, and they dropped still further as the scare developed. In December, 1963, and that was the time I was at Molonosa, these people were paid by their own co-operative the amount that what was left for the work that they had done. It was their money, this was what was left — no one made a profit — it was their money. Jumbos 22 cents lb., large white-fish 17 cents lb., mediums 12 cents and pickerels 17 cents a lb. and this is a far cry from the figures that the hon. member gave this house the other day.

The important thing is that when I talked to these fishermen they told me how glad they were that they had a marketing agency of their own where they could sell fish. They were glad to have a marketing agency which had contacts with buyers in the United States and where buyers knew the quality of our fish and were willing to buy the produce in spite of the fact that these buyers did not know whether they would be able to sell this fish. They accepted our fish. These are the prices that were finally realized. I say I want to put this on record so that we will have the record straight.

As to the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy), I hope he goes and meets with the co-operatives there in the north and I hope he meets with the people in the near future so they can set him straight where they stand on the value and their approval of co-operatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the tourism in this province. I noticed the other day from a report of the Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce that the Canadian increase in tourism is only five per cent and when compared to Saskatchewan, our tourism has increased by 17 per cent, Mr. Speaker. We are very happy about that, it goes to prove that the money that is being spent on the parks and recreation centres and for conservation of game and so forth, is paying dividends because there must have been a great number of people who have come to Saskatchewan to enjoy themselves.

I would like to mention something about surveys of moose. It appears we should continue the program for early hunting of moose. Mr. Speaker, I have heard and the minister can confirm this, that in my area D.N.R. made a survey very recently and they have found that there is about a 30 per cent increase of moose population over the year before. Now if that is true, and I would say that the minister could pass on this information to the interested public, I am sure he will consider continuing an early season. That is the time of year when many tourists do come to

Saskatchewan spending a lot of money and our people in the north benefit and they appreciate that kind of tourism.

At this time, I would also plead with the Minister of Natural Resources to see if he can't persuade the government and the Provincial Treasurer (maybe it is already arranged for) to provide for a few more biologists in the north. I am rather concerned about the feeding grounds. I do a little bit of hunting; I know some of the areas; and I'm just a little worried about browse, and the gorse and wurze, in plain words, food for big game, and I think that if we had more biologists in these areas they would be able to do some practical work and advise us whether we shouldn't provide some feeding plots and plan a few dams so that the water can be retained and assure that game animals will be able to survive into the future.

I think that by having feed plots we might be able to save a lot of deer. I noticed two years ago that there was a tremendous die-off of deer and I think the reason for that was because there wasn't enough browse and the snow was too high. By having some areas seeded down with the proper kind of foods for these animals, we may continue to save a greater number than in the past.

I wish to thank the government for becoming interested in the Carrot River Delta. It is in the budget and I think it is both timely and desirable. I'm glad because it will mean that after the surveys are completed the government will be able to carry out more and better works to utilize the resources that are found there. We have resources for trapping, we have resources for hunting, we have resources of forestry and, of course, we have resources there that indicate agriculture. I have had some difficulty in explaining this study to the people, because people fear dislocation and become apprehensive, and I am very glad that the government has made it very clear that Cumberland people will receive some priority in whatever happens. The survey must be carried out. This is a large area. Some of the best land in Saskatchewan still remains wild there. It isn't developed, and of course, there are areas that are best for trapping and hunting and should be protected for that purpose.

We often hear charges how little we do for farmers. I asked for some information the other day and I found that one of my co-op pastures has seven members and the government has spent \$14,000 to help these farmer out with this pasture unit. That works out to about \$2,000 for each farmer. Now, even though the farmers did pay a little bit of taxes, I think that kind of assistance is tremendous, and is certainly appreciated by farmers.

Maybe all don't get \$2,000 of assistance but even if they \$500 or \$1,000, you can see yourself, Mr. Speaker, that this is a tremendous help. This is not a loan, this isn't something that has to be repaid, this is a direct grant from the Saskatchewan to provide pasture areas and forage areas for those people in the north, owners of small farms who need help.

Hon. members recently changed their tune about natives and labour and I can't help but point out what their recent attitude was to working people. I remember that a member of this house on the Liberal side, November 26, 1953, a gentleman by the name of Minty Loftson attacked labour making reference to goldmines in Manitoba and I shall quote:

Through the unfair demands of labour over half of the gold-mines in Manitoba and all across Canada have been closed down this last two or three years.

The same gentleman refers in another statement in this house, he said:

I would just like to remind this house that if they will go back a little bit, follow up the reasons for the high cost of machinery, they will find that the actual cost of a lot of that lies at the door of the CCF party and the Communist party.

He always, of course, put us together. He says:

There has been in every strike, and every agitation for increased salaries and wages, and shorter hours, leadership from the Communist leaders of union. In spite of all that, my hon. friends (referring to us) can say about increases in wages, increases in taxes and prices, but all they have to do is go to Great Britain to

March 4, 1964

the socialist government and see what they experience every time they increased wages. I think it is fair to say that there never was an increase there in wages unless there was an increase in the price of the commodity that goes with what is produce, and when they talk about increases in machinery we can go right back and see that it is the result of an increase in wages and that is what increased the price of machinery.

Of course, this is not true, Mr. Speaker, as the records show in Ottawa and I think a reply was made in this house that when machinery increased, the wages of people went up a very small amount. I remember on a binder at one time, \$4.80 in wages but the price the machine company raised on the binders was \$50.00. But this is the kind of malarkey we have been getting from Liberals opposite and I do hope that future generations of Liberals will be an improvement.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Any more advice for us, Bill?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I can read you more, I've got lots of it. There is another thing that Mr. Loftson said, and this is in connection with the Canadian Congress of Labour

The union leaders who are with the CCF forming the new political party are affiliated with the worst gangster-led unions of America.

An. Hon. Member: — That is right.

Mr. Berezowsky: — The hon. member says probably that is right.

They are men convicted of every crime in the criminal code in order to force their demands on the people they are dealing with, including murder.

Now these are the working people, some of them good Liberals, that Liberals in this house have attacked in the past and now you are trying to be friendly with them in order that you can get their votes.

I have already said that I hope my hon. friends opposite will take a different attitude towards native people. Native people do need a great deal of help to get on their feet and I don't think it is going to hurt to urge again, let us work together to give them a chance to become equal Canadians in every way or first-class citizens if you want to call it that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could say much more but I have said enough. I think we are all satisfied that this is a good budget, certainly I am, as are all of us on this side of the house and I am certainly going to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to warn the members the mover is about to close the debate, if anyone wants to speak, they must do so now.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank all members of the legislature who have said in their speeches very kind words in regard to the speech I made a week ago Friday, and their kind words in regard to the budget.

I want to pay my compliments to the members who are voluntarily retiring from the legislature and won't be back again unless we don't have an election until 1965. My hon. friends opposite don't seem very anxious to have an election right now, they haven't been making any demands.

Some Hon. Members: — Try us anytime.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Do you want it? Well, O.K. That is good. Probably this will be their last because we aim to please.

Now those who are going to retire involuntarily, I also want to pay my compliments to them, and to say that I am going to do everything I can when the election does come to see that there are as many as possible involuntary retirements on the opposite side of the house. This is normal, and I am sure my friends over there will be doing the same for us on this side of the house. Of course, this is a part of democracy.

I want to compliment all the speakers who took part in this debate, I think that some of the proposals put forth by some of the speakers in this debate were pretty queer, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this is a part of democracy. Though we differ, and I think my friends over there have some queer ideas, they probably think I have some queer ideas, and finally we go to the people of Saskatchewan and they decide which one, which group they want to be in charge of their affairs in this province.

An Hon. Member: — Which ones are queer?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, we can stand here and call each other queer, but that doesn't amount to very much actually, because the decision will be made in quite another court from this one.

I would just like to say a word or two in regard to some of the remarks of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). Last night he made this statement:

If this government continues to make a mockery of parliament, some person will have to be put over them.

That I think is as near as I could get it down what he said. Now, I was very worried to hear him say this. This is a clear indication of this thoughts which indicate that he has not too much faith in the democratic process. That a government that is elected by the people, according to him, should have somebody over them if they don't do what he thinks should be done. Now this isn't a good democratic approach to the problem. The people decide and though we may differ with the government, and I've had the experience of sitting in the opposition and differing with the government. I may be too old; I may not get that privilege again, but because a prediction was made by one of the prominent magazines in Canada many years ago that the Liberals were in for 40 years in the wilderness, and they only half way through now, I doubt if I'll have a chance to sit on the opposition.

The member for Maple Creek reminded me — he has a very sanctimonious manner when he is speaking, and unless people know some of the back history of the political party with which he associates himself, one would think he might be a bit of an angel, comes out like the Angel Gabriel with his flaming sword and full of sound and fury. I'm getting my quotations kind of mixed up, Mr. Speaker, but they're all quite applicable.

But one of the things that I was amazed at was that the hon. member wept tears for the teachers who retired years ago and are living on a small pension now. Why? They were retired on a small pension, why? Two things. We had a government in '44 that didn't give two hoots what kind of salaries teachers had, and the former minister of education is still working for the Leader of the Opposition, and it is because of the salaries because of the conditions under which they worked and taught school and of the superannuation. I want also to say, Mr. Speaker, that practically all of these who were retired on such low superannuation have had their superannuation doubled or tripled by the action of this government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And they will get some further attention in future too. I would like to say this too, if there is any one reason that the people of Saskatchewan may have for not trusting the Liberal party with the responsibility of government in this province, it is because of their record in education. I know what it was and there are a great many people around yet who know what that record was, and when it comes to my hon. friend, all he talks about is the thirties as if that was an excuse. This country was just as rich and its ability to produce wealth in the thirties as great as it was in the twenties. Just as rich. But we had a Liberal government at Ottawa, a Liberal government in Saskatchewan that brought us up to and dumped us into the depression and they didn't know how to make use of our resources. This was the problem that we faced and this is no excuse for these people, they didn't know how to get out of the depression until the world war came along and took us out of the depression so when they talk, about getting the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan on the question of education, or on the question of health, or on the question of highways, they haven't got much chance of getting it.

March 4, 1964

Now the financial critic, said he couldn't understand how the Provincial Treasurer could under-estimate revenues to such an extent and he pointed out that in two years the revenues were totalled up to about \$45,000,000 more than we had estimated. That wasn't really good guessing, I admit that, but it was a good way to be wrong, a very good way to be wrong, and I took the trouble to look up some of the records and I found that in fiscal year 1943-44, when we had a Liberal government and a Liberal Provincial Treasurer, they weren't very good guessers either. That year they got beaten – they deserved it five years earlier.

Some Hon. Members: — OH! OH!

Mr. Brockelbank: — That's the first year you got beaten, you've been beaten many times since. Now in that year – look, would the hon., Leader of the Opposition keep quite and read his rule 46. I got 20 minutes to speak.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! I would refer the hon. members to their rules, rule 46 from section 3, and you will see that the mover of the debate has the right to continue till 20 minutes after 5 to close the debate. It's a standing rule, proceed . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I find that in the fiscal year 1943-44, the revenue exceeded the estimated by 25 per cent that year. Terrible guessing. The revenue is 25 per cent greater than the Treasurer estimated. In 1962-63, the last complete fiscal year here, our revenue was only 13.7 per cent more than the estimate. In 1943-44, the expenditures were 9.7 per cent greater than the estimate, in other words, they had a supplementary estimate to the extent of 9.7 per cent of their original estimate. In the year 1962-63, and we had a lot of criticism about our supplementaries, our expenditures were only 6.4 per cent greater than the original estimate, and in 1943-44, the surplus was 13 per cent of revenue. In 1962-63, the surplus was 5 per cent of revenue. So there's no need for the financial critic to talk about poor guessing. We're all poor guessers, only the Liberals were worst guessers than we are.

Now then the financial critic predicts that the revenues in 1964-65 will exceed the estimates by \$20,000,000 and the Leader Post wrote an editorial about this on February 26th and it says:

Mr. McDonald predicted provincial revenues in 1964-65 will exceed Mr. Brockelbank's estimates of \$215,000,000 by another \$20,000,000.

And the Leader Post comments:

Mr. McDonald is on sound ground with his prediction.

Now, I'm just hoping they're right. I'll be happy if this happens again, I really don't think it can, but I'll certainly be very happy if it does happen.

In Alberta of course, they had an unpredicted surplus of \$30,000,000 but in Alberta, of course, that's all right. But here it was bad. I would like to quote just from something that came to my hands yesterday. This is Tax Memo dated February 1964 and it is published by the Canadian Tax Foundation, and they're talking about the federal budget, and it says:

For the 1964-65 year, a number of unusual factors will contribute to one of the largest revenues increases in history. The largest revenue increase in history in the dominion of Canada. Over \$5000,000,000 is this large increase.

The Liberal government at Ottawa, they're going to have a large increase in the revenue, but there it is virtue; here it's a sin. Funny isn't it? It is unlikely that all of these factors will recur again in the same year. Close to \$170,000,000 of the gain will come from the acceleration of the corporation income tax payments schedule. They're having the payments coming in quicker. Over \$150,000,000 extra is expected from the sales tax, the result of extending it last year to building materials and machinery and doubling the rate on them to 8 per cent on April 1st of this year.

Almost \$150,000,000 more is anticipated from personal income tax, due to higher employment and labour income. Canada is booming, Saskatchewan is booming, and this is what the hon. friends don't seem to realize. And a gain of about \$40,000,000 is looked for in custom duties as imports are expected to recover from the surcharge setback and will likely rise with the increase in personal income. So it's all right, Mr. Speaker, when you get an increase of revenue there, here it's a different thing. But then the member said he believed that the underestimation of the revenues was by design and that I wasn't taking the advice of the good people that I have – I'm glad he admits that I have some good people – I want to say that I do listen to their advice. I can't see that I would have any incentive to underestimate by design. It is my object now, I don't know how it will come out, but to come just as close as possible to the right thing in the estimate which are now tabled in this house, we'll have to see how that comes out, but if I'm wrong, I hope I'm wrong on the right side, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The financial critic may talk about the form of our accounts and he said the system of accounts are not the same as the federal government and he produced this issue of Hansard of June 13, 1963, page 93 and showed us this table. Then I got the Public Accounts of Canada, Mr. Speaker, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1963, this is an abridge report and here's the same thing as was in the Hansard, the same balance sheet, assets and liabilities, oh except that it's in bigger print, some of the items in here are interesting. In assets, besides current assets, which are composed of cash and working capital and security held and so forth, then there's an item, sinking fund, other investments, held for retirement of unmatured debts. Exactly the same items we have. They have another one, loans to and investments in crown corporations. They have crown corporations at Ottawa you know, and there's a whole page full of the list of the crown corporations, there are 28 of them 28 of these agencies. And do you know how much we Canadians have got invested in these corporations? \$4,468,000,000 – an asset that is set off against the debt of the dominion of Canada. Other loans and investments, capital assets exactly the same, they value them at \$1.00 as we value our capital assets, and public buildings, the roads, the bridges and everything else in our balance sheet, they're valued at \$1.00.

Now, on the other side, the liabilities. You have the current liabilities of outstanding treasury cheques and so forth, and then the big item, unmatured debt, bonds, \$15,796,000,000 and treasury bills are \$2,165,000,000. The total liabilities, \$24,799,000,000 and on the other side we find a net debt represented by excess of liabilities over net assets, \$13,919,000,000 is the net debt of Canada and their form of accounts is exactly the same as ours. If you want to look in our financial statements, or this is in the public accounts, and it's the same kind of form of balance sheet as presented here, and of course we have, as I have repeated on many occasions, net assets now totalling approximately \$30,000,000.

The opposition seems to object to the fact that we do have no net debt, but we do have no net debt, but we do have no net debt; we have net assets of \$30,000,000 at this time, approximately that amount.

Now nobody can change this situation. You can't change it by screaming about it and the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) can't change it by saying the figures are juggled, because we have Provincial Auditor. When we adopted this system back in 1957, it was copied from the federal government accounts.

I am amazed at some of the statements made by the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) when he says we're borrowing more each year, than we are paying back. Certainly, and it's a pity, it's a pity, Mr. Speaker, that the former government hadn't borrowed more, hadn't been able to borrow more to build power lines and dams and telephone lines and to develop this province, when they were in power. As a matter of fact, they couldn't borrow because at that time, Saskatchewan had no credit and there was no new money borrowed, nothing except refunding from the early 1930's until two years after we were in power. We re-established the credit of this province after the Liberal government had left its ruins so you couldn't borrow any money at all. We're borrowing more money each year than we're paying back, our economy is expanding and developing and we've got to do this if we are going to keep up with the demands for these things. But the worst story that the member for Pelly told, of course, was when he said the \$28,000,000 gross interest, quoting from my estimates, was to be paid by taxpayers, users of electricity and natural gas and telephone services. These are the people that are going to pay it. Well, first of all this is not right, because the taxpayers are not going to pay any of that interest

at all. Not one cent. No, the taxpayers as such are not going to pay a cent of it, and I'll tell you why. But before I do that, I want again to try to point out some things to my hon. friends in regards to this question of net debts, gross debt and gross interest payments and net interest payments.

I know this is pretty hopeless, the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) has got his mind shut and he couldn't take this in, but this is a speech by the Hon. W.J. Patterson, Provincial Treasurer. You may not believe what he says, but I think on this occasion, he was saying a good principle, he said:

It is a common practice with many people when discussing the amount of interest paid by the province, to refer only to gross amounts they pay, without taking into account the interest revenue. This is unfair, and is not calculated to give the public a true picture of the actual situation.

And if you want another one, or two, well there's lots of them, and we can go to the budget speech of January, 1920. This speech in 1920, Mr. Speaker, was made by the Hon. C.A. Dunning about this net debt. I am fully in agreement with the Leader of the Opposition that we should get up to date and it is only because he hasn't yet caught up to the Hon. C.A. Dunning of 1920 that I'm trying to bring him up that far.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brockelbank: —

And so we get to the position, Mr. Speaker, that our net debt per head of \$21.30 is against last year's per capita of \$22.14. I am not afraid personally of increasing our gross debt, so long as that increase is very largely made up of self-sustaining items such as telephones, elevators, creameries and others which assume the interest and do not involve the charging of it to the general public.

There's what Charles Dunning says. You see, I could quote some more but I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that it is really love's labour lost in trying to educate my friend in this respect. They have made up their minds to misunderstand.

Mr. R. Barrie (Pelly): — Would you permit a question? In the case that the taxpayers are not going to pay any of the interest bill in the province, I suppose they won't need to pass item 34 of your estimates.

Mr. Brockelbank: — We could do without passing that; that would be simply an adjustment of accounts, because if you look at the estimate, Mr. Speaker, you'll see that \$28,000,000 of gross interest and then there's reimbursement of \$26,000,000, leaving \$1,781,000 which is a statutory appropriation it doesn't have to be passed but I do want to point out, that the interest receipts shown in this book, for this same year, are not \$1,781,000 but over \$2,500,000 while paying interest of \$1,781,000 the taxpayer hasn't got any interest load at all. That's the fact of the matter.

An Hon. Member: — Socialist arithmetic.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I also want to ask the members opposite and particularly the member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) would this interest be any less burdensome if private corporations had put in the full power system and the telephone system? They would have to charge fees sufficient to enable them to pay the interest on the capital borrowings. Would it be any less? No, it would be more, it would be more, because in the first place, they couldn't borrow as cheap as the government can borrow and in the second place, they would have to have a profit to distribute to their share holders of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things and I just want to say that 20 minutes is much too short a time in which to close this debate, I would like to deal with many other things, but I have one here that I particularly might like to mention. This again, the member for Pelly. When he was up at Star City at a nominating convention there, and

he's quoted in the evening edition of the Leader Post of February 29th on page 13,

The people of Saskatchewan already are burdened with a debt in the amount of \$617,000,000, and the Saskatchewan government continues to borrow money from the United States at the interest rate of 7½ per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have a clipping here and I disclaim the figures that were used in that item.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, I'm awfully glad, because I was certainly disappointed to think that the hon. member would quote stuff that wasn't true because we've never borrowed at 7½ per cent. Five per cent is the greatest that we have paid in United States loan, \$617,000,000, of course I don't think it's the right figure for that either, but up in my constituency, the hon. member did make some of these quotations, that weren't accurate either.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker, I hope we succeed in getting you to leave the chair.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! It's now 25 minutes after 5 o'clock on the standing order 46 of clause 3, the vote must now be taken.

The question being put on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas – 32

MESSIEURS

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

Nays – 18

MESSIEURS

Thatcher	Cameron	Coderre
Klein	McFarlane	MacDougall
Batten (Mrs.)	Staveley	Snedker
McCarthy	Foley	Gallagher
Barrie	Boldt	Erb
Danielson	Horsman	Steuart

The Assembly, accordingly, resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 p.m.