

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**14th Day**

**Tuesday, February 23, 1965.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**ANNOUNCEMENT RE HEAVY WATER PLANT**

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have an announcement to make.

About one hour ago in the House of Commons, the Hon. C.M. Drewry, Minister of Industry, made an announcement of historic significance to the province of Saskatchewan.

The government of Canada has accepted the recommendation of the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, to accept the bid of Western Deuterium Company Limited, for the sale of heavy water. This will mean construction of the world's largest heavy water plant at Estevan, Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The plant will have a capacity of 300 tons and the government of Canada will guarantee the sale of the first five year's production of heavy water at this rate. The cost of the new plant will be \$46,000,000. It will employ in the construction stage about 500 men, and about 200 men when completed. In addition, the plant will utilize more than 1,000 tons of lignite coal from the Estevan area daily.

Saskatchewan should be very proud of this latest industrial accomplishment, for the contract was obtained in competition with at least three other provinces of Canada. The bid of \$14.65 per pound of heavy water, was the lowest bid submitted. It will be recalled that Western Deuterium was an unsuccessful bidder in 1963, when the government first asked for bids on heavy water. At that time the bid went to Nova Scotia. Naturally, we are happy at the outcome of this mission, doubly so since Western Deuterium is a wholly owned private Canadian company. Under this government agreement with Western Deuterium, the plant will be owned by SEDCO and leased back to Western Deuterium who will be responsible for its construction, maintenance and operation. The lease-back agreement will be for twenty-five years. Western Deuterium will have an option to purchase at any earlier date if it wishes.

The government will hold forty per cent of the capital stock of Western Deuterium. The large quantities of steam required to process the heavy water will be supplied by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Boundary Dam plant. The acquisition of this new industry will be a great boon to the economy of Saskatchewan. In addition to the direct employment it creates, it will utilize vast amounts of our lignite reserves, and establish a base for subsidiary industries and suppliers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition):** — Before Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like, first of all, to say that I am sure that everybody on this side of the house is very happy about the coming of this new industry to Saskatchewan . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTION RE. MR. FURLONG'S SALARY**

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and from the announcement of the Premier, it appears that it is a good and probably a logical mixture of public ownership and private enterprise. A government agency is going to own the plant, and rent it to the company. There is another matter I would like to mention, that is

in regard to an article in the Leader Post last night, the headline "Furlong appointed S.P.C. General Manager". I want to say, first of all, that I have known Mr. Furlong for a good while, and I think a good deal of him, and I want to say that I wish him the very best of success in his new position. I was, however, very shocked to see in the Leader Post, this statement:

Mr. Furlong's salary will not be disclosed, Premier Thatcher said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly disrespectful of this legislature, is a reflection on this legislature, that the Premier should make a statement like that, outside of this house. I hope that he will change his mind and that this will not be the policy which he will follow. Too often, on a number of occasions, he has shown the inclination to do things covered up.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should wait until this question is properly asked before he puts thoughts or makes charges against the Premier. This was a news conference. When they get around to this, if we don't answer the question, then he can make his charges, but they haven't asked it yet.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — I was thinking that maybe the Premier might want to say something about this. This is what he meant, that it was not going to be disclosed but I want to assure the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), the question will be asked.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on this matter, I recall having been on the Crown Corporation Committee on numerous occasions. When I wanted to know Mr. Cass-Beggs' salary, the government repeatedly refused to give it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Nonsense. Never.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Yes, repeatedly, so we are just following their example if we do not give it.

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I beg to draw to your attention, and to the attention of this assembly the presence of a very fine group of grade twelve high school students from the town of Willow Bunch. These students are accompanied here this afternoon by their bus driver, Mr. Davis, and their principal, Mr. Verhelst. We sincerely hope that their visit with us this afternoon will not only be enjoyable but educational.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wesley A. Robbins (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are called I would like to draw to the attention of the assembly, a group of twenty-nine students from Albert School in Saskatoon, in the east gallery, along with their teacher, Mrs. McMillan and their principal, Mr. D.L. Hicks. I take particular pleasure in introducing the group to the house because this happens to be my home school. I can not recognize too many of these youngsters from this distance, my eyesight may be failing. The only fellow I can recognize is the fellow with the black eye. He got it by being in connection with the business end of a hockey stick last week.

I am sure that every one in this house will join with me in wishing these youngsters and their teachers an informative and educational stay in the house.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walter Smishek (Regina East):** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I would like to draw attention to a group of students from St. Chad's School. It has just been drawn to my attention, and I would like to welcome them to this assembly and hope that their stay will be enjoyable. They are here with their teacher.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney, (Regina East).

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate last night, I made some comments on remarks that had been made and noticeably had not been made by the financial critic of the opposition (Mr. Blakeney).

While he was talking about the budget, and I should say here, Mr. Speaker, that he did a pretty fair job with a very weak case. I suppose his legal training accounts for this.

It was quite noticeable, as I remarked last night, Mr. Speaker, that he did not talk about some of the things in the budget that the people of this province had long awaited. For example, the million dollars that was spent by the Department of Agriculture on the South Saskatchewan River project; or the \$40,000 that was to be spent this year on the Cumberland House Farm, as compared to \$5,000 to \$10,000 last year; or the \$500,000 incentive program for mineral exploration that was announced in the budget. He did not talk about the votes in the estimates of the Department of Natural Resources that were increased.

Figures like \$14,000 of an increase for parks and recreational facilities, an increase of \$50,000; regional park grants, an increase of \$70,000; nor did he mention the fact that there was a \$31,000 increase in tourist development. No, Mr. Speaker, he picked out a few very choice pieces that he thought would make him some votes in the country, and I suppose they have the desired effect on his NDP friends out in radio-land. He also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that he took exception to the government not giving the auditorium in Regina \$2,000,000. I want to repeat again this afternoon what I said last night, Mr. Speaker, that this government believes that there are more places in the province of Saskatchewan than just the cities of Regina and Saskatoon.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the boundaries of Saskatchewan spread from the Northwest Territories to the United States and from Manitoba to Alberta, and we are going to deal fairly with all the people of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — He rather sneeringly scoffed at our decision to abolish the mineral tax and also that farmers should be allowed to use purple gas. I could go on and on, but I see now that I am on radio time which is very limited. For this reason, I will not go too far on this particular phase of what he had to say, but I would like to make one statement. I think that he actually thought that he had hit a soft spot when he talked about the decrease in the grants for education. I wonder if he listened to the news at dinner time today, Mr. Speaker, when the Trustees' Association of the province was commending the government for the generous grants that they are giving towards education.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

As I said last night, Mr. Speaker, only once before was there a larger increase in the grants to education in this province. He mentioned the fact that last year there was \$5,200,000 of an increase in grants to education, and as I said last night, the year before it was only \$2,400,000 of an increase and the year before that, \$2,700,000 of an increase, less than the increase in grants that is going to be provided by this government for education, Mr. Speaker. So his argument does not hold too much water.

When I was finishing my remarks last night, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about something that the party on the other side should be very shy about mentioning the matter of political patronage. I recall while he was speaking yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that he held up a list of eight names and he said, "These are the people that the Liberal party is employing, political heelers". Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people that the Liberal party employs likely vote one way or another, and I think that the Liberal party has the right as the government of this province, to hire the people that they think can run the government of this province best, and it

just so happens, Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that in most cases Socialists can not run the government of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — But I want to repeat what I said before, Mr. Speaker, I think there were one or two of these people who happened to be defeated Liberal candidates. There were others who had very good qualifications for their jobs. I would just like to mention one of the people who was a defeated Liberal candidate. I do not think people on the other side of the house should question his ability at all — Mr. Walter Erb. Tommy Douglas appointed him as a minister of a CCF government in this province. He must have had a lot of confidence in his ability, and that is why he is holding the job that he holds today, Mr. Speaker.

I notice that the member for Regina West, the financial critic of the opposition (Mr. Blakeney) did not mention the fact that this government had in their employ, since coming into office, a former CCF cabinet minister, Mr. O. Turnbull, teaching at the University of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend all afternoon, but I could, relating to this house and to the people of this province the names of some of the people who, because of their political work in the past, got jobs from the CCF government. I think this has been gone over time and time again, and I am not going to bore the house with this, but I want to say once again that of the people that the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) spoke of yesterday, only one or two of them happen to be defeated Liberal candidates.

Do you know that the record of the previous government, the CCF government, was the worst record for political patronage of any government in this country, past or present? Naturally, when a government goes to hire people, most people that they do hire, vote Liberal or they vote Conservative or they vote CCF. Well, the people who sat across the way, regardless of whether they had qualifications or not, gave their friends jobs. People like Mr. Bentley, for example. I mentioned his name last night, and I would just like to repeat it today, because I found a little memo afterwards to the effect that he was a CCF member from 1945 until 1949, and that, when he was defeated in 1949, he was appointed as director of staff training, and I got hold of a memo this morning that he sent to all his field officers while he was a director of staff training, and here is what the memo said:

Would you please supply me with the names of all the field officers in your department, together with their addresses and the areas in which they work, by constituencies, if possible.

Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, this man must have been hired, not only because of his past performance and what he had done for the CCF, but what he was going to do after he was hired.

I will go on, Mr. Speaker. What about names like Mr. L.L. Lloyd, brother of the Premier? What about Mr. Alan McCallum, defeated CCF candidate in 1934, subsequently appointed as Deputy Minister of Education and Mr. J.O. Probe, M.P. for Regina, 1945 to 1949? After he was defeated in 1949, he was appointed Director of Civil Defence.

I want to repeat once again a name that I mentioned last night because I noticed the whole family was hired in this particular case — Mr. O.W. Valleau, M.L.A. for Melfort, 1938 to 1948 and Minister of Social Welfare in the first CCF government. When he was defeated in 1948, he was appointed Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board. His son ran in the Last Mountain constituency. When he was defeated he got a job, and I notice on the files that even his wife got a job as a temporary secretary in this government. This is a sort of a family affair, Mr. Speaker!

Then there is John Burton, and there is Kim Thorson. There are a lot more of them, Mr. Speaker. I can't spend all afternoon relating these names to the house and to the people of this province, but I think that if there is any group in this province, or in this country, that shouldn't talk about political patronage, it is the people on the other side of this house. Especially, Mr. Speaker, the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) who happened to be an employee of the former CCF government. Mr. A.E. Blakeney was working with the Securities Commission up until the time he was a CCF candidate. Mr. Ed. Whelan, the member for Regina North, worked with the Mediation Board, and as I mentioned last night, the member for Regina West, the lady member (Mrs.

Cooper), and Mr. W.J. Berezowsky, people who are sitting here in this house today, worked for the government.

Mr. Speaker, these people had it working both ways. If they could not get elected, they worked for the government. They quit working for the government when they could get elected. If they got defeated they went back and worked for the government. Surely, Mr. Speaker, these are the last people that should talk about political patronage! In closing my remarks on this particular subject, Mr. Speaker, I only want to say that all that is the matter with the people that sit opposite is that they are very bitter today because there is no haven of refuge for defeated CCFers from one end of Canada to the other.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I want to turn my remarks now Mr. Speaker, to the budget. I want to commend the Provincial Treasurer for the job that he did in bringing down this budget. I have confidence that the Provincial Treasurer of this province is the most able administrator that this province has seen in many, many years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — When he brought down the budget, the other day, he outlined the principles the government is going to pursue in the following months and I want to review these principles at this time.

First of all, our concern regarding high taxes, and our moves to bring taxes down. Secondly, the change in the economic and political climate of this province to induce development and investment. Thirdly, our concern for raising the standard of living of our people; and fourthly, providing the best services that can be provided for by the peoples' own tax money in all fields of government service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why was this budget possible? Because sound business principles are being applied to the running of government in this province since May of last year. If I, or the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, (Mr. Howes) who sits in front of me; or the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) who sits behind me, or any other farmer in this assembly, didn't apply those same principles to the running of our farms, we wouldn't be on our farms, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Meadow Lake, (Mr. Coupland) or the member for Shaunavon, (Mr. Larochelle) or the member for Rosetown, (Mr. Loken) or any other member of this house happens to be a businessman, didn't apply those same business principles to the running of their business they would not have stayed in business, Mr. Speaker. I say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that because the people that sit to your left, did not apply sound business principles to the running of the government, they find themselves in the opposition today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — For the first time in twenty years, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are getting some relief from high taxes. Too long has the Socialist government extracted every last possible penny from the taxpayers of this province, In fact, I think that their defeat last June could largely be attributed to their attitude to the taxpayers of this province.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, a twenty per cent reduction of the sales tax, saving the people of this province \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 is not to be scoffed at by our Socialist friends. Surely, the \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000 the farmers will save on tax free gas for farm trucks is a step towards helping the farmers of this province.

But my friends across the way say that the farmers should not burn tax free gas in their trucks. Well, I can understand the member for Regina West or any of the city members saying this, but I cannot quite see the member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), or the member for Pelly (Mr. Larson), or thee member for Watrous (Mr. Broten), or even the dean of the house, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), telling the farmers in that part of the province that they should not use tax free gas, Mr. Speaker, but that is exactly what they will be saying if they stand up in this house and vote against this budget.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker, applies to the reduction in sales

tax. Do you mean to say that the Mayor of Regina (Mr. Baker), who incidentally happens to be in his seat this afternoon for a change, is going to tell the people of this city and the people of Saskatchewan, that they do not deserve to save \$9,500,000 to \$10,000,000 because of the reduction of sales tax? Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what he is saying if he stands up and votes against this budget, and I would think from the program that he has outlined in this house that he is the last man in this province that should be voting against anything that is for the people of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Mr. Speaker, the difference between the Socialists and the Liberals was expressed pretty clearly in the budget the other afternoon. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) and members who sit to your right, believe that the people of this province have a right to spend some of their own money. We have enough faith in the good judgment of Saskatchewan people to believe they can invest the money they save in tax dollars just as well as the government can invest that money, and it is my hope that the money that the people of Saskatchewan save in tax reductions this year will be invested in Saskatchewan industries. I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan will be proud to have a part in helping the development of this province in the next ten years, and I might say that it is only by investing their savings that they will have a real share in the development of this province. That development for which this budget is designed is the very thing that will provide the funds for government services we need, and raise the standard of living of the Saskatchewan people.

The Socialists think that they, and they alone, Mr. Speaker, should spend the people's money. Well, Mr. Speaker, the record of the opposition speaks for itself. By extracting the people's money to invest for them, they have just kept Saskatchewan from ten to fifteen years behind the rest of this country.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it is not good taste for any of us to drag down, to malign, or condemn, or to accuse people on the other side of the house of always being the guilty ones, but I can tell you, Sir, that I am getting a little bit tired of listening to people who sit to your left suggesting that they and they alone, have a monopoly on all virtues, and that the Liberal party and its members have all the vices. This holier-than-thou attitude of the NDP has been carried just a little bit too far, Mr. Speaker. They are supposed to be the only party that operates a clean election campaign and the only party that can be trusted with public funds. In their own right they are the only true custodians of our natural resources, and no one but the Socialists ever thinks about our people. The little man, the man on the street, the small farmer, the wage earner, or the poor underprivileged family that must have to accept social aid.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there was a time when I might have been taken in by this sympathetic smooth talk of the Socialists. Well, I can tell you that after I went through the 1964 election, if I have ever been fooled in the past, I will not be fooled in the future by Socialist smooth talk.

After the methods that they used in my constituency to try and win that seat for the Socialists, if they thought it was honorable, they found out that it wasn't very fruitful, Mr. Speaker.

The Liberal party, according to the people on your left, Sir, are not to be trusted with public funds. Well, I only want to say that from the record of the last eight or nine months of this government, from what has been said in this house, I would think that the people to your right are more to be trusted with public funds than the people to your left, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, we are more to be trusted with public documents too.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Our Socialist friends would have you believe that some money-hungry millionaire was going to steal all our forests under the Liberals, or some shady American was going to extract all our oil and take off without us seeing it. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I would rather see some pulp company or some sawmill operator come into this province to develop our forests, to produce something for this province . . .

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — What about after they are gone?

**Mr. Gallagher:** — . . . and to provide homes and jobs for our people, than to see our forests burn down or rot with a crown monopoly handling all the harvest of Saskatchewan's forest products. As far as our oil fields, or where other American investment is concerned, it is far better for the people of this province if we risk our capital to develop our oil resources, our mineral resources, or any other investment we might make to provide wealth in this province and jobs for Saskatchewan people, than the dog-in-the-manger attitude of the Socialists.

This last point, Mr. Speaker, that I mentioned a moment ago that only Socialists represent the people, the small farmer, the wage earner, the worker, the under-privileged, this point, Mr. Speaker, has been worn out by my friends who sit across the way.

I think the people who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, have given up the idea that they are friends of the small farmer any more, and if they vote against this budget, Mr. Speaker, we will know where they stand in that regard. They still seem to be persistent though, in trying to paint the Liberal party as being anti-labor, anti-co-op, and anti-reform. I don't want to bore this house, Mr. Speaker, with reading into the record all the legislation that has been passed by Liberal governments, both federal and provincial, regarding labor. I think I did this a year or two ago and I want to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that all the basic labor legislation that is on the statute books of Canada today and in this province was passed by Liberal governments. Practically all the social reform legislation that we have in this country, legislation to help farmers, workers, unemployed, old people, and the under-privileged, was passed by Liberal governments.

Then to make good fellows of themselves, Mr. Speaker, they get up and they suggest that we should increase the minimum wage by twenty-five cents an hour. One of them even suggested forty cents an hour. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that they would expect us to do as much in one year as they did in twenty years. I don't think we will be able to get the minimum wage up, Mr. Speaker, quite as much in one year as the Socialists did in twenty years. But I do believe that before four years are up, we will be able to do a lot more for the working people than our Socialist friends did in twenty years. In fact, the most they did was to export them to other provinces. If this Liberal government cannot do more for labor in its first term of office than the Socialists did in twenty years, we won't deserve the support of labor in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I think it must worry the Socialists. They feel they are losing their grip on labor. They are like a drowning man clinging to a straw. I think they are beginning to realize that it is only the top dogs in the union that will be left for the NDP and, as for unions, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it was Liberal governments that gave the people the right to organize unions in this country, a right that every man and woman who has to work for a living should have, and it will be a Liberal government, Mr. Speaker, that will restore to the workers the right to run their own unions and not have them run by some power-hungry Socialist at the top, who wants to use the rank and file members as pawns or puppets.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — This is the difference, Mr. Speaker, between the Liberals and the Socialists. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, it is down right disgusting to listen to the garble that emanates from the mouth of the member for Regina East, and he has been quite bold in this house. Now he should talk, he is not looking after . . .

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member for Regina East has not spoken in this debate.

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — . . . in this house.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Yes, but you can not refer to a previous debate.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I am not talking about a pre-

vious debate. I mentioned nothing about it. I am not talking about the Mayor either, Mr. Mayor. I am referring to the member to your right. Mr. Speaker, he is not looking after labor. He is one of these power-hungry individuals who is taking advantage of union members for his own political gain.

Now, what about co-op's, Mr. Speaker? We all know what the former government tried to do. They tried to make the co-op's a political movement. There are areas in this province where if you were not a prominent NDP, you could not be elected to the board of a co-operative organization. In fact, some NDP members make no bones about what their intentions were in this regard. I recall in this house, only about two or three years ago, when the former member for Bengough stood up in this house and said, the CCF is the political arm of the co-operative movement. What a statement, Mr. Speaker! I think more of the co-operative movement than to suggest that any party should be their political arm. They should not have a political arm if they are going to grow and flourish. The co-op's, Mr. Speaker, were set up many years ago, not by socialists, but by progressive, free enterprise people. They were set up by both producers and consumers to give service to their members and to protect them against exploitation by any group or any individual who might try to exploit them.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to be over my radio time, and I am going to leave some of this out. I only want to say at this point that the founders of the United Grain Growers, the Grain Growers Grain Company, the founders of the Pool, and the founders of the first Co-operative Consumer Organizations in this province did not set these organizations up to make political organizations out of them. They set them up to protect the people that belong to them, from being exploited and to give service at cost to the people that belong to them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Mr. Speaker, the co-operative movement is a good movement. It has served a useful purpose, and rather than politicians of any party trying to use it for political gain, the co-operative movement should be the guiding conscience of a free enterprise system. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker, between our attitude toward the co-operative movement and the socialist attitude toward the co-operative movement.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this talk that emanates from the people who sit to your left as being the people who represent the little man, the farmer, the worker, and the under-privileged, has gone a little bit too far. I have the privilege of representing a seat that was settled many years ago by people from central and eastern Europe. The majority of my constituents are of Ukrainian and German background. Many of them are small farmers, many of whose sons and daughters are the working people in the city of Yorkton, and in the villages of my constituency. Many of the business people of my constituency are the sons and daughters of these pioneers. They are industrious people. They are proud people and they are thrifty people. They are among the best farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker. They have been successful in business and in the professions. All they asked for or all they expected when they settled in this country was a chance to carve out their own future without some socialist planning it for them. I want to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, I consider it an insult to my constituents for some socialist to stand up in this house or outside of it and tell my people that they and they alone are concerned with their welfare. Mr. Speaker, these people fled from a socialist country to come here and have the opportunity to build this country to what it is today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — They want a chance to plan their own future, Mr. Speaker, and that chance was restored to them last April 22nd.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) has called the budget a development budget. I think he named it well. It outlines the path the government will follow. It reflects the attitude of this government towards developing Saskatchewan for our people. I think it is also a budget of change, a budget of promise, and a budget of hope. It is also a change in government attitude toward investors, a promise for long past due relief, hope for the farmers, hope for our business people, hope for the men



and women of our labor force, hope that all the people of this province might share in the riches our province was blessed with, and hope for every man and woman, for every boy and girl for a better life and a richer future. It is going to be a real pleasure, Mr. Speaker, for me to support this budget and I am going to vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your new position, and I am sure it is an honor to your constituency and I know that you will do your best in keeping good order in the house.

I also want to thank the voters in my constituency for having returned me to this house for the third time. I took part in four-way fights, three-way fights, and last summer we heard of a saw-off but finally, at the last hour, the Conservative candidate decided that maybe it was just as well to give the Liberals their wish, and so we had a two-way fight. We had a good battle, and, by the way, we have only five votes that are not counted. There were only five challenged votes. We got along very well. Both the Conservative and Liberal candidates were good fellows, and just to show that they were quite agreeable, we have not got 400 votes that were not counted. I got in with a majority of 207 votes which I think was a substantial majority. I want to thank the people of my constituency for having turned out and placed their confidence in me and I consider it an honor to represent these people. I can assure the people of my constituency, whether they are Liberals, Conservatives, Social Credit, or CCF, that I will represent them with fairness, regardless of their race, color or creed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — After listening to the debate, I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) who is taking the place of Mr. Lloyd who is in hospital in Saskatoon. We hope Mr. Lloyd comes back soon. But I want to say that the dean of the house has sure demonstrated his ability in this session.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I want to congratulate the financial critic, (Mr. Blakeney) for the magnificent way in which he spoke yesterday. I want to compliment him also. When the Premier delivered his Budget Speech, the financial critic remained absolutely silent. I think that he raised the dignity of the house by doing so. But the Premier did not award him the same respect. It is not surprising that he decides once in a while to kick in doors and to dig in the garbage cans and so on, to carry on his political ambitions. I also want to compliment the two ladies of this house. I want to say that it adds color to this house, with flowers on each corner, and two nice lady members, and it helps the dignity of the house, I would say.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I want to give them full marks for delivering such wonderful speeches and as far as the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is concerned, I will say that he did not get full marks. He failed and I hope he writes again some day.

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — On a point of order, I . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — You failed . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — I wish you . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — I never referred to any previous debate, and I wish you would sit down. I was not referring to any previous debate. I said that you failed, and you failed. That is the way I said it.

As far as local governments in my constituency are concerned, I want to congratulate them for the wonderful co-operation they have given the

previous government and I know they will give this government the same cooperation that they gave the CCF government.

The previous government had a wonderful program and they took part in it whether it was sewer and water, power, or natural gas. The CCF government got wonderful co-operation and I want to tell the members on the other side of the house that they can expect the same degree of co-operation from the local governments in my constituency.

I hope that this atmosphere will continue to prevail. It is the only way that we can make our country move ahead — to lay our political differences aside and work for the welfare of the country. Some of the programs that I am hopeful that the government at this time will carry out, is regarding regional parks. We have three wonderful lakes in my constituency that can be improved and a regional parks board has been set up and work is going in that direction. I am asking the present government to be kind to them and help them out all they can.

I have not much time so I am going to make my remarks as brief as possible. We are going to celebrate this year, our sixtieth anniversary. I think that the pioneers of this country did a wonderful job and that in every year and in every decade, people dedicated their lives to improving our country. We are only sixty years old and we want to build on the foundation that was laid by our pioneers. Sixty years in the life of a person may be a long time, but in the life of a nation, it is a very short time. I think one of the things that we should work for this year is to build the Brotherhood of Man. Too often in this house, I have listened to people trying to pit labor against farmer, and farmer against labor, and people who will do that will try to pit father against son, and son against father, and mother against daughter.

This is the kind of attitude that is being built up today and I do not like it. Those are the attitudes that bring world wars. So during this year, let us dedicate ourselves to the Brotherhood of Man. This is what we need.

I also want to say a few words about the new flag. We had quarrels about it but we must accept it. I think that a lot of wounds that were opened up over it were unnecessary. I hope that they will heal up very soon.

I want to talk about local government. When the grid roads started that was the program, I would say, that took the cars off the blocks. We used to put our cars on blocks for six months of the year, and the grid road program was the program that got the cars rolling. By driving around, they paid gasoline taxes and thus they built more roads. Now, as the program is coming to an end, these members across the way seem to think that the municipalities can cut down on their spending. I am very sorry that I can not agree with the way the budget is drawn up. The cutting back on funds for municipalities means that local governments are going to have to raise their taxes. You cannot have it both ways. I think we should have had a substantial increase in the money allocated to municipalities. I want to make a few comparisons here. Back in 1949 and 1950 when the public revenue tax was paid, and the government of Saskatchewan took \$1,600,000 away from the municipalities and paid back \$723,000, they were paying that out of the money collected from municipalities. But in 1958, practically \$5,000,000 was paid to municipalities and what they got back from municipalities was a matter of a few thousand dollars. This enabled the municipalities to build the roads they have today. But their problems do not end there, because the grid road program is coming to an end, and we can see by the budget that there is a cutback in the amount of money that they are going to receive this year.

Now, let us face it. If you look at the S.A.R.M. resolutions that are going to be presented this year, you will find that they are asking for help in maintaining these grid roads and help to build more roads.

Also, they fondly imagine that farmers want purple gas. But here is a resolution from meetings of Districts no. 1 and no. 2:

Whereas the provincial government has proposed to permit the use of purple gas in farm trucks, and whereas it is felt that farmers in general do not object to paying gasoline tax on fuel used in farm trucks providing for their expenditure . . .

Therefore, be it resolved that the government of Saskatchewan be requested to return the gaso-

line revenue from farm trucks to the rural municipality for road construction and maintenance purposes rather than to permit the use of purple gas in farm trucks.

Believe you me, we drove too long on purple gas roads, and it looks as if that is what we are going back to or the municipalities are going to have to raise their taxes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I am not buying that kind of deal. I think that one of the main issues is that the farmers want a fair return for their products so that they will be able to pay these taxes. The loss of revenue due to the cut in grain prices that the farmer has to face now is more than twice the tax for school purposes, on their land. This is the loss they are faced with today. It will take a lot of purple gas to pay for that.

My time is running out, but I must deal with a few other things. I want to point out that some are wondering how you will improve the farm problem. I would say that you can't, but that the federal government can by taking a slice of the military budget and feeding it into the farm economy. It will create jobs and give the farmer a better standard of living and it will feed the hungry people of the world.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — That is what will bring peace to the world. As long as you have 200,000,000 people dying of starvation, you cannot expect to have peace. These people will not buy any government system that does not provide them with a full stomach and shelter and medical care.

I would like to say a few words about the agricultural lease. I want to touch on it briefly as my time is running out. I want to tell the Minister that I am not against the allocation committee for crown leases. I expect that he should be just as fair in my constituency as people have been fair before, because in my constituency I can take him around and show him a lot of Liberals who have crown leases. As far as I am concerned, I have no knowledge of any leases being granted in my constituency on the basis of political patronage.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I am not afraid to face that question any day. Now, I want to say a few words about our civil servants. I have to cut my speech very short. The people of this province lost some of their freedom. I think there is one letter that was never quoted in this house and I am going to quote it now. It is a letter from the Power Corporation to all employees. This is a typed copy that was mailed out November 3rd, 1964. On paragraph five this is what it says:

Employees who wish to stand for or who are elected to the legislative assembly of the province of Saskatchewan, must terminate employment with the corporation.

I want to remind the members opposite that we passed a bill last year for a man named Dojack who wanted to run for the Liberals and what was his occupation? You know very well, that he was a member of the teaching staff of the Boys' School. This is the kind of freedom the CCF were giving.

I can use another example in my constituency, where the Ag. Rep. secretary belongs to the Liberal executive. We never questioned his ability to do the job as long as the job was well done. I said he has the right, and I thought we had outgrown this business of choosing civil servants on the basis of political background.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — Now, I will continue quoting this letter:

Activities by employees in provincial political

affairs which, in the management's opinion is not in the best interest of the corporation, are not permitted. It must be recognized that political activities even outside the working hours may cause serious difficulties in dealing with the public corporation business and in relationship with the corporation among supervisory staff.

There you are, telling the employee who has to climb the power-line pole and hang the transformers and put the insulators on, that even after hours, he cannot take part in politics.

I talked to this fellow. I am not going to divulge his name, but this is a typed copy of the letter that was sent out and I am prepared to table it. This is the kind of Liberal freedom that we have in my constituency, and believe me, neither the civil servants nor the people in general, buy this stuff. I believe that they should have freedom, and this letter definitely denies it to the people who are working for the Power Corporation.

I do not want to belabor this point too long, but I want to talk about the by-election that took place recently. I would like to give you a little run-down of the history of by-elections. In Turtleford, a few years back, they elected a Liberal. After a few years of being represented by a Liberal, they returned to the CCF. In Weyburn, they elected a Liberal, but after a year or so, the CCF was re-elected again. Then, when you get to Prince Albert, if there were not some 400 votes sitting in envelopes, I do not know if the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) would be sitting over there.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — So, when it got to Hanley, after about six months of Liberal rule, the people decided that they wanted a CCF representative in no uncertain terms. The people of Hanley said "No" to many things. They said "No" to the giveaway of our natural resources. They said "No" to such things as liquor advertising that was protested by the Temperance Association and Mr. Premier got a brief on that. They said "No" to the sale of liquor in drug stores. They said "No" to the mafia. They said "No" to many things, and this is why I am going to say "No" to the budget and "Yes" to the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East):** — Mr. Speaker, the government has presented to this house, in its own words "a prediction of what is likely to happen in the year ahead" — a prediction which fails to take account of the economic and social changes which are taking place in Saskatchewan and in Canada. The Premier, also Provincial Treasurer, has stated the kind of principles that the government intends to pursue in the coming months as well as the rationale of those promises that his party made to the electors, a rationale which is negative, which is backward and which is regressive. The budget is a setting of priorities, a place where pious remarks take concrete action.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech sets out four priorities. (1) The Liberal promises which were hastily and for the most part, ill-conceived and which are not being fulfilled. (2) It charges that taxes in Saskatchewan are higher than in the rest of Canada. This is untrue, Mr. Speaker, and it fails to explain that taxes in British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec are higher, that in fact 72 per cent of Canadians pay more taxes and receive less services than Saskatchewan citizens did under the CCF administration.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — (3) That development will only take place in a new economic and political climate. This too is incorrect. Significantly in the fourth and last place, and I quote:

That there remains much to be done to improve living standards for our people.

A priority which this side of the house is dedicated to placing first and foremost.

Let me first, Mr. Speaker, analyse the budget, not on my priori-

ties but on those of the government. Let me draw to the attention of the members of the house the platform of the Liberal candidates in the city of Regina. They made ten pledges. One only, is reflected in the budget — the reduction of sales tax. But where, Mr. Speaker, are the other items? I draw to the attention of the house, a leaflet that was distributed during the last election campaign by the Liberal party. It is called "A New Deal for Regina". Where, Mr. Speaker, is the tax exemption of children's clothing and shoes? Where are the free text books for grades one to grade twelve? Where is the fifty per cent of all education costs that the province was going to pay, or approximately \$1,500,000 additional for the city of Regina alone?

Where is Regina's share of the gas tax revenues which the Regina Liberals promised the city for road construction and maintenance? What happened to the pledge that Saskatchewan government and Crown Corporation buildings pay taxes at the established mill rate? Where is the exemption of city purchases from the provincial sales tax? Where is the General Hospital which we were told would be erected "immediately"? Or the 600 bed Geriatric Centre which we were told would be provided "immediately"? Where are the increased grants for provision of adequate nursing homes? It was on these promises, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member from Regina South, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) was elected. The people of Regina are entitled to know where he now stands on the promises that he made. But so far, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Regina South (Mr. Grant) has been glued to his chair. We have not heard from him. Are these promises which Liberal candidates expounded but never expected to be fulfilled?

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the inconsistencies in the budget. Agriculture diversification and development is to be given prominence, yet the technical resources in the Department of Agriculture are reduced; the Animal Industry branch, four positions eliminated and \$40,000; the Plant Industry Branch is cut by \$200,000; seven positions are eliminated in the Representatives Branch and \$40,000; the General Agriculture Assistance has a \$40,000 cut.

In spite of being told that the economy is booming, six per cent of the labor force in Canada remains unemployed. About 22,000 persons in Saskatchewan are presently unemployed. But we are told that a labor shortage looms in Saskatchewan.

We are told that this government will increase employment in the non-agricultural sector by ten per cent per year over the next four years — 80,000 new jobs in the next four year period. But what does this government do to the Department of Labour budget? It reduces it by fourteen positions and \$100,000. Every branch but one has a smaller staff. Every branch but one has less money. Mr. Speaker, in the 1964-1965 budget, the CCF provided \$10,370 for a Women's Bureau in the Department of Labour. The Liberals completely ignored this provision until a few weeks before the Hanley by-election. Then the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) issued a statement to the press announcing the establishment of a Women's Bureau. Here is the way the story appeared in the Star Phoenix of November 28th:

Appointment of Miss Mary Rocan as Supervisor of the newly-established Women's Bureau of the provincial Department of Labour was announced today by Labour Minister Lionel Coderre. Special attention will be given to the Bureau to conditions of labor and legislation affecting working mothers, the effect of technical change on women's employment, and the opportunities for vocational and technical training.

After all this fanfare, when I opened the estimates to page 27, what did I find under the Women's Bureau? I draw it to your attention. No appropriation under the expenses. No appropriation under the Women's Bureau for personnel services. No appropriation at all, Mr. Speaker. The Women's Bureau has been wiped out, after only two and one half months of existence.

The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is also the Minister in charge of Co-operative Development and here the budget reveals the same formula — the budget reduced by five positions and \$56,000. These are the friends of labor. These are the friends of co-operatives that the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) was talking about.

Technical education appears in the budget, but it appears too little and too late. And I might note that the net amount being put up by the province for technical education is not \$1,000,000 but is \$250,000, the

balance \$750,000 will be paid by the federal government.

In the face of a larger population, more people in older age groups and chronic unemployment, the budget of the Department of Social Welfare is held static. No increase is allowed for social aid. Supplemental allowances are cut by \$10,000. Old age assistance is reduced by \$80,000. Blind pensions are reduced by \$11,000. Construction grants for facilities to the aged are reduced by \$200,000.

This government has been outraged at the cost of social welfare payments but the very people who intelligently administer the program, and who are essential in the early review of cases, the staff in the Regional Services Branch, are held constant — really a cut when one takes into account salary increases and other costs.

The result is one of two things. Either people who need social aid will be denied it, or social aid will increase because a routine review of present recipients will now take place some months later.

The treatment of the social welfare budget is added evidence that this government is planning a further regressive step to foist on the municipalities a larger share of the costs of the indigent, a program which is a provincial responsibility and over which the citizens of Regina will have no control and must accept because the indigent tends to move to areas of employment and congregate in urban centres. The province should be paying the city to administer their programs and should assume 100 per cent of the cost — not 93 per cent, and surely not a lower percentage as the Premier has proposed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — At a time when urban changes are pressing upon us, the paltry sum of \$6,500 as grants for urban development has been reduced to \$2,250. At a time when the government has been concerned about economy, it now proposes to hand out \$100,000 of government printing to weekly newspapers. Where are the public tenders? Will union shops be allowed to bid on these, or is this to be parcelled out on the basis of political support?

The budget, on the one hand proposes to make and guarantee loans to industry on a massive scale. On the other hand, the government indicates it will try to dispose of the Wizewood Plant, a recipient of a loan from the former CCF government. Is this the new economic and political climate which the Liberals want? Regina today would not have a steel plant and the 550 jobs if this attitude had prevailed. At this rate we will deter industry and the "risk takers", not assist them. Is this the type of confidence — a loan one day, and a sell-out to their friends the next?

Last year, this house voted unanimously for a new base hospital for southern Saskatchewan. The cost of the base hospital would be \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000. The budget provides a measly \$100,000 for the hospital. Must southern Saskatchewan wait for decades before the Liberals are prepared to act or does the government propose to place upon the citizens of Regina the cost of a new hospital, a facility which will serve mostly citizens outside Regina, at a cost to the over-burdened property owner now living in Regina?

Oh yes, the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) skated around the new hospital yesterday, but he did not commit his Department or the government to approve a provincially built and paid for hospital. I want to hear this commitment from the Minister before this house adjourns.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Let me turn, Mr. Speaker, to the single greatest weakness of the budget. I am dismayed at the government's lack of fiscal understanding of the costs of primary and secondary education. There is indeed a tax debate going on in the province, but it is not on the level of taxes, but on the equity of taxes. The oppressive tax situation, which members opposite are fond of talking about, does not centre on the sales tax, it centres upon the property tax and this government has done absolutely nothing about it. Indeed, in its attitude to hospitals, social welfare, and now, education is moving to place an intolerable burden on the farmer and the home owner. Property taxes for the financing of general services are regressive, inequitable, and out-moded. There is absolutely no validity or rationale to the property tax as it presently prevails.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up, and I must close by saying I will support the amendment. I must oppose the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — In rising to take part in this debate, it affords me my first opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, for the very high office you hold in this legislature. I am sure that it has not only brought great pride to the people you represent, but I am certain it has enhanced the prestige of the Liberal party and the government to your right. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating all the new members in the house, and especially to the new members on the government side of the house. I don't think in the history of Saskatchewan there was ever as many new people came in with the abilities that our new members have on this side. They have done themselves proud in debate. They have done themselves proud in committee, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I can speak for the Premier and my colleagues in assuring you and assuring the people of the province that as a result of their presence here, the future is great for the Liberal party and for all people in Saskatchewan.

I want to especially congratulate my neighboring representatives, Mr. Thomas Weatherald in the constituency of Cannington, who replaced my former colleague, Mr. Ross McCarthy. I want to congratulate our very able Attorney General, Mr. Darrel Heald, who is my neighbor to the west in Lumsden, and another very efficient young member, Mr. Cy MacDonald, my neighbor in Milestone. I want to express my sincere appreciation this afternoon, along with my colleague from Estevan, in the announcement today of this tremendous new industry, The Heavy Water Plant in his city.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, I must, before I proceed, thank the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, for once again giving me the opportunity to represent them in this house and in this government and I want to thank the five former CCF cabinet ministers who came down to take part in the election campaign, and help me out. I want to also thank the three former CCF-NDP MLAs who came down to help me out, and I want to also thank the former federal Minister of Agriculture, who came down for a week and held two meetings a day. He also did a great deal to help me out.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that during the election campaign I did not have time myself to hold any meetings. I held one meeting in my own constituency, but I was busy telling my people and notifying them of the meetings to be held by the five former CCF cabinet ministers, the three former CCF MLAs, and the federal Minister of Agriculture, to make sure the crowds got out and attended their meetings, and because we heard speeches from them similar to what we heard from the former Minister of Health (Mr. Blakeney) yesterday, and the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) today, I didn't have to hold any meetings on my own.

I want to thank the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley for having given me the highest Liberal vote in the history of that constituency. They gave us the highest Liberal majority in the history of that constituency, and they gave the smallest vote for a CCF candidate in the history of that constituency. In fact, the CCF candidate in the past election was only able to garner 28 per cent of the vote, and I have the honor and the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to inform the house that the CCF are so little thought of down there that we have one poll where they never even got one vote. Not even the poll clerk or the deputy returning officer supported them.

Mr. Speaker, I want at this time, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) for presenting a budget which is the most realistic and far-reaching that I have ever heard in this house since entering it several years ago.

We are at long last able to speak with sincerity about industry moving into this province on a large scale. Previous budget addresses could only talk about bolstering sagging crown corporations. We are talking, not about promises, but about real accomplishments. I am proud to be associated with a government which will go down in history as the one that rescued the province of Saskatchewan from the Socialist economic experiment.

We have a new government patterned after the governments in the rest of the provinces of Canada which during these past twenty years have

moved out in front in development and their people have been enjoying the fruits of industrial growth, while here in Saskatchewan the Socialist government sat on their proverbial posteriors waiting for some miracle to happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, something did happen. The people elected a Liberal government — one which will not sit idly by and watch the other provinces attract industry, and our youth, into jobs outside the province.

The task of bringing industry to the province will be difficult in the beginning simply because much has to be done to overcome the climate that the previous government created. The programs which the government unfortunately adopted to discourage industry from locating here have to be removed and new ones will have to be substituted. This, Mr. Speaker, will be our goal, and I am sure that you realize as we do, and the people of Saskatchewan do, that up to the moment we have been tremendously successful.

Furthermore, we will have to stop the flow of university graduates to other provinces in Canada and across the border. We have a large investment in the youth of our province and it is unfortunate that in the past we have not been able to retain them for the benefit of Saskatchewan. The solution to retaining them is to make this province the kind of place where our youth will be proud to stay from both an economic and a social standpoint.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Our economic base under the previous government was never encouraged to broaden. We have the best grain growing potential in the world and not even the previous government could have changed that. But we also have the greatest potential for other agricultural pursuits. It is necessary to broaden our agricultural base to encourage the breeding and feeding of livestock of all kinds in order to capture the lucrative markets, not only of eastern Canada, but across the line and in Europe. The growing of specialized crops, to cope with the problem, in the event of a limited market for wheat, should be fought. Encouragement should be given to the supplying of necessary feed and food supplements throughout the province so that cattlemen can be assured of all the supplies necessary to maintain livestock herds which will find a ready market, both inside and outside of Canada.

In the grain basket of the world, it is fair to expect to find the development of products which require grain as a prime ingredient. This province should and could be bristling with abbatoirs, feed mills, flour mills and other allied industries.

This province has natural resources and mineral products, forest products, and products of water. The former government did very little to encourage the development of these resources. In the years ahead it will become abundantly clear that the blame for the lack of the development of this province over the past twenty years rests squarely on the shoulders of our Socialist friends across the way.

Pulp and timber which abound in the north has been left to be harvested by the elements, and notably by forest fires, while other provinces have been enjoying royalties and taxes from industrialists who are developing large pulp and lumber mills within their bounds, and Mr. Speaker, we will be announcing new industries in this regard in the very near future.

Industrialists on the other hand have been discouraged from entering the province because of the Socialist's signs posted on the borders, "Crown Corporations Only". Yes, of course, some industry was allowed to enter the province because the government was desperate for money to carry out experiments. These industries came in on bended knee. They knew the wealth was here and it must have been difficult to keep them out, but the Socialists did a remarkable job of just that.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that our Liberal government has already shown in the few short months, what the absence of the Socialist government can mean to the province, insofar as encouraging location of industry here is concerned. Announcements that have been made to date are only a forerunner of what the future will bring. We will be able to look back on the industrial famine of the past twenty years, in a few years hence, and thank the people of the province of Saskatchewan, thank the electorate for having made the kind of decision they did on April 22nd last.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. McFarlane:** — Before I go further, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about my own Department of Municipal Affairs, which has an important role to play in provincial matters. In my short time in office, I have been pleased to note that we have a good basic staff with many of the personnel having been many years in the service in the Department. It is important that the staff in this particular Department have experience in dealing with local governments. We are short of staff in some of our branches, but every effort will be made to recruit suitable persons.

I am particularly interested in expanding our Community Planning Branch, because there is a pressing need to provide more community planning assistance to our larger urban centres and for others which are expected to expand. We are on the verge of industrial expansion and it is expected that a number of villages and towns will avail themselves of the provisions of the Industrial Towns Act. It is of utmost importance that the smaller urban centres, which will experience rapid expansion due to the boom which is taking place in the potash industry, receive proper guidance in the matter of physical development.

There will be an initial burden placed upon the staff of the Department to service these centres. Recruiting of trained and experienced community planning personnel is a problem, and I gather has been a problem for a number of years. We hope to remedy this situation by engaging private consultants where and when necessary, should we find difficulty in recruiting suitable staff for the Department.

I would like to mention the town of Lanigan, which as you know, was the first town designated as an industrial town under the Industrial Towns Act. A physical plan of development was completed by Department personnel and recently a town manager was engaged to serve as Chief Administrator, acting under policies as set by the Council. We expect a model town will develop in the area, as a result of proper planning and the fact that the industrial activity in the area will require more homes and businesses and local facilities.

The Department is aware that urban centres, other than Regina and Saskatoon, find it difficult to engage and pay for specialists in community planning. This problem has existed for some time and, therefore, we are planning the establishment of regional offices to be located in the areas of the province, not as yet determined, where a planning office can be established and staffed by experienced planners. Such planners would be able to assist all urban centres in the area with their planning problems, in conjunction with our office in Regina. This move will be welcomed by urban councils and administrative personnel, as well as by the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association.

I would like to mention something about the Water Assistance Branch. It is gratifying to see so many of the smaller communities install water and sewer systems. This kind of improvement not only adds to the amenities of the people, both old and young, but assists in attracting more home owners and business ventures, and in many cases, industry. Certainly, hospital and school facilities benefit from such improvement. Water and sewer services to nursing homes and homes for the aged are of prime importance, and this will have been noted that the budget has made adequate provision for assistance to such communities and the scope of our water assistance program will be widened.

Some amendments to the Family Farm Improvement Act will be before this house this session.

The Municipal Water Assistance Board was allotted \$600,000 in the last budget passed by the legislature and when we took office in May of last year, about seven weeks after the budget was in operation, I learned that commitments made by the Board up to that time had precluded making few new allocations during the year.

This was a serious position because there were numerous applications for assistance, which could not be dealt with because the allotment had been committed. This matter received our immediate attention and additional funds were made available to assist communities who had already undertaken works, and were in need of funds. During the present fiscal period, a total of \$1,000,000 was made available for assistance to urban communities toward water and sewer facilities. We have been able to thus far in the year, give assistance to about forty urban centres under the program.

It is our intention to continue this program for the benefit of

local communities. We are concerned that the lack of modern water and sewer facilities will discourage industries from locating in some areas, and therefore, every effort will be made to provide assistance, especially where there is a possibility that the lack of a system may turn industry from locating in this province. We are, of course, mindful of the comfort that such utilities provide to a community and particularly the aged.

The foregoing points up the need for continued research and exploration into the problem of finding adequate water supplies so that the benefits of our water and sewer systems can be fully realized.

Some areas are presently finding it most difficult to supply the needs of their people for water. Costly water pipelines have had to be constructed. The matter of finding adequate supplies of water will require our full attention and the ingenuity of engineering specialists in this particular field. We will undertake appropriate studies, however, to overcome the problem since we recognize the magnitude and importance of the problem to the people of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about highways. You will have noted mention in the budget of the very large increase in the amount to be expended on highways. This increase is significant, not only to the public at large, but will benefit particularly many of our municipalities. The increase in provincial highway mileage will relieve municipalities of many miles of roads, which are presently their responsibility, both with regard to construction and to maintenance. I want to congratulate the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) for the close cooperation between his Department and the Department of Municipal Affairs, especially in taking some of the grid roads into the highway system. This is something that has been long overdue.

We have experienced a winter of not only severe cold weather, but one in which snow and blowing snow have caused havoc with our highways and our local roads. The building of the kind of roads which are designed to resist drifting and blocking, those which are of the provincial or grid road design, should be encouraged, so that snow clearing will not be a major problem. It is becoming increasingly important that municipal roads be kept open, not only so that farmers can move freely to market but because school buses must be able to transport children to school. The cost of snow clearing, if performed by municipalities, could in some years, such as this one, seriously affect the financial position of the municipalities. Roads built to grid standard would reduce the cost of snow clearing, and therefore when the present grid road program ends, as it does this construction year, serious consideration will have to be given to the matter of an additional program.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — This whole matter will be discussed thoroughly with municipal authorities and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. Most municipalities utilize snow-blowing clubs to clear snow from the municipal roads. This method is not the most economical but appears to be the most efficient. Members of the snow plough clubs are to be commended for the admirable job they have done. This kind of local effort should be encouraged and expanded.

I am pleased that provision has been made for an expanded program of assistance to urban municipalities for street improvements. The policy of assistance in improving main streets will encourage more of these centres to extend such improvements to other areas of the communities. Dust-free roads and streets can mean more pleasant living from the standpoint of beauty and health and utility.

We are presently experimenting with the use of salt, a by-product of potash and mining and refining which is in plentiful supply, as a means of providing dust-free roads and streets. Present indications are that the experiment may prove successful. While I do not wish to raise any false hopes regarding the utilization of salt as a road conditioner, I am sure that all of you can appreciate the significance of success in this experiment. I can visualize a tremendous benefit to our rural municipalities, to our park areas, and to our urban centres, in the use of such a process. It would also provide a means of utilizing what is otherwise a waste product in the production of potash, and there will be an unlimited supply of such salt. It is planned to expand our experimental program so as to cover a number of areas of the province which contain different soil types and perhaps different weather patterns. The Department has prepared a review of the test pro-

grams in a pamphlet prepared by the grid road authorities and which I recommend for reading by all members of this house.

I want to say a few words here about the Municipal Road Assistance Authority which is also part of my Department. Grid construction in 1964-1965 was considerably accelerated in comparison with previous years. Approvals for construction were issued on the basis of twelve per cent of the grid mileage in the individual municipalities, and grants were paid on this basis. In addition, a sum of \$2,000,000 was provided by the provincial government to be used for loans to enable municipalities to construct grid roads in advance of the ordinary grid road grants. The main purpose of the \$2,000,000 loan, which was used to cover the provincial government share of the cost only, was to enable municipalities to take advantage of the municipal development and loan fund which was provided by the federal Liberal government.

The municipalities were able to borrow two-thirds of the municipalities' share of grid costs from this federal fund, and will receive a twenty-five per cent rebate on the amount borrowed. As a result of all the available funds, 1,546 miles of grid road were constructed in the 1964-1965 construction season. This involved the moving of an estimated 30,000,000 cubic yards of earth. In addition, sixteen miles of oil field access roads, which are constructed to grid standards, were worked on, as well as six point two miles of resort access roads.

The provision of temporary provincial funds and funds under the Municipal Development Loan Act, has resulted in quite a few municipalities constructing grid roads a year or more in advance of receipt of the Authorities Assistance grants. As a result, 204 municipalities are ahead in their program by a total of 884 miles. Five hundred and two miles of this was financed with the aid of the provincial loan funds and 382 miles through local municipal funds. One of the results of this acceleration is that 100 municipalities have completed their entire original grid road mileage. However, the government still owes its share of the cost to 66 municipalities.

The impending completion of the initial grid program has made it necessary for the provincial government and rural municipalities, to examine the rural road problem to see whether grid road extensions, are desirable. The Municipal Advisory Commission and the Municipal Assistance Authority have made a detailed study of the situation and as a result of their recommendation, I am pleased to advise you that the government is prepared to approve in principle, a limited extension of the grid road system. The Municipal Advisory Commission and the Authority have already commenced negotiations with municipalities regarding relocation of the extensions.

In 1960-1961, a program assisting municipalities in the re-gravelling of grid roads was begun. Under this program the Authority pays its normal grid share of the cost of applying up to 300 cubic yards of gravel per mile, with those miles which have been gravelled at least five years previously being eligible. By the end of the last construction year, a total of 3,576 miles had been re-gravelled.

To sum up the grid road program, as of today, a total of 292 rural municipalities, eleven local improvement districts and 111 towns and villages have participated in the construction of 11,028.2 miles of grid road. Of this total 10,535 have been gravelled. In addition, 14 municipalities have constructed and gravelled 150 miles of oil field access roads. Nine rural municipalities, and one local improvement district have constructed 26.8 miles of resort access roads.

I am happy to report that this budget will allow the rural municipalities to undertake a substantial construction program. This year is the final year of the original ten year program.

Our ferry service, which is administered by the Municipal Road Assistance Authority, has been further modernized this year with the purchase of five steel ferries, which are being used to replace worn out wooden ones. These steel ferries provide greater loading capacity and are expected to last indefinitely.

I turn now to the Community Development Branch. This is one part of my Department which I should like to say something about, and which will be incorporated, Mr. Speaker, in the new Indian Affairs Branch. It has experienced some difficulties during the year, due to the fact that the entire program in the Green Lake and Canoe Lake areas has been inadequate and has not been properly planned or executed in the past. My main objection to the farm program at Green Lake has been that there was inadequate planning

by the former government, and a lack of a practical program.

The central farm operation, in my opinion, was a prime example of lack of management and lack of planning. An attempt was made to establish settlers on numerous small farm plots, of from thirty to forty acres, in an area where the growing of grain would be hazardous at the best of times. Wheat appeared to be a main crop, whereas it is obvious that the area is best suited to the raising of livestock. Little encouragement was given to the settlers to operate their own farms since it should have been obvious that the small acreage involved could never allow a settler, let alone a family, to subsist. No encouragement was given to those interested in farming to expand their holdings or establish a livestock herd. The central farm was used by the settlers for the stabling of their cattle the year around, and the central farm equipment and labor were used to cultivate seed and harvest crops for the settlers. In other words, farm dwellers were not encouraged, but farming operations by such dwellers, were in the most cases, not undertaken, and not encouraged.

Conditions on the central farm were in a state of chaos when I visited the area last fall. The condition was a direct result of the former government failing to engage supervisory personnel who were competent. The residents of the area who were engaged on the farm, would have done a better job by themselves in operating the farm than was accomplished by some of the government employees who were in charge.

The original idea, prior to 1944, of the central farm was certainly worthwhile. The plan to assist the Metis in the area, by making available farm plots, was admirable. My main criticism is that there was a lack of adequate detailed planning and poor execution of any plan that existed during the ensuing years.

I would like to speak for a few minutes on the matter of local government, which is the main concern of my Department. Taxes for our municipal and school purposes have been increasing year by year, and municipal people have shown remarkable restraint in accepting this burden. The time is fast approaching, Mr. Speaker, when local governments, with increasing demands being made upon them for services, will be hard pressed to obtain the tax money to meet their bills. What is needed to relieve this situation is the creation of more taxable property and businesses, so that more tax funds will pour in with no increase in tax burdens to the present property and business owners. Here again, industry is the answer. We also need more people to share the cost of some of the basic services. We need to bolster our population total, which has been lagging so badly over the past fifteen years or more. The trend has to be reversed. We have to attract more workers for the jobs that industry will create. This is a problem at the moment.

We are short of laborers in this province and the situation may become worse. I have attended numerous rural and urban municipal association meetings this past summer and fall. The spirit of the delegates, Mr. Speaker, at these meetings, left little to be desired. I have faith in the municipal councillors, the reeves, the mayors, and the overseers who are doing their utmost to strengthen local government. It is my aim, and object, as Minister of Municipal Affairs, to assist them in this very important undertaking.

Recent estimates indicate that total municipal expenditures, including payments to schools, are approaching the \$145,000,000 mark in this province. This is an indication of the importance of our municipal governments and the tremendous task which they are undertaking. The elected members of local government, who in the main are paid very little for the devotion of time and energy to their jobs, are to be admired by all members of this house for their efforts. It is to the credit of these people that we have the kind of democracy we do in Canada today. Let us not forget that if we weaken local government, we are jeopardizing our own position here in this legislature, where local government is the basis of our democratic system.

I have met with the executives of the two municipal government organizations, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. These meetings, I am pleased to say, have been most cordial and beneficial. I cannot over-emphasize the importance I attach to these organizations. They provide an important contact between the Department and the local governments. I will be relying upon their representatives for guidance in dealing with some of the crucial problems in the months ahead. Organizations such as S.U.M.A. and S.A.R.M. are to be fostered and to be encouraged by both the people they represent and the government, for they are effective and necessary, in the conduct of a successful democracy.

This government will do its best to create a better climate for negotiations with both government bodies so that mutual problems may be solved and desirable adjustments may be made. We believe that there are two sides to all questions and that an honest examination of both sides is necessary and desirable if there is to be fairness and good will. I will make every effort to encourage local governments to work out common problems with us and to solve other pressing problems where research is not being undertaken.

Certainly, we mean to work together for the common purpose of strengthening local governments and to strengthen the ties that bind the two levels of government. In this kind of climate we can overcome any mutual problems.

This house is well aware of the study which was carried out by the Continuing Committee set up by the previous government. A glance over public accounts will refresh the memory of a few who may have forgotten this Committee and such accounts might enlighten the new members. We have had sufficient debate upon this topic, both inside and outside the house, but as Minister of Municipal Affairs, I should like to make these observations.

Over \$1,000,000 has been spent by the former government in the study of municipal reorganization without one dollar of return for such investment. You may say that you have boundaries established which are now being used by school units, which some day may be used for county boundaries. True as that may be, the main purpose for establishing the study was to propose something reasonable with regard to reorganization, which was to be acceptable to these local governments.

Acceptance was easily gained from the school units, because the boundaries were little different from the existing school unit boundaries. However, it must have been clear to the government of that day that the proposed boundaries and suggested reorganization was not acceptable to our rural municipalities. Not one county application has been received since the study, or at least not one has come to my knowledge, since taking office. What good has the \$1,000,000 or more spent done towards encouraging municipalities to make adjustments? I would say, Mr. Speaker, very little. I believe that the basic system of local government, which we have today, has served this province admirably over the years, due to the devotion and dedication of those persons who have served in office and accepted the challenges and responsibilities. I further believe that changing conditions dictate necessary changes in local government and that we must be sensitive to such needs. However, if changes are to be useful they must be acceptable to those who represent and those who are affected by local government.

We recognize today, that there possibly may be municipalities whose boundaries could be enlarged and we will be receptive to their problem. But as you know, our stated policy has always been that there will be no municipal reorganization without a vote of the persons concerned.

As you know, there has recently been a great deal of research done on this subject but municipalities have not been convinced that the recommendations are acceptable. It will be our policy to strengthen the present basic system and keep an open mind on the question of reorganization and to create a climate of mutual trust so that any desirable changes can be freely discussed and any changes may be accomplished without due pressure from any source.

Another area covered by my Department is that involving local improvement districts. There are, at the present time, twelve local improvement districts, which are areas of the province where local self-government has not yet been established? These areas have for many years, received subsidies from the provincial treasury by way of direct grants and also earned assistance. While it is recognized that there are areas covered by these districts, which can be considered depressed and under-populated areas, this does not apply to all the areas. The Department employs a supervisory staff, which is directly involved in the administration of all L.I.D.'s and all final decisions are made by head office, including the budget procedures. It is recognized that local governments must have responsibilities in order to develop. To concentrate powers at the senior level of government, which rightfully belong to local level, can serve only to discourage local ratepayers interest.

As a first step in providing greater responsibility to local ratepayers in the local improvement districts, voting by secret ballot was introduced in the fall of last year, in the election of members of ratepayers committees — the first time in the history of the province, Mr. Speaker. The

elections were held in a similar manner and at the same time as the elections in rural municipalities. Committees will meet much the same as rural municipal councils and conduct their meetings in the same manner as rural municipalities.

We plan to encourage local committees to accept more responsibility in budget planning, operation and control and to establish mill rates based upon realistic budgets. It is our aim to move cautiously but firmly in the direction of total local self-government for all local improvement districts, which desire and are able to accept the responsibilities. This move will not only increase the service in these areas, but will assist in their more rapid development.

With regard to land leases, the Department is charged with the responsibility in the matter of leasing land which belongs to the local improvement districts. In order that there will be a degree of uniformity in our leasing policies, we are adopting the same policy as that now being established by the Department of Agriculture.

The Appeal Board, set up by that Department will also be used for hearing of appeals. This will insure that any patronage that may have developed under the previous system will be removed. The sale of lands for cultivation purposes will be encouraged so that farmers may develop economic units and so that they may develop a private interest in these lands. This will lead to better farms and to better farming methods simply because the farmer will reap the benefit of all the improvements to his land. There are farmers with families, who would like to encourage their sons to start their own operations. Land which is made available for sale will encourage this kind of expansion.

An attempt will be made to encourage more private contracting for major road improvements in local improvement districts. This will be encouraged in areas where there is no shortage of contractors and bids and therefore competitive. This will insure that roads are built at the least possible cost to the local improvement districts. It will also provide work for contractors.

Local improvement district equipment will be used to construct roads in areas where there are insufficient contractors and where construction is difficult due to perhaps the long hauls of outside equipment. It is not expected that wholesale changes will be made in our construction equipment inventory. However, there will be a gradual change where we have shipped the equipment from one area to another instead of purchasing new equipment.

Adequate provision will be made for equipment which is of a maintenance nature because it is my feeling, that once roads are built, proper maintenance is mandatory for reasons of economy and convenience to the public.

It is anticipated that mining and forest industries will locate especially in the northern development improvement districts, as well as in northern administration areas. This will have a very desirable effect upon the tax structure on local improvement districts. It will also have an effect upon the urban centres in local improvement districts, and will allow the extension of needed local services as well as tax relief — hence a reduction in provincial subsidies.

I would like to mention a few words in regard to the Winter Works Incentive Program which is another program administered by my Department. The program, developed by the federal government several years ago, has been of considerable assistance to the municipalities. It is unfortunate that this year severe winter weather will slow down winter works undertakings. The effect of the weather on the program was recognized by the provincial government and recently representations have been made to the federal government for an extension of the program for one month. We trust that our request will be given favorable consideration. We have had representations made to have the program extended on a permanent basis for one month, due to the severity of the weather and on the grounds that the winter season in this region is longer than in other regions in Canada.

This particular matter will be discussed with federal and municipal authorities at the earliest opportunity. The assistance, through the Winter Works Program, relates to direct labor costs, but it is recognized that the material used in winter works undertakings does have a direct effect upon the whole economy. Therefore, the importance of the program, Mr. Speaker, should not be overlooked. I would like to take this opportunity of

paying recognition to organizations which fostered the whole idea of winter works through local effort. I had the pleasure of attending a recent meeting of the local "Do It Now" Committee in Moose Jaw. This organization and others like it do much for a community and the province as a whole, in fostering employment.

The Municipal Development and Loan Fund which the federal Liberal government introduced in 1963, will help local governments in the province. The program is designed to make funds available to local government bodies so that they may undertake projects which accelerate capital works programs. For this purpose, the federal government made available to the province more than \$20,000,000 at an interest rate of five and three-eighths per cent which is now down to five and one-quarter per cent.

It is significant that the local governments in Saskatchewan are out in front of other provinces in Canada in having applications for loans approved, since over ninety per cent of the funds available have been committed on such approvals. For those who are not entirely familiar with the working of the funds, I would like to review it as briefly as possible. A local authority such as a municipality or a school unit makes application for a loan through the fund. The amount available from the fund is calculated on the basis of two-thirds of the cost of the project. Temporary financing by local authorities is carried out through a local bank or a credit union. When the costs are finalized and the project is completed, debentures are issued to the provincial government in the amount equal to seventy-five per cent of the funds to which it is entitled. This is a program which was introduced by the Pearson government. It is a worthwhile program which certainly helped the province of Saskatchewan.

The availability of senior government funds for local government borrowings helps considerably in keeping interest rates at a reasonable level for the local body, and it is especially beneficial to the smaller centres where credit ratings are difficult to establish by the investors.

Efforts will be made to develop a permanent fund of reasonable size to assist local governments in marketing their debentures, especially when the Development and Loan Fund has completed its program in March, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, it has given me a great deal of pleasure on this occasion to outline some of the accomplishments of the Department of Municipal Affairs in the past fiscal year and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to review some of the major projects we will be undertaking in the year ahead.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, the Premier, who has moved that you do now leave the chair in order that Her Majesty be granted the necessary sums to carry out the provisions of the magnificent development program that he has outlined. This is truly a most fitting manner for the inaugurating of the celebration of the Diamond Anniversary of our province, and Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you, the Premier, and my colleagues, that my Department will assume its responsibilities for the monies allocated to it, for its share in this, the initial year of a great new era of development under a Liberal government. I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the opportunity go by to say a few words about the budget that we heard in this house last Friday.

I should say that the first impression I had from hearing the budget was that the government has a special talent for distracting attention from the real issues. We heard the budget loudly lauding certain tax reductions, and I think before we allow ourselves to be carried away in our enthusiasm for the so-called tax reductions, we should analyze the budget to see just what the effect of these changes will be on the financial structure of the province.

Mr. Speaker, one of the tax reductions referred to was the elimination of the gasoline tax on farm truck fuel — the right to use purple gas in farm trucks. Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone who is a farmer will naturally welcome and enjoy any tax relief however slight, however insignificant it may be, and I am sure that a great deal more transportation will be by farm truck now than was formerly the case. The government has had a long time to consider this tax reduction. The Liberal party was posing this

tax reduction as far back as 1951 so they have had some thirteen or fourteen years to consider the wisdom of this policy and to consider how it would be applied, how it would be worked out in practice. Since being elected last May, they have had approximately nine or ten months to work this out. One would have thought it would be possible to work out this tax easement in a way which would not create as much resentment and do as much harm as it does good. I think that we are all anxious that people who use motor vehicles in the making of their livelihood should be relieved from unnecessary imposts and taxes, and this is true of farmers as it is of small business men and working people who have to use their vehicles in gaining their livelihood.

I think that my farm friends in the constituency of Hanley certainly are not happy about being singled out for discriminatory tax benefits — not as happy as they would have been if they had been able to say that all others, with an equal degree of need, were entitled to share in the same privilege. You have the situation now, where there are people living in the constituency of Hanley who farm in the summer time and who carry on some work in the city of Saskatoon during the balance of the year and they will drive their farm trucks in from the surrounding villages or the rural areas, and enjoy tax exemption on the fuel that they use to go to and from work. Similarly, there are people living in the urban communities near Saskatoon, Dundurn, Warman, Aberdeen, and other places, within twenty-five miles of the city, who go every day to work, commute back and forth, and who will not be able to enjoy the same benefit that is accorded to the farm people who work in the city and go back and forth to work with their half ton truck. There will be, I suggest, some resentment about this by people who are just as much in need of tax relief as the rural people and I make it clear that I am not objecting to tax relief being given to anyone when it can be done. All I say, Mr. Speaker, is that a government that has apparently had this in mind for so long could have done a more equitable and fair job of granting this tax exemption.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — I can think of people in my constituency who do sales work from door to door, who wash windows, who engage in janitor services in several buildings, who have to go from building to building in the pursuit of their livelihood. I can think of people who have to work on shifts and who have to drive their cars to work because the transit system does not function after midnight when they change their shifts. Many of them have to drive ten miles a day, 4,000 or 5,000 miles a year, going to and from work because there is no other transit available during the hours of their changing of shifts. These people are just as much in need, I submit, of some tax benefits as are the people whom I represent in the rural portion of Hanley. I think it would have been a good thing for this government if they had thought this thing out a little more and had seen to it that this benefit was accorded to all people engaged in work where they have to use their vehicles. We all agree that wherever possible taxes should be removed from the costs of production, and that all these people who use a motor vehicle in gaining their livelihood are entitled to consideration with respect to this matter.

Something was said about the removal of the mineral tax from farm lands. Here again the government has had a good deal of time to consider the effect of this proposal and we have not yet had a chance to see just what the legislation will be, but I would hope that if it does not take this factor into account, it be given consideration even at this late date. I refer to those cases where farmers have leased their mineral rights to an oil company on the terms that the oil company will reimburse the farmer for any mineral tax which he may have been required to pay. Hon. members on the other side of the house will know that it was common for oil companies to lease the farmers' mineral rights giving to them one-eighth of all production and for the oil company to assume seven-eighths of the cost of any mineral taxes paid by the farmer on those mineral rights. Now, if an exception is granted to all farmer-owned mineral rights then of course the farmer who has leased his mineral rights will enjoy the same benefits and it will mean that the company leasing those rights from the farmer will be relieved of the mineral tax which they presently are required to pay. When the Premier says that it is not the intention of the government to relieve the companies of this mineral tax, I hope he has considered this category of mineral rights, those which are owned by farmers but leased to companies. Otherwise, seven-eighths of this benefit, seven-eighths of this tax remission, will go to oil companies and only one-eighth of it will go to farmers. I hope the government has considered this aspect of it.

Now we are told . . . I'm sorry, I did not hear what the hon. member said, if he has a question I would be more than happy to resume my seat . . .



**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Is that Socialist arithmetic?

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife):** — That is the kind of a question we would expect . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — I hadn't really thought it was arithmetic at all, Mr. Speaker, but this modern mathematics may include some areas that I am not aware of. I thought we weren't talking about arithmetic at all, that we were talking about common sense and fair play. We were talking about the obligation of the government to the farmer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, we are told that this budget contains a reduction of \$14,300,000 of tax. Well, if we look in the estimates, we see whether the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) really means what he says in his Budget Speech. Because if we look in the estimates, we find that this government proposes, in the coming fiscal year, to collect \$107,552,000 in taxation compared with \$108,980,000 that was estimated by the government a year ago. This represents a reduction of something like about \$1,400,000 in the revenue estimates. Now, I am well aware that the estimates of a year ago were exceeded, but they were not exceeded by \$14,000,000. They were exceeded by less than half of that amount. So that this government is asking this legislature to authorize it to collect only \$1,500,000 less than the previous legislature authorized the government to collect.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this reduction in the estimated revenues from taxation of \$1,400,000 is more than half accounted for by the reduction in an item which the Premier didn't even mention. That is the corporation income tax. I am surprised that the Premier did not mention it because the estimates a year ago were \$11,800,000 and the estimates this year are \$11,000,000. At the same time, personal income tax is estimated to increase from \$19,250,000 to \$22,250,000. So while you have a ten per cent increase in personal income tax estimated by this government over a year ago, you have a ten per cent reduction in the corporation income tax. My hon. friend, the Premier, did not mention or explain this. There are only two possible explanations which occur to me, Mr. Speaker, whether the government of the day expects this province to fall into a state of economic stagnation and corporations produce less income than they have been producing, or the government over there is contemplating a substantial reduction in the rates of corporation income tax . . .

**Hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Do you want the answer now?

**Mr. Walker:** — If there is any other explanation I would be pleased.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — The answer is that you were away over estimated expenditures last year and you didn't have a quarter of the activities you pretended to have.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if that was the case, I am surprised that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) didn't make any reference to it in the Budget Speech.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — . . . laid a trap for you . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — I thought that if that was true, the Provincial Treasurer would have said so.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — It is true.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, if that is true, then of course, the statement which I am making about the excess in tax revenues over the estimates a year ago has to be qualified. When I said that the yields from these taxes during the current fiscal year exceeded the amounts estimated, they didn't exceed them by as much as I had assumed, and so this government is asking this legislature to authorise it to collect almost as much money in taxes from the people of Saskatchewan as the previous government asked the legislature

a year ago to collect. The rates are slightly down, but the dollars are almost exactly the same, Mr. Speaker. The number of dollars being taxed out of the people is almost identical.

Well, Mr. Speaker, assuming that the Provincial Treasurer's statement of a reduction in taxation was true, \$14,300,000, this represents a reduction of \$15 per person in the coming fiscal year. Assuming that his statement is true, that there is a \$14,000,000 reduction which I don't concede, Mr. Speaker, but even if it were true, what are the increases? What are the increases? Well, if a man smokes, the increase will be \$10 a year from the cigarette tax, three cents a day for 333 days is ten dollars, and if . . .

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — . . . pretty heavy smoker.

**Mr. Walker:** — That is less than a pack a day and that is considered, I think, a moderate smoker. Of course, if his wife smokes then he has to pay for that too. Then that is just too bad. Then of course, he had to pay \$10 more for medical and hospital care as a result of the tax increase policy of the present Liberal government, so you see, he is already \$5 in the hole, as a result of these so-called tax reductions, even if the reductions are as much as claimed by the Premier, even if the amount which he claims has actually been reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I find it a little hard to work up much enthusiasm for tax reduction which leaves the taxpayer more heavily burdened than before. It is a case of simple mathematics that if you are going to reduce the per capita tax, if you are going to reduce the taxation burden by \$15 per capita, then everybody who smokes is going to pay \$10 more and everybody who has hospital and medical care is going to pay \$10 more, he is worse off than he was before. It is true that the non-smoker might save \$5 providing they don't get him some other way.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the Liberal party in the Hanley by-election whether I would support a proposal to reduce the sales tax by one per cent and support a reduction of these other taxes. I said that I would support it providing I could be satisfied that the tax reduction would not do the people of Saskatchewan more harm than good. Well, what are the results of this tax reduction? It is perfectly clear to anyone who listened to the hon. financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) yesterday, that the increases in school grants are not even enough to take into account the increased school population, certainly nothing there to compensate for the increase in the cost of operating our schools. The resulting increase in local taxation which will come about as a result of the miserliness of this government with respect to education, with respect particularly to school grants, will raise the mill rates all over this province, more than the alleged tax reductions which the Provincial Treasurer boasted about.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that when this government talks about applying priorities that they applied the wrong priorities. For example, the \$3,800,000 which they say they have given to the farmers in authorizing the use of purple gas in farm trucks, that \$3,800,000 would be of more use to the rural people of Saskatchewan if it was used to relieve them of the direct burden of property taxes in their municipalities.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, as a rural member I have made it my practice for the last seventeen years to visit every rural council in my constituency every year and oftener when called upon to do so. I found that, without exception, the rural councils in Hanley constituency would have preferred to have received this money in the form of a \$13,000 unconditional grant to the municipality, rather than as a reduction of gas tax for farm vehicles. This would have meant, for a municipality having a \$1,300,000 assessment as two of them have in my constituency, a ten mill reduction in property taxes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — And if I ask them whether they would rather have a \$40 saving on their farm truck fuel or a ten mill reduction in their property tax rate, they would have to be out of their minds to choose the alternative as it was chosen by the government across the way.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't all. All we had to do was to peruse the

estimates to see where we were going to have to extract money from the people of Saskatchewan in order to do these things, and I was quite shocked to discover that by and large, it was the most helpless, the most dependent groups of people in society who were being fleeced in order to make the Provincial Treasurer's Budget Speech possible.

All you have to do is look at some of the items. If the hon. members have their estimates before them, turn to page ten under Agriculture — the Saskatchewan River Delta survey. There is a reduction of seventy per cent in that item. I hope, when the estimates come up, that the government will reconsider and decide that the future of agriculture calls for a proper survey and study to be done in this area, and that the government will give an assurance that it does not hope to settle this area in the way that the Sifton administration settled Saskatchewan, without any proper survey before the settlement occurred. This seems to me to be a particularly short-sighted kind of thrift, Mr. Speaker, to reduce this item by seventy per cent. There may be some explanation of it. If there is, I hope that we will hear it before the estimates are disposed of.

If you take agriculture as a whole, the government across the way trumpets and beats its breast about what a great friend it is of the farmer. But just look at the estimates for agriculture, Mr. Speaker. You are a farmer, Sir, and I am sure that as a farmer you must feel some sense of consternation at not being able to protest against this obvious injustice to the agriculture industry. But just look at it. It is proposed next year to spend \$4,604,000 on the Department of Agriculture compared to \$5,276,000 the year before. But indeed, if you add the supplementary estimates for agriculture, of another \$330,000 in the current fiscal year, the amount spent on ordinary expenditures for agriculture is \$5,606,000 in the current year, and they only propose to spend \$4,604,000 on ordinary expenditures next year — a reduction of a little over a million dollars on ordinary expenditures.

Well, if you turn to capital expenditures on page twelve, what do you find? There is one big project in there, the bringing of irrigation to the farmers of Broderick. But if you take that out, take out the expenditure that is proposed on the South Saskatchewan Dam, and I don't say that should be ignored — it is an important expenditure — but if you want to see how the rest of the province is faring, consider that item separate from the whole agricultural budget, and what do you find? It is down too, from \$7,280,000 to \$6,404,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, from a government that got elected by claiming to be the friend of the farmer, I think this is an amazing about turn. I remember and I am sure the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) remembers, that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) orating eloquently in his place over here on this side of the house, not many years ago, when he said, "What this government should be doing is spending, not \$5,000,000 but \$35,000,000 on agriculture".

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — We remember this and now he joins the government as Vice-Premier and he has to sacrifice both the capital and the operation budget. I guess perhaps, it is really too bad that the farmers of Saskatchewan have to pave the way to the Senate for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald).

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — . . . jealous ?

**Mr. Walker:** — What about another area that farmers are vitally concerned with? I refer to the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. The hon. Minister representing the constituency of Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has, no doubt, raised his stentorian voice on behalf of co-operatives and co-operative development, and what has been the result? The total for Co-operative Association services is down from \$132,000 to \$118,000. I am sure that he has cried out loudly on behalf of the credit unions, but we find that in the credit union services, the expenditure is down from \$128,000 to \$115,000. I am sure that he will be an ardent believer in the value of research and statistical services, but unfortunately the amount of money is down from \$53,500 to \$46,000 next year. The total sum of money for extension services in the co-operative movement is down from \$149,000 to \$140,000.

Now, there has only been one area I did not mention and that was administration, and it is down too, from \$50,000 to \$42,000. The hon. members on the other side betray their real feeling for co-operation and the spirit of human brotherhood, when they applied the pattern of the estimates

for the development of the co-operative movement.

**Mr. Speaker,** what are the areas from which this government has extracted money in order to make possible the flamboyant claims that the Premier has made? Look at education. He talks so eloquently about the importance of culture, the development of the arts, and . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He only discusses it . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — There is one area which I suppose could be called a frill because it is a cultural and artistic matter. I refer to the area of continuing education. This is where you discover what this government really thinks of people who need help, who need to have an opportunity, having dropped out of school, having gone to work, having been burdened by the failure to acquire the education they might have acquired. The Continuing Education Branch was set up to help these people to lead a fuller and better life — but in this area, down from \$300,000 to \$272,000.

Or just look at education generally . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Way up . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — Yes, way up. The Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) says, "Way up". Well, let us look at it . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — That means higher . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — A great deal is said about the assistance which this government was giving to the university. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this government was not able to point to any substantial assistance to the public and high schools, so it made quite an issue out of what it was doing for the university.

I look at my estimates, and if the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) wants to look at them too, look at page nineteen, and there you find what they are doing for the university. On operation, they propose to spend \$8,335,000; on construction, \$1,500,000; for a total of \$1,835,000. The Premier says that in addition, there was \$3,000,000 out of the current year's budget turned over to the university for next year's program, but that is part of the budget that was passed in this house by the previous government and . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Never heard of it . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, every cent of that \$3,000,000 was levied out of tax revenues that were imposed by the CCF government at the last session of the legislature and that \$3,000,000 came about, Mr. Speaker, because we resisted the ill-timed demands of the gentlemen who now sit on the other side, that taxes should have been reduced. If we had accepted their advice, and reduced taxes by \$3,000,000 it wouldn't be there, but it was because the people who sit on this side of the house had more sense of fiscal responsibility than to heed this frivolous kind of opinion that was voiced by the Liberal party, but that \$3,000,000 is there and so, if you add that \$3,000,000 . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — I counted that . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . which was paid in the current fiscal year, out of those funds appropriated and levied by the CCF government, you find that, in the current fiscal year, the sum of \$11,200,000 was appropriated for operating and construction of the University of Saskatchewan, — \$11,200,000 in the current year, and all we are providing for in the next year is \$9,800,000 or a reduction of a \$1,200,000, Mr. Speaker, — a reduction of \$1,200,000. But oh, they say to the University, "Go and borrow" and that is what the University is going to have to do — borrow \$7,000,000 in order to be able to carry on their expansion program in the coming year, not because of anything that was done by my hon. friends opposite out of current revenues, out of the revenues for the next fiscal year, but out of funds that were accumulated, that were found in the till by these gentlemen when they came into office.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends opposite haven't got a good record in terms of the one area where they have done the most shouting and the most cheering, namely in connection with assistance to the university.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is another factor that needs to be taken into account. Even though they have provided, in the next fiscal year, for \$1,400,000 less for the university, they have included within the university's costs monies which last year were headed under Regina Teachers' College and Saskatoon Teachers' College, Technical Training and Vocational Development Advisors Committee, all together another \$500,000, Mr. Speaker, that are now included in this university grant, in order to buoy it up and make it look bigger. It still falls a \$1,400,000 short of what was done in the current fiscal year out of revenues that were levied by the CCF government last spring. Well, enough for that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I should think so.

**Mr. Walker:** — I want to turn to one other area. The members opposite used to say a great deal about this. "Too many cabinet ministers", they said, and the expenses were too much. Well, let us look at the budget. Here we are — not a reduction. We are now not dealing with university students or dependent groups or unfortunate people. We are dealing with the hon. gentlemen who sit across on the Treasury benches, and what happens? Last year \$296,000 was voted; this year \$308,000. You see, Mr. Speaker, where their heart lies.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . high priced help . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you also that there is no provision in this \$308,000 for these little boys who are going to get their fingers in the pork barrel if the legislation passes dealing with legislative assistants. There is no provision for that in the pork barrel, Sir. None whatever. So you have to add another \$10,000 or more to that \$308,000 — \$318,000, a substantial increase, Mr. Speaker.

Where else have they economized? Look at the Department of Labour. The previous speaker has already referred to the reductions in the Department of Labour. I want to refer to the Labour Standards Branch. This is the branch that goes out and inspects places of employment, assists workers in getting their rights and seeing to it that the laws are carried out for their benefit — that employers observe the Holidays with Pay Act, and so on. These are the people who, if necessary, go to Magistrates' Court, and help the workmen collect their pay. This is the area in which a bill is already before the house to try to curtail the rights of the worker and apparently they expect the bill to pass, Mr. Speaker, because they are proposing to spend less money on this service. Last year we voted \$138,000 for this purpose — this year \$117,000.

These are people who for the most part are working under the minimum wage; they get fired or they leave their job and their employer tries to do them out of their holiday pay. It may not be very much, \$25 or \$40 or so. These are the people that used to get the benefit of this particular vote and now the vote is proposed to be reduced by \$20,000, some 15 per cent, at a time when most expenses are going up.

That is, no doubt, an example of the kind of thrift and sound produce business-like administration that the Premier used to prate so loudly about when he was Leader of the Opposition.

Then, I am really sorry, Mr. Speaker, to see this one on page twenty-eight regarding the Legislative Library. I think all members of this house have grown to appreciate the services that are available in the institution, and I am sure that most of us could learn better how to use those services and to exploit them to better advantage. This is a service which I think is really exceptional and which is an important asset to the people of the province of Saskatchewan — the finest Legislative Library I believe you will find anywhere. So what happens? Well, when it comes to books, when it comes to learning, we can be economical and cut down from \$73,000 to \$63,000. There is a reduction of fifteen per cent, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the Minister or the Premier can give an explanation for that when we come to the estimates.

Look at what the farmers' friends are doing to the rural municipalities. True, there is not a very substantial reduction here, but if you look at page thirty-three, you will find that assistance to the market road grid is down just slightly. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that if the

government is embarrassed with a surplus of funds that this is an area which would have done the rural people of Saskatchewan much good if this amount had been somewhat increased. This item almost always was increased under the previous regime, because we recognized the importance of this area, and I am sorry that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) is not about to exert the eloquence on the Treasury Board that he practiced here before he sat down a few minutes ago, or maybe they are more immune to it than we are.

We find the total for municipal ferry accommodation also down and total for Municipal Road Assistance Authority ordinary expenditure down some \$200,000. There is an area, I submit, Mr. Speaker, which the rural people of Saskatchewan will regret and that all those who represent the rural people of Saskatchewan will protest . . .

**Mr. Stuart:** — . . . keep hoping . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to deal with all these items but I would like to just mention where the economies are occurring in the Department of Public Health. On page thirty, Research and Planning — I should think that this government probably needs, more than any other government in the history of Saskatchewan, to appreciate and understand the value of research. It seems to me that if the problems which they enunciate, the problems which they say really exist, they need more research, not less. I guess maybe the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Stuart) is going to use his well known talent for ironing out problems and he is not going to need the advice of anyone who could do some research on these questions. He is just going to go out and talk to these hospital boards and tell them that they should close their hospitals, or they should convert them to some other use, or . . .

**Mr. Stuart:** — Keep hoping, Bob . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . Well, he doesn't need research. I guess he will just go out and tell them what to do.

Then we find in the Regional Health Services another reduction from \$1,900,000 to \$1,836,000 and a reduction of five in the personnel.

In the Northern Health Services the reduction is greater. These people are more defenceless and less able to fight for their rights, and so Northern Health Services get a bigger reduction, \$169,000 instead of \$197,000 — a fifteen per cent reduction. I am sorry that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) does not direct his attention to fighting for the retention of these benefits for the people of his constituency, and devote a little less effort to seeking to advance himself in the eyes of his leader here in this assembly.

Here is another group of people who are pretty helpless, and so just as you would expect, this item is down — Psychiatric Services — down from \$874,000 to \$839,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite used to chide us for not having provided better health services, or better psychiatric services, and that item is down.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Those fellows had power . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . or look at the Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford. That item is down and a total of twenty people subtracted from the staff. I was up there a year or two ago, on a visit I hasten to add, and I found that the people up there are overworked already. Conditions could have been improved there with more staff.

**Mr. Stuart:** — We are going to improve them.

**Mr. Walker:** — Oh, you are going to improve them. Like the snail, making progress backwards, reducing the staff, and not improving the service. As I say, the sum of money voted is down.

Here is another group that is pretty helpless and pretty dependent — the children in the training school at Moose Jaw. I do not suppose they have any way of bringing pressure to bear on the government or the Minister, or the Premier, and so they get poorer treatment. Another group is the Saskatchewan Training School at Prince Albert. Again a reduction in the staff and a reduction of \$19,000 in the money voted. Here is another pretty helpless group of beneficiaries, Mr. Speaker.

They were able to gouge \$2,700 out of this expenditure.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little hard to get excited about the illusory tax reductions which the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) talks about when I see what is happening here. I find this a little hard to understand — why there should be a reduction in the Department of Public Works of \$2,000,000 in capital expenditures for senior citizens housing. Maybe that they have just finished up a large institution and they do not intend to start building another one, but a \$2,000,000 reduction in this important area seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be shutting our eyes to the needs of the people of Saskatchewan.

With reference to social aid, I would have thought that the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), by going out and brandishing his club over the heads of these children who are getting too much to eat, would have been able to show some cash benefits from this item and that he would be able to go and jingle some money on the desk of the Provincial Treasurer to show that he had succeeded in his mission.

Well, either he expects that there is going to be an economic recession or he does not expect to succeed in his venture because the total amount of money for Social aid is estimated at \$13,406,000 compared with \$12,900,000 last year. There is a supplementary estimate being proposed for the current year which brings it up to \$13,147,000 but nevertheless he expects an increase of \$300,000.

There is a reduction of \$200,000, a reduction of almost twenty per cent in the grants for construction of housing for the aged and the infirm. This is an important area which I think is not receiving sufficient attention from the government.

We turn to municipal affairs, and we find a big reduction in loans to rural municipalities for the purpose of financing the construction of grid roads. Last year we voted the sum of \$2,000,000 to help municipalities to finance their share but this year the total amount was only \$500,000, \$1,500,000 being taken away from the rural areas for this purpose.

I do not propose to go into the estimates any more fully than that to show, Mr. Speaker, just how the government is proposing to get the money that it is talking about in its economy drive. If you take the Budget Speech of the hon. Premier, and take his own figures with reference to the university, you find that he says this government is going to make available next year \$10,500,000 provincial financial assistance. He admits that \$7,000,000 of this doesn't come out of the budget at all, \$7,000,000 of this they have got to find for themselves. The province will, however, guarantee their debt if they borrow it — but there is a \$2,000,000 supplementary grant for capital purposes taken out of the current fiscal year, and put over into next year and counted as next year's assistance to the university. But there is only \$1,500,000 being voted out of next year's capital budget. So the amount being provided by the province out of next year's budget is only \$1,500,000 out of a total capital program of \$10,500,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that the shadows are a lot longer than the substance, that the Provincial Treasurer is not really providing for the university in the fiscal year that is about to begin, he is only providing \$1,500,000 out of requirements amounting to \$10,500,000. As I say, \$7,000,000 of it is being found by the university itself and \$2,000,000 of it is being taken out of cash which they found in the kitty in the current fiscal year.

What kind of problem does that pose for this government in future years? Well, they talk about the need for a \$40,900,000 to \$50,000,000 capital program for the university in the next five years but all this government can muster out of the budget for the coming fiscal year is \$1,500,000. Where is the money going to come from for this capital program? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government has committed itself to a course which is going to cost a great deal of money. I am not objecting to the spending of a great deal of money on capital programs for the universities. What I am objecting to is that this government is making no proper provision for finding this large sum of money in the years ahead and in the budget that we are considering.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this means that if the government is confronted next year with a similar demand for capital construction at the university of some \$10,000,000 or more, that the fund will again have to be borrowed, and in four years the university at that rate, will owe something over \$30,000,000. Not only \$30,000,000 to cover their share at the present

rate, but they will also have to borrow another \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 to cover the funds which this fortunate government found in the till when they took office. They will not find it in the till next year.

Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to a course which cannot but drive them into a policy of deficit financing. They are already committed to some \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 of deficit financing, the \$7,000,000 which the financial critic referred to as having been borrowed by the university, the \$2,000,000 of capital funds which they took out of the previous fiscal year's surplus, and the \$1,000,000 which they took out of last year's budget for operating expenses, and whatever amount was in the medical care fund. This is all deficit financing, and this, I suggest, is the road to ruin which Liberals followed in Saskatchewan from 1905 to 1930.

I suggest that if you can make a \$12,000,000 tax reduction, only by borrowing \$12,000,000, you are guilty of the kind of improvidence that ought not to be found on the Treasury benches of a province, ought not to be found in a responsible government in this province. I suggest that is not businesslike administration — to borrow \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000, to use up reserves and borrow \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 in order to make a \$12,000,000 tax reduction possible.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the reduction in taxes that the government takes so much pride in, was financed out of reserves and out of borrowings, and that it will have to be paid for, not only in principal, but in interest, in the years to come. The \$7,000,000 borrowed by the university means there has to be a third of a million more found every year for operating expenses and this places an additional burden on the Treasury of Saskatchewan, until it is paid off — a third of a million dollars a year, plus the capital requirements again next year and in the years ahead. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) ought to have "levelled" with this house and with the people of this province and told them that he was running a deficit finance show and that he was using these deficits to create the illusion of tax reductions when no tax reductions were possible.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — It would have been much better, Mr. Speaker, if this government had used any surplus funds which it had to relieve the burden of taxation upon rural property in Saskatchewan. If they had any surplus funds they should have shifted the load of taxation off rural property, off farm land, off urban homes, and recover that money instead from business expansion and from the commercial development of Saskatchewan. The choice which the government made will result, I am convinced, in the sharpest increase in property taxes, school and municipal, in many a year.

The \$3,800,000 that the farmers will receive under the tax exemption for purple gas would have done much more good had it been made available to the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan at the rate of, say an average of \$13,000 a piece, because that is what it works out to. This would have made it possible for the municipalities to provide for the ever increasing load of maintenance costs for the growing grid market road system. It would have made it possible for the municipalities to enjoy greater financial security at a time when the rural people of Saskatchewan are suffering a reduction in take-home pay amounting to some \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 because of the failure of the Liberal party's wheat marketing policies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — This loss of rural income will make it harder for rural people to pay taxes, even at the present level of local taxation, but if they have to pay instead at an increased level of municipal taxation, it will be even more intolerable.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It being 5:30 the house stands adjourned until 7:30.

**Mr. Walker:** — I had only one sentence left.

The house adjourned at 5:30.

**Mr. Walker:** — Before concluding my remarks I would like to pay some



attention to the estimates of the Department of the Attorney General, if I may.

I want first of all, to compliment the Attorney General for having found some places where he could effect some economies in personnel. I applaud him for those places where he has been able, or where he hopes to be able, to achieve some economy. I caution him against doing so at the expense of the standard of service which the public have come to expect from the Department. The one that causes me just a little anxiety is the economy in the Magistrates' Courts. I would have hoped that the government and the Department might have seen fit to effect a further increase in the salaries of magistrates. The previous government had felt constrained to set the salaries at their present level because we felt that they should be lower than the salaries of District Court Judges and at that time the salaries of District Court Judges were quite low but have since been substantially increased by about twenty-five per cent. I think it is fair to say that, if the salaries of District Court Judges had been increased a year or two earlier, the salaries of judges of the Magistrates' Courts would have been set correspondingly higher and maintained somewhat in the same ratio as District Court judges. I think that the Attorney General is well aware of the fact that the judges of the Magistrates' Courts are hard working and have a very onerous burden of judicial work. People are sentenced to substantial jail sentences by our Magistrates' Courts and it is very important that these courts be accorded the dignity and the importance which they deserve, in view of their jurisdiction. I hope he can assure me and the house that there will be no curtailment of the standards of that court, as a result of the decrease in the estimate from \$364,000 to \$349,000.

I want to conclude my remarks by saying that the rural people of the province will find this budget a keen disappointment. Rural people want a continuation of the policy of the previous government in expanding and enlarging school grants so that the increase in school grants will absorb the increase in the cost of education and thereby stabilize the rural school tax rates. This government has abandoned that policy.

Rural people will want to see a continuation and an expansion of such services as the agricultural machinery testing service, but this government has seen fit to abolish that program. There are other sub-votes in the Department of Agriculture which I will not take the time to refer to today, but rural people would wish to see them improved. For example, farmers want an enlargement and improvement in the Ag. Rep. service, not a curtailment as this budget forecasts.

Rural people will want an expansion, not a contraction, of the grid road system, and they will want some recognition given to the increasing costs of maintenance of this road system. The costs of maintenance are pyramiding because there are more and more miles in use each year and the average age of the road mileage is increasing so that maintenance is becoming an increasingly onerous burden upon rural municipalities.

I think all rural people will be disappointed that this budget appears to make no provision for maintenance and in particular to cope with the snow removal problem on these main grid market roads.

It is not much comfort to the people of Hanley constituency to be told that the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and the people of Lumsden had had their grid roads included in the highway system.

Rural residents and the residents of the small urban communities will want the government to recognize the increasing need for broader educational opportunities, particularly technical and industrial training. Instead we have a curtailment of that program on abandonment of the program that was launched by the previous government and a failure to fulfil the program that was approved by the previous legislature one year ago.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of this government to give proper recognition to the needs of agriculture is very difficult to explain. They were elected only a few short months ago, Mr. Speaker, as the farmers' friend, they tell us. They have said that a majority of the members of the Liberal caucus are farmers. Why then have these farmers not adequately represented the interest of farmers?

The Premier announced in December that he was going to meet the Liberal caucus in a few days and that he would shortly announce the appointment of a new minister to fill a vacancy that exists in the cabinet. After he met the caucus, he said that he would not be making an appointment at this time, but would wait until all the private MLA's from the government had gone back home and the session was over. Apparently the caucus would

not go along with the choice which he had made to fill the vacancy. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the rural back benchers were able to assert themselves in this instance. Well, now the Premier wants to give six rewards, emoluments, salaries, in the form of legislative assistant-ships to distribute each year to the good boys of the Liberal back bench.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — These hand-outs will each cost as much or more than the cost of a master farmer award. Two plums for the master farmers of Saskatchewan and six for the faithful little back benchers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, rural people will expect their Liberal members to fight for programs of general benefit for rural areas. They will expect their members to resist the blandishments of a \$2,000 hand-out for being faithful to the business-minded millionaire point-of-view of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by saying that the budget of the present government set this province on a course which can lead only to increased taxes or to increased deficits or increased borrowings.

I suggest that if this government is not very, very lucky, they will commence to realize in the coming weeks, that they are faced with an intolerable economic financial framework and that they will recognize that the sins which they have committed in this particular budget can not be lived with for four years, either by the people of Saskatchewan or by the members of the government.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these shortcomings that I have enumerated, if they are not already known to the members of the government, will become known to them by painful necessity in the weeks that lie ahead.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when the full magnitude of these fiscal irresponsibilities become known to the members of the government, there will be a clamor amongst them to escape the consequences of their fiscal irresponsibility. I suggest that rather than face the consequences which are inherent in this budget, the Liberal leadership will try to hide from their just reward . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . they will try to find some excuse for plunging this province into an election. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they would rather face probable defeat than face the annihilation that waits for them after three and a half years of these policies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Balancing as they will, these two desperate alternatives, I'm sure that they will select what they think is the least dangerous and desperate expedient to get themselves out of this predicament. Mr. Speaker, certainly four years of this kind of irresponsibility would lead them to defeat. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that they think that by plunging this province into an election, that they may be able to scrape through before the desperate consequences of this budget become manifestly known to all the voters.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — I suggest that the people of Saskatchewan will not be long in finding out just how impossible this budget really is. The people of Saskatchewan will not be quite as easily taken in by specious and high flown promises, as they were a year ago. They will come to recognize that carrying out promises at the expense of worthwhile programs and at the expense of the rural tax payers, can be serious, can be damaging, and can be disastrous, and so we may expect that this government will become increasingly desperate to try to find some escape from the consequences of their actions.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I shall try to make the voters of

Saskatchewan aware of the predicament that they worked themselves into. I shall certainly try to acquaint the voters as quickly as I can, with the position that this government is in, in the hope that they will not be able to take advantage of the fact that the full effects and consequences of this budget are not yet fully known.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be clear to every member of the house that I cannot conscientiously, in the interests of the people I represent and the people of Saskatchewan, support this particular budget. I will have to support the amendment that was introduced by this side of the house and I am sure that fullness of time will vindicate my choice.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G. Romuld (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this budget debate, I would like to first congratulate you for the high position you have achieved in this house. I have known you for quite some time and I know that you bring distinction to the chair you occupy.

I would like to also compliment the new members in the house, on both sides. I know there is one member from the Kelsey seat (Mr. Brockelbank) who must be very proud that he has a son sitting in the house with him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — I have some advice for the younger member of the Brockelbank family, and that is if he is going to pursue the course that his father has, I would suggest that perhaps in the future he should cross over to this side, so that he will be on the government side for thirty years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — Or perhaps not quite that long.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — He will be there but it won't be like that.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Oh, he will, Brock. Don't you worry.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — I would like to mention the fact that we have on this side of the house, the first member of the Jewish faith to sit in the Saskatchewan legislative assembly and I would like to congratulate him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — I am very happy to be part of a government that has so many teachers in its ranks. I can recall, at one time, that I could go through our constituency and practically all through the province, and not find a teacher who was a Liberal. Now, it is just the reverse. You can hardly find a teacher who is a CCF.

I think I should publicly thank the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He came into our constituency and held one meeting. In the last election I was seven down and this time I was forty-nine up. So you can see what a good honest politician can do when you take him into the right poll. I know you don't agree with me, but nevertheless it's the truth. To prove it, I am down here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — I want you people on the other side to know that you can relax. I am not going to reveal any dark secrets of your past. I have not been digging down in the files deep enough yet, but I am going to get there. I could never quite understand how you fellows ever did get caught that way. You know, your party sort of reminds me of a duck that always flew backwards because it was more interested in where it had been than where it was going. The former government should certainly have been able to cover up their mistakes. I suppose one of the reasons that they looked backwards was not know-

ing where they were going. They had to look back to see where they had been.

I would like to compliment the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) for the wonderful budget he brought down. I think it is a dynamic one. It is positive. It is full of action. It should have been here two sessions ago but I think there is still time to save Saskatchewan from the crippling effects that the long Socialist government has had on this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — When I see a budget brought in that is going to increase industry, which is one of our main objectives, I am certainly going to be one that is going to support it. When you support industry, you are going to bring back one of the main resources in the province of Saskatchewan and that is our people. Now, I do not know how the members on the other side feel about people. They always talk about being such humanitarians and I am going to deal with that a little later on. At one time they thought that people were very important to the province of Saskatchewan, and that was when Tommy Douglas was here. It goes back quite a few years and they always like to talk about the dirty thirties. I have here a news release from the Moose Jaw Times. Premier Douglas, speaking there, said:

We don't want them on the farms. With increasing mechanization, we need fewer people on the land.

He said in an address to the National Dairy Council of Canada:

We do need them in Saskatchewan to use them in services we have already provided. For instance, we have only eight per cent of Canada's population yet we have thirty per cent of its highways.

And the CCF member qualified Sir Wilfred Laurier's prediction that the twentieth century would belong to Canada. He said that:

The second half of the century would definitely belong to the West. Western Canada was entering a period of mineral and industrial development which doubled with a large program of processing its own primary products, a greater contribution to the welfare of the country as a whole.

Tommy Douglas saw this away back in 1951 but we had to wait thirteen years later until a Liberal government was elected to see this dream come true. It is amazing to me when I think that the budget was brought down a few days ago and today we had another \$49,000,000 industry announced for the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — Was that yesterday? Oh well, whenever it was. It is amazing how fast the members on this side of the house were in attracting new industry. I was very impressed.

I wasn't actually impressed by what he said although I was impressed with the delivery of the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney). I was amazed too, that he would talk about civil servants.

I would like to say something about some of the civil servants we had back in 1944. Some of them had worked for years in the civil service, particularly in the northern part that I represent. What happened to them when the government came into power? I do not think it necessary for me to tell you but I have a list of civil servants who resigned. The reason they resigned was that the pressure that was put on them was more than they could bear. Here is one, in particular, that I would like to mention. (My files are something like those of the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). But they are not quite as bad. They are in a little bit of order.) This is a man who had a family of eight and who now lives in Yorkton. He was employed by the Liquor Board Commission. He was just dismissed from the civil service without any warning of any kind. To this day, he has not been employed in any full time job. He is now, I believe, about eighty years of age but it did create a hardship on his family at that time.

Now, these are the fellows who talk about being such humanitarians.

How do you think this family feels about socialist humanitarians? I can tell you how they feel because I am personally acquainted with the family. Their son has just obtained his Bachelor of Education degree from the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. He is forty years old because he had to work his way through because you people on the other side saw fit to see his dad relieved of his job.

I would like to say something about what happened in the constituency of Canora. Just prior to the election, we heard of people being hired for their qualifications. Well, I know that there are members in the civil service that were hired for one qualification and I won't mention what it is. But . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Now, Alex . . .

**Mr. Romuld:** — But I can mention one person who worked during the campaign and who appealed to the people of Canora to support him because he said, "if you vote for Romuld, I am going to be fired". That is how the Liberals work. I want the members on the other side to know that we have not fired, or transferred, or dismissed one civil servant in the constituency of Canora.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — This is the trash that you Socialists peddled through the country prior to the election. This is why the civil servants of the province of Saskatchewan were scared. This is why a lot of them voted for you, but I can tell you today that the civil servants do not live in fear any more and that they are happy with the government that is now in office in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — Now, to get back to the subject. We believe that our policies will stop the exodus of young people from the province. I would just like to quote a few facts regarding what has taken place in Saskatchewan since 1944. For instance, in 1944, British Columbia had 952,000 people. On January 1st, 1964 its population was 1,720,000, an increase of eighty-four per cent.

During the same period Alberta had an increase of 75.9 per cent. All the way down the line you see the same until you get to Saskatchewan. We had 836,000 on January first, 1944, and on January first, 1964, we had 936,000, an increase of twelve per cent. Mr. Speaker, don't you think it should be the policy of a government to try and stop this exodus of the best resources we have, our young people, leaving our province after we spend thousands and thousands on their education? I congratulate the former government for carrying out and improving our educational system, but we spent this money and then what did we do? The people left the province because we were unable to keep up with the rest of Canada. Until such time as we stop our young people from leaving the province, we cannot say we have been a good government. But I know that we will not have a finger pointed at us, such as we pointed at you members on the other side.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — Mr. Speaker, I was quite amazed with the report from the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) when he said he was alarmed and shocked at the agreement with Dumont Forestry Association. I suppose he has reason to be shocked because it is a few years since they made any announcement like this, but I want to point out the difference between how we announced it and how they brought it in. They used to make the announcements before elections. We make them after the election because we know it will be forthcoming.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — Now, I would like to have you know again, I was not in the wastepaper basket, but I was in the library. You fellows have done a lot of speaking over the last few years. I guess you think you are not going to be quoted. I have here a copy of a statement made by Russ Brown when he was down in St. Johns, New Brunswick. I believe he used to be on this side. He is not even over there now. He was the member from Last Mountain. When he

was in St. John, New Brunswick he was talking about a merger of the Liberals and the CCF. He said that they are not too far apart. Now, when we hear what you say, I don't think we have to worry that there will ever be a merger between the NDP and the Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — . . . the people of Saskatchewan couldn't stand it. But now, I would like to make reference to the first announcement that I found.

A \$60,000,000 pulp mill for Prince Albert. Agreement signed. Giant construction site near P.A. Forerunners of others.

This goes on and the print is a little bit too small for me to read, but however, it is going to employ some 5,000 people. This was announced on May 31st, 1956, if I remember correctly — I was campaigning that month, I am not sure . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — . . . but I think it was before an election. Then Mr. Fines was up here. I don't know where he went but apparently he did not like the socialist policy or philosophy because when he got a little money, where did he go? He went to a free enterprise country. I don't think the socialist philosophy used him too good. I remember, when he was still one of the boys, and was up there, he said there would be lower gas costs due to pulp mill. Now, that was real vision! He could see lower gas costs due to the pulp mill but what he failed to see was that the pulp mill wouldn't be in Saskatchewan until there was a Liberal government.

Then we went on further:

Mill important to Saskatoon. Should mean slash in gas prices to Saskatoon.

I am sure that would make Sally Merchant very happy if she could say they are going to have reduced gas prices in Saskatoon. I am just trying to point out that we come out and make one little announcement — that in the future we are going to get a pulp mill. We didn't bring it in as an election promise, but how you fellows went out and spread it before election! It goes on way down here. It says:

P.A. feeling pretty good.

You made them feel pretty good. It took about seven years until they weren't feeling so good, then they sent Davey down here and he is going to be here for awhile. The member for Canora at that time, had to get into this too. On his first trip up there, the Minister said that they had formed the pulp section. This must have made them feel pretty good. It is too long and I don't want to quote only from papers. I would like to say a few things besides what you said, but I would like to remind you of what the Minister said:

A ten year forestry inventory was carried out by the experts and completed last fall. It established that pulp wood in the province with major wood resource of more than 70,000,000 cords of its stands reaching from Meadow Lake to Hudson Bay . . .

It still stands there. It is a lot bigger now. And we are going to get more than 700,000,000 cords -out of it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Thatcher keeps his promises.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Actually though, I would like to read this here. It is quite a yarn! It goes on and on and on. Then I have got some more. I don't have to read this one.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Come on.

**Mr. Romuld:** — The next time the hon. Minister of Natural Resources went up there, it says:

Kuziak asks recognition for CCF when mill arrives.

Now, this is really funny. The only thing I am sorry about is that the CCF are not going to get the recognition. I don't think you socialists should feel so badly because you say you are interested in people, and to help people is by bringing this industry in. But then, after the election was won in 1958, the same Minister of Natural Resources goes up and then, in the back pages away from the headlines, we read:

No Saskatchewan pulp mill for a year.

This is the way you socialists work, so don't think that we are doing anything wrong when we come out and make announcements that we intend to carry out.

**Mr. Walker:** — Warming up for the by-election.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Don't worry. The next time I go up to Hanley you are not going to win either. I never got out there in time last time. So much for the pulp mill. The next time I talk about a pulp mill it will be about the one that we are going out to open.

I would like to say something about our budget because it seems to me that the members on the other side have poked quite a bit of fun at it. These taxes seem to be quite an issue. If I remember correctly, when we were out campaigning, one of the things that we promised the people was that we were going to reduce taxes. We said we were going to reduce the education tax from five to four per cent. We said we were going to take the tax off purple gas for farm trucks. We said we were going to extend the number of goods exempted from the sales tax; and to grant newly-weds an exemption from sales tax up to \$1,000. I suppose this is a worry to the socialist party too because if you encourage people to get married, naturally the population is going to go up and when the population goes up, unemployment increases. Toby, you know its true.

Apparently we weren't the only ones that believe in tax reduction. Not at all. I've got a clipping here that says:

Taxes can be cut.

And it goes on and it says:

Keep the Liberals out. Re-elect the CCF government.

Let's see. Is this from the Mayor of Regina (Mr. Baker)? No, oh here it is:

Saskatchewan needs a communist voice in the legislature. In Regina North, vote Norman Brudy.

So even Norman Brudy thought the taxes should be cut. So if Norman Brudy figures the taxes should be cut and he says:

Keep the liberals out. Re-elect the CCF government.

. . . then you must believe the taxes should be cut.

**Mr. Walker:** — Just one of your friends.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Here it is. Come and look at it! Come and look at it!

**Mr. Walker:** — Fellow travellers.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Then recall, when you socialists came into power one of the things I remember was that I was sort of sympathetic to the cause at that time. I had grown up during the depression. I had to walk to school. Of course, it was kind of easy to think that you were going to solve everything. I was promised a job in the woollen mills . . . That is what made me change. Now let us see. I have something here I don't think you are

going to like too well. It says:

The CCF said that the Liberal sales tax will be repealed under a CCF government. They also said that they will shift the basis of taxation from the land to large mortgage companies.

Well, I'm glad they did that because I am a farmer. I want to tell you what the taxes were on the southeast quarter, twenty, thirty-five — the quarter I grew up on. In 1944, \$44.20. Five years after our humanitarian government had been in power the taxes were \$155.50 — a shift of \$67.30.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Still ahead.

**Mr. Romuld:** — To the backs of the mortgage company. No, my back! Then we will go on. I am not going to quote every year. We will go to 1954, The taxes were then \$217.80. A shift not quite as big — \$52.30. Then again in 1960, they were \$227.10 — a shift of \$10.70. I guess they cut it down a bit that year. The election was coming up. They must have given a little bigger grant. Then in 1963-1964 the taxes were \$236.90. That is a total shift of \$140.10. This is what they shifted on my back. What did you shift on the mortgage companies back? That is the figure I would like to know.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Just . . . from now on.

**Mr. Romuld:** — What was that?

**Mr. Nollet:** — Keep records from now on. Go over to Manitoba and take a look.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Dollars for poor people.

**Mr. Nollet:** — I am going to watch that quarter section.

**Mr. Romuld:** — We have had quite a time just reviewing some of the things that you socialists did. Now, any time a government can break its promises as you did — in all these. I have a list of what you promised before. You could stay in for twenty years and here we have been in power for nine months and have been a government for three weeks, and already we have carried out a big portion of the promises we made to the people of Saskatchewan. Then you say that you think we are afraid to go before the people of Saskatchewan. We might be there sooner than you think. But if I go, there are a couple over there that are going too. Don't worry about that.

And now my friends, I would like to turn to highways, because this has really been something that has been kind of a pet talk of theirs. I guess we'll have to admit they built roads. They couldn't help it. They were there when they took over. They only had to build them up a little higher.

**An Hon. Member:** — What's . . .

**Mr. Romuld:** — Oh yes, don't worry. I'll get to you later. I have a chart here which shows how much provincial governments spend on highways, roads, and bridges per capita. The amount is given in dollars per thousand. Now, first of all we hit Newfoundland. You on the other side who don't know where Newfoundland is — it is away down east. They have a little fellow there named Joey Smallwood. I have heard a lot of criticism of him from the members on the other side, but in that province, Joey spends \$40 some dollars per capita; Prince Edward Island spent over \$70; Nova Scotia just under \$40; New Brunswick, over \$45; Quebec, just over \$30; Ontario, over \$40; Manitoba, just over \$35; Saskatchewan, under \$35. The only province under it, on a per capita basis, was Quebec.

**Mr. Walker:** — Liberal government.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Then we will go on a little further and look at provincial government expenditures on highways, roads and bridges. These are broken down under vehicles in the provinces concerned. There is little Joey Small-



wood's province, Newfoundland, in dollars almost 300 per vehicle. And here for you people on the other side, if your eyes are open. Right on the bottom of the whole works. Every province is over it, Saskatchewan spent somewhere under \$100 per vehicle in the province of Saskatchewan. These are 1962 and 1963, based on the 1962 vehicle registrations. The we get further down, we have provincial government expenditures on highways, roads and bridges per vehicle mile travelled in the provinces concerned. These are cents per vehicle mile. Again we find Newfoundland just under four cents; Prince Edward Island under three cents; Nova Scotia, under two cents; New Brunswick over two cents; Quebec under 1.5; Ontario just about equal; Manitoba 1.3; Saskatchewan just over the one point. Again the smallest amount spent per vehicle.

Certainly then, when we see figures like this is it any wonder that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) put in more money for highways? How are we going to develop our country if we do not have highways? Sure, we know we have more miles. But the cost to develop roads in Saskatchewan is not as great as it is in some other provinces.

We know that we must develop our highways if we are going to attract industry and if we are going to attract tourists. We are not going to build a highway only for politicians. We are most interested in people, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — We are not going to have pavement in one section of the province and then go jumping over from another section because a constituency isn't on the government side. We are going to serve the best interests of the whole province. I think they well could have built more highways if they had not been so concerned about slogans. It is strange when you see a government that had more slogans than it had highways. It had a two-fold purpose, one was to hoodwink the voters in election time, and the other was to throw out a smoke screen to cover up their shortcomings.

I am confident that our government will carry out a program of highway expansion and we will develop roads in the north. Therefore, I have no alternative but to support the budget that was brought down by the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the constituency that I represent, for a while anyway. It is thirty years since a Liberal was elected in Canora constituency. I can't apologize for the fact that we haven't been here before and I can't offer any condolences to the Scandinavian people because most of them are on the other side of the fence.

**Mr. Nollet:** — They are all gone.

**Mr. Romuld:** — However, in the constituency where I live, and I am very proud of it, we have a large ethnic group — a very fine group of people. They worked very hard for me during the campaigns in 1960 and 1964. I think that the people of the Canora constituency are very happy that the Canora constituency is no longer on the socialist side of the government. They already realize the benefits that will be theirs. They know what they are going to get in the future because they already know from the way we brought down the budget that we don't make promises and not keep them.

Our constituency is a mixed farming area. We have a lot of problems with roads. We have a lot of people. The half-section farmer is above average in our constituency. We have good fishing . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** — They are all gone.

**Mr. Romuld:** — No, they are not all gone. They are coming back since we changed the government too.

In our constituency the best resources are people. We want to get industry in our constituency and now that the government is more favorable, I don't think that the people are going to be moving out as much. They will invest more money in the Canora constituency.

One of the things that we have is timber which we have heard a lot about from the other side, as well as talk about monopoly. If it had not been for the timber in the northern part of the constituency, the people

would have been pretty hard up, quite a few years ago. A lot of people in the northern part of the constituency made their living from the resources at hand and they were able to take out homesteads and build houses, barns, granaries and fine buildings.

Then this other government got in that was going to socialize resources for the benefit of all. But what did this help the people in the northern part of Saskatchewan? I live twenty-three miles from the reserve and until a fire went through, I couldn't get a permit. Once it was burned down, then we were able to get permits in order to get rid of this lumber. They had to cut it in the next year. How has this benefited the people in the north? I can see no benefit. I am positive that, when this government has been in for a while, the people who live in the northern part will be able to receive benefit from the timber resources they have close at hand. They say that they save us money. I would like to give you an example. When we built the municipal office in the town of Preeceville, — do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we put this on tender? And do you know that the highest tender out of the three was the timber board? The highest tender. Two other private companies that bid on it were able to sell lumber to the R.M. No. 334, cheaper than the timber board. Is this how to help the people? How can the lumber company that had to ship its lumber in from B.C. quote us a lower price than the timber board? This has not helped us one bit in the northern area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with telephones. We thought we would have great telephone development in the north when the CCF took over. This has not happened with the exception that they have improved the services that we had when they took over. I can recall people in the village of Endeavour practically pleading with the government every once in a while. They would tell me they had been down here. Do you know that there wasn't an announcement of the telephone going into Endeavour until after the election in April? For fifteen years they have been begging and pleading for telephones. Now they are going to get them. We are not worrying about winning the next election. We feel that if we do the things that are right, we automatically will win the election. I can tell you that the people in the northern part of my constituency appreciate these services. I am not going to have to go around and tell them next time what I did. I can remember hearing all the promises many times before elections. I can recall one time, I think it was in 1952, where the same group were campaigning year after year, promising us black-top.

Once I was in the bank when the bank manager was leaving for Regina. I asked him if he would stop in and see how our highway was coming along. This he did. When he came back, I happened to be in the bank again, borrowing money to pay the taxes that the CCF raised. I asked him if he had inquired about our highway. He said, "Well, there is only one problem. They don't know what color to make it." I don't think we will ever have such confusion on this side of the house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were to vote against the budget, I would be voting against industrial expansion. I would be voting against money for education. I would be voting against more money for public schools; more money for student loans; more money for universities; more money for highways; more money for northern roads; more money for Indians and Metis. Pardon me, did I say "if" I voted against it?

**An Hon. Member:** — You are right, Keep right on going.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Right. If I did not support the motion, I would be against more money for teachers and public service pensions. I would be against more money for the Arts Board, against more money for agriculture. Do you people on the other side feel, that after I have been elected for the constituency of Canora, that I could oppose such a budget? Why, I wouldn't dare to go home! Now, they tell me that when I come home, they are going to have a real big shindig for me.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment but I wholeheartedly support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown):** — Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my maiden speech, I should like to join the rest and congratulate you on your appointment on the high office of Speaker, in this legislature. Your sense of justice and fair

play will be recognized by both sides of this house and I wish you well.

I am honored, Sir, to address you, as a representative for the constituency of Rosetown. I want to assure you that I do not take my responsibility as a member lightly. I realize that the good people of my constituency, in electing me as their representative, expect that my service in this legislature, will be of some benefit to them. I hope that the confidence they have placed in me last April will be warranted. It will be my pleasure to do all within my ability to serve them well.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Rosetown, which is located in central Saskatchewan, is known as the heart of the wheat belt. To have this distinction, in a wheat province, such as Saskatchewan, makes my constituents justly proud. Not only does our constituency raise great quantities of grain and wheat, but we also produce the finest quality. Mr. Speaker, this is established by the fact that five awards were won by farmers at the provincial seed fair this year — one of which was the award for hard red spring wheat. These people should certainly be congratulated for this worthwhile achievement. My constituency, although proud of its farming achievements, is also concerned with mineral resources, such as the oil industry. It is hoped now that this industry can continue to expand and grow.

Mr. Speaker, areas in this constituency are connected with the South Saskatchewan River Dam development. This development, although at times controversial, promises to open new fields of industry. The benefits to my constituency could be of great future importance. I am sure that with proper legislative action and management, the dreams of a great achievement can be realized. At the present time, the irrigation agreement signed by the former NDP government in Saskatchewan and the federal Conservative government in Ottawa, causes great concern to some farmers. This situation can be rectified by proper public relations and suitable government assistance.

Over the past number of years I have had the opportunity, through community associations and community affairs, to be closely associated with the young people in this area. This association has always made me keenly aware of their ambitions and their problems. Mr. Speaker, my constituency has had the distinction of being the childhood home of such distinguished gentlemen as the now Premier of Alberta, the present president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and the late Dean of Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan. These are just a few of the notable citizens that have had their early training in the Rosetown constituency. What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that I have only mentioned a few. There are many more capable young people who have found it necessary, not only to leave the constituency, but to leave the province to find suitable employment and opportunities. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the failure of the former NDP government to cope with this employment situation has done more permanent damage to our province than any other single factor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Loken:** — Mr. Speaker, in the period from June, 1944 to April, 1964, a period of socialist government in Saskatchewan, the population of this province increased by 107,000. In that period, our natural increase in population, the excess of births over deaths, was 326,000.

**An Hon. Member:** — Where did they go?

**Mr. Loken:** — In the same period, 55,000 immigrants came to Saskatchewan from outside of Canada. Had we just merely held our own in population increase, it would have been the total of these two groups or 381,000, but the actual increase as reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, was only 107,000. We therefore, lost some 274,000 people. This is over one-quarter of a billion. This loss is equal to the present total population of the four largest cities in Saskatchewan. In the period of socialist government the population of Canada, as a whole, increased by 61.8 per cent. The population of Saskatchewan increased by only 12.8 per cent — the smallest increase of any province in Canada.

This loss of population has had disastrous effects on our province. Many of those who left us were voting people, trained at our expense in our high schools and in our University. They left to get jobs and they used their education and talents in other provinces and in the United States. We have been left with far too few people to maintain our social services, to

build our roads, and to carry the cost of the greatly increased gross debt of the province, which took place under Socialist government. As a result, our average provincial per capita tax has been one of the highest in Canada. We missed the period of increased industrialization and the population increase which was enjoyed by every other province in Canada.

We may never overcome the loss sustained and, in any case, it will take us decades, or a century, to do so. The Socialists, in their futile efforts to draw attention away from their failures and incompetence frequently refer to the decline in Saskatchewan's population from 1936 to 1944. There is no comparison between this period and the period of Socialist government. In the thirties this province suffered the twin disasters of depression and drought. For seven years, preceding 1936, this province had its leanest years. The total of farm net income in those seven years averaged less than \$28,000,000 a year. In the period of 1936 to 1944, the total of farm net income averaged only \$112,000,000, while in the twenty years of Socialist government from 1944 to 1964, the average was \$334,000,000 or three times as much as in the period of 1936 to 1944.

Also, in this period, from 1939 to 1944, large numbers of our people were leaving this province to work in factories, producing arms, machinery, and equipment required for the nation's war effort. The Socialists held office in the two decades following the second world war. In all other provinces it was a period of great industrial expansion and population increases.

In this province, because of good crops and the price and marketing policies of governments at Ottawa, it was by far the most prosperous period in agriculture this province has ever experienced. But, because we had a government addicted to Socialism, we had but an impoverished share in the nation's industrial expansion. About a quarter of a million of our people left to obtain employment under free enterprise governments. Mr. Speaker, we now have a free enterprise government. Already we are experiencing an influx of persons to fill our industrial development needs. We understand from reliable sources that Saskatchewan will be experiencing a labor shortage by July of this year.

I want to congratulate the Premier on his presentation of this development budget. I will not support the amendment but will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the budget debate, I would like to take this opportunity to extend to you my congratulations on your appointment to the esteemed position of this legislature, a position which carries with it respect, tradition, and impartiality.

Having had the opportunity over the last five sessions to observe two members of this legislature acting in your present capacity, I know that your task is somewhat difficult and will require good judgment, wise and courteous decisions, and honest and unbiased judgments to the members of the government and to this side, occupying the position of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. This tradition, Sir, I am confident you will uphold.

Before proceeding, may I take this opportunity to congratulate all the members who have been re-elected to represent their respective constituencies in this house. Undoubtedly the confidence and trust placed upon all hon. members by the electors is an inspiring challenge to our responsibility and self-dedication to our respective constituencies and to the people of Saskatchewan.

To the members who were elected for the first time, may I offer my congratulations. I am confident that by now, Sir, they have adjusted themselves to the legislative atmosphere, irrespective of the side on which they sit.

To me, Sir, the duties and obligations entrusted by the electors of the Redberry constituency have been pleasant and rewarding. I would at this time take this opportunity to convey to the people of my constituency my sincere thanks for the confidence and trust conferred upon me at the last provincial election. I will, as in the past, fulfil my obligation with humility and dedication in their best interests and in the interests of all the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, listening to previous members who had participated

in this debate, reference has often been made, quips have been thrown across the floor of this legislature as to why we have a small farm representation. Well, I don't know if we consider ratios, Mr. Speaker, our ratio is fifteen farm representatives to eleven city representatives and the ratio on the side to your right, Mr. Speaker is twenty-nine to three. I will agree that the government has a larger representation on behalf of rural constituencies, but I do not want, and may I suggest to the government not to use this device as a thin edge of the wedge to divide the farmer and labor. This device has been tried by the hon. gentlemen when they sat on this side of the house. It is being tried practically in every speech that is made by any member speaking in regards to labor and farmer during the present session of this legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — It is correct, Mr. Speaker, that some of the members who represent rural constituencies are not sure whether they are elected as yet.

May I mention a few things in respect to the budget, Sir. The hon. member for Regina East made some reference to budget cutting particularly in the field of Public Health. If you look at the comparative figures of the estimates that were provided for public health in 1964-65 estimates, and the 1965-66 estimates, you will note that the budget for public health for the ensuing year is cut by some \$6,000,000.

In the Department of Municipal Affairs, assistance for municipal road grids has been cut by \$100,000, and the total decrease for municipal road assistance was \$154,000. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Public Works the amount of money for the Department, has been cut by some \$956,740. Of course, the goal of the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt), who has made all sorts of threats to the cities, to the people, and to the local governments, somehow did not decrease the estimates of the Department of Social Welfare. I wish to congratulate him. It appears that he has a slight increase in his estimates of some \$210,000.

Now, may I say a few words with respect to some of our people receiving supplemental allowances. I have here, Mr. Speaker, what is reported to be a standard form used by the Department of Social Welfare to notify recipients of old age assistance, who have been receiving supplemental allowances, that their payments will be discontinued. This was given to me by an elderly lady who is well into her eightieth year, a lady who had been hospitalized with a broken hip in the Notre Dame Hospital at North Battleford. She owns a small home in one of the northern communities and had a bank account of \$300 which she had saved for her funeral. May I read the standard form which she received while she was in the hospital? It reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

For some time now you have been receiving an allowance from the Department of Social Welfare. Because of this you were also issued with a Health Services card entitling you to a broad range of health benefits at public expense. It has been learned that your allowance has now been cancelled. It has been learned consequently the Health Services card which you have is no longer valid.

It is important, therefore, if you have not already done so, you return your Health Services card as soon as possible in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. To replace this card, we are enclosing a medical and hospital card valid for the remainder of this year.

This card entitles you to those services insured under the Hospital Services Plan and Medical Care Insurance Commission, as described in the enclosed pamphlets. It does not entitle you to any assistance with drugs or for dental or optical services.

Your medical premium, medicare premium and hospitalization tax have been paid by the province until December 31st of this year. However, payment of this joint tax for next year will be your own responsibility if you are residing in

Saskatchewan. You will be required to pay it before November 30th in order to get coverage beginning January 1st, next. Present this letter to your tax collector when making payment.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. Totten,  
Administrator of the Medical Services Division.

Now this is humanitarian! A lady who had given her best years to the development of the province of Saskatchewan; a widow with a broken hip; an elderly lady who had saved \$300 for her funeral; receives a card from the Department of Social Welfare to this effect. A good Christmas present!

**Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Yes.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Would you mind asking the former Minister whether these are the identical forms that have been sent out by the Department on previous occasions? We have made no changes in regulations, since this is the former government's policy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Mr. Speaker, may I continue?

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the former Minister of Social Welfare to . . .

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Am I allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker? Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) feels very uncomfortable, but this form was not received by this lady during the time when the CCF was the government of the province of Saskatchewan. This form was received by the Minister of Social Welfare when the Liberals became the government.

**An Hon. Member:** — I have other people in the same situation . . .

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Do you want to speak?

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . they have got them from March last year . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Before he continues with something else, I ask him to table it now forthwith, with the date of the letter and the signature thereon.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, this is completely out of order and I object to your statement . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member is quoting from a piece of paper. He is quoting from a letter. He hasn't stated the date and I ask him to state the date.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think a member of this house deserves some respect too. I was asking a point of order and you rose and interrupted. I don't think you should do that as long as I am speaking properly to a point of order. I do not think you have that right, Sir.

Now, it is one rule that Ministers of the Crown must table correspondence. It is another rule entirely for private members of this legislature, and I object to your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . the date on it to begin with.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — . . . or interfering with the letter at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Give the date. Give the date.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — This was a standard form used by the Department of Social Welfare, and if this isn't the standard form used by the Department of Social Welfare, who is W.J. Totten, administrator of the Medical Services Division? This was given to me by the son of this lady and if the Minister of Social Welfare want to know the lady's name I will give it to him in private.

**An Hon. Member:** — What do you think you have found?

**An Hon. Member:** — I could give you a hundred names . . .

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Now, much ado has been made about the great progress that has been made since the election of the new Liberal government in development of minerals, and potash, and industry generally.

**An Hon. Member:** — What about heavy water?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I must give you credit for heavy water, but this completely contradicts your belief in private enterprise because this is socialism and private enterprise.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — If this is heavy water, give us more of it.

**An Hon. Member:** — That is a soft water plant.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Mr. Speaker, I was the member who last year moved the Address-In-Reply to the speech from the throne, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I am allowed to revert back a year. I want to read to this house and to the members of this legislature, what I said with respect to potash development.

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . . give us some more.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I will give you some too, Mr. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), don't worry.

Another shaft to triple production at Esterhazy. Stagnation? Thirty thousand . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Private enterprise.

**Mr. Michayluk:** —

Thirty thousand dollar potash of America Plant at Patience Lake — stagnation? Alwinsol Potash at Lanigan, a \$50,000 investment. Continental Potash at Unity, stagnation?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Private enterprise.

**Mr. Michayluk:** —

Booming business for the steel mill in Regina, stagnation?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Private enterprise brought in by the Liberals.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — We all recall, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the Hanley by-election, the present Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) and the present Premier (Mr. Thatcher), made quite an effort to claim credit for U.S. Borax coming to the Allan district to develop another potash mine. As a matter of fact, if I am not mistaken, the Liberal government and the Lib-

eral party tried to take credit for convincing U.S. Borax to come into Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of Friday, May 15th, 1964, and of course, the Liberals didn't form a government until May 22nd . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You fellows were getting your files out about then.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Here is the title, Mr. Speaker:

Company plans two shafts near Allan.

These \$50,000,000, \$60,000,000 plants or companies don't fly in over-night like a crow to roost in a tree. And here is what it says:

U.S. Borax which plans a major potash mining venture in the Allan district, east of Saskatoon, will be sinking two large shafts simultaneously, it was learned today.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who is now Premier was not even sworn as Premier yet. Here was the announcement in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of the coming of U.S. Borax to the Allan community.

**Mr. Allan Guy (Athabasca):** — Have you a clipping about Noranda that says the same thing?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I will find that one too, don't you worry.

**An Hon. Member:** — Table it . . .

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — May I proceed, Mr. Speaker? I think I am entitled to the same courtesy that all other members are.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think possibly that this is as good a time as any to draw the attention of all the members of the house to regulations that are fairly well known. Rule 126, citation 126 from Beauchesne:

The rule is well known, that interruptions should not be tolerated. On the 25th November, 1932, when a member interrupted with these words: "May I ask the honourable member a question?" and the request was refused, Mr. Speaker took the opportunity to give the following ruling: "It is out of order to interrupt a speaker in this way. When a member speaking is asked whether or not he will permit a question, he signified his willingness to be interrupted by taking his seat; when he does not do so, he indicates that he does not wish to be interrupted."

It goes on further to say that no member should interrupt while another member is making a speech. I am not going to spend a lot of time repeating all the citations from all the various books that there are. Let me merely close by saying that I most sincerely hope that the senior members of the house will follow the very excellent example which has been set throughout this session by the junior members of the house, making their first appearance. This is the rule, this is the regulation. I hope all hon. members will obey it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I thank you heartily, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling. I want to say a few words further in respect to mineral development in the



province of Saskatchewan. Mineral production first commenced in what we now know as Saskatchewan in 1886. By 1944, when the CCF took over, Saskatchewan had produced a cumulative total of \$170,000,000 of mineral wealth over a span of sixty years. In 1963 alone, the mineral wealth production is going to surpass or has surpassed the \$280,000,000 figure. It took Saskatchewan seventy-three years, from 1886 to 1958, to produce the first billion dollars worth of minerals. In June of 1963, and in less than five years, another or a second billion dollars worth of minerals was reached, and at that time, it was predicted that a third billion dollars worth of minerals will be reached in the next three years.

Now, direct government revenues from mineral resources in the form of royalties, fees, mineral land sales, have risen from \$233,000 in 1944 to an estimated \$28,000,000 in 1963. Is it any wonder then, Mr. Speaker, with the discovery of potash and with the location within the province of Saskatchewan of five or six companies, that several companies were in the process of negotiating with the government when it was defeated on April 22nd of last year, that more and more companies are locating in Saskatchewan to extract potash from the core of our province?

I would say that the credit is due, not to any particular party. Credit is due to nature that awarded us with this plentiful supply of potash which will provide future generations with economic resources for the benefit of every man, woman and child living in this province, providing that it is used wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn my remarks to a few things which are of some concern to me personally, and to some people within my constituency. Much has been said in respect to people in public service; people who have been appointed by Order-In-Council by the past government. I am concerned with what is being done to some of the people within my constituency with things which we in the CCF would consider as petty, too small to trifle with politically. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is being done within my constituency. I want to make reference to only two items. I have a letter here dated December 12th, 1964. It states:

I am sending you two copies of letters, one I received, and one I wrote. I was talking to Eiling Kramer . . .

It happens that Mr. Kramer lives very close to the boundary of my constituency, about five miles from the city of North Battleford.

. . . about this and he advised me to write the letter to Mr. Flynn, which I did. This is unfair and there is no good reason for the change except for politics. I just wanted to let you know what was going on and see if there is anything you can do to help me keep this agency.

And this is in respect to a Saskatchewan Transportation Bus stop.

I would appreciate an answer to this letter.  
I hope you can help me in some way. Thank you.

Yours truly,

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — Will the member tell the house who the letter was from?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Yes. I have no fear. Mrs. May Deery of Cochin, Saskatchewan. Now, here is the letter that Mrs. Deery received from Mr. W.W. Flynn, General Manager of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company:

As provided in the agency agreement between yourself and the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, we are giving 30 days notice of termination of the said agreement to become effective October 19th, 1964.

The letter from Mrs. Deery to Mr. Flynn:

**February 23, 1965**

Dear Mr. Flynn:

In reply to your letter of September 2nd, stating that you are moving the bus depot, and giving me thirty days notice as provided in the agency agreement. I would like to know the reason for this change, as the agency contract was signed for a period of five years, and to my knowledge there has been no default in the accounts or complaints as to service.

It is not inconvenient for the bus driver or unsafe for the passengers when loading or unloading. The bus has stopped here for a good many years.

The only reason they gave me for moving the agency was that the bus would stop closer to the highway at the new place, but that is right on a very busy highway where it would not be safe for loading and unloading. Also, the bus would be crossing and re-crossing a very busy traffic lane where there are no stop signs. It is also in a very busy part of a resort, whereas here it is off the main highway enough so as the heavy traffic does not interfere with the unloading and loading of passengers and express.

The roads are in good shape and we do have stop signs here. It is also more convenient here as we are right across the street from the hotel and cafe, and the majority of the passengers come from this side of the resort.

I hope you will reconsider the decision in this matter. An early reply would be appreciated, as I can, if necessary, take further action to retain this agency.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Deery.

I wrote this letter to Mr. Flynn, whom I know personally. I had an opportunity of meeting him on one occasion at the bus depot. This is a copy of the letter I wrote to Mr. Flynn:

September 25th, 1964

Dear Mr. Flynn:

Re. S.T.C. Bus stop at Cochin

The decision of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company to reallocate the bus stop in the above hamlet has been brought to my attention by Mrs. Deery, agent for the S.T.C. there. Would you kindly, at your convenience, inform me as to the reason for this move on the part of the S.T.C?

With kindest personal regards to you, I am

and my name. On September 28th, about three days later, I received this letter from Mr. Flynn:

Please be advised that your letter of September 28th, 1964, has been referred to Hon. G.B. Grant, Chairman of the Board of Directors for his attention and action.

Yours truly, Mr. Flynn.

This is the letter I received from the Minister (Mr. Grant).

September 30th, 1964.

Re. — S.T.C. Bus Stop at Cochin.

Mr. W.W. Flynn, General Manager of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, passed on to me your letter of September 25th, dealing with the above.

I feel that the relocation of the bus stop at Cochin was justified, due to the highway changes and also because the new location has many features superior to the former location.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know Cochin. It so happens the first bus stop is on the left hand side of the highway. The present bus stop is on the right hand side of the highway, going north. The only relocation that was made was that the highway no. 4, instead of turning in towards the hotel and making a small bridge, the highway was straightened, so that the bus, when it turned off, turned off to a grid road, to the bus stop across the little bridge with a stop sign, and kept on going. It was only moved, possibly not even a hundred yards, across the road. Now, I am just wondering Mr. Speaker, I don't want to infer to the hon. Minister in charge of S.T.C., but I would suggest to the government that these little petty things are of no benefit to anyone; they are of no benefit to you as a Liberal party. This little change of the bus stop which could be called a nuisance because those people have to be there to meet the bus. The commission for the sale of tickets is very small. It is causing enemies in small hamlets and communities in the province of Saskatchewan.

I don't know whether other changes have taken place, but Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister isn't happy and I am not happy. I am just suggesting to the government not to meddle in petty things that are too trivial to talk about in the legislature. I know that the Minister and Mr. Flynn did not act on their own. I am sure that possibly an active Liberal executive said, "Look, we have two people, two premises where buses can stop. Let us take it away from the one who may be CCF or may have voted CCF and give it to a fellow whom we know is a Liberal supporter". I am not sure.

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Highways):** — Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Yes.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member argues that the present location at Cochin is inferior, in accommodation, convenience, and facilities to the previous one?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not. I am not inferring and I do not want to infer in any way, shape, or form, that the present place is superior to the place where it was located originally; or that the original place is superior to where it is located now. But I am speaking on a matter of principle. I know personally that this has caused ill feeling, not only between these two people in this little hamlet and between certain groups in this community. I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that I am certain it did not cause ill feeling between parties as such, but as a matter of principle, because surely the people in a small community can assess action like this on its own merit.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member inferred that this action was taken on authority other than mine. I will take full responsibility for it and I claim it was just for the reasons cited, namely convenience, accommodation and facilities.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to one other matter which, to people who devote some time to politics, is of vital importance. It is also of vital importance to the gentlemen of the press. I am referring to propaganda. We use radio broadcasts to inform the people of the province of Saskatchewan regarding proceedings in the legislature. This is a form of propaganda that propagates whatever takes place during the hour and fifteen minutes of proceedings in this house, but I want to speak about propaganda

generally.

You know it is quite a device, Mr. Speaker, It is quite an instrument that kills, devastates and builds. It is a device which some of the hon. members on the government side, and maybe some on this side, try to use to influence the electors. It is used effectively to misrepresent and to catch the public unaware. It is a device, Mr. Speaker, which I said at the offset, destroys and builds. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that this is the reason why some of the hon. members opposite try to use propaganda. Continuous efforts are made to capture the minds of the unsuspecting public in the interest of some policy or idea. Technical instruments, unknown in previous ages, are now used to influence the thinking of millions of people. With respect to this elaborate web of communication, a modern writer says:

Our nation has become a small room in which a single whisper can be magnified thousands of times.

The purposes for which these facilities are employed are of primary concern to all Canadians who are interested in constructive citizenship. I want to refer to the meaning of the term College of Propaganda — an organization founded in Rome. It had a purpose in the educating of missionaries. Later, this term came to be applied to activities carried on for the purpose of spreading any doctrine or belief.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems that no important undertaking is carried on in modern society, and particularly politics, without propaganda. Whether a community is planning a centre, an open football season, a fight against cancer, or a safety campaign, we must have the approval of the public for success. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that without effective advertising even the most worthy project fails to make a wide-spread impression. Without fear of contradiction, Mr. Speaker, it is not this type of propaganda that I and the members of this house consider objectionable. It is rather, the distortion of facts and the insinuations that I view with alarm. It is only too obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that unscrupulous interests can use the most up-to-date techniques of publicity for their selfish purposes just as persuasively as those who employ them for socially desirable ends. One other writer said this of propaganda:

It is a method, an instrument, equally available in starting wars. It may appeal to the generous and tolerant impulses of men or their brutal instincts. It may be compared to a garden hose. Through it may pass water from a cesspool or crystal clear water or a mixed muddy stream. Propaganda may present the clear truth or a muddy mixture of truth and lies, or a poisonous stream of prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, how can one recognize dangerous propaganda? Socialist scientists, who are experienced in analyzing the ways of publicity agents, believe that it is possible to distinguish between the appeals of trustworthy leaders and those of dangerous unscrupulous demagogues, be they political or otherwise, by listing seven common tricks employed by modern propaganda. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, may I name the seven? First, the name-calling device — a simple old trick or practice of giving a dog a bad name. A movement is condemned by fixing a label to it which is known or thought to be unpopular. Anyone whose policies or politics is disliked, is said to be leftist, red, socialist, agitator, or free enterpriser, and so on.

The next one is a glittering generality — a sweeping statement for a clever slogan, backed by no evidence . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — A slogan from your end.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — . . . which is obviously agreeable to the reader or listener. This is the trick employed by politicians. "Virtue" words in which people like to think they believe, are used freely such as: progress, democracy, free enterprise, truth, freedom and civilization. Policies are put forward as being in perfect harmony with the way of life.

The third, Mr. Speaker, is by transfer. Propaganda attempts to win support by association with a symbol which is universally respected and accepted. In this way, cartoons make effective use of the Christian Cross, the Union Jack, the Maple Leaf, John Bull and others. In other phases skill-

ful employment of music is used. Testimonials are commonly used in advertising where people of popular fame associate themselves with products. Hockey stars use "Bee-hive" syrup and of course movie stars use certain brand of make-up.

Then there is the "plain folk" technique. "I am for the under dog". The plain folk technique is often used by politicians to win confidence by appearing to be just "plain folks", therefore, wise, good and trustworthy.

The card stacking trick is another device. This is a good one, Mr. Speaker. This is the use of faulty logic or the suppression of known facts in order to promote a cause such as breaking of a tape to discontinue a rebroadcast of an explanatory portion of legislative broadcasts. Information which would be embarrassing to one's own cause is conveniently overlooked or an argument is shifted from a point of major importance to those of little consequence. Every effort is made to conceal the truth and to mislead the public. This is used by the Leader Post and the Saskatoon Star Phoenix exclusively during times like this. Every effort is made to conceal the truth and to mislead the public. Reports on events of vital importance are found among the want ads.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the trick to which the party and hon. members to your right will employ is the "band wagon" device. It is the old method of attracting followers by creating the impression that everybody is doing it, everybody is with them, the people are supporting them, and so on. Mr. Speaker, if it can be demonstrated that a certain cause is bound to win, the inclination is to "climb on the band wagon". By this means, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is made unpopular, hopelessly weak, and perhaps just a little queer. In using this technique, appeal is directed at whole groups, which share common interests. Prejudice, hatred and fear are the main stock-in-trade. In all these efforts to direct the interest and tastes of people, Mr. Speaker, the propagandist avoids the test of reason and logic.

A steady battle is waged to control people and human emotions. Without it, the propagandist is helpless. With it, he tries to make people glow with pride or burn with indignation. The unsuspecting public, completely unaware of what the purpose is, stops thinking and follows the leader. Political campaigns, Mr. Speaker, are orgies of propaganda. Unfortunately they reveal an almost irresponsible use of every device I have mentioned. Elections are conducted in an atmosphere of color and excitement, and I wonder who tuned some of our leaders in this province during the last provincial election? Some people didn't even appear to be their natural selves. They were tuned down, to make it appear that they were respectable and that they could be trusted and be relied on.

**Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture):** — Tune him down a little.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Elections are conducted in an atmosphere of color and excitement. The successful leader is expected to be a showman as well as a statesman. We have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that our Premier has been toned down to the personality type of Premier, not to his true self, as we on this side of the house know him. Thus, Mr. Speaker, propaganda is a menace to Canadian democracy when it is directed by selfish interests towards sinister ends.

Vast sums of money may be used to purchase newspaper space and time on television and radio — a very expensive media which is somewhat beyond reach of those who have limited financial resources. Thus the campaign proceeds to capture the minds of people for political or business purposes, and public opinion is influenced by powerful interests without the real design being disclosed.

Another device that I want to mention is the suppression of fact. There was . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — How come you know all about it?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — . . . an example of this, during the Hanley by-election, Mr. Speaker. You know the Star Phoenix (and I am sure they have a representative in the press gallery this evening) as a matter of principle, accepts letters to what is known as "The Letter Box".

**An Hon. Member:** — Free press.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Just when the Hanley by-election was announced, on November 16th, the following item appeared in the Star Phoenix Letter Box:

The Letter Box page of the Star Phoenix has been closed to letters. Letters on hand, considered by the editor to be strictly political propaganda, will not be published until after the December 16th election in the Hanley constituency. A person attacked directly will be allowed to reply on the editorial page as is the usual custom.

Now, the ruling has been forced on the editor by propaganda raised by letters. Several politicians were warned some time ago of this matter. The Letter Box is meant to be a forum for the discussion of subjects of interest. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the Hanley by-election was not in the best public interest. It will not be allowed to be a propaganda outlet for any political party, in power or out of power. Now, this is what I mean by black-out.

I hope that these few things that I have mentioned with respect to propaganda will enlighten some of the members on both sides of the house and I want to say to the members opposite that we know what they are trying to do.

During the present session, it has been stated frequently that we refused to call by-elections when they were made necessary. Now, I know that the calling of the Hanley by-election, Mr. Speaker, was the last thing that the Premier wanted, but the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) put him up against the wall so that he had to call a by-election under the Controverted Election Act.

I want to say something about by-elections that we had some years past. In the 1960 election, the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) who is now representing this constituency, was elected by a mere eleven votes, and of course, his opponent presumably went throughout the constituency and found eleven people who were not qualified to vote under the Election Act, as it existed at that time.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . all Liberals too.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — On January 17th, 1961, that was before the session was called, the election of the hon. member, now member for the constituency of Turtleford, (Mr. Wooff) was declared null and void. What did the then government do, Mr. Speaker? The writs were issued for a by-election in the Hanley constituency on January 18th the next day.

**An Hon. Member:** — Turtleford.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Turtleford, I am sorry. Yes. The writs were issued on the 18th, and the election was held on February 22nd. In other words, one day the election of the hon. member, now sitting in his seat was disallowed, and the next day the writs were issued. The election was held on February 22nd, and the legislature took every action to make it convenient for the elected member who was not on the side of the government, to take his seat and represent the people of Turtleford constituency.

You will recall that the hon. Mr. McIntosh died during the session, March 17th, and that we adjourned to attend the funeral. The session ended on April 14th. There was no time to hold an election during the balance of the sitting days, but the first question that the now Premier asked when this house came to order after the funeral was, "When are you going to hold a by-election in Prince Albert?"

**An Hon. Member:** — Before the body was even cold.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I do not think that the deceased Minister's feet were cold when the election was requested.

You know what happened during the summer of 1962. This would have been the opportune time for the party who were in opposition to hold a by-election during the medical care crisis. They had a lot of things going. They had the now Premier kicking on the door; they had what was commonly

known as the K.O.D. Yes, they had the members of the then opposition speaking at K.O.D. rallies and enticing people to march on Regina in July. Then they wanted an election. You know, it is nice to catch fish in muddy water. The by-election was held on November 9th and of course, we were defeated. However, at no time was the Prince Albert constituency unrepresented.

Mr. Speaker, then of course, we had the by-election in Weyburn. You know the then Premier resigned November 7th and the writs were issued on November 8th. The by-election was held on December 13th, and again we were defeated. Again Weyburn did not go unrepresented in this legislature.

In 1952, Mr. Speaker, I acted as a returning officer for the Redberry constituency and we had a very close vote. You know, Mr. Speaker, that Redberry has had a batting average of 500 since 1944, but it has now changed that status. I have taken it twice in a row. But at that time, the then member, Mr. Dick Zipchen, was elected in the final count, by forty votes. The Liberal opponent called for a recount.

Personally, I don't see much wrong with the Election Act, providing that good will exists on both sides. This is what the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) said, five ballots remained uncounted, but of course, his majority was 207. In my constituency they counted every vote, but my majority was 207. When a majority is pretty close and good will is non-existent, then there seems to be difficulty, and difficulties were found in Hanley, Canora, Pelly, and Kelsey. In Regina East, difficulties ceased to exist after the Hanley election. All that is necessary is good will. The Redberry recount was the first to be held in twenty-one years. All parties appeared before his Honour Judge Nye, in the courthouse of North Battleford. Judge Nye carried out the count and declared Mr. Dick Zipchen elected by twenty-four votes. However, the difficulties of the 1964 election are more than I can comprehend. I cannot recall, Mr. Speaker, during the time that I sat in this legislature, that any of the members opposite made reference to the Election Act. They did make reference to a soldier vote.

When you were in opposition, you did make reference to the soldier vote, but you know our defeat was not as spectacular as the members opposite would want the people of Saskatchewan to believe. You know there was a little bit of hide-and-seek. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) is not in his seat, but you know there was quite an attempt made by the now Premier for what was called a saw-off. I have here a statement made by the now Premier, and reported in the Leader Post of Saturday, March 14th, 1963. I want to quote this section:

Party officials say that most of those leaving early were known Liberals. What were they doing at the P.C. nomination convention?

Thatcher calls for P.C. saw-off, Tuesday, February 11th, 1964.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Not a saw-off.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Well, it gives good saw dust. Speaking at Moose Jaw and I quote:

Speaking at the Moose Jaw Liberal provincial constituency nominating convention, Mr. Thatcher declared flatly to the P.C.s, "if you will come along with us, we will finish the job, and then we can have our squabbles after the job is done".

**Mr. Walker:** — Said the spider to the fly.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Now, if we look through the Saskatchewan Gazette, it is amusing to note the way things seemed to stack up. They could not find a Conservative candidate in the Canora constituency, and yet that area which the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Romuld) represents, has a Conservative in the House of Commons. Yes, in a federal seat, which includes your constituency . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . they found me.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — . . . includes your constituency. They couldn't find a Conservative in Elrose. Coincidental, isn't it? Both Ministers, the Hon. A.G.

Kuziak and Hon. O.A. Turnbull, both Ministers, had no Conservative opponents. That is not all. They couldn't even find a Conservative in Gravelbourg. Kerrobert-Kindersley, did you have a Conservative?

**Mr. W.S. Howes (Kerrobert-Kindersley):** — No.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Well, you were fortunate. Then the member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) said that this time he had a two-way fight. They couldn't find a Conservative in Moosomin, so a two-way fight. How about Morse? You know that the hon. Premier's majority is smaller than mine. He said in one of his speeches, "I had a squeaker in Morse".

**Mr. MacLennan (Last Mountain):** — A real squeaker . . .

**Mr. Michayluk:** — It sure was a squeaker. No Conservative. Oh no. Regina South, no Conservative. No Conservative in Souris-Estevan; and of course, no Conservative in the hon. member's constituency representing Swift Current -a two-way fight. No Conservative in the constituency of my hon. friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). Last but not least, the hon. member for Watrous (Mr. Broten) had to put up quite a fight to win Watrous in a two-way fight.

Mr. Speaker, do you mean to tell me that this was all coincidental? That there were no Conservatives in all these constituencies? I think that these bold calls made by the then leader of the opposition paid off. However, we did take Swift Current; we took The Battlefords; we took Kinistino; we took Watrous; but we lost a few which caused the defeat of the government.

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . . we took the government.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — You sure did, but it won't be for long.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Try it again.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough for this evening. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **MOTION: — ASSISTANCE RE — SCHOOL BUS ROUTES**

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River) moved:

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the government that a special emergency grant be established to provide assistance to rural municipalities for the purpose of opening school bus routes where snow-clearing facilities are inadequate, resulting in the inability of pupils reaching school.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, I believe that members on both sides of the house are very well aware of the extreme conditions that have existed in the province this winter, insofar as our roads, particularly grid roads, are concerned, and as they affect the transportation of children to school.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had several representations, as I understand members on both sides of the house have had, from various groups, the school units, municipalities and individuals, suggesting that the machinery in existence in a great many of these areas at the present time for the opening of grid roads to allow the passage of school buses, has broken down. In my own constituency of Arm River, I have a group of twenty-eight pupils who live out at the far end of a grid road, and who are blocked off from access to their school by a mere half mile of road. This is in a fourteen mile piece of road.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this situation can be duplicated in literally dozens and dozens of communities in this province. My recommendation to the government, Sir, is that they would consider the possibility of providing some type of a special emergency fund to deal with this situa-



tion. I realize that this is not a permanent type of an answer, and I was very pleased to hear mentioned in this house that the Minister is aware of this problem and is planning some steps to correct this through the construction of further grid roads to bring them up above the snow level. For the present time, and because I believe this matter is very urgent, many pupils having already been deprived of the opportunity to get to school, I would hope and would earnestly suggest that the government give consideration to this resolution.

My own suggestion would be that a very nominal amount could be made available; I believe that it would be quite within keeping for municipalities to approach the Department of Highways for the rental of their equipment on a per hour basis. The costs are relatively modest and many of these areas that are affected, if they had just one good cleaning out job done on these roads, would probably last until spring. In many municipalities, this would require a matter of only two, three, four, up to eight or ten hours of work for snow removal, in order to ensure easy passage for the busses from now until spring.

I have tried to calculate what the cost would be and I would think something in the neighborhood of a maximum per municipality, say of a couple of hundred dollars, would probably be ample to look after this particular problem. Many municipalities have expended what little money they had available for this kind of work and most of them have not allocated such funds on snow clearing and are unable to go further.

Snow Plow Clubs have done a tremendous job, but with the hard crust that is formed on the snow, with repeated plowings, their machinery is inadequate, and unless, Mr. Speaker, something is done, and done almost immediately, we are going to have literally hundreds and hundreds of children in this province deprived of the opportunity of attending school for literally weeks on end. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is serious enough that I hope the government will take this into consideration and act on it as quickly as possible.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Wooff of Turtleford:

That this assembly recommends to the consideration of the government that a special emergency grant be established to provide assistance to rural municipalities for the purpose of opening school bus routes where snow-clearing facilities are inadequate, resulting in the inability of pupils reaching school.

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — To anyone who has lived for almost sixty years and has had experience with drifted roads and water conditions, realizing that these conditions literally bring winter traffic to a standstill, one who has had experience facing these roads as a youngster going to school, who has literally driven oxen over three miles to school, followed by the era of horses, it has now come to the point where snow plowing for some time has been essential.

I think a resolution like this does have considerable appeal. The situation, as it exists today, with our cars, trucks, and our bus traffic, running all winter, it is even more vulnerable to winter weather than was old Dobbin.

I would like the members to let their minds run back only three days, and picture what would have happened had we had only two inches of loose snow last Saturday with the wind reaching sixty miles per hour, winds that covered the entire province.

I think that the resolution, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself, that it is intended as an emergency form of assistance, in its application to problems of school bus routes.

The mover, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) I think has made this abundantly clear. Such a fund is for the assistance in difficult and extreme situations where through lack of funds and heavy enough equipment for snow removal, the students are unable to attend school regularly because of the blocked conditions of the roads, and many students are losing valuable time from their school term, time which, I think we all realize, as parents, they cannot afford to lose. I would like to emphasize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are many areas, especially throughout the

north, where rural municipalities, L.I.D.'s, or local ratepayers have neither the funds nor the equipment to cope with these emergency conditions.

I am not speaking without experience, Mr. Speaker. For two years I have been plowing snow myself, and I find that the equipment I have is unable to cope with road conditions after they become blocked and have been plowed once or twice. So, in these cases where it seems impossible to have the roads open in time for the school buses, I would suggest that this resolution has real merit. I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding this resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Members of the Liberal party, year in and year out, while they were in opposition, advocated that something should be done in this province for snow removal to help our municipalities and our L.I.D.'s. Just as often as we made suggestions in estimates, or wherever the place might be, this group across the way, who were then the government, turned it down, refused to do anything, so I would find it very strange today if they should support this motion, moved by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) and seconded by the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff).

I do not know whether it was one of his seasons when this matter was discussed before, but as I say again, this government, all the years they were in office, refused to do one single thing to help the municipalities and L.I.D.'s. with snow removal.

Now, I can tell you that the government has this matter under consideration. We said in the last election campaign that we would do something about this problem, and we intend to do something about it. We cannot carry all our promises out overnight but we are doing pretty well at it, and I may tell the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) we are sympathetic to this principle. I am not saying whether we can move in the immediate future or not, but move we will. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Debate adjourned.

## SECOND READINGS

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved second reading of **Bill no. 30 — An Act to provide for the Appointment of Legislative Secretaries to Members of the Executive Council.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think I can, perhaps in five minutes, state what the government is trying to do in this particular bill. When introducing bill no. 30, providing for Legislative Secretaries, the government is placing before the house an innovation to our provincial administration.

We are proposing to appoint not more than six Legislative Secretaries to assist Cabinet Ministers with heavy portfolios. It is the suggestion that each will hold office during the calendar year and under the bill it will be possible for the government to rotate personnel from year to year if the government feels it is desirable. We are interested in establishing the policy that a number of members will have a turn at filling these positions.

As hon. members probably know, this practice has been used in many parliaments throughout the world. I am informed that the system originated in the British parliament, but it has been used in other parts of the continent, and at Ottawa, it has worked very satisfactorily for a long period of time.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're kidding.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It is our contention that the system would work the same way here in Regina

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — My hon. friends may laugh,

but the system worked very well and I am quite sure that if my hon. friends were ever fortunate enough to achieve power in Ottawa they would use the same system because I have certainly heard their members support the system in the House of Commons.

Section three of the bill, which is now before us, provides that a Secretary's duty shall be to assist the Minister in such manner as the Minister directs. At the present time the Minister in charge of a department is the only political officer in the department. As I say, Secretaries will be appointed in the department where the portfolio is heavy.

We think that a parliamentary assistant could relieve the Minister of many routine duties. Where the work-load faced by a Minister is extremely heavy, the time which is taken to perform these routine tasks would be better spent on more vital policy matters by the department's chief policy maker.

Legislative Secretaries assigned to a department could perform many of these secondary functions. A Secretary could assist the Minister in answering questions in the house and in aiding in the presentation of the legislative programs. They could lighten the burden placed on the Minister by speaking at various functions, where the Minister is called upon to attend. Deputations of citizens who come in, hour after hour, some days could be met by the parliamentary assistant.

I would point out that the former government had fifteen Cabinet Ministers. It is not the intention of the government to make these legislative appointments full time. However, each Secretary will be expected to keep in touch with his department fairly frequently each month throughout the whole year.

I contend that this system would have several major advantages to the government and to the people of Saskatchewan. First of all, I say again that the work-load of senior Ministers will be lightened; secondly, members will be given the opportunity of obtaining direct and intimate knowledge of the operation of the administration; thirdly, this system offers a valuable training ground for promising young members who are future cabinet material;

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Promising what?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Fourthly, an additional benefit of the bill is the fact that it will allow the government to bring members of the legislature from all parts of the province, one time or another, into the administration of the government.

The bill, as you will understand from reading it, provides for a salary of \$2,000 per year to be paid to the Legislative Secretary. I would point out that the total salary paid to all six Secretaries, if the government should appoint six, would not be as much as one Cabinet Minister. These assistants will not be provided with cars. However, provision is made for reasonable expenses for travelling. In the light of the valuable addition that these Legislative Secretaries would be to the administration of the public business, I suggest that the cost is nominal.

For the reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that any sensible member, on either side of the house, will want to support this particular motion.

So I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald), the second reading of bill no. 30.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, in the event that on examining this bill I find myself not one of the sensible members of the legislature, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.